

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**  
**800-521-0600**



**Account Vocabularies and Social Accountability:  
Constructing Social Reality in Decision-Making Talk**

**Theresa Rose Castor**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**University of Washington**

**1999**

**Program Authorized to Offer Degree: Speech Communication**

**UMI Number: 9952803**

**Copyright 2000 by  
Castor, Theresa Rose**

**All rights reserved.**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

**UMI Microform 9952803**

**Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.**

**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

## **Doctoral Dissertation**

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature *Shelley D. ...*  
Date 10/3/99


University of Washington  
Graduate School

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a doctoral dissertation by

Theresa Rose Castor


and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by the final  
examining committee have been made.

Chair of Supervisory Committee:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John Stewart

Reading Committee:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Valerie Manusov

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerry Philipsen

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John Stewart

Date: August 18, 1997

University of Washington

Abstract

**Account Vocabularies and Social Accountability:  
Constructing Social Reality in Decision-Making Talk**

Theresa Rose Castor

Chairperson of the Supervisory Committee:  
Professor John Stewart  
Department of Speech Communication

This project examines group decision-making as a social construction process. Few group decision-making theories view communication as constitutive of social reality, and those that do have not addressed the processual and situated nature of communication. Moreover, while the social constructionist perspective has been discussed a great deal in the communication literature (see Leeds-Hurwitz, 1995), few empirical studies have been published. I utilize Shotter's (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive social constructionist approach to address these gaps in the social constructionist and group decision-making literatures. I identify account vocabularies as a primary discursive site for the interactive negotiation of meaning, and apply Buttny's (1993) conversation analytic social constructionist methodology to describe account vocabularies. The decision-making cases analyzed here are from University of Washington Faculty Senate resolution discussions during the 1995-96 academic year. They concern the size of the Faculty Senate, a Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement, and alleged Faculty Code violations during the 1994-95 program elimination and review process. This examination illustrates how interlocutors' account vocabularies function in constructing decisions, identity, and notions of social accountability.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables .....	iii
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Literature Review .....	5
Conceptual Tools.....	19
Research Questions.....	27
Summary and Preview .....	28
<b>CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE .....</b>	<b>33</b>
The Social Constructionist Orientation.....	34
Accounts Analysis.....	48
Accounts, Decision-Making, and Social Constructionism .....	54
Summary .....	60
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD .....</b>	<b>62</b>
The Faculty Senate and its Functions .....	62
Method of Data Analysis.....	65
Summary .....	78
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: CONSTRUCTING FACULTY SENATE IDENTITY.....</b>	<b>80</b>
Resolution Background.....	81
Analysis .....	82
The Construction of Social Worlds .....	90
Summary .....	94
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: CONSTRUCTING UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTABILITY .....</b>	<b>96</b>
Resolution Background.....	97
Analysis .....	99
The Construction of Social Worlds .....	115
Summary .....	119
<b>CHAPTER SIX: CONSTRUCTING DECISIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.....</b>	<b>122</b>
Resolution Background.....	122

<b>Analysis</b> .....	123
<b>The Construction of Social Worlds</b> .....	142
<b>Summary</b> .....	146
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION</b> .....	149
<b>Research Questions</b> .....	150
<b>Contributions to Decision-Making</b> .....	160
<b>Contributions to Social Constructionism</b> .....	165
<b>Limitations</b> .....	170
<b>Future Research Directions</b> .....	171
<b>Concluding Remarks</b> .....	173
<b>References</b> .....	175
<b>Appendix A: Transcript of Discussion on Senate Size Reduction Resolution</b> .....	186
<b>Appendix B: Transcript of Discussion on the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement Resolution</b> .....	190
<b>Appendix C: Transcript of Second Discussion on the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement Resolution</b> .....	209
<b>Appendix D: Transcript of Discussion on Faculty Code Violations Resolution</b> ..	214

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. Distribution of Utterances for Senate Size Discussion.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>II. Distribution of Utterances for First CED Discussion.....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>III. Distribution of Utterances for Second CED Discussion.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>IV. Distribution of Utterances for Alleged Faculty Code Violations Discussion .....</b>	<b>124</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I feel very fortunate to have several wonderful friends and colleagues who have given me their support during my graduate studies and during the time it has taken me to complete this dissertation project. I would like to thank specifically the following individuals: Karen Williams for being a wonderful mentor and friend; Eric Aoki for providing me with unfailing support and quirky memories; Lisa Coutu for offering me her personal support and insightful advice; Carolyn Chow for her enthusiasm and midnight Denny's runs; and, Jennifer Peebles for helping in the last, crucial step of taking this dissertation to the Graduate School.

I would also like to thank and acknowledge my former colleagues from Wake Forest University who offered their support in helping me to complete my dissertation project. Specifically, I want to thank Dr. Michael Hazen for his consideration and concern as department chair in encouraging me in my dissertation work while I was a visiting faculty member in his department.

My colleagues at the College of William and Mary also assisted me in many ways to stay both disciplined and sane. Matthew Sobnosky helped to give me very practical dissertation writing advice while reminding me on an almost weekly basis to work toward completing my dissertation. While I did not talk directly with Tamara Burk about my dissertation, she served as an exemplary role model. I am especially grateful to the entire Department of Theatre and Speech (now, Theatre, Speech, and Dance) for their support of my dissertation work and for their personal support when my mother passed away unexpectedly.

Throughout the course of my doctorate graduate studies, Catherine White provided me with her support and friendship. Through our conversations, she helped me to push myself intellectually, philosophically, and academically. More importantly, she was there for me during both the good and bad times.

**My friendship with Jasmin Lambert at the College of William and Mary has been a blessing to me in many ways. She encouraged and cheered me on especially during the times in which I needed it most. Her confidence in me helped to restore my confidence in myself. Her faith helped to restore my faith. I also wish to thank Linda and Richard Revolinsky and the members of their Life Group and the other members of the Williamsburg Christian Life Center for their prayers and thoughts during the time I defended this dissertation.**

**While I was finishing my revisions and defending, the support and assistance of Patricia, Robert, and Isaac Covarrubias were invaluable to me in helping me with my revisions and with celebrating! I also appreciated the assistance of Beatrice Restoule, Mary Toepel, and Beth Berner from the office of the Department of Speech Communication at U.W.**

**The members of my dissertation reading committee helped me to grow intellectually in many different ways. I am thankful to Valerie Manusov for her personal support and assistance in helping me to articulate and support my arguments and to Gerry Philipsen who helped me in strengthening my arguments through his questions. I extend my greatest appreciation to my advisor, John Stewart, for his support of this project and for all of his efforts in helping me to complete my degree despite the distance of a continent that separated us for most of the time that I was writing this document.**

**Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank my family, James (Dad), Joseph, Joseph Jr., and Gina for their unfailing support and faith in me. I know that you have waited a long time, but thanks for your patience and understanding!**

**DEDICATION**

**In loving memory of my mother, Nancy (Hou Yeung) Castor**

**May 26, 1941- April 1, 1999**

*The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face shine upon you and be gracious to you; the Lord turn His face toward you and give you peace.*

**Numbers 6:24-26, NIV**

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Decision-making pervades society. With the help of decision-making processes, governments develop domestic and foreign policies; organizations decide on products to develop and market; schools make curricular decisions; and families decide how to spend their vacations. But decision-making involves more than just selecting a pre-defined course of action that is independent of the interactions of social actors. Decision-making involves defining choices during social interactions. The former perspective on decision-making as choosing a pre-defined course of action is akin to treating decisions as objects or tools that may be picked up and used at the preference of social actors. In the latter perspective on constructing choices during decision-making, speakers, in their discursive interactions, define their available options.

In this dissertation, I examine social constructing processes during decision-making. I apply a social constructionist perspective that has as its primary interest the understanding of how speakers “describe, explain, or otherwise account for the world” (Gergen, 1985, p. 3). Social constructionists assume that the very nature of speakers’ social worlds is constituted in speakers’ discursive practices during social interactions. These social worlds are historically and socially situated. I focus on account vocabularies or key terms and phrases in speakers’ justifications for particular choices. Account vocabularies are a key discursive site in which speakers’ socially negotiate meaning.

Carbaugh's (1995) description of how an ethnography of communication approach contributes to the analysis of decision-making also describes the contribution of a social constructionist perspective to the study of decision-making:

The [projects] posed here are efforts to suggest that what a person (or 'self') is, that whether a person can and should 'make decisions', that how the person conceives of actions, and similar 'things' or processes, can all be conceived as deriving from particular discursive formations [italics added]. . . Moving the site of one's thinking about decision-making from the inside of the person outwards suggests that one explore the social and cultural dimensions of this discursive process. (p. 137)

This project, like the one described by Carbaugh, focuses on decision-making not as a process occurring in the inner-psyche of the individual but one carried out in the discursive nexus between people. The result of this move is that decision-making talk is viewed not as a conduit for conveying information but as a site in which, as they make decisions, speakers shape their social worlds. By examining group decision-making talk from a social constructionist perspective, this project provides insight into the discursive negotiation of problematic events, identity, and social accountability.

Through the application of a constructionist perspective, I treat decision-making discourse as both indicative and constitutive of social reality.<sup>1</sup> By calling attention to the social constructionist implications of talk during decision-making, the perspective on decision-making I advocate may help social actors to become more

aware of how their discursive practices constitute the choices available to them. Participants may be better able to challenge or expand their choices by gaining greater awareness of this facet of decision-making. As Penman (1992) states,

If there are elements of our condition that are kept rationally invisible or are only incipient in our practices, then our communication has an impoverished representation of what could be possible. This in turn limits our options and opportunities. (p. 241)

Within this project, I seek to develop social constructionist procedures for helping to make explicit the implications of speakers' taken for granted discursive practices in decision-making.

A social constructionist analysis also can assist speakers who wish to participate in decision-making by sensitizing them to the particular, local nature of the discourse of a decision-making group. Shotter (1993a, 1993b) argues that ways of speaking are constrained by a dominant ideology. When a speaker knows how to speak from within a dominant ideology, he or she may be recognized as being accountable and thus may be enabled to participate within the dominant discourse of a decision-making situation as a legitimate voice.

Through this project I also seek to make a contribution to social constructionist research in communication. Social constructionist writing in communication has tended to be conceptual and in this respect has functioned to help lay the groundwork for the approach to decision-making I take here. I contribute to the work in social

constructionism by providing an example of one way to apply social constructionist theorizing to analyzing discourse in a naturalistic setting.

The primary objective of this project is to describe how communication practices during decision making function as social construction processes. The general research question I address in this dissertation is:

How do speakers construct social reality in their decision-making talk?

I deliberately pose this as a “how” question to be consistent with a social constructionist position. As Leeds-Hurwitz (1995) explains,

social approaches [which includes social constructionism] are first and foremost social. That is they describe events occurring between people in the process of interacting rather than reporting how events are perceived through a single person’s understanding. . . . A social approach is less likely to focus on why they do this (which would be a cognitive question) than on how they do it (an interactional question). (p. 6)

In asking a “how” question, I seek to describe the communication practices with which speakers engage in reality constructing processes. I analyze naturally-occurring decision-making discourse to describe how, in joint interactions, interlocutors construct aspects of their social realities. Decision-making is treated as a site in which notions of reality, such as the meaning of a decision or of the organization, may be defined and contested in the discursive interactions of speakers. In this project, I describe what

social realities are implicated in speakers' communication practices in order to better understand the interactional processes that function to shape those social worlds.

### Literature Review

Previous theorizing has been useful in providing insight into decision-making by discussing general communication processes. However, many of these theories have largely ignored the socially situated nature of decision-making discourse or communication praxis. As Williams (1973) notes,

What [the hu]man experiences through communicating is 'things becoming what they are' between self and other. Such experience is not simply and variously designative, or appraisive, or imperative, but always formative.

(p. 241)

I describe the formative nature of communication in the context of decision-making situations. Within this literature review, I first define key concepts relevant to my research site of decision making and then situate this project in relation to other theoretical perspectives on communication and group decision-making.

### Definitions

In group decision-making literature, a decision traditionally has been defined as "a choice from among available alternatives that is validated by achieving consensus among members" (Ellis & Fisher, 1994, p. 307), and decision-making is defined as "the process of choosing among alternatives for which no 'best' or 'correct' answer can be validated by any means other than group consensus" (Ellis & Fisher, 1994, p. 307). A

decision is thus often viewed as the product of a group's deliberations, and decision-making describes the interactions of a group that lead to a decision.

Rather than adopt the traditional definition of decision-making, however, I rely on Cohen, March, and Olsen's (1972) definition of decision-making as a "choice-making opportunity" (p. 2). Cohen et al.'s conceptualization of decision-making was developed to describe decision-making in a university setting which is also the setting for this project. According to Cohen et al., decision-making in universities is characterized by fluid participation, ambiguous technologies, and indeterminate goals.

#### Decision-Making Theoretical Perspectives

Decision making theories in the field of communication have been reviewed recently by Poole and Hirokawa (1986, 1996) and Frey (1996), both of whose efforts I draw upon for this overview. Poole and Hirokawa (1986, 1996) describe two general perspectives on the relationship between communication and decision-making: (a) communication as a medium, and (b) communication as constitutive.

In the former perspective, communication is treated as an instrument for mediating the actual significant factors in decision-making such as traits, knowledge, task characteristics, etc. From this perspective, factors other than communication are deemed to be of greater importance in the task of decision-making, and communication is treated as a channel or conduit of information. This perspective treats communication representationally as a reflection of other phenomena. Poole and Hirokawa (1996) explain that:

To regard communication as a medium is to place the main emphasis on factors or processes other than communication per se in the explanation of decisions.

Two sets of factors are invoked to explain decision behavior and outcomes: (1) factors describing the inputs into and context of the decision, such as group size, group composition, members' preferences, or task type; and (2) factors determining the nature of interaction processes in the group, such as group polarization or leadership style. (p. 7)

In the communication as a medium perspective, talk is viewed as a resource for analyzing other, more important features of decision-making rather than as a topic for study in its own right.<sup>2</sup>

Poole and Hirokawa's (1996) second perspective on the relationship between communication and decision-making views communication as constructing reality in two ways:

(1) Through communication, the form and content of decisions are worked out.

Decisions can be viewed as emerging texts or developing ideas, and we can trace the communicative processes of [for example] accumulation, deletion, elaboration, and the alteration of premises. (2) At a more fundamental level, decisions are social products, embedded in "social reality" (Cooley, 1962).

Communication processes are the primary means through which social realities are created and sustained and therefore are the prerequisites for making decisions. (Poole & Hirokawa, 1996, p. 8)

This approach is consistent with a social constructionist perspective and is the perspective on communication and group decision making adopted for this project. Decision-making is treated as an interactional process in which speakers' communication practices shape meaning.

In the following sub-sections, I focus on the main approaches that make up the communication as constitutive approach (Poole & Hirokawa, 1996). I do not address the communication as medium perspective that includes theories such as Gouran and Hirokawa's Functional Theory (Gouran & Hirokawa, 1996) and Bales' (1951) Interaction Process Analysis. These theories are descriptive of communication based on a priori categories of the functions that communication fulfill and are not descriptive of communication as meaningful within particular situations.

I review instead the theoretical perspectives that, according to Poole and Hirokawa (1996), make up the "communication as constitutive" approach and focus my efforts on clarifying how the approach I advocate in this project makes a unique contribution to the understanding of communication as constitutive in group decision-making. The three main theories that make up the constitutive approach are Symbolic Convergence Theory, Structuration Theory, and the Bona Fide Group approach (Poole & Hirokawa, 1986). I review theoretical statements and overviews written by key scholars of these theories, because my project is based on advocating a new theoretical perspective of communication in group decision-making.

**Symbolic Convergence Theory. Symbolic Convergence Theory (SCT) was first presented in the 1970's by Ernest Bormann (see Bormann, Cragan, & Shields, 1994).**

**SCT is based on the assumption that**

**shared fantasies provide group members with comprehensible forms for explaining their past and thinking about their future--a basis for communication and group consciousness. (Bormann, 1985, p. 128)**

**SCT helps to describe the common "fantasy themes" that group members share and the meanings of those themes. According to Bormann (1985), fantasy themes may influence both the decision-making of a group and the decision. Fantasy themes may also influence the norms or procedures with which a group makes decisions (Bormann, 1996). When group members share a common fantasy theme, the group also converges on a common decision.**

**Symbolic Convergence Theory has three goals:**

**(a) discovery of the way communicative forms and practices evolve into structured patterns that create shared consciousness, (b) description of the dynamics of people sharing group fantasies, and (c) explanation of why people share group fantasies. (Putnam, Van Hoeven, & Bullis, 1991, p. 87)**

**Within Symbolic Convergence Theory, "fantasy" refers to "the creative and imaginative shared interpretation of events that fulfills a group psychological or rhetorical need" (Bormann, 1985, p. 129). Fantasies may deal with actual past events or events**

reported to have happened for the group (Bormann, 1985). Bormann (1983) explains that a fantasy theme

consists of a dramatizing message in which characters enact an incident or a series of incidents in a setting somewhere other than the here-and-now of the people involved in the communication episode. Fantasy themes are often narratives about living people or historic personages, about an envisioned future. (p. 107)

When groups evoke a fantasy theme, they refer to a story, either true or fictitious, that is familiar to group members. The power of the fantasy theme is in its calling forth of common understandings and the common history of a group.

While there may be several fantasy themes that arise in a group, not all will be accepted by a group. According to Bormann (1986), the three factors that explain why a group accepts a particular fantasy consist of the predispositions of individuals, the shared concerns of a group, and the rhetorical skill of group members in communicating their fantasies.

Symbolic Convergence Theory also provides an explanation of how decision-making occurs. As Bormann (1986) states, SCT “explains the creation and development of a group culture and then indicates how that evolving culture interacts with the task dimension to shape the communication processes of decision-making” (p. 219). Groups may share fantasies regarding how decisions should be made, what counts as evidence and reasoning, and how problems should be solved.

**Bormann (1986) provides some examples to illustrate the relationship between group fantasies and decision-making:**

**A quality circle or involvement team in a business organization whose predominant shared fantasies are mastery stories will tend to make decisions with an eye to how these will affect their power to control their own fate and the fate of others. The team whose predominant fantasies are achievement dramas will direct its attention to solving problems involving productivity and quality. (p. 234)**

**Fantasies regarding group identity and group consciousness affect both how groups makes decisions and the decisions they make.**

**From the perspective of Symbolic Convergence Theory, group fantasies are analyzed through fantasy theme analysis. Bormann (1986) specifies that in applying fantasy theme analysis, a researcher must reconstruct fantasy episodes through interviews or written records. From this data, fantasy theme analysis is then based on the identification of recurring narratives. This repetition of stories is used as “evidence of symbolic convergence” (Bormann, 1986, p. 227).**

**As a constitutive approach to decision-making, Symbolic Convergence Theory explains decision-making as occurring when a group comes to share in a common fantasy that it connects communicatively to its present circumstances. In sharing common fantasies, group members develop a common identity and consciousness. The communication of fantasies functions to constitute the shared social reality of a group.**

The fantasies of a group also, in turn, affect both the decision-making and decisions of a group.

As I clarify below, there are three main limitations of Symbolic Convergence Theory which are addressed through the perspective I apply. First, Symbolic Convergence Theory examines exclusively speakers' fantasies, and I believe it can be shown that social construction processes occur in other communication practices, especially account vocabularies. Second, SCT focuses on individual reconstructions of fantasies rather than on interaction in context. Third, SCT is descriptive mainly of a group's dominant fantasy themes leaving unexplored the significance of multiple and possibly competing social realities.

Structuration Theory. Structuration Theory is drawn from Giddens' (1976, 1984) work in sociology and is based on the premise that societal structures are produced and re-produced in social interaction. The basic unit of analysis in Structuration Theory is the social practices of a group. According to Poole, Seibold, and McPhee (1986), the first proposition of a Structuration Theory approach is that human actions should be understood based on their meaning to group members.

Poole, Seibold, and McPhee's (1986) second proposition distinguishes between system and structure with an emphasis on the latter. System is defined as "observable patterns of behavior and institution," whereas structure is defined as the "unobservable rules and resources used to generate the system" (p. 245). Structures are inferred from observable behaviors and refer to the rules and resources for social practices. The goal

of Structuration Theory is to describe the “rules and resources involved in the production and reproduction of social systems” (Frey, 1996, p. 34).

Structuration Theory links social practices with societal institutions by describing how actors appropriate structures from institutions in the process of legitimizing conduct. Structuration Theory takes into consideration both the “micro” and “macro” features of social interaction by examining both the communication practices of social actors and how those practices are constrained by societal institutions.

In applying Structuration Theory to decision-making, researchers describe the rules that social actors both use and reproduce in their interactions. Poole, Seibold, and McPhee (1996) describe two lines of structuration research. The first line applies “adaptive structuration theory” to computer mediated group decision-making, and the second line focuses on the structures underlying arguments. Both lines of structuration research study interactions among group members. However, both lines of research describe general characteristics of decision-making, as opposed to the particular social realities of groups, or, to use phrasing from Structuration Theory, the particular systems which speakers produce and reproduce in their interactions.

Within the first line of research, scholars have focused on demonstrating that interaction is important for group decision-making without describing the content or specific structures that are re-produced in those interactions. In the second line of research, Seibold and Meyers (1986) describe the various argument structures used in

group decision-making by relating these arguments to other schemes such as Toulmin's (1969), Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's (1969), and Jackson and Jacobs' (1980) schemes of interpersonal arguments. These studies describe argument structure rather than how groups create and re-create particular structures and what those particular structures are.

When applied to the analysis of how communication is constitutive of decisions, a structuration perspective describes group interactions as structures discerned through group interaction. Group decisions within this approach are described by identifying the structure of a group's discussion during decision-making. Structuration Theory is an important contribution to the communication as constitutive approach in that studies conducted using this perspective highlight the importance of interaction in decision-making. Further, Structuration Theory has been used to show how communicative interactions are embedded within other, broader structures. Below I describe how a social constructionist perspective can contribute to a structuration approach by describing the group specific realities which are implicated during decision-making.

Bona Fide Groups Perspective. Putnam and Stohl's (1990, 1996) Bona Fide Groups perspective highlights the complex relations both within and between groups in natural contexts. Putnam and Stohl review field studies of small groups to describe two main characteristics of bona fide or naturalistic groups: (1) stable, yet permeable boundaries, and (2) interdependence with the immediate context. These characteristics highlight how a Bona Fide Groups perspective does not merely entail studying groups

in situ but also includes attention to the relationship between a group and its context and communication occurring outside of the immediate group setting. In other words, groups are not to be treated as “containers” but as embedded within a context.

Putnam and Stohl (1996) argue that in order to study the “permeable and fluid boundaries” of a group, communication scholars should examine how

group members change, redefine, and negotiate their borders through (a) multiple group membership and conflicting role identities, (b) representative roles,

(c) fluctuations in membership, and (d) group identity formation. (p. 150)

Putnam and Stohl specify that a group is “interdependent with [its] immediate context” through intergroup communication, coordinated actions among groups, negotiation of jurisdiction or autonomy, and interpretations or frames for making sense of intergroup relationships. In these ways, a group negotiates its boundaries and identity in relation to factors outside of the group.

Putnam and Stohl’s (1996) encouragement of a Bona Fide Groups perspective is significant for this project for two reasons. First, the authors point out that few studies, 13% of the 96 studies published in the 1980s (from Cragan & Wright, 1990), were conducted in organizational and applied settings. This dissertation project will contribute to the understanding of decision-making interactions in a naturalistic, organizational setting. Second,

although there are numerous studies of groups in organizations (see Jablin & Sussman, 1983, for a thorough review), only a small proportion of them examine the internal dynamics of the group. (Putnam & Stohl, 1990, p. 251)

This research project addresses the gaps noted by Putnam and Stohl (1990) by examining decision-making discourse in an organizational and applied setting and by describing the “internal dynamics of the group.”

Summary and Critique. Poole and Hirokawa’s distinction between communication-as-medium and communication-as-constitutive provides a useful framework for describing the relationship between communication and decision making. In this review, I focused on theories with a constitutive orientation to describe how the communication-as-constitutive approaches have contributed to a particular understanding of group decision-making. Although this area parallels many of the goals and assumptions of a social constructionist perspective, this project builds upon and adds to past constitutive research.

Symbolic Convergence Theory, like this project, helps researchers to describe social construction processes during decision-making. However, Symbolic Convergence Theory researchers use fantasy themes exclusively as their unit of analysis and ignore how other communication, such as speakers’ accounting practices, contributes to reality construction processes. In this way, Symbolic Convergence Theory presents an incomplete picture of actual decision-making processes.

As described by Bormann (1986), Symbolic Convergence Theory analyzes individual reconstructions of fantasies, as opposed to naturally-occurring, face-to-face interaction. Although individual reconstructions provide insight into the meaning of decisions, these reconstructions do not describe taken for granted meanings and constraints on how speakers actually participate in decision-making. In describing how meaning is constructed interactively and situationally, researchers and decision-makers may become more aware of decision-making as a locally situated practice and also become aware of how subjectivity is involved throughout the entire process of decision-making.

Third, SCT privileges the dominant fantasy theme thus limiting the description of decision-making to a single, dominant theme. In this project, I take into consideration the multiplicity of social realities that may be implicated during decision-making. The social constructionist perspective I take assumes that reality construction is a negotiative process in which social reality is constructed and sustained by speakers commenting or responding to others' accounts. This examination of the multiplicity of realities created during decision-making lends greater insight into the complexities of decision-making.

Especially because they employ quantitative data primarily, structuration analyses of communication and group decision-making do not actually describe the specific "structures" as defined by Giddens (1993) that are produced and reproduced in a group's decision-making activity. As Giddens (1993) himself suggests, "social

research has a necessarily cultural, ethnographic or ‘anthropological’ aspect to it” (p. 152). As an example of this type of research, Giddens (1993) cites Willis’ ethnography of working-class school children in Birmingham, England. Giddens highlights how, in their everyday communication practices, school boys produce and reproduce their own social structures that are resistant to the dominant discourse and structures of the school system. However, structuration research on decision making has not utilized qualitative research methods and has ignored effectively the content or substance of decision-making talk, and in this respect it fails to describe the socially-situated and context-based features of decision-making communication.

This project, in contrast to the previous structuration research on decision-making, foregrounds the description of specific communication practices in context. I describe how speakers construct their social worlds discursively as a way of understanding decision-making as a situated practice. The analysis of meaning in decision-making from a social constructionist approach is better able to provide an understanding of decision-making that is context specific as opposed to the general descriptions of decision-making described by Structuration Theory researchers.

The Bona Fide Groups perspective and the perspective advanced in this paper are complementary. This study contributes to the analysis of bona fide groups by analyzing decision-making discourse and the internal dynamics of a natural group. This project differs from Putnam and Stohl’s (1990, 1996) work because I do not examine directly the interactions between the group being studied and other groups. However,

Putnam and Stohl do not provide guidelines on how to analyze within group interactions. Hence, this study contributes to the Bona Fide Groups approach by advancing specific conceptual tools for analyzing a group's internal interactions.

In sum, this study complements the work of Symbolic Convergence Theory through the analysis of a communication phenomenon different from fantasy themes, specifically, accounting practices. This project extends the work of Structuration Theory by focusing on the description of speakers' local communication practices. By studying a naturalistic group and its communicative practices, this study will contribute to the analysis of Bona Fide Groups. Overall, this project contributes to decision making research by examining speakers' local communicative practices in decision making and how those practices function to construct particular social realities for that group. In other words, it is one thing to know that decision-making consists of speakers discussing the pros and cons of a solution. It is another matter to understand what, for a community, constitutes a pro or con. By describing what social realities speakers construct, through this project I provide insight into how particular communication practices function to shape those social realities.

### Conceptual Tools

The approach taken in this project primarily appropriates concepts from Shotter's (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive version of social constructionism. The sensitizing or focusing concepts I utilize are accounts, utterance, ideology, and account vocabularies. I use these concepts to help focus on particular aspects of the socially

constructive nature of decision-making discourse. In the following sub-sections, I describe how, during decision-making, speakers' accounts function to justify particular choices. These accounts also implicate particular aspects of social reality. I also address how the concept of accountability highlights accounts as responsive to a particular social and cultural context.

### Accounting

For this project, I analyze the specific communication practice of accounting. Scott and Lyman (1968) describe an account as "a linguistic device employed whenever an action is subject to valuative inquiry" (p. 46). Shotter (1984) explains the situated nature of accounting practices by stating that:

In accounting for ourselves we must always meet the demands placed upon us by our status as responsible members of our society, that is, we must talk in ways that are both intelligible and legitimate to others, in ways that make sense to them and relate to interests in which they can share. (p. 168)

Accounts are justifications for actions, and in accounting, people try to show themselves to be moral and responsible individuals in ways which, by definition, are also socially constrained. Within decision-making, speakers present accounts that "may [describe] events in certain sorts of ways that account for, justify, excuse, or legitimate action or behavior" (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 100). It is in this process of describing events in particular ways that speakers' accounts also function to construct

social reality (Buttny, 1993). In Chapter Two, I discuss in more specific detail the relationship between accounts, social constructionism, and decision-making.

### Utterances

One challenge of analyzing accounts is the identification of accounts in discourse. In other words, where does an account begin and end in a speaker's talk? A unit of analysis that is useful for analyzing talk and speakers' accounts is the utterance. Shotter (1993a) defines the utterance by drawing on Mikhail Bakhtin's writings.

Bakhtin (1986) characterizes utterances by making a distinction between language and speech communication. Bakhtin argues that language, as it has been conceptualized previously, is acontextual in that it does not include the actual circumstances of language-use. In contrast, with the concept of speech communication, the researcher pays attention to the fact that when:

the listener perceives and understands the meaning (the language meaning) of speech, he simultaneously takes an active, responsive attitude toward it. . . .

Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive, although the degree of this activity varies extremely. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or another: the listener becomes the speaker. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 68)

When researchers describe utterances, they must also describe the context of the utterance's existence. When an utterance is spoken, the speaker presupposes an active

listener who can respond to that utterance. Utterances are formulated to be responsive within particular contexts and to specific listeners. Both Bakhtin (1986) and Shotter (1993a) call for the analysis of the utterance as a unit whose meaning is contingent upon its context of occurrence.

Bakhtin (1986) also argues that the utterance is a “real unit of speech communication” (p. 71). As Bakhtin states, “the boundaries of each concrete utterance as a unit of speech communication are determined by a change of speaking subjects, that is, a change of speakers” (pp. 71-72).

An utterance is understood as meaningful in relation to other speakers’ previous and anticipated utterances. Utterances are also delineated or distinguished by a change in speaking turns. In this way,

utterances are not understood referentially, but also responsively, that is, not by listeners coming to possess the same ideas as speakers, but in terms of an answering response such as affirmation, disagreement, puzzlement, elaboration, application, etc. (Shotter, 1993a, p. 180)

The concept of the utterance highlights the social and historical context in which speech communication occurs. When speakers talk, it is in response to a situation, to previous speakers’ utterances, and to future, anticipated utterances.

### Ideology

Bakhtin’s (1986) and Shotter’s (1993a) conceptualizations of the utterance recognize the significance of ideology in communication practices. Specifically, one

feature of utterances is that they “have their meaning within . . . a way of speaking associated with a form of social life with a ‘history’ to it” (Shotter, 1993a, p. 180). One consequence of this feature is that not all responses are considered responsive. Instead, what counts as responsive is based on a community’s designated, appropriate ways of speaking within a given situation. Shotter (1993a) also argues that:

our ‘selves,’ are produced in our ‘official’ ways of interrelating ourselves to each other--these are the terms in which we are socially accountable in our society (Shotter, 1984)--and these ‘traditional’ or ‘basic’ (dominant) ways of talking are productive of our ‘tradition’ or ‘basic’ psychological and social ontologies. (p. 180)

Participation in the dominant discourses of society entails not just speaking but knowing a particular way of speaking which is recognized as being “socially accountable.” These specific ways of speaking contribute to a society’s conceptualization of what it means to be a person (psychological ontology) and to relate to others (social ontology).

The concept of accounting also connects utterances and ideology. In accounting practices (which consist of utterances), speakers show that they are responsible members of society by being able to participate in the discourse of a dominant ideology. Speakers’ accounts must demonstrate that they are responsible and moral individuals.

Accounting, in order to be considered responsive, is also constrained by ideology. As Shotter (1984) describes,

besides enabling accountable action, such procedures also work to constrain members in what they can say and do. They put limits upon their behaviour, for people must talk and act only in ways which are intelligible and legitimate within their society, and which are appropriate to their momentary position (or status) as the persons they are within it.<sup>3</sup> (p. 173)

In order to be viewed as accountable, responsible, and moral participants, speakers' accounts are limited by the mores of a given community.

In Shotter's (1984) view, accounting both enables and constrains speakers. In accounting in socially acceptable ways, speakers are enabled to participate in society; however, at the same time, speakers are constrained in that, to be considered accountable, they must speak in appropriate ways.

### Account Vocabularies

The final and most important conceptual tool utilized in this study is that of vocabularies of accounts. The concept of account vocabularies is central to this project in that while accounts describe "how" speakers socially construct reality, or the interactional processes involved, vocabularies embody "what" social reality is implicated. Vocabularies provide an understanding of what identities and notions of socially accountability are implicated in speakers' discourse.

I take the concept of vocabulary from Mills' (1975) writings on "vocabulary of motives" (also see Buttny, 1993; Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Hopper, 1993; Shotter, 1984). According to Coffey and Atkinson (1996), a vocabulary includes terms in speakers' discourse that "produce coherent and plausible accounts of social events and social action." As Brewer (1990) describes, vocabularies may consist of words or phrases that function to provide organizing principles to make sense of a given event or situation.

Accounting practices and vocabularies of motives are related in that, as Coffey and Atkinson (1996) describe,

social actors also draw on particular sorts of vocabularies in order to account for their social actions. Mills (1940) refers to these particular sorts of rhetorical devices as "vocabularies of motive." Certain types of vocabulary and speech devices can be used to produce coherent and plausible accounts [italics added] of social events and social action. (p. 100)

In explaining or accounting for one's actions or choices, according to Coffey and Atkinson (1996), speakers utilize certain vocabularies that are acceptable to their broader community.

Not only do particular vocabularies help to order events and social action, they also function to demonstrate the social accountability of speakers. As Shotter (1984) states,

they [speakers] have a duty to act in ways which are not only intelligible, but which make sense in other kinds of ways also. They must make reference to the 'vocabulary of motives' (Mills, 1940) current in their society at the time. (p. 5)

Buttny (1993) provides one example of a vocabulary by describing how terms such as "assessment," "failure," "offense," "blame," and "responsibility" constitute the notion of social accountability within society. As Buttny states, "this vocabulary, and the interrelations among its terms constitutes the ways we think about, structure, and finally evaluate, our own and others' actions" (pp. 7-8). Brewer (1990) provides a second example when he describes how the phrase "when your number's up, it's up" is used as a fatalistic organizing vocabulary among British soldiers in Northern Ireland.

In articulating certain account vocabularies, speakers define events or actions in particular ways. Account vocabularies also provide insight into the broader cultural mores of a group that include issues of identity and social accountability. For these reasons, account vocabularies are an important unit of analysis.

Within this section, I described the various sensitizing devices I use to examine the social construction processes in decision-making. During decision-making, speakers may provide accounts for their choices. In ongoing interactions, I identify accounts by examining utterances or a speaker's talk during his or her conversational turn. I focus specifically on describing how speakers discursively negotiate the meanings of account vocabularies during the course of decision-making. The

interactive constructing of these account vocabularies also has implications for defining specific aspects of social reality.

### **Research Questions**

The main purpose of this study is to describe how speakers' account vocabularies function to socially construct reality during decision-making. Buttny's (1993) accounts perspective is used as a guiding framework by describing certain utterances in decision making as accounts in that during decision making, group members may provide accounts or justifications for their choices.

As stated earlier, the overarching research question for this project is:

**RQ1: How do speakers construct social reality in their decision-making talk?**

In applying the concept of vocabulary to accounts, I examine the categories of meaning of social reality implicated in some speakers' accounts. These categories of meaning define a particular social reality relevant for the decision-making process. Based on my preliminary analysis of data and research proposal development, I have identified meanings of the decision, identity, and social accountability as being the prominent aspects of social reality which speakers address during decision-making. The subsequent research questions focus on these three areas to describe in more specific detail how speakers' discursive practices define each of these topics.

**RQ2: What are the vocabularies of accounts presented by speakers during decision-making?**

**RQ3: What meanings of decisions do these account vocabularies implicate?**

**RQ4: What conceptualizations of identity do these account vocabularies implicate?**

**RQ5: What conceptualizations of social accountability are implicated by these vocabularies of accounts?**

### **Summary and Preview**

**Social constructionism itself is not a new perspective. In conducting this dissertation project, however, I show how a social constructionist perspective may be utilized in the analysis of talk during decision-making. There are also a number of contributions to the study of group decision-making that this project makes from a social constructionist perspective.**

**First, I contribute to the understanding of decision-making by examining how decisions themselves are defined and socially negotiated during the course of decision-making through speakers' accounting practices. My analysis demonstrates how discourse in decision-making and, in turn, decisions themselves, are matters of local convention. When talk during decision-making is viewed as socially and culturally situated, researchers, decision-makers, and would-be participants in decision-making may gain better knowledge of how decisions and decision-making itself is shaped by culturally-situated knowledge and taken for granted meanings of events and situations.**

**Second, although I have stated that social constructionism is not a new perspective, it is still developing within the field of communication (see Leeds-Hurwitz, 1995). I conduct an empirical project using a social constructionist perspective to**

demonstrate how this perspective can be utilized in practice rather than just in concept. In doing this, I contribute to the theoretical understanding of how specific communication practices function in social construction processes and the implications of those communication practices for group identity. My project provides one example of and a set of guidelines for applying social constructionist assumptions to empirical data.

In the next chapter I discuss the metatheoretical and epistemological assumptions of social constructionism in greater detail. In doing this, I make explicit and provide a justification for the type of claims regarding decision-making that I make in my data analyses. Chapter Two also provides reviews of extant perspectives on accounts in order to differentiate the conceptualization of accounts used in this project from other conceptualizations. I also describe Shotter's Rhetorical-Responsive Approach as the main perspective used within this project. Shotter's perspective ties together the assumptions of social constructionism with an accounts analysis of decision-making discourse.

In Chapter Three, I discuss my research methodology by providing background on the context of this study--a university faculty senate. This chapter also discusses my procedures for analyzing and interpreting my data through the use of Buttny's (1993) conversation analytic social constructionist method.

In Chapters Four, Five, and Six, I analyze three case studies of decision-making discourse, each of which occurred in the University of Washington Faculty Senate.

These cases include the Senate's discussion of the following topic: reduction of the size of the Faculty Senate, the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement, and Faculty Code violations during a program elimination and review process. The case study in Chapter Four helps to illustrate how, during the process of decision-making, Senators define their organization and what it means to be a participant in the Faculty Senate. The case study in Chapter Five describes the Faculty Senate's decision about whether to implement a Culture and Ethnic Diversity (CED) requirement for undergraduate students. During the discussion of this resolution, Senators define what actions a socially accountable university should take. The third case study in Chapter Six illustrates how during decision-making, Senators construct decisional responsibility by defining a past event, the Senate, and rules of appropriate behavior for the Senate.

The concluding chapter summarizes how a social constructionist perspective can provide insight into decision-making through the description of the social and cultural worlds that are implicated during decision-making processes. Specifically, by viewing communication in decision-making as constitutive rather than as a medium, decision-making researchers and practitioners can gain a greater understanding of the significance of local knowledge for participating in and understanding how decisions are made.

## End Notes

<sup>1</sup> While it may seem contradictory to state that discourse is both indicative of and constitutive of social reality, this view is consistent with the social constructionist orientations of Gergen (1994) and Shotter (1993a). Both of these social constructionist scholars argue that reality construction occurs as social actors interact. However, both acknowledge that reality construction is also constrained by historical and cultural circumstances. In stating that discourse is indicative of social reality, I recognize the constrained nature of the construction of social reality. In stating that discourse is constitutive, I highlight how interlocutors sustain or negotiate discursively social reality as they interact.

<sup>2</sup> The distinction between talk as a “resource” versus talk as a “topic” is one frequently made by ethnomethodologists. As Atkinson (1988) describes:

Introducing the distinction between topic and resource, he [Sacks (1963)] argued that conventional sociological descriptions were confounded with commonsensical cultural knowledge which remained tacit. The charge, then, was that unexplicated resources were drawn on. Sacks contrasted that state of affairs with an ideal science which aims to produce a literal description of its subject matter. Ethnomethodologists claimed subsequently to have expunged the flaws of conventional sociology by topicalizing unexplicated resources.

**Tacit cultural knowledge was to be brought to consciousness and transformed into the topic of inquiry. (p. 452-453)**

**By treating talk as a resource, the cultural nature of discourse is ignored. However, when talk is treated as a topic in and of itself, researchers examine how talk is “problematic” in that what speakers say draws from “tacit cultural knowledge” which is made explicit by the researcher.**

**<sup>3</sup> Shotter’s (1984) discussion of constraints could be interpreted, as one reviewer noted, as expressing a deterministic or normative position. However, Shotter’s purpose in describing language practices as both constrained and enabled is to make explicit and challenge the constraints on members of society. As Shotter (1984) states,**

**If our ways of talking are limited in any way, then our understanding and experience of ourselves and our reality will, by the same token, be limited also. It is in particular the issue of ‘entrapment’ (Stolzenberg, 1978; see also the Epilogue to this book), or ‘trained incapacity’ (as Veblen called it) that concerns me here; the fact that our current ways of sense-making prevent us from experiencing and understanding certain aspects of ourselves. (pp. 173-174).**

**Shotter calls attention to constraints in order to challenge those constraints and to expand the range of actions possible.**

## **CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE**

**Social constructionism is a paradigm or way of viewing the world and not a specific theory per se. Semin (1990) states that**

**The social-constructionist orientation consists of a policy statement. It suggests a very specific way of looking at social reality (cf. Gergen, 1985). The important point about this is that a social-constructionist orientation in general does not specify a systematic theoretical framework with a corresponding methodology (cf. Coulter, 1983). These aspects have to be worked out in detail independently.**  
**(p. 151)**

**Although social constructionism has been developed in many diverse ways, social constructionists do subscribe to common metatheoretical assumptions as articulated by Gergen (1985; see also Burr, 1995).**

**The general purpose of this chapter is to describe in greater detail the theoretical orientation of this project and how this perspective contributes to an understanding of group decision-making. I first describe the general assumptions of social constructionism by focusing on the four main metatheoretical assumptions discussed by Gergen (1985). After describing the general social constructionist orientation, I address some key assumptions of Shotter's (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive approach, the primary perspective of this project, as it is critical for understanding how a social constructionist perspective is applied in this project.**

The metatheoretical assumptions of social constructionism intertwine with social constructionist epistemological assumptions. The epistemological assumptions of this type of research implicate what counts as data, what type of analyses are conducted of data, what type of claims are made regarding data, and how data relate to a broader social constructionist understanding of communication. These epistemological assumptions are discussed in order to make explicit how social constructionist research claims should be evaluated, because this process differs from that commonly subscribed to in postpositivist research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

In the latter portions of this chapter, I review extant perspectives on accounts in order to distinguish Shotter's perspective on accounts from other perspectives. I also discuss the assumptions of a social constructionist approach to accounts analysis in decision-making.

I will use the terms "constructionism" and "social constructionism" to describe the general perspective adopted in this project. Like Burr (1995), I avoid the term "constructivism" because of its use to describe Piagetian theory and a particular type of perceptual or cognitive theory.

### **The Social Constructionist Orientation**

Gergen's (1985) description is often used to characterize the social constructionist perspective:

Social constructionism is principally concerned with elucidating the processes by which people come to describe, explain, or otherwise account for the world in

which they live. It attempts to vivify common forms of understanding as they now exist, as they have existed in prior historical periods, and as they might exist should creative attention be so directed. (p. 3-4)

Social constructionists analyze and interpret social reality as it is discursively defined by social actors. According to this orientation, humans exist in an inherently social world in that events, objects, situations, relationships, etc. are constituted as meaningful in social interactions. Reality constructing is an ongoing process which occurs in communication and in which interlocutors define their social worlds.

Constructionists do differ from each other with respect to whether or not they believe that there is an objective reality that exists separate from social interaction. Many constructionists such as Gergen (1994) focus away from this topic by arguing that their research interest is in social reality. Other constructionists, such as the contextualist constructionists described by Sarbin and Kitsuse (1994), are interested in comparing social constructions with “objective” data such as economic and political statistics. Regardless of this difference, social constructionists hold in common the assumption that humans define the world through social processes.

#### Metatheoretical Assumptions

In addition to his general statement regarding the social constructionist orientation, Gergen (1985) describes four metatheoretical assumptions of the social constructionist orientation.

1. What we take to be experience of the world does not in itself dictate the terms by which the world is understood. What we take to be knowledge of the world is not a product of induction, or of the building and testing of general hypotheses. (Gergen, 1985, p. 4)

Social constructionists argue that how reality is defined is contingent upon the descriptions of social actors. As Gergen (1985) states, social constructionism begins with the radical doubt in the taken-for-granted world--whether in the sciences or daily life--and in its specialized form acts as a source of social critique. Constructionism asks one to suspend belief that commonly accepted categories of understandings receive their warrant through observation. (p. 4)

Burr (1995) paraphrases this first tenet as taking "a critical stance towards taken-for-granted knowledge" (p. 3). The social constructionist orientation calls for questioning the categories through which social actors commonly understand the world, or as Burr (1995) states, challenging the notion that "what exists is what we perceive to exist" (p. 3).

Social constructionism developed as a critique of the Cartesian notion of a subject-object duality which assumes that reality (object) exists separately from human subjects (see Pearce, 1992). Constructionists argue that what counts as reality and how it is defined is based on the discursive practices of human subjects (see Gergen, 1994). This position has often been taken to imply that social constructionists deny the existence of events and things such as death, a fire, a chair in the middle of the room, etc.

However, as Gergen (1994) counters, social constructionists do not deny these events. Instead, constructionists are interested in these events as they are meaningful within humans' social worlds. For example, death has been defined in various ways such as the cessation of cells or as a re-birth for the soul. Social constructionists would be interested in these various definitions, because these constitute the meaning of an event and implicate its social significance.

The second assumption Gergen (1985) describes addresses the social nature of knowledge:

2. The terms in which the world is understood are social artifacts, products of historically situated interchanges among people. (p. 5)

For social constructionists, how reality is defined is a fundamentally social achievement. This assumption has been developed in various ways.

Some constructionists assume that once individuals obtain particular frames of interpretation, they apply these frames to understanding future events (see Pearce, 1992). This approach treats constructions as formulated prior to interactions. Pearce (1992, 1995) refers to this perspective as a "product" orientation in that researchers who subscribe to this view focus on describing what social reality is produced by social actors.

For other constructionists, reality construction is "the result of an active, cooperative enterprise of persons in relationship" (Gergen, 1985, p. 5). In this perspective, social reality is viewed as a situated, social accomplishment that occurs in

the ongoing process of social interaction. Pearce (1992, 1995) labels this perspective as a “process” orientation in that constructionists who subscribe to this approach are interested in the practices or methods utilized by interlocutors to construct social reality or how interlocutors construct social reality.

The third assumption described by Gergen (1985) states that social construction processes are interconnected with communication practices:

3. The degree to which a given form of understanding prevails or is sustained across time is not directly dependent on the empirical validity of the perspective in question, but on the vicissitudes of social processes (e.g., communication, negotiation, conflict, rhetoric, etc.). (p. 6)

Burr (1995) paraphrases this assumption by stating that “knowledge is sustained by social processes” (p. 4). Although Gergen describes communication as one example of a social process, the other social processes that Gergen describes--negotiation, conflict, rhetoric--are all themselves different types of communication. Thus, the process of social construction is a communication process. As Burr (1995) states, “it is through the daily interactions between people in the course of social life that our versions of knowledge become fabricated” (p. 4).

Gergen’s (1985) fourth assumption is that:

4. Forms of negotiated understanding are of critical significance in social life, as they are integrally connected with many other activities in which people

engage. Descriptions and explanations of the world constitute forms of social action, as such intertwined with the full range of other human activities. (p. 7)

Burr (1995) re-states this assumption as “knowledge and social action go together” (p. 5). Knowledge as a social construction implicates particular social actions. Burr uses the example of drunkenness to illustrate the interconnection between understanding and social action. Before the Temperance movement, “drunks” were viewed by society as responsible for their behaviors and treated as criminals. After the Temperance movement, drunks or “alcoholics” were viewed as victims of a disease and “the social action appropriate to understanding drunkenness in this way [was] to offer medical and psychological treatment, not imprisonment” (Burr, 1995, p. 5).

The four metatheoretical assumptions discussed here provide a basis for social constructionist thinking. Social constructionists question taken-for-granted knowledge by viewing understanding as historically and culturally situated. Communication is central to social construction processes, and these in turn are intertwined with social life. The social constructionist orientation should not be taken to mean that social reality is created uniquely within each new interaction. The general social constructionist position is instead that social reality is shaped in social interaction.

#### A Rhetorical-Responsive Approach to Social Constructionism

As described earlier, the main tenets of social constructionism have been developed in various ways resulting in different versions of social constructionism. Shotter’s (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive approach is a specific social constructionist

perspective that contributes to Gergen's (1985) general description by specifying ways in which the process of social construction occurs in social interaction. In this section, I provide an overview of some key aspects of Shotter's (1993a) approach by describing the concepts of the critical tool-box metaphor, "knowledge from within," "joint action," and "persons-in-conversation."

Shotter (1993a) prefers not to refer to his work as "theory," because this term implies that the world is systematic, structured, stable, and "can be intellectually grasped in a detached, uninvolved way" (p. 57). Instead, Shotter refers to his concepts as a "critical tool-box" that provides a set of sensitizing concepts that may be utilized selectively by researchers and social actors in general. Shotter's (1993a) "critical tool box" provides concepts for understanding and describing how interlocutors construct social reality and the implications of that process for community and identity formation and sustenance. In Shotter's (1993a) approach, reality construction occurs within the "joint actions" of "persons-in-conversation." In describing the concept of "joint action," Shotter specifies three different "ways of knowing"--knowing that, knowing how to, and knowing from within--the latter of which is important for understanding the nature of "joint action."

The first type of knowing described by Shotter (1993a) is "knowing that" or theoretical knowledge. "Knowing how" is practical knowledge such as having a particular skill. "Knowing from within," also referred to by Shotter as "knowledge of the third kind," entails knowing how to act within a particular situation. "Knowing from

within” is “practical-moral knowledge” in that it involves not just doing, but knowing how to act within the moral constraints of a particular community and within a specific, given situation. As Shotter (1993a) describes,

By its [“knowing from within”] use, we can see that in the ordinary two-way flow of activity between them, people create, without a conscious realization of the fact, a changing sea of moral enablements and constraints, or privileges and entitlements, and obligations and sanctions--in short, an ethos. (p. 39)

Shotter (1993a) specifies that social construction is the result of “joint action” in which, when speakers speak, they assume that

others around them are prepared to respond to what they do and say seriously; that is [as] if they are . . . a proper participant in that people’s ‘authoring’ of their reality, and not excluded from it in some way. (p. 39)

For Shotter, conversation is the “ultimate sphere” of joint action and of social construction processes in that it is from within the give and take of conversation that “negotiated and shared agreements are reached” (p. 40). In joint actions or conversation, speakers construct social reality in ways that are responsive or accountable to other participants and more broadly to society.

Earlier, I contrasted the process and product social constructionist orientations. Shotter’s perspective is process oriented by utilizing talk as a “unit of analysis” (see Pearce, 1992). As Pearce (1992) states of the implications of this focus,

[it] introduces a new set of rubrics as the “content” for what we should deal with. In general, these are verbs rather than nouns; activities per se rather than those who perform the activities or the institutions in which those activities are performed. Simply put: “doing”; “activities”; “situated accomplishments”; or “persons-in-conversations” are the units of observation and analysis. (p. 155)

For example, the Rhetorical-Responsive approach has been used to describe how interlocutors construct social reality in communication practices such as accounting, instructive statements, and self-ascriptions (Shotter, 1984). Shotter’s (1993a) view of reality construction also implicates a particular perspective on the notion of agency and the role of society in social construction processes. Some social constructionists emphasize the role of societal structure in reality construction, whereas others emphasize the significance of individuals in actively constructing social reality (see Frank, 1979). Shotter’s approach takes a middle ground.

Shotter (1993a) holds the view that individuals are free to make whatever choices they wish; however, these choices are constrained by a priori cultural expectations. To describe this perspective, Shotter refers to a quotation from Karl Marx which describes that individuals are free to make choices but not in circumstances of their own choosing. In this respect, Shotter argues that in order to participate in social interaction and be treated as a legitimate voice within the dominant discourse, social actors must speak in ways that demonstrate that they are socially accountable. Shotter (1993a) writes,

[Social actors] cannot just innovate as they please, for the fact is, not just 'anything goes'--they cannot be authors of fictions, which bear no relation to what the unchosen conditions they face will 'permit', or 'afford.' Their authoring must be justified or justifiable, and for that to be possible, it must be 'grounded' or 'rooted' in some way in circumstances others share. (p. 140)

Given this view, Shotter's work has described some of the communication practices through which social actors constitute their realities and the implicit, taken-for-granted cultural knowledge that helps to shape those social realities.

Shotter's (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive approach contributes to general theorizing in social constructionism by calling attention to how social construction processes occur in the "joint action" of "persons-in-conversation." In addition, Shotter's perspective highlights how the context in which interactions occur is important for the construction processes. Specifically, when speakers speak, it is from within a social milieu in which only particular discourses are permitted. The implication of this latter point is that the study of social construction processes does not just consist of the examination of the immediate situation, but it also implicates a broader social and cultural context.

### Epistemological Assumptions

The treatment of social constructionism so far has emphasized its ontological assumptions. For social constructionists however, ontology and epistemology are

fundamentally interconnected in that social constructionists view their own research claims as socially constructed.

Guba and Lincoln (1994) describe epistemology as addressing the relationship between research and knowledge. The social constructionist perspective on epistemology differs from the epistemological perspective of postpositivistic research (see Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Specifically, social constructionists recognize the contingent and socially situated nature of their own research practices and claims. In this section, I describe social constructionist epistemology, because it is vital to understanding the overall social constructionist orientation.

Stewart's (1994) discussion of three different versions of validity helps to clarify the social constructionist view of epistemology. The first version discussed by Stewart treats validity as the accuracy of research claims in representing reality. This is also considered the "classical" version of validity. The second version of validity that Stewart (1994) discusses is drawn from Brinberg and McGrath (1985). These authors have a "pluralistic" perspective on validity that encompasses, construct, content, convergent, ecological, face, internal, and external validity. However, as Brinberg and McGrath discuss validity, this concept, whether at the conceptual, methodological, or substantive stages of research, still refers to the "fit" of claims to data and the generalizability of claims. Underlying Brinberg and McGrath's version of validity is the assumption of a reality that exists separate from the researcher and can be represented through language.

The third version of validity discussed by Stewart (1994) is drawn from Mishler (1990) and, from Lincoln and Guba (1985) and introduces the concepts of authenticity and trustworthiness. This approach to validity, utilized within “naturalistic” and constructionist research, acknowledges that research claims are socially constructed and treats validity as a persuasive story or argument rather than as factual reporting. Stewart (1994) describes this view of validity as an interpretive approach, and it is this approach that is most relevant to a social constructionist orientation.

Stewart (1994) reviews a philosophical basis for interpretive validity by drawing upon the works of Gadamer (1975) and Taylor (1971). These authors treat knowledge claims themselves as communicative accomplishments or arguments rather than as representations of reality. Although there are slight differences in emphases and phrasing between these two authors, both provide arguments to support and describe an interpretive approach to validity.

As Stewart (1994) notes, Gadamer and Taylor both reject the Cartesian notion of knowledge, which assumes a separation between subject and object and between researcher and researched. Gadamer and Taylor view research as ontological rather than as epistemological. In other words, reality, including that described by the researcher, is constituted in discursive practices. Research is not viewed epistemologically, because this would presume a separation between the researcher and researched. Instead, knowledge is viewed ontologically in that the researcher is not just describing but also participating in the constructing of his or her research claims.

Likewise, methodology is not viewed epistemologically as a means toward discerning truth. Instead, methodology is viewed reflexively as being a situated accomplishment that functions to create a particular version of reality. In these ways, methodology, epistemology, and ontology are interconnected.

The assumption that all reality, including that described by the researcher, is a communicative accomplishment has implications for the goals of inquiry. Rather than striving towards explanation, prediction, and control, researchers who take an interpretive approach strive for understanding. With the former concepts of explanation, prediction, and control, reality is assumed to exist separate from human subjects. In striving towards understanding however, social constructionist researchers attempt to describe what subjects believe they are doing or accomplishing within particular situations.

Validity is also viewed as an ongoing process rather than as a product. When validity is viewed as a product, researchers assume certainty and closure. However, in viewing validity as a process, Gadamer and Taylor utilize the metaphor of conversation. That is, the goal of validity is not to determine what reality is, but instead is to maintain a commitment to conversation about knowledge that is acknowledged explicitly in a researcher's claims. This philosophical perspective on interpretive validity is not meant to imply that "anything goes" or that there is no way to evaluate research claims as "good" or "poor." However, rather than evaluating claims based on their accuracy or fit

to reality, research claims are evaluated based on how confident the reader can be in the interpretations of the researcher.

Mishler (1990) emphasizes that the “trustworthiness” of a researcher’s claims is dependent upon the “visibility” of analysis. According to Mishler (1990), a researcher may make her analysis explicit to the reader through

the display of primary texts; the specification of analytic categories and the distinctions in terms of discernible features of the texts; and, theoretical interpretations focused on structures, that is, on relations among different categories, rather than on variables. (p. 437)

For social constructionists, research claims themselves are viewed as social constructions and as a result, validity claims cannot be based on examining the correspondence between research claims and an objective reality. Social constructionists instead recognize the constructed nature of their own research claims and present arguments for the trustworthiness of their claims. These arguments are based on making explicit procedures for analysis and include the procedures discussed by Mishler (1990).

### Summary

Social constructionists are interested in how everyday communication practices function to constitute the social worlds that humans inhabit. Shotter’s (1993a) perspective is important for this research project in that Shotter specifies some ways communication practices constitute social reality. In addition, Shotter highlights the

importance of context in reality construction and how cultural and social contexts both constrain and enable communication practices.

In describing the epistemological stance of social constructionism, my goal was to describe and provide a rationale for the type of claims made by social constructionist researchers. Reality construction is viewed as a process rather than product and should be described as such. The conduct of research itself is also viewed as a process, rather than as a movement toward closure, and as a result, social constructionists attempt to write with an awareness of the contingent nature of their own research.

### Accounts Analysis

One type of communication practice that social constructionist researchers have focused on is “accounts.” This communication practice has been examined from a variety of different theoretical perspectives. To distinguish Shotter’s (1984, 1993a) social constructionist approach to accounts from other theoretical approaches, I review different perspectives on accounts as described in Buttny (1993). The four main account perspectives described by Buttny (1993) are accounts as responses to social breaches, as ordinary explanations, as psychological attributions, and as everyday communication.

#### Accounts as Responses to Social Breaches

A first approach to accounts is derived from the work of Scott and Lyman (1968) and Goffman (1971). Buttny (1993) groups Goffman’s (1971) work with Scott and Lyman’s (1968) because all three view accounts as being offered in problematic situations in order to mend a social breach. According to these authors, accounts are

verbal responses that social actors give when their behavior is perceived as problematic. Accounts are offered when a social breach has occurred, and the social actor whom others deem as being responsible for the breach is called upon to provide an explanation for his or her actions. In accounting for his or her actions, a social actor reconciles him- or herself with the social order.

Scott and Lyman (1968) describe various ways to analyze accounts including categorizing them according to type and vocabularies, identifying styles of giving accounts, and listing strategies for avoiding accounts. Scott and Lyman also consider accounting as a process in which the negotiation of social identities occurs. These authors acknowledge the culturally-situated nature of accounts in that “the idiomatic form of an account is expected to be socially suited to the circle into which it is introduced, according to norms of culture, subculture, and situation” (p. 57).

Scott and Lyman describe the importance of appropriate vocabularies for the acceptance of accounts within a community. For example, although witchcraft would not be considered an acceptable justification for committing a social breach in most Western societies, in Azande culture, it would be (Pritchard, cited in Scott & Lyman, 1968). In this example, witchcraft is a suitable vocabulary for accounting for a social breach in Azande culture, but it is not suitable in most Western societies. This example illustrates how the use of appropriate account vocabularies is crucial for the acceptability of an account.

### Accounts as Ordinary Explanations

In a second approach, accounts are conceptualized more generally as explanations or descriptions of everyday activity. As Buttny (1993) describes,

Accounts are not circumscribed as responses to a problematic situation, but include references to unproblematic or routine situations. This conception focuses on how persons portray their ordinary actions, practices, and relationship to other; how persons render these accountable is through language. Accounts of everyday, mundane activities merit social scientific attention because such talk embodies persons' sense-making procedures. (p. 15)

From this perspective, researchers focus on accounts as public presentations and explanations for actions as in Benoit's (1995) work on image restoration in politics.

Scholars within this perspective treat accounts as rhetorical achievements in that they are specific communication practices that occur within social situations.

### Accounts as Psychological Attributions

Attribution theorists examine accounts of social actors to address "questions about mental mechanisms responsible for the selection, storage and integration of social information relevant to the judgment of causality" (Antaki, 1988, p. 8). Key features of this approach are that researchers:

1. Focus on the causal explanations of social actors;
2. Address questions of accuracy and bias, information processing, and the effects of these on human behavior;

3. Develop social cognitive theories;
4. Use laboratory studies, rating scales, and questionnaires to gather data; and,
5. Use data based on individuals' responses to controlled dimensions. (Antaki, 1988)

An attribution approach examines accounts in order to describe the cognitive mechanisms that mediate or determine conceptions of causality which laypersons develop. As Dickson, Manusov, Cody, and McLaughlin (1996) describe more specifically,

the study of attributions is concerned with the ways in which social actors assign the origin of behaviors to internal or external causes (Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1972) and the degree to which the actions are perceived as controllable, stable, and intentional (Harvey et al., 1990; Manusov, 1990; Weiner, 1985). (p. 28)

The attribution approach focuses on individual notions of causality and the assigning of responsibility to self or other.

### Everyday Communication as Accountable

A fourth tradition is based on the ethnomethodological perspective. As Buttny (1993) states, "accounts involve the various ways persons present their activities so as to render them sensible, normal, understandable, proper, and the like" (p. 15).

Ethnomethodologists conceptualize all everyday activity as potentially problematic in that:

People engaged in action together need to make their practical reasoning somehow “visible” to each other. . . . According to Garfinkel (1967), “The activities whereby members produce and manage settings of organized everyday affairs are identical with members’ procedures of making those settings ‘accountable,’ . . . [by which I mean] observable-and-reportable, i.e., available to members as situated practices of looking-and-telling” (p. 1). Thus the evidence for social order can be found in people’s accounts of their activities, which are usually produced verbally. (Lindlof, 1995, p. 38)

In the ethnomethodological perspective, accounts are “sense-making procedures” (Buttny, 1993, p. 16) utilized by interlocutors whenever their activity is open to question in order to render their actions intelligible to others. The ethnomethodological perspective is very similar to the ordinary explanation perspective in that both examine talk in everyday contexts. However, the ethnomethodological perspective views all activities as accountable, whereas the ordinary explanations perspective treats only certain communication activities as explanations.

### Summary and Critique

This overview of perspectives on accounts describes the various ways that accounts analysis has developed. Some perspectives view accounts as being offered exclusively in response to social breaches, whereas other perspectives view accounts more generally as explanations offered for conduct. The perspectives on accounts have also varied in their locus of explanation. Some perspectives view accounts as indicators

of psychological dispositions, and others describe accounts as public presentations and as such, focus on the social context of accounts.

Buttny (1993) criticizes some of the diverse approaches to accounts in a way that justifies a social constructionist approach to this communication practice. First, he notes, “a limitation of much of the accounts research is that it does not examine accounts in naturally occurring settings” (Buttny, 1993, p. 29-30). According to Buttny, extant research has mainly analyzed accounts derived from researcher memory, respondents’ written reconstructions, or respondents’ evaluations of hypothetical situations. “These methodological procedures result in a conception of the person offering the account, as though accounts are invariable achieved as a single speech act” (Buttny, p. 30). The result of this emphasis is that it “sacrifices the complexity or naturalistic richness of accounts phenomena” (p. 30).

Buttny’s (1993) second criticism highlights the need to consider accounts as part of a broader, social context by considering the relationship between an offense and account. As Buttny states,

much of accounts research glosses how accounts work as a response; typically it is assumed that one is merely reacting to an accusation, rather than actively construing and formulating the problematic to use in producing an account.  
(p. 32)

As Buttny argues, accounts do not function exclusively as “repair mechanisms” but also work to define events. In addition, accounts as everyday explanations should be

characterized by more than abstract principles; they should be described as “cultural inscriptions or speech practices reflecting implicit, moral/practical reasoning--the group’s folk logic of everyday action” (Buttny, 1993, p. 33).

#### **Accounts, Decision-Making, and Social Constructionism**

Shotter’s Rhetorical-Responsive approach addresses Buttny’s (1993) criticisms of accounts research in the following ways. First, in applying Shotter’s concept of “persons-in-conversation,” researchers describe accounts as part of naturally occurring interactions. Accounts are viewed as joint accomplishments, or more specifically, the outcome of “joint actions.” From Shotter’s perspective, accounts cannot be examined in isolation as a single set of statements. Instead, researchers must examine how accounts are responsive to particular situations and how accounts are responded to in those situations. In order to do this, Shotter (1984) calls for describing accounts within the ongoing flow of discourse. In doing this, researchers may examine accounts as interactive accomplishments (see Buttny, 1993).

Shotter’s concept of “knowledge-from-within” also calls for understanding accounts as inscriptions of particular cultural values and beliefs. Speakers’ accounts make explicit particular norms and beliefs. However, not all accounts may be viewed as acceptable to a broader community. Speakers may disagree with or alter preceding accounts. In this process, a given community also works out discursively the definition of a particular situation or event, and the community’s norms, values, and beliefs. By

examining this process, researchers may gain insight into the social world(s) that speakers inhabit.

There are particular implications that Shotter's social constructionist approach has for decision-making discourse. The following section reviews research on accounts in decision-making and describes how Shotter's perspective may be utilized to build on these studies.

### Accounts in Decision-Making

During decision-making, speakers sometimes provide accounts that function to justify their choices. There are two communication studies that discuss and analyze accounts explicitly in decision-making (see Geist & Chandler, 1984; Tompkins & Cheney, 1983). While these studies do not claim to be social constructionist, they draw upon social constructionist literature.

Tompkins and Cheney (1983) utilize accounts analysis to examine decision-making and identification in organizations. The authors draw upon Burke (1969) and Harré and Secord (1972) to argue for the connection between organizational identification and accounts in decision-making. In discussing Burke, Tompkins and Cheney (1983) state that Burke's concept of identification refers to the belief on the part of social actors that their interests are joined. Persuasion occurs when an audience identifies with the speaker, and decisions are reached when members of an organization identify with the goals of the organizations.

Tompkins and Cheney (1983) build upon the social constructionist work of Harre and Secord (1972) in their argument for the importance of examining “lay” explanations of behavior. By analyzing speakers’ accounts of their own activities, researchers privilege the language and terms of speakers, and in doing so, develop a greater understanding of what people claim they are doing or trying to accomplish in particular situations. Tompkins and Cheney (1983) state that in examining accounts, researchers may gain a greater understanding of “the actor’s statement about why he or she performed certain acts and what social meaning he or she gave to the actions of himself or herself and others” (p. 129).

In applying accounts analysis to decision-making, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) develop and support the following five propositions:

1. Accounts express decision premises (or rules).
2. Accounts point to sources of decisional premises.
3. Accounts “identify social units for whom the decision maker was prepared to give accounts at the time of making the decision” (p. 131).
4. Accounts reveal identification targets.
5. Accounts help to explain the nature of the identification process.

These five propositions also specify the different ways in which accounts function to shape a particular social reality during the course of decision-making. Specifically, during decision-making, speakers’ accounts may characterize particular features of a situation relevant for the decision-making process.

One shortcoming of Tompkins and Cheney's (1983) study is that they analyzed exclusively retrospective accounts or accounts offered after a decision was made. They leave unexplained how during the actual course of decision-making, speakers account for particular choices to other group members and how those accounts are modified or responded to by others based on a group's values and notions of social reality. In other words, Tompkins and Cheney ignore the social nature of group decision-making.

Geist and Chandler (1984) address the limitation of Tompkins and Cheney (1983) by examining accounts in actual interactions during the course of decision-making. Geist and Chandler (1984) argue that

Because accounts are generated when people ask a question or challenge a speaker, they exist in the small group decision-making context as excuses or justifications for statements or premises. In essence, the method of analyzing accounts in this manner is operating on two levels. Through the use of coded transcripts of group decision-making, the researcher may use account analysis to gain information about decisional premises and identification. Likewise, the members of the decision-making groups use questions to force other members to account for the statements they make. (pp. 70-71)

During the process of decision-making, speakers may challenge, modify, or build on previous speakers' remarks. Through this process, a group also defines its social reality. This does not necessarily mean that agreement is reached on a singular definition of an event. However, by examining this process, researchers may gain insight into the

meaning or contested meanings of a given event or decision within a community. Geist and Chandler (1984) state

[Accounts analysis] should be used in other long-term groups in different types of organizations to determine if there are organizational-specific rules that influence the interactional possibilities. Stated differently, are there context-specific premises and identifications that impact the decision-making process? (p. 76)

Geist and Chandler (1984) point out that accounts are not just individual productions, but occur within a particular group or organizational context and must be understood as responsive to that context. Buttny (1993) describes that

Decision-making involves not only explicit institutional rules and procedures, but also tacit conventions and criteria based on cultural assumptions of the situation, appropriate ways of structuring information, and preferred ways of speaking.

(p. 128)

This project responds to Geist and Chandler's (1984) call for future research by applying accounts analysis to describe "context-specific premises" which shape a group's decision-making discourse.

Tompkins and Cheney's (1983) study points out that accounts offered during decision-making function to shape a particular reality that participants view as significant for the decision-making process. Geist and Chandler (1984) add to Tompkins and Cheney's (1983) work by highlighting how, when accounts are given in group or organizational decision-making contexts, speakers respond to others' accounts and in

this process, make explicit group norms, values, and beliefs. Taken together, these studies illustrate the type of insight that a social constructionist perspective may provide regarding group decision-making. Speakers' accounts during decision-making function not only to justify particular stances, but also, as Tompkins and Cheney (1983) and Geist and Chandler (1984) demonstrate, to implicate aspects of social reality which are relevant for decision-making (Buttny, 1993).

Shotter's (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive approach contributes to extant research on accounts in decision-making through the various conceptual tools his approach provides. Shotter's approach highlights the cultural-embeddedness of accounts through the concepts of utterances and ideology. The analysis of group decision-making contexts can also contribute to Shotter's perspective. Shotter's work primarily addresses the identity construction of individual selves (see for example Shotter, 1984, 1993a). But in group decision-making, people speak not only as individual selves but, also as members of groups. In other words, Shotter's research has primarily addressed the issue of "who am I?" However, when Shotter's approach is applied to group decision-making, central questions also include "who am I as a member of this group?" and "who are we?" During group decision-making, speakers argue for particular choices. In doing this, they speak as members of a group and argue for particular definitions of themselves as a group or organization. A social constructionist analysis of group decision-making can provide insight into the ways that group rather than individual identity is defined.

A second important way in which Shotter's approach contributes to the understanding of group decision-making is through the examination of how speakers' discourse functions to shape reality. During decision-making, speakers' accounts may function to define choices (what does this decision mean?), define past events (what are the events which give rise to this decision?), or define other significant aspects of the decision-making process. By applying Shotter's social constructionist approach to group decision-making, researchers may better understand how various definitions of social reality are shaped during the process of accounting during decision-making.

#### Summary

This chapter describes the general theoretical assumptions of this project and the assumptions of the specific perspective, Shotter's Rhetorical-Responsive approach, which I apply. I also describe the epistemological assumptions of social constructionism as these are interconnected with its metatheoretical assumptions.

In addition to providing background on social constructionism, I discussed extant conceptions of accounts in order to show how the treatment of accounts in this project differs from other approaches to accounts analysis. A social constructionist perspective on accounts focuses on accounts as co-constructions within ongoing discourse. Also, the perspective applied in this project views accounts as functioning to shape a particular social reality.

Finally, this chapter describes how the three major concepts of this project-- accounts, decision-making, and the Rhetorical-Responsive social constructionist

approach--are interconnected. Accounts are offered during decision-making when speakers justify or are called to justify the choices that they advocate. Vocabularies of accounts describe specific aspects of social reality which are deemed important for the decision-making process by defining a group's identity, an event, or a choice. In the following chapter, I describe how a social constructionist perspective may be applied to the analysis of empirical data and in doing this, move my discussion of social constructionism from theory to practice.

## **CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD**

**Social constructionist researchers are interested in reality constructing processes in social interactions. Few studies however have applied social constructionist assumptions to the analysis of empirical data. Buttny's (1993) conversation analytic social constructionist method provides a clear set of analytic procedures for conducting research compatible with the social constructionist orientation of this project.**

**Buttny's (1993) approach focuses on the description of accounts. Because Buttny derives his approach in part from conversation analysis, his procedures are sensitive to the ongoing and interactive nature of reality constructing processes. This chapter begins with background information on the setting of this project and then describes Buttny's perspective and how it was applied.**

### **The Faculty Senate and its Functions**

**The University of Washington Faculty Senate is the official faculty legislative body of the university. According to the University of Washington Faculty Senate Office (1996),**

**The Faculty Senate's principal function is to promote the general welfare of the university; its legislation affects not only the faculty but the entire university community. The Senate must also propose and enact legislation that accurately represents the UW faculty opinion on the issues under consideration. (p. On-line)**

The voting members of the Senate consist of the university president and faculty elected by their departments. There are approximately 160 senators who have the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Administrators appointed by the university president, chairpersons of Faculty Councils, deans, and the leaders of the undergraduate and graduate student governments are *ex officio* members who have the right to speak but not to vote.

The main officers of the Faculty Senate are the chair and vice-chair who are elected by the Senate body. The chair is usually the previous year's vice-chair. The Faculty Senate is required to meet at least twice during each quarter of the academic year. Senate meetings follow parliamentary procedures with the Chair of the Senate presiding. During meetings, the Senate usually debates and votes on legislative items and listens to and comments on reports from the university president and committee representatives.

Tierney (1983) describes five functions of communication within Faculty Senate meetings--directional, news-related, ceremonial, decisional, and confirmational--that also apply to the Senate meetings I observed. The Chair of the Senate provides directions or instructions for meetings by conveying and enforcing parliamentary procedures. News is conveyed via reports from the President, legislative representatives, and chairs of committees and councils. The most obvious ceremonial activity of the Senate is the approval of the memorial resolution to honor recently deceased faculty members. This is the only resolution that is unanimously approved through a standing vote.

The Senate's main function is decisional, because it is responsible for policies affecting the entire university. The Senate also confirms decisions by providing a stamp of approval that certifies acceptance or rejection of a particular piece of legislation by the faculty. This function comes immediately after, and relates directly to, the decision function. It entails the actual vote, and the confirmation of that vote after it has occurred. (Tierney, 1983, p. 175)

There are three classes or types of legislation: Class A, Class B, and Class C.<sup>1</sup>

Class A legislation amends or alters the Faculty Code and results in a policy change for the university. Class A legislation discussed during the 1995-96 school year pertained to alterations to the procedures for reorganization, consolidation, and elimination of programs (approved); changing the name of the Faculty Council on Community Services and University Relations (approved); establishment of the faculty councils on women and minority faculty affairs (approved); and ex officio membership on faculty councils for the Bothell and Tacoma campuses (approved).

Class B legislation alters sections of the University Handbook other than the Faculty Code. Class B legislation discussed during the 1995-96 academic year pertained to revisions to the faculty family and sick leave plan (approved); revision of the student code of conduct (approved); and the Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement (a substitute Class C motion approved instead).

Class C items are non-legislative actions such as non-policy binding resolutions, appointments of committees, and approval or disapproval of committee reports. These

actions are effective as soon as the Faculty Senate approves them. Class C actions discussed by the Senate during the 1995-96 academic year involved the re-organization of the Classified and Proprietary Research Review Committee (approved); alterations to the size of the Faculty Senate (rejected); criticism of alleged Faculty Code violations during the 1994-95 program elimination and review process (rejected); establishment of an Urban Design Committee (referred to the Senate Executive Committee); recommendation to the administration to delay the decision for the new Law School site (approved); and, extension of benefits to domestic partners of faculty (approved).

In 1995-96, the most contentious of the 14 resolution items were the recommendation on the Law School siting, the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement, and violations of the Faculty Code during the recent program elimination process. Discourse from the discussions of these last two resolutions items are analyzed in chapters five and six.

#### **Method of Data Analysis**

The method of data analysis for this study draws from Buttny (1993), who describes a seven step way to analyze accounts from a conversation analytic and social constructionist perspective. Buttny notes that his method “should not be taken as discrete, linear steps, or be employed in a mechanical-like fashion; in practice, [the seven steps] work in a more reflexive, circular fashion” (p. 56). I follow Buttny’s advice in my discussion of his steps by describing how I apply them and by noting where I modify or diverge from his outline. Each will be discussed in turn.

### Step One: Transcribe and Observe Naturalistic Phenomena

This step entails a number of decisions on the part of the researcher. In addition to selecting a particular, naturally occurring communication phenomenon to observe, the researcher must transform his/her observations into transcripts. There are several possible levels of transcription, ranging from a verbatim transcription to the noting of vocal intonation and other nonverbal communication. Buttny (1993) advises that the level of specificity should be dependent on the research questions.

In applying this step to my research, I tape recorded University of Washington Faculty Senate meetings from January 1995 through May 1996. I attended three meetings during the 1994-95 academic year and all seven<sup>2</sup> Senate meetings during the 1995-96 academic year. Because recordings of Senate meetings and documents such as agendas and minutes are public and because Senators are public officials, I requested and received certification of exemption from the University of Washington Human Subjects committee. I also unofficially informed the 1995-96 chair of the senate, Professor John Junker, and the president of the university, Professor Richard McCormick, of my research project through personal conversations. In my analyses, I use the actual names and titles of the individuals who speak at meetings because of the public nature of meetings.

Senate meetings took place in 301 Gowen Hall at the University of Washington campus. This room can seat approximately 200 people and is physically arranged as an amphitheater. During Senate meetings, a microphone is available by a desk in the front

of the room for the Senate Chair and others to use. In the 1995-96 academic year, the Senate chair initiated the use of mobile microphones to be transported to seated Senators who wished to address the entire Senate. While collecting data for this project, I sat in the seating area occupied by Senators and other meeting attendees, usually either in the middle or just to the left of the center of the room with my tape recorder placed on the desk in front of me. By the physical appearance of my age and my casual attire, I was clearly not a Faculty Senator. My presence however was never questioned explicitly by Senators, possibly because of the public nature of the meetings and because undergraduate and graduate students who were involved with student government or the student newspaper also usually attended meetings.

Because my purpose is to describe the vocabulary of accounts of Senators, my transcriptions primarily focus on verbal rather than nonverbal communication. Verbal communication is most relevant for describing account vocabularies, and there was a fair amount of consistency in the nonverbal aspects of Senators' talk during resolution discussions. Occasionally there are variations in nonverbal communication such as interruptions, pauses, and vocal emphasis. These types of nonverbal communication are noted in my transcripts in the following ways:

1. **ALL CAPS**: indicate raised volume.
2. **[brackets]**: indicate a portion of the transcript that was inaudible; I provided words within the brackets as an approximation of what speakers said.
3. **a hyphen-** : indicates when a speaker is interrupted.

4. (remarks in parentheses): indicate researcher comments added to help clarify speakers' remarks.

I transcribed the portions of meetings in which the Senate discussed resolutions, because these discussions constituted the official, decision-making activities of the Senate. Although discussions of resolutions occurred in other settings, such as informal conversations and on the Senate listserv, I focused on the resolution discussions during Senate meetings for two reasons. First, resolution discussions during Senate meetings are public, so utterances made in the context of Senate meetings are made with the purpose of being responsive to the university's public and official discourse. Second, although changes to resolutions may be discussed before meetings, any actual changes to a resolution must be introduced and approved during the course of the official discussions. In addition to my tape recordings, I obtained publicly available documents such as meeting schedules, agendas, minutes, and texts of legislative items from the Office of the Faculty Senate.

#### Step Two: Sample Size

Buttny (1993) leaves the selection of sample size (defined as the number of communication events analyzed) open so that a researcher may choose to focus on a single case or on a "corpus of cases" (p. 57). There are benefits as well as limitations of either choice. By focusing on a single case, such as a particular therapy session, a researcher may gain depth of analysis. By utilizing a corpus of cases, a researcher can examine patterns of interaction across cases.

For this project, I analyzed three decision-making discussions or cases of the Faculty Senate. A decision-making case begins with the official introduction of a resolution and ends when a vote is taken on the resolution. I chose to focus on three cases, because this number is small enough to describe the uniqueness of each case and large enough to compare and contrast social construction practices across cases.

In the first case study, I analyze a resolution calling for the reduction of the size of the Faculty Senate. The corpus of data for this case study consists of four pages of transcript, a meeting agenda, and meeting minutes. During this resolution discussion, there were a total of 40 utterances.

For the second case study, I analyze two discussions of a proposal for a Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement. The corpus of data for this case study consists of 19 pages of transcription of the first discussion, and 5 pages of transcription of the second discussion. In addition, I collected an agenda and meeting minutes for the second discussion, a letter from Senate Chair John Junker to the Senate on parliamentary procedures for the second discussion, texts of the original and substitute resolutions, and photocopies of email letters distributed during the Senate meeting from faculty voicing their concerns regarding the CED. For the first discussion on the CED requirement resolution, there were a total of 144 utterances. This resolution was also very contentious, with the end result being the acceptance of a substitute, non-policy binding motion. During the discussion of the substitute resolution, there were a total of 51 utterances made.

In the third case study, I analyze a resolution which called for the Faculty Senate to express its “strong disapproval” of alleged Faculty Code violations on the part of College of Arts and Sciences Dean Simpson during the program elimination and review process of the 1994-95 academic year. The corpus of data for this case study consists of 17 pages of transcription of the resolution discussion, a meeting agenda, and meeting minutes. There were a total of 140 utterances made during the resolution discussion. This resolution was very contentious, and the discussion highlights how the Senate defines past events, itself, and responsibility.

### Step Three: Analysis--From Utterances to Actions

This step entails the first overtly interpretive analytic move in Buttny’s (1993) procedures. Buttny summarizes this step as inquiring into “what actions are being performed and what moves are being made?” (p. 58). For this step, Buttny describes how the researcher may interrogate “what’s going on in the talk” (p. 58) by turning to two sources. First,

As analysts we begin with our own cultural knowledge, or intuition, of what is going on in the talk. But this intuition must be based on some publicly available data in the transcript. Instead of relying solely on conventional understandings of the utterances, examine what the talk is being used to do in context, how it functions for members. (p. 58)

The second technique that Buttny (1993) recommends is to examine “how interlocutors understand or interpret each other’s utterances” (p. 58), or, in other words, how participants seem to interpret each other’s utterances within the given context.

Within this step, according to Buttny (1993), researchers describe the function of discourse or “interactional moves” such as “recognition, understanding, and assessment of the prior actions” (p. 59). This step has some roots in Speech Act Theory because of its focus on the performative nature of discourse. Buttny also draws from Garfinkel’s (1967) ethnomethodological tradition in stating that

The general point is that an utterance can be used to perform a variety of interactional moves; attention must be given to its use in its particular, situated context, that is, its ‘indexicality’ (Garfinkel, 1967). (Buttny, 1993, p. 58)

In this respect, Buttny’s analytic procedure within this step is not a speech act analysis in that Buttny emphasizes the importance of context in understanding what is being “done with words.”

The interpretive procedures within this step provide useful orienting information for an analyst in understanding general functions of accounts. Because Senators use parliamentary procedures to guide their remarks, Senators’ accounts function mainly to give information, to direct others (as when the Senate chair provides guidelines for parliamentary procedures), to support a point, to challenge an account, or to ask a question. This step is not discussed explicitly in my data analysis chapters so that I may focus my analysis on the following steps, which are of greater significance for describing

account vocabularies. One consequence of not discussing what actions are being performed by utterances is that I do not describe utterances made by Senate Chair John Junker even though his utterances constitute nearly half of those made during a resolution discussion. Chair Junker's utterances are primarily parliamentary and do not provide accounts to justify stances on resolutions.

#### Step Four: Analysis--From Actions to Interactional Sequences

In addition to interpreting interlocutors' individual utterances (from Step Three), Buttny (1993) suggests that the analyst pay attention to patterns across utterances. This analytic step involves the examination of the "language games" of social accountability by uncovering the "sequential ordering" of accounting. Buttny elaborates by stating

Having located an instance of accounting, look to what gives rise to that account, and in turn, what does that account give rise to. Accounts can be used as a site to examine the antecedents and consequents of accounts. More importantly, examine what connects these parts together as a coherent discursive practice of accounting. (p. 59-60)

Buttny (1993) describes example account sequencing such as (a) blame, account; (b) problem-telling, questioning/probing, accounting; and (c) offer/request, dispreferred response (the account). The latter example highlights how accounts may be offered in problematic situations that do not involve criticism of behavior but instead involve the anticipation of criticism.

This step helps to provide an understanding of how individual or single accounts are interactionally accomplished. Some accounts research also ends with this step. But as Buttny notes, it is often useful to take a next step in order to gain a greater understanding of what counts as a socially acceptable account within a given community.

For this project, because I examine multiple accounts that speakers present during decision-making discussions, I do not apply this step, but instead rely upon Buttny's step six to discuss the interactional nature of accounts. In my discussion of the following steps, I focus primarily on conveying Buttny's characterizations and discuss generally how I apply these steps. In the data analysis chapters, I apply these steps more specifically.

#### Step Five: Analysis--What Accounts Make Relevant

Buttny (1993) argues that "as blames project accounts, so accounts can be seen retrospectively to frame the problematic event at issue" (p. 61). As Buttny (1993) describes, "the nature, magnitude, and consequences of the problematic event are themselves interactional constructions which are made relevant by the actor in the course of accounts talk" (p. 61). The researcher, in examining what accounts make relevant, describes how interlocutors define, and thus construct, the meaning, significance, or result of a problematic event. For example, Buttny states that one way in which speakers' accounts construct reality is "by making relevant some conditions, events, or states-of-affairs which interlocutors either do not know about or do not fully appreciate" (p. 62).

In applying this step to my research, I focus on identifying and describing the account vocabularies of speakers. “Account vocabulary” is the label for the central unit of analysis in this project. Vocabularies consist of key terms used by speakers to characterize and thus define an event addressed in their accounts. In using a specific vocabulary of accounts, speakers define and construct problematic events in particular ways. I illustrate how account vocabularies can be treated as a primary, empirically observable communication phenomenon by means of which decision-making discussion participants socially construct their realities.

#### Step Six: Analysis--Accounting as Interactional Achievement

Buttny (1993) states that “accounts do not spring full blown from the mind of the speaker, how they are ordered and produced is contingent upon the recipient” (p. 62). Instead of focusing on utterances in isolation, researchers pay attention to the continuous interchange of utterances between speakers. As Buttny describes, “how the account gets told--in what order--is monitored and interactionally negotiated between participants” (p. 63). This step helps to describe the social construction of reality. Through their conversational exchanges, speakers are free to disagree with, modify, or agree with preceding accounts. It is in these exchanges that a group negotiates its social reality.

Shotter’s (1993) description of utterances and social accountability is especially relevant for this step. As Shotter notes, utterances, in order to be considered socially accountable, must be responsive to prior and future-anticipated utterances. Within this

step, Buttny (1993) calls for examining how the ongoing flow of utterances together function to construct social reality for a particular group.

When speakers invoke particular account vocabularies during decision-making events, other speakers may agree or disagree that these vocabularies apply to a problematic event. In addition, speakers' future utterances may function to define the meaning of particular vocabularies. For example, in one of the following case studies, I describe how the vocabulary of affirming diversity was used to justify a Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement. However, in that particular discussion, speakers had varying characterizations of what constituted an affirmation of diversity and varying definitions of what constituted diversity.

In applying this step to my analyses of account vocabularies in decision-making discourse, I move beyond the identification of what account vocabularies were used by speakers to describing how, through their interactions, speakers define what those account vocabularies mean. I do this by examining how speakers' utterances are responsive to previously voiced account vocabularies. Within my data analysis, I illustrate the responsive nature of utterances by displaying portions of utterances relevant to a particular account vocabulary in the chronological order in which the utterances occurred. By displaying utterances in this order, I mean to show how the meaning and significance of account vocabularies in decision-making discourse are interactively negotiated.

### **Step Seven: Method of Expansion--Making the Implicit Explicit**

In this step, the analyst interprets or attempts to understand the cultural presumptions or folk logic implicated by speakers' discourse. In order to make the "folk logic" of accounts explicit, Buttny (1993) suggests that analysis

may be approached through using a method of expansion: interpreting what is said in terms of background contextual knowledge, tacking back and forth between the part and the whole, and reading the part in terms of the whole, and the whole in terms of the part . . . (p. 63)

This type of analytic move, of going from part to whole and back again as a means of interpreting texts, is also known as a hermeneutical analysis or interpretation of discourse and is frequently employed in constructionist research (see Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

In describing a hermeneutical approach and its application to accounts analysis, Shotter (1985) states that

Accounts indicate metonymically, as part to whole, what a person is trying to do in the activity they were observed as doing; they (the accounts) work to specify the larger whole (the situation) in which such an activity can play its proper part. Accounting, then, in this account of it, is the activity in which people, methodically, by the use of established "but as yet unaccounted for" accounting practices embedded in their everyday activities, actively make themselves accountable to one another. And it is a research activity, of course, to discover the nature of these "as yet unaccounted for" practices . . . (p. 174)

In short, a researcher may gain an understanding of social meanings through this analytic tacking back and forth and may interpret what constitutes the “whole,” or cultural knowledge, based on the examination of account vocabularies. For example, in the following chapter I describe how in a discussion over whether or not to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate, the invocation of the vocabulary of “duty” is used to argue against reducing the size of the Senate. The vocabulary of “duty” goes beyond being a way to characterize a position on the specific resolution to contributing to identity constructing processes. In this example, I identified “duty” as an account vocabulary which was voiced in several different speakers’ accounts. I developed my claims regarding the significance and meanings of “duty” by examining how speakers defined “duty” during the course of the discussion and in their responses to previous speakers’ accounts of the importance of “duty.”

Accounts are not just statements about specific events or situations. When speakers invoke particular vocabularies of accounts, they make explicit the key terms with which an event should be defined. Vocabularies of accounts and their accompanying social reception also define what constitutes the “whole” or cultural knowledge. In this analytic step, researchers use account analysis to look beyond the specific event being accounted for and describe what account vocabularies also say about the social worlds which speakers construct.

## Summary

Buttny's (1993) conversation analytic social constructionist approach provides a valuable methodological tool for analyzing how interlocutors during social interaction jointly construct accounts. Accounts are an important research tool for a social constructionist understanding of decision-making. Speakers' vocabularies of accounts during decision-making not only function to advocate particular choices, but also to make explicit a particular social reality. My purpose in applying Buttny's approach is to describe the vocabularies of accounts used during specific decision-making instances and how these vocabularies function to sustain a particular, broader social world for Faculty Senators.

In the following chapters, I analyze three decision-making cases of the University of Washington Faculty Senate. The account vocabularies offered during these resolution discussions do more than just address choices regarding the specific decisions; they also function to define broader aspects of social reality for the Senate such as what is the Senate, the meaning of higher education, diversity, and accountable decision-making.

## End Note

<sup>1</sup> This description of the different classes of legislation is taken from “Faculty: Your Role in University Governance,” a publication of the Office of the Faculty Senate, and obtained on-line at <http://weber.u.washington.edu/~fachome/also/role.html#chart>.

<sup>2</sup> Normally, there would be six meetings during an academic year, however, one meeting was a continuation meeting held when the previous week’s meeting went over time with several lengthy and important resolutions left to discuss.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: CONSTRUCTING FACULTY SENATE IDENTITY**

During the course of decision-making, speakers may provide accounts that function to justify their positions. One of my key claims for this project is that accounts during decision-making also function to construct particular aspects of social reality. The main aspects of social reality that I focus on throughout my dissertation are the meaning of the decision, identity, and social accountability. In the decision-making discussions that I analyzed, speakers' accounts functioned to implicate particular meanings of these three areas across decision-making discussions. The specific decision-making discussion that I analyze in this chapter foregrounds identity while also implicating particular notions of social accountability.

The case study that I describe within this chapter is on a resolution that proposes to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate. This resolution, because it calls for a re-organization of the Faculty Senate, particularly foregrounds issues of Faculty Senate identity. Officially, the Senate is characterized in this way:

The Faculty Senate's principal function is to promote the general welfare of the university. . . . The Senate must also propose and enact legislation that accurately represents the UW faculty opinion on the issues under consideration. (University of Washington Faculty Senate Office, 1996, p. Online)

Although this written definition in some ways characterizes the Senate, during the course of deciding whether to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate, Senators discursively

constructed other ways to characterize the Senate. In the following sections, I provide background information on the resolution and then describe and analyze the vocabularies of accounts presented by Senators.

### **Resolution Background**

At the November 30, 1995, meeting, Professor Steve Warren presented a resolution to the Senate that recommended a fifty-percent reduction in the size of the Faculty Senate. This resolution called for the formation of a task force that would work towards submitting a future resolution to the Faculty Senate that would outline procedures for reducing the Faculty Senate size.

The following utterance (#2) from Professor Warren provides more background information on the resolution:

I'm proposing to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate by about half, and to do this would require a task force to work out a plan for reapportioning the Senators among the various programs. Two years ago I asked the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs to consider this proposal, and they did, but their feeling was that the Senate should not be reduced in size. However, a number of individual senators have expressed a little bit of support for this idea, and so now I'm bringing this issue to the full Senate to find out whether you all are in favor of such a change. So this is the motion, and I move, just a Class C resolution, that a plan should be developed to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate by half of the current membership from one senator for every fifteen faculty members to

one for every thirty. The task force would be appointed by the Senate Chair to formulate a plan to reapportion the Senators [?] and to formulate a process with the transition occurring over a period of four years. The task force would include at least one member from each of the eight faculty groups, and the task force report would be prepared in the form of a proposal of a Class A legislation to be presented next May, 1996.

The Senate voted down this resolution, but during the decision-making discussion, Senators presented various account vocabularies that implicated particular identities for themselves and the Senate.

#### Analysis

In deciding on whether to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate, 7 senators made a total of 11 utterances to speak in favor of or against the resolution.<sup>1</sup> For this analysis, I focus on those 11 utterances (see utterances number 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 35 in Appendix A). Some utterances were procedural as in Chair Junker's or many audience remarks, and other utterances focused on clarification of the resolution (see Table I below for distribution of utterances).

In the following analysis, I describe what account vocabularies Senators used in their decision-making talk (RQ2). I also discuss in more specific detail the implications of these account vocabularies for a social constructionist interpretation of decision-making talk (RQ4, RQ5).

**Table I. Distribution of Utterances for Senate Size Discussion**

	Number of Utterances
In favor of resolution (2 senators)	4
Against resolution (5 senators)	6
For clarification	3
Openings for future utterances	2
Senate Chair Junker <sup>2</sup>	17
Audience <sup>3</sup>	7
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>40</b>

In the data analysis presented below, I applied mainly Buttny's (1993) steps five through seven. In order to describe what accounts make relevant (step #5), I inductively identified speakers' account vocabularies. Then, within a speaker's account of his or her position, I identified the key terms or phrases that were used as the basis for their accounts. Senators articulated three account vocabularies in either supporting or refuting the resolution: work, representation, and the identifying the real problem.

I apply Buttny's (1993) step six by describing accounting as an interactional achievement carried out as speakers describe and respond to the various account vocabularies. I discuss and display utterances which address each account vocabulary in the order of their occurrence to illustrate how speakers are responsive to a given account vocabulary. The responsive nature of speakers' utterances is used in turn to support my

claims regarding how particular meanings are implicated in speakers' remarks. I address Buttny's step seven, the making of the implicit explicit in the following section.

### Work

The vocabulary of "work" was initially voiced by supporters of the resolution. However, during the course of the discussion, other Senators challenged the primacy of this vocabulary in describing the Senate. In justifying the resolution, the sponsor's discourse emphasized the work vocabulary:

Professor Steve Warren (from utterance #7): Number one, many departments have trouble finding volunteers to fill up the Senate. Secondly, the attendance of the Senate meetings is often poor. However, there are some Senators who are more committed and interested in the work of the Senate.

In Professor Warren's comments, he emphasizes a characterization of the Senate that privileges the importance of Senators accomplishing work by serving on the Senate and attending meetings. The work vocabulary was also reinforced in the remarks of the only other supporter of the resolution:

Unknown Senator (utterance #15): Many people consider it a duty to be endured, even a hardship. I think we'll get more effective leadership with a leaner, smaller Senate. It's consistent with the sort of downsizing of most institutions. Albeit it has some (economy?) associated with it. And I think it will result in a livelier, more vital Senate.

Through these remarks, the supporters of the resolution attempted to construct the Senate as an organizational body that must accomplish work. The applicability of the work vocabulary was even supported in the remarks of an opponent of the resolution, Professor Anderson (from utterance #17), “I can appreciate the need to reduce the total number to guarantee that we can have a quorum and get some things done.” However, Professor Anderson later pointed out that one activity associated with the Senate is serving on committees and councils and that a smaller Senate would make finding volunteers for this activity more difficult. In making this point, Professor Anderson applied the work vocabulary in defining the Senate. However, he disputed whether the resolution would facilitate more work.

Other Senators rejected in three different ways the vocabulary of the Senate as a “work” body. Senator Dave Cohen did this by re-defining the relationship between faculty and the Senate from being “work” oriented to being a “duty” with the former term connoting “burden” and the latter term connoting “responsibility”:

Cohen (from utterance # 21): Serving in the Senate is one of the duties that we as faculty members have. The lack of a quorum reflects our own failings as a body as much as the size of the body.

Senator Christine Stephenopolous added that the Senate has an alternative, specific function for new faculty:

Stephenopolous (from utterance #23): One of the things that I’m very concerned about is the assumption that meaner and leaner is necessarily better and

that's potentially what our function is. I think one of the important functions of the Faculty Senate is that it's a kinda training ground for new faculty who come in.

Rather than just consider what the faculty does for the Senate, Stephenopolous argued that the Senate fulfills certain functions for the faculty.

Professor Vivian Wolf-Willetts also challenged the emphasis on the Senate's work as passing legislation:

Wolf-Willetts (from utterance #35): I think now what happens is that we frequently have one person from a department or in some cases two. And they convey a lot of information about the Senate decisions coming up and ask people to think about issues.

Professor Wolf-Willetts applied the work vocabulary by describing what activities Senators do outside of the context of Senate meetings.

Some senators applied the work account vocabulary to support the resolution, while other Senators applied a work vocabulary in rejecting the resolution. Although Senators accepted a work orientation as a way of describing the Senate, the definition of work in the Senate was discursively negotiated to implicate particular acceptable identities for Senators.

The supporters of the resolution characterized the resolution as addressing a problem in the Senate of work not being accomplished with work being described as passing legislation. However, this description treats the Senate as a uni-dimensional

entity, and this characterization was resisted by many Senators. In speaking out against the resolution, some Senators highlighted other facets of the Senate.

Senators socially constructed a multidimensional conceptualization of both themselves as faculty and of the Senate. First, some Senators highlighted work on the Senate as being a duty rather than a burden. Through this redefinition, Senators defined faculty, rather than the organizational structure, as agents who are responsible for their own level of participation. Second, faculty members emphasized other important functions of the Senate such as conveying information to their departments, providing a “training ground” for new faculty members, and providing a volunteer pool for committees and councils. In brief, the work vocabulary was resisted by many Senators who constructed an alternative identity of the Senate by including other functions of the Senate.

### Representation

Initially, some Senators, such as Professors Warren and Anderson, highlighted how the resolution would result in more effective leadership by trimming the size of the Faculty Senate so that it could pass legislation more efficiently. The supporters did address the issue of representation in their accounts but expressed the sentiment that representation should not be a factor for Senators in considering the resolution:

Warren (utterances #7 & 9): The size of the Faculty Senate actually exceeds that of the Washington state legislature . . . For example, I think of (?)

sciences they have 23 Senators, but I think that our interests could be adequately represented by 11.

Unknown senator (from utterance #15): I don't think it's a question of democratic representation. . . . It's consistent with the sorta downsizing of most institutions.

Professor Warren and the other Senator do address representation in their accounts to justify their positions against the resolution. They both assert that the resolution should not be discussed in terms of a vocabulary of representation.

However, some Senators opposed the resolution by using the account vocabulary of representation. These Senators equated a decrease in the size of the Senate with a loss of representation. For example, as Professor Anderson (from utterance #17) stated, "I think that the reduction is maybe more severe than might need be because any reduction at all is a loss of representation."

Professor Dave Cohen (utterance #21) also highlighted the importance of having a Senate that represents the broader views of the faculty:

Things come to us pushed by some body who thinks they KNOW what the right answer is, but that doesn't really reflect the larger views of the faculty. Having more of us here tends to ensure that if it comes out of this body at least it will be more likely chance of being acceptable to the faculty at large.

In his account for his stance, Professor Cohen pointed out a link between the goal of the Senate to pass legislation and to be a representative body. The Senate cannot achieve its goal of passing legislation effectively if it does not represent the faculty adequately. In this respect, the identity of the Senate as a representative body should take precedence over characterizing the Senate's primary objective as passing legislation.

In an early account in favor of the resolution, Professor Warren focused on how the Senate would be better able to accomplish its work with fewer members. This characterization of the Senate emphasizes what the Senate does rather than how it operates. However, in applying the vocabulary of representation, Senators socially constructed a particular characterization of the Faculty Senate and its purpose. When the Senate's primary responsibility is viewed as representation, then process (i.e., the sharing of diverse views), rather than product (i.e., passing legislation), is privileged. Senators socially constructed an identity of the Faculty Senate in which representation took precedence.

### The Real Problem

Some Senators were against the resolution, not because they were opposed to its purpose, but because they felt that the resolution was too extreme in proposing the one-half reduction. As one Senator stated,

Dave Cohen (from utterances #19 & #21): I'd be very interested to know what the arguments of the Council on Faculty Affairs were when they rejected the previous proposal. I would like to oppose the motion as it is because

it presumes that we shall cut it in half. It does not address the issue of what should we do, what is the appropriate size, what is the appropriate mode of organization. . . . the real debate here is to what extent should we [be?] organized.

In general, Senators wanted to have more information on the problem:

Jim Herrick (from utterance #25): I think we need to gather data on the problem here. I think we need to do that by going to our departments and getting some sense of what are the reasons . . .

Vivian Wolf-Willets (from utterance #35): I would also not be in favor of this motion without some data.

By questioning the initial definition of the debate and requesting for more data on the problem, these Senators' accounts function to reject the problem as presented by Professor Warren, the sponsor of the resolution. In addition, in the account vocabulary of identifying the real problem, Senators constructed implicitly a desirable way of making decisions. This decision-making process specifies that in order to be accountable decision-makers, the Senate must have adequate information to understand the problem, and the Senate must take into consideration the views of other relevant groups associated with the Senate.

### The Construction of Social Worlds

In the preceding section, I focused on identifying and describing the various account vocabularies used by Senators to justify their stances as they attempted to reach

a decision in the resolution discussion. I emphasized how the meaning and significance of particular account vocabularies for the decision-making process I described was socially negotiated by interlocutors. In discussing the Senate size resolution, Senators' account vocabularies contributed to the construction of broader notions of social reality that went beyond the immediate issue of deciding the appropriate size of the Senate. In this section, I apply Buttny's seventh analytic step (the making of the implicit explicit) by relating Senators' account vocabularies to social constructionist conceptualizations of identity and social accountability.

### Identity

Senators' account vocabularies implicated a particular identity for the Faculty Senate as an organizational body and for faculty as individuals. The accounts in favor of the resolution focused on the need for the Senate to be efficient. However, the concept of efficiency places priority upon the products of the Senate rather than on the processes of the Senate. Instead of allowing the concept of efficiency to be used to define the Senate, in invoking the vocabularies of work and representation, other Senators defined the nature of the Faculty Senate as a democratic body.

Senators' account vocabularies also contributed to the construction of an organizational identity which valued both rationality and collegiality. In presenting their accounts against the resolution, Senators articulated a preference for a rational model of decision-making. The rational approach to decision making emphasizes gathering

information in order to define the problem accurately and assess the merits of the solutions proposed (Jarboe, 1996).

In addition to pointing toward a rational organizational identity, Senators' accounts implicated a collegial organizational identity that values shared power and collective responsibility (Birnbaum, 1988). Specifically, faculty were expected to be good colleagues by fulfilling their duty to serve on the Senate. As Bergquist (1992) states, "men and women who are successful in this [collegial] culture usually are actively involved in the faculty governance processes of their institutions" (p. 17). In voting down the resolution to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate and by referring to the vocabularies of duty, representation, and participation, faculty implicated a collegial organizational identity that values the involvement of faculty in university governance.

However, the discussion on this resolution also captures a tension between individualism and collectivism in collegial cultures. According to Bergquist (1992), individuality and autonomy are valued in a collegial culture. By validating diverse ways of participating during this discussion, Senators also expressed an appreciation for the individuality and autonomy of faculty. However, faculty, as good citizens, are still expected to fulfill their duties as described in the work vocabulary. This tension also illustrates Shotter's (1984) point that

besides enabling accountable action, such procedures [of ideology] also work to constrain members in what they can say and do. They put limits upon their behaviours, for people must talk and act only in ways which are intelligible and

legitimate within their society, and which are appropriate to their momentary position (or status) as the persons they are within it. (p. 173)

A faculty member may still be an individual; however, he or she must function as a part of the collective university community.

### Social Accountability

Senators' account vocabularies also contribute to constructing faculty as accountable agents. In defining the nature of the problem, supporters of the resolution identified a flaw in structure of the Senate: that it is too large to accomplish its purposes. However, in speaking against the resolution, other senators disagreed with the characterization of the problem as a flaw in the organizational structure. Instead, these senators cast blame, and thus responsibility, upon the individuals whose duty it is to serve on the Faculty Senate. In this respect, agency is placed upon faculty rather than the organizational structure. This particular conceptualization of agency defines what it means to be an accountable Senator. Faculty members, rather than the organizational structure, are to be held responsible for fulfilling their duties, representing the faculty, and participating in the Senate.

Senators also defined what it means to be an accountable participant. While Senators must fulfill their duties, they are not accountable for participating simply by always being active and speaking out during meetings. Instead, accountable participation may involve reluctance, conveying information to departments, and listening and learning during the course of meetings.

### Summary

The analysis in this chapter contributes to an understanding of the connection between decision-making and identity construction and also to an understanding of the utility of this type of social constructionist analysis. In examining speakers' accounts from a social constructionist perspective, I described how speakers discursively constructed a problem they were addressing by applying particular account vocabularies. For example, Professor Cohen and other Senators applied a work vocabulary to describe the problems of a lack of participation and attendance at Senate meetings which prevented the Senate from passing legislation efficiently.

In discussing whether or not to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate, Senators presented various account vocabularies to justify their stances on the resolution. These account vocabularies also functioned to construct the problematic situation and Faculty Senate identity. Senators rejected the dominance of the work vocabulary and instead emphasized a vocabulary of representation to define the Senate. In the identifying the real problem vocabulary, Senators rejected the initial definition of the problematic event. Senators also constructed a particular identity of themselves as rational and collegial decision-makers in describing the ways in which they wanted to identify the real problem.

## End Notes

<sup>1</sup> Two Senators used two utterances in providing their accounts, and one Senator used three utterances for his account.

<sup>2</sup> John Junker's utterances are procedural or do not address the merits of the resolution, and for these reasons, Junker's statements are classified separately from other remarks.

<sup>3</sup> Because audience remarks are made either to second motions, vote, or laugh at humorous comments, audience utterances are classified separately.

## CHAPTER FIVE: CONSTRUCTING UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTABILITY

During decision-making, speakers' account vocabularies function to define the meanings of decisions. The social negotiation of a choice's meaning during decision-making may be especially prominent for controversial issues as in the University of Washington Faculty Senate's debate on whether or not to implement a Culture and Ethnic Diversity (CED) requirement.

In 1996, the University of Washington Faculty Senate attempted to implement a course requirement to promote awareness of diversity. The Senate deliberated on a resolution that called for the implementation of a four-unit Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement. This proposed requirement consisted of one course focusing on "expand[ing] each student's ability to think critically about issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and class differences and similarities that are manifested in U.S. society."<sup>1</sup> The Senate's discussion of the proposed CED requirement was extremely controversial in that Senators voiced several strong and disparate opinions about the proposal. However, as I will illustrate, the Senate debated not just the issue of whether to implement the CED requirement, but also the meaning of the CED. The Senate's discussion of the proposed CED also in turn implicated a particular organizational identity and notions of social accountability for the Senate.

## Resolution Background

During the resolution discussion, Jan Carline, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, stated that the University of Washington community has “had a long history of student and faculty interest in these matters” of culture and ethnic diversity (utterance #4). Discussion of a CED requirement began in 1988 as a result of racially-based incidents on campus. In response to these incidents, the student government formed a Task Force on Racism, which recommended an Ethnic Studies Requirement (an early version of the CED) (Rodriguez, 1996).

In 1993, the Faculty Senate approved a CED requirement, but enough faculty wrote to protest the requirement so that it needed to be re-considered by the Senate. The CED proposal was sent to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and a special task force was set up to determine if a CED requirement was needed and whether resources were available for supporting such a requirement (Dudley, 1996). Student interest in a CED requirement was so strong that in 1994, a group of students shut down a Faculty Senate meeting in protest over a proposal for an American Pluralism Requirement (an early version of the CED). This group of students complained that the proposed requirement was too broad, because it did not deal specifically with diversity in U.S. society (Rodriguez, 1996).

At a February 29, 1996 Senate meeting, a CED requirement proposal was again presented. The CED task force developed its proposed requirement by examining various course statistics to ensure that graduation rates would not be affected. In

addition, the task force consulted with the Faculty Senate during a January 25, 1996 meeting and with student groups to take into consideration the concerns of these various campus groups regarding the content of the proposed CED requirement. The proposal to the Faculty Senate was phrased as follows:

(Effective Autumn Quarter 1994, the requirements for graduation shall include:)

d. no fewer than 5 credits of course work that addresses the following education goals: to expand each student's ability to think critically about one or more contemporary issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religions, and class differences and similarities that are manifested in the U.S. society.

[Implementation of this requirement will take place when enrollment spaces in courses are adequate to assure reasonable access to courses meeting this requirement, but no later than the entering class of 1998.]<sup>2</sup>

The two-year delay was to ensure that the university administration and undergraduate students could adjust to the requirement in a way that would not lower graduation rates. The proposed requirement also could be used to fulfill other university-wide requirements.

During the 1995-96 academic year, there were two meetings in which the Faculty Senate deliberated on the CED resolution. In the first meeting, the Senate approved the resolution after a great deal of controversial debate. However, because enough faculty wrote to the Faculty Senate Office to protest the requirement, the resolution was brought back to the Faculty Senate for a second vote.<sup>3</sup> In the second discussion of the

resolution on May 23, 1996, a substitute resolution was introduced and approved. This non-binding substitute resolution recommended that departments and programs examine their courses to see if there were a sufficient number of classes available for students to take that addressed issues of diversity.

### **Analysis**

One key feature of accounts analysis is that accounts are presented in response to problematic issues or a perceived social breach. Within the context of the discussion of the CED requirement, there were several problematic issues that were defined. During the decision-making process, Senators' account vocabularies also implicated other aspects of their social worlds. Specifically, the account vocabularies (RQ2) of diversity, higher education, and requirement all functioned to characterize the resolution (RQ3) and notions of university accountability (RQ4 & RQ5). In the following sub-sections, I address research questions two and three by describing Senators' account vocabularies during the two discussions of the CED. In the following section, I relate Senators' account vocabularies to research questions four and five on identity and social accountability, respectively.

#### **CED-Round One Discussion**

The first discussion of the CED resolution consisted of 144 utterances. Six participants made a total of nine utterances in favor of the resolution (see utterances number 4, 6, 90, 92, 94, 110, 112, 114, and 130 in Appendix B). Three participants made five utterances against the resolution (see utterances number 8, 10, 12, 14, and 85

in Appendix B). The other 130 utterances consisted of procedural remarks, amendments, requests for clarifications, and information (see Table II below for distribution of all utterances). I primarily focus on the 9 accounts in favor of (6) or against (3) the resolution. I also discuss utterances that were offered as amendments to the resolution. These utterances were significant because of how they functioned to re-define the resolution in ways which were responsive to the various account vocabularies. Senators' account vocabularies consisted of diversity, education, and requirement.

**Table II. Distribution of Utterances for First CED Discussion**

	Number of Utterances
In favor of resolution (6 participants)	9
Against resolution (3 participants)	5
For clarification (3 participants)	11
Amendments (4 participants)	11
Procedural remarks (7 participants)	11
Information (2 participants)	2
Opening for future remarks (1)	1
Senate Chair Junker	59
Audience	34
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>144</b>

Diversity. The term “diversity” occurred a total of 40 times, constituting 4% of the words uttered. However, to say that diversity was a key point based solely on its frequency of occurrence loses the richness of what diversity meant for the interlocutors and how the meaning of diversity was socially negotiated in Senators’ decision-making talk. Diversity, as an account vocabulary, was used in many different ways to either support or speak against the CED requirement. In some instances, the CED was defined as an affirmation of diversity, and in other instances, the CED was defined as being contrary to the value of diversity.

The first occurrence of the vocabulary of diversity to support the resolution was in Senator Jan Carline’s opening remarks (from utterance #4):

They [students and faculty] have been concerned that the academic community address issues of diversity and having our students be exposed to an intellectual approach around those issues, so that indeed our institution has some critical, reasoning skills, where they have some chance to exercise those skills around diversity.

Senator Carline further supported this vocabulary of diversity by citing that the university mission statement emphasizes “providing our students with critical abilities with independent judgments to deal with issues of diversity and achievement called for in the liberal arts and sciences.”

Senator Carline’s claim that the resolution is an affirmation of diversity was also supported by the student representative’s statement (utterance #6) that “what is at issue

here is diversity, how we think about it and how we feel about it as a society.” James Rodriguez, the student representative, stated explicitly that the university was to be held “accountable to value diversity” and, that, as such, “there’s no better way to show that you value diversity than by requiring that diversity be studied.”

When the resolution was initially presented, many participants applied the vocabulary of diversity to characterize the main issue of the resolution. There were no Senators who disagreed with the importance of diversity; however, Senators disputed the application of diversity in characterizing the resolution. For example, Senator Pierre Van Den Berghe remarked (from utterance #8), “Basically, I’m saying that it’s [diversity] too good of a subject to be spoiled by a requirement.” In his remarks, Van Den Berghe did affirm the importance of diversity, however, he disputed the characterization of the CED requirement as an affirmation of diversity. He did this by describing how, because of its narrow focus on specific groups within U.S. society, the proposed CED requirement did not truly address this central issue.

The link between the resolution and diversity was socially negotiated in a variety of ways. Some senators amended the resolution to include more groups of people. For example, in response to the accounts which supported affirming diversity, but disagreed on whether the proposed CED actually was an affirmation of diversity, Senator John Gallant offered two amendments. The first added the category of disability (see utterance #21). Senator Gallant’s second amendment replaced the phrase “U.S. society” with “human society” (see utterance #28). Both of these amendments were approved

with no discussion. Senator Dolphine Oda moved that age be added to the list of diversity elements (from utterance #57). This amendment was also approved.

By amending the resolution, Senators Gallant and Oda were responsive to Van Den Berghe's account about the proposal not being a diversity requirement, because it addressed a very limited number of categories of individuals. Senators Gallant and Oda re-constructed the resolution in a way which while defining diversity broadly, also affirmed diversity. As Senator Gallant stated (utterance #16), "I'm in favor of the proposal in principal, but I'd like to amend it to meet some of the objections that have been made." Also, Senator Gordana Crnkovic (utterance #130) affirmed the ways in which the amendments functioned to validate a broad conceptualization of diversity:

I must say that I'm much happier with it, the amended proposal, than I was with the proposal that we originally had. One of the things that my department and my students were opposing was this limitation to U.S. society . . .

By amending the resolution to encompass more categories of diversity, the value of diversity was implicitly affirmed for some Senators.

Many of the utterances following the amendments focused on how the CED would affect students. Not until medical student Jeff Henderson<sup>4</sup> spoke (utterance #94) was the issue of diversity brought up again:

We have a blurring of what it is that we're really talking about. To take this issue and couch it in terms of dollars, space, four year graduation rates, etc., and to bring it out of its real life, that of the importance of a deep appreciation and

understanding of the uniqueness of the diversity of the individuals in this country or colleagues or other students or future co-worker and colleagues. . . . Don't let the lines be blurred, and what it is that we're really talking about. If this university truly does value diversity, it will find some way to deal with the space, the dollar, the potential impact on graduation rates, etc., etc.

In his account, Henderson described why the account vocabulary of diversity should be valued over other vocabularies.

That the CED is an affirmation of diversity was also foregrounded in other utterances following Henderson's. For example, Senator Lou Wolcher (utterance #114) stated that

it seems to me that a university in the service of a 2,000 year tradition of critical thought, taking very little for granted about what is discussed, should embrace a requirement which requires people to think critically about their culture and their society in depth.

In this way, Senator Wolcher re-affirmed the importance of diversity.

Despite the changes made in the resolution to broaden it, other senators expressed continued uncertainty about what it meant to study diversity. For example, Senator Paul Beame related his uncertainty over what courses would address the CED by asking if the study of language would meet the requirement (utterance #134). In other words, some Senators indicated that the account vocabulary of diversity in relation to the proposed requirement was vague.

The application of a social constructionist perspective highlights the various constructions of diversity during the resolution discussion. Although Senators disagreed on whether to support the resolution, they agreed on the importance and value of diversity. Senators disagreed, however, with how best to affirm the importance of diversity and, in this respect multiple and competing constructions of the resolution were developed. Although the vocabulary of diversity was applied to support the resolution by defining it as an affirmation of diversity; this same vocabulary was also used to refute the resolution by claiming that it was not an affirmation of diversity. In response to this latter application of the diversity vocabulary, the meaning of diversity was made explicit. For example, when some Senators criticized the resolution for not being inclusive enough, other Senators responded by modifying the resolution to encompass categories such as age, disability, and human rather than U.S. society. In addition to being used as a key term for the decision-making process, the vocabulary of diversity was also interconnected with the other account vocabularies which I describe below.

Education. In deciding whether or not to implement a CED requirement, Senators also negotiated the meaning of education in the university and how the CED related to that meaning. Senator Carline in his opening remarks (utterance #4) used the vocabulary of higher education by citing the university mission statement and its call for “providing our students with critical abilities.” Senator Carline also emphasized the role of education in preparing undergraduate students for their future careers:

The other last reason for thinking about this requirement now is that in the world that we are facing in the United States with questions and concerns from potential employers of our undergraduates, the ability to think clearly about diversity issues really will be a skill that is needed by our undergraduates going off into the work force.

In this respect, the CED was characterized as being a critical part of education by being aligned with the university mission statement and by contributing to the education of undergraduates. Specifically, education at the university was characterized as teaching students to be critical thinkers and as preparing students for future careers in a diverse workforce.

Senator Van Den Berghe, the most avid opponent of the CED, used a vocabulary of education at the university to oppose the resolution (utterance #8). In his first argument against the resolution, Van Den Berghe described how the university was not a “place to foster self-esteem or political consciousness.” There were no other Senators who echoed Van Den Berghe’s statement that the CED was a positive self-esteem requirement; however, other Senators did share Berghe’s concern about whether or not the CED meets the goals of higher education. For example, as Senator Graham Allen stated (from utterance #14),

I believe that education is on the verge of cataclysmic changes with the advent of the personal computer, and I think that the Faculty Senate and the faculty should

be directing its attention to what education is going to be like in the 21st century, rather than on what it was in the last 50 years.

The vocabulary of higher education was not addressed again until Jeff Henderson's utterance (#94). In his remarks, Henderson tied his points back explicitly to those made by Van Den Berghe (utterance #8) regarding the meaning of higher education by stating,

Professor Van Den Berghe states that this is a very naive motion that we have before us, and that it is not this university's place to help assist, enhance, or otherwise support the self-esteem of the students nor to provide any comfort for them. Reading from his very last line in his email message, "good education is not about feeling good about oneself and others," end quote. Well, while I would not say that that's not exactly true, good education certainly is not about feeling bad about one's self or others.

Professor Lou Wolcher (utterance #110) of the Law School also relates the CED to the goals of education by stating, "for me the important aspect of this proposal is to think critically about anything at all." In his remarks, Wolcher connects the vocabulary of diversity with that of higher education by stating,

To think critically about society leads inevitably back to questions about race, ethnicity, and gender. . . . If we study these [court cases] without reference to these criteria, the students that we would turn out at the Law School would be technocrats without a heart or without a soul. They would not be (?); they

would be uneducated technocrats, and it seems to me that a university, in the service of a 2,000 year Western tradition of critical thought, taking very little for granted about what is discussed, should embrace a requirement which requires people to think critically about their culture and their society in depth.

In the process of referring to higher education to support the CED requirement, Senators in turn define the meaning of higher education. For some Senators the meaning of higher education comprises the notion that higher education should prepare students for future careers. For other Senators the significance of a university education comports preparing students to enter a culturally diverse workforce or a technologically-oriented workforce. Some Senators described competing meanings of higher education such as whether it should be forward or backward looking, and the involvement of students' feelings or emotions in learning. Despite these differences, Senators agreed that higher education should train students for their futures and to be critical thinkers. However, Senators disagreed on the role of the CED in achieving these goals.

CED as Requirement. The third account vocabulary regarding the CED addressed defining what the requirement means, as opposed to what diversity means. For example, in arguing that graduation rates would be affected Senator John Sidles (from utterance #85) stated,

In the present graduating class within Engineering, about 30% would presently pass the CED requirement, and about 70% would not. So, it does seem that there would be an adverse impact on the 4 year graduation rates . . .

Sidles' concern regarding the impact of the CED on graduation rates is also echoed in inquiries from other senators regarding what courses could be taken to satisfy the proposed CED. For example, Senator Edward Clark (utterance #77) asked if the study of the Spanish language could fulfill the requirement.

Sidles and Clark's remarks were addressed in part by Dean Campbell and University Registrar Tim Washburn, who provided information about how the task force took graduation rates into consideration. Also, Clark and Sidles' comments were countered by Senator Phil Bereano's account (from utterance #90):

As another representative from the College of Engineering, I guess I have to differ with my other colleagues and report that I don't believe this feeling unanimous in the College of Engineering. Engineering students must take certain General Education courses, many of which would qualify for this, so there's absolutely no reason to conclude, it's illogical, that the passage of this would unnecessarily extend anyone's time for graduation. They have to be up on what their requirements are. They have to have good advisors, which I know that the College provides, as you know.

The vocabulary of CED as requirement emphasized the effects of the CED on graduation rates. This particular vocabulary also shifted the notion of how faculty should be socially accountable educators. The earlier vocabularies of diversity and higher education characterized education with respect to the content of the material taught to students.

The vocabulary of requirement instead focused on accountability as faculty being responsible for making sure that students graduate in a timely manner.

Summary. In the discussion of the proposed CED requirement, Senators' accounting practices not only functioned to justify their positions on the resolution, but they also shaped the context of the resolution. Specifically, senators' account vocabularies characterized the problematic issues relevant for the decision-making discussion. One problem was the inconsistency of the university with its codified purpose to value diversity. One way to respond to this inconsistency would have been to implement the CED. However, for other senators, the CED itself would have create a social breach, since, they believed, the CED did not affirm diversity, was contrary to the goals of higher education, and would affect adversely graduation rates. By invoking each of these vocabularies, Senators defined what the CED would mean for the university and what it means for faculty to be socially accountable decision-makers.

#### CED-Round Two Discussion

As described earlier, the Senate initially approved the CED resolution. However because the requisite number of faculty wrote in to protest the resolution, it was brought back to the Senate for a second vote. Instead of re-voting on the initial resolution, a substitute resolution was introduced to the Senate by Professor Bereano and a group of three other Senators. This resolution was approved by the Senate. The discussion of the substitute resolution illustrates one way for a group to reach agreement on a decision by constructing a choice that encompasses and affirms the different account vocabularies of

the group. One consequence of this type of meaning negotiation, however, is that the new choice that was constructed, while encompassing prior meanings, ultimately did not have the same meaning as the prior choices.

For the second discussion of the CED, there were a total of 51 utterances.

During the course of this discussion, the substitute resolution was introduced, and one amendment proposed, which was voted down. There were two accounts in favor of the substitute motion (see Table III below for distribution of all utterances). The account

**Table III. Distribution of Utterances for Second CED Discussion**

	Number of Utterances
Senate Chair Junker	24
Audience	15
In favor of initial resolution <sup>5</sup>	0
Against initial resolution	0
In favor of substitute	2
Against substitute	0
In favor of amendment	2
Against amendment	1
Informational	3
Procedural comments	4
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>51</b>

vocabularies from the previous discussion of the CED on diversity, education, and requirement are all addressed by the substitute motion; in addition, Bereano introduces a new account vocabulary of “good faith.”

The substitute resolution, as described by Professor Bereano (utterance #10) consisted of the following:

This is moved as Class C resolution which means that it is just voted here because it's a recommendation as you'll see, so it does not have to go to the faculty at all (?) just die. [Reading from the resolution] Whereas the Faculty Senate supports in principle the stated purpose of the Cultural and Ethnic Diversity Requirement Code to enhance students' abilities to think critically about issues of diversity, and whereas the Senate debate surrounding the proposed requirement is evidence of broad faculty consensus that the curriculum of the university should provide a rich array of courses that explicate those issues, now therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend, one, that the faculty of each department, school, and college review its curriculum (a) to ensure the existence of a broad spectrum of courses that contribute to each students' ability to think critically about issues of diversity, and (b) if necessary, develop plans to enhance or revise that curriculum in order to attain its definition of that goal, and two, that the president mandate to deans and directors of colleges and schools to facilitate and support such curriculum reviews and to report their progress reporting those reviews and any curricular needs thus

identified by June 15th, 1997, and three, that the administration should provide funds required to support new curricular initiatives of colleges and schools that result from this plan. That actually should read for any department, colleges, and schools.

The main discussion of this substitute resolution centered on the issue of funding, first raised by university president Richard McCormick (see utterances #21 and #23). President McCormick states explicitly that his concern about funding should not be taken as a pro or con argument and that he supports the “spirit” of the resolution. However, President McCormick had concerns about how the administration could fund the courses that could result from the substitute resolution. Other Senators tried to address the issue of funding subsequently by modifying the resolution (see utterances #25 and #29) until Senator McDermott pointed out that the resolution was a recommendation and not a mandate (see utterance #38).

Bereano’s substitute resolution successfully incorporated the competing account vocabularies from the first resolution discussion thereby facilitating acceptance of the substitute resolution. First, the value of diversity is affirmed through the resolution (“Whereas the Faculty Senate supports in principle the stated purpose of the Cultural and Ethnic Diversity Requirement”). Second, an acceptable goal of higher education is expounded (“to enhance students’ abilities to think critically about issues of diversity”). Finally, the substitute resolution does not have the drawback of mandating a course requirement since faculty are asked to only ensure that courses are available for students

to take which address issues of diversity. Because students would not be required to fulfill a course requirement, graduation rates would not be affected by this resolution.

Professor Bereano also introduced the account vocabulary of “good faith” by noting in his account (utterance #14) that “nothing is mandated by anyone, other than that there be a report” and that the faculty would address the issue of diversity “not under any kind of gun, any kind of requirement, and in good faith, try and address some of the concerns raised . . . without any coercion.” The vocabulary of good faith treats the requirement as being unnecessary due to (unmandated) efforts on the part of faculty and departments to address issues of diversity. Senator Carline (utterance #36), the only other Senator to provide an account to support explicitly the substitute resolution, also reinforces the vocabulary of good faith:

I am very pleased to see the alternate resolution. In fact the report from Shawn Wong and his task force stated clearly that he hoped that at some point in the future that the kind of requirement that was proposed by the council would in fact be unnecessary by virtue of adequate courses having content that was appropriate to represent diversity

Senators did not comment directly on how Bereano’s substitute resolution affirmed the earlier account vocabularies. However, the resolution received strong support from various significant university administrators. For example, university President Richard McCormick stated (utterance #21), “I sure like the spirit of this and

it's academically sound." The main comments from Senators were about the details of successfully implementing the resolution.

### **The Construction of Social Worlds**

During the CED resolution discussion, the CED was defined in as an affirmation of diversity, a part of the objectives of higher education, and as a course requirement. These various account vocabularies functioned to define the decision about whether or not to implement a CED requirement. Each of these account vocabularies also implicates particular notions of organizational identity and social accountability. Even though in the end a substitute resolution was agreed upon, the discussion of the CED resolution can be characterized as a struggle over meaning. This struggle was resolved through the construction of university faculty and departments as accountable colleagues. Each of these themes of the politics of meaning, organizational identity, and accountability will be expanded on within this section.

### **The Politics of Meaning**

The discussion of the CED illustrates how decisions can also be political struggles over meaning (RQ3). This disagreement over the meaning of the CED is interconnected with identity issues (RQ4). I argue that the substitute resolution was passed because it incorporated the disparate meanings associated with the CED in ways which implicated a particular, desirable identity on the part of faculty.

Even though Senators agreed on the key terms or vocabularies with which to discuss the resolution, they disagreed on the specific meanings of those vocabularies.

For example, while diversity was valued, there were disputes about how best to affirm diversity and even the meaning of diversity. Also, while Senators agreed on the importance of higher education for fostering critical thinking and for preparing students for their futures, they disagreed about whether the resolution was appropriate for these goals.

During the CED discussion, many different interest groups had the opportunity to voice their opinions regarding the CED. This struggle over meaning illustrates how social construction processes involve the interactive negotiation of meaning. The supporters of the CED favored the requirement as an affirmation of diversity. Some opponents of the CED were against it because of the very issue of diversity. These opponents argued that the CED was driven by a political agenda. A second group of opponents opposed the CED because of concerns about how graduation rates specifically among engineering and science students would be affected. In these ways, the dispute over the CED requirement involved a struggle over both ideological issues (diversity) and material issues (undergraduate course requirements). The substitute resolution affirmed the disparate positions on the CED by validating diversity without mandating a course requirement.

The debate over the CED also involved a debate over faculty identity. Baxter's (1993) ethnographic study helps to describe how the discussion of the substitute resolution implicated a particular identity. Baxter (1993), drawing from Philipsen (1975), describes two competing codes of communication in a university setting. The

code of “collegiality” holds that “the person is a unique individual whose integrity is best affirmed through the informality of face-to-face talk” (p. 317). Alternatively, the code of “professional management” holds “that the person is constituted through his or her roles, positions and category memberships and that people are best served by written codification” (p. 317). The type of identity affirmed for the Senate through the substitute resolution discussion was one which emphasized collegiality.

Baxter (1993) describes how organizational members who emphasize collegiality feel that written, codified rules “displayed a lack of faith in the person’s ability to reach decisions” (p. 317). Many Senators objected to the original CED resolution because of the “politics” associated with it. The substitute resolution, by not mandating a course requirement, grants autonomy and free choice to departments with respect to how they address issues of diversity within their curriculum. As Professor Bereano, a key sponsor of the resolution, stated, no one is “under any kind of gun, any kind of requirement, and [the faculty will be allowed to] in good faith, try and address some of the concerns raised . . . without any coercion.”

In deliberating on the CED resolution, faculty not only contested the meaning of diversity and the CED, but they also disputed an aspect of their own identity in ways which I describe below. The substitute resolution, by being a recommendation as opposed to mandate, affirmed the right of faculty members and departments to make choices regarding their curriculums. In this way, the Senate demonstrated “faith” in the faculty’s “ability to reach decisions” (Baxter, 1993, p. 317).

### Organizational Identity and Social Accountability

The discussion of the CED resolution also illustrates how identity (RQ4) and social accountability (RQ5) are interconnected. The various account vocabularies--diversity, higher education, and requirement--implicate both a particular organizational identity and conceptualization of accountability. Even though Senators disagreed about whether a CED requirement was an appropriate way to appreciate and understand diversity, they agreed that diversity was an important issue. Similarly, in the account vocabulary of higher education, Senators' characterizations focused on critical thinking and preparing students for the future. Also, in the vocabulary of requirement, Senators emphasized that faculty should assist students in completing their education in a timely manner. These three account vocabularies function to define both what the university is (an identity issue) and what the university should do (an accountability issue).

The CED resolution discussion also highlights how organizational identity is constructed through discursive practices. Much social constructionist writing has focused on individual identity, personhood, or self-hood (see for example, Gergen, 1991; Shotter, 1984, 1993a, 1993b). In deliberating about the CED resolution, Senators' discourse constructed an organizational rather than individual identity. For example, Senators' discourse showed them to construct university identity as characterized by responsiveness to students and committed to diversity.

Senators' discussion of the university adds an important feature to Shotter's (1984) discussion of the interconnection between identity and accountability. Shotter

(1993a) argues that “our ‘selves,’ are produced in our ‘official’ ways of interrelating ourselves to each other--these are the terms in which we are socially accountable in our society (Shotter, 1984)” (p. 180). During the CED discussion, speakers’ accounts functioned not necessarily to describe how individual speakers should relate to each other, but how the university as an institution of higher education should relate to other groups such as students and society. In this respect, the identity of the university as an institution with particular obligations and objectives was socially constructed in speakers’ accounts during the course of decision-making.

#### Summary

The decision-making discourse regarding the CED functioned to define what the CED requirement means and the expectations for appropriate behavior on the part of the university. Some advocates emphasized the importance of affirming diversity. Other Senators did not dispute the importance of diversity but, instead, challenged the specific proposed requirement as a valid and appropriate way to affirm diversity. Given this decision making discourse, the university was defined as accountable for affirming diversity, as responsible to undergraduates in helping them to graduate. In addition, what constituted diversity was modified by adding the categories of disability and age, and by expanding the CED to include courses which analyze non-U.S. societies. In the end, the least contentious, although not most satisfactory decision for many, was a resolution that validated the disparate vocabularies of accounts of Senators.

The discussion of the CED resolution also has implications for social constructionist thinking about identity. During the course of this resolution discussion, faculty constructed a particular organizational identity in which the university was cast as having certain obligations to students and non-academic constituencies. The debate over the CED also encompassed a struggle over identity. The final decision of the Senate affirmed the rights or ability to make curricular choices on the part of individual faculty and departments.

## End Notes

<sup>1</sup> The quotation is taken from notes distributed at the May 23, 1996 Faculty Senate meeting.

<sup>2</sup> I obtained the phrasing from a copy of the resolution obtained at the University of Washington Faculty Senate Office.

<sup>3</sup> Two-hundred forty-one faculty wrote to the Senate office to protest the requirement. A minimum of 135 faculty writing in would have been sufficient to bring the resolution back for a second discussion.

<sup>4</sup> According to the student newspaper, Jeff Henderson was a graduate student in the Department of Medicine (Sullivan, 1996). However, he requested and was given the microphone to speak at the meeting.

<sup>5</sup> By initial resolution, I am referring to the proposed CED requirement which had been previously approved by the Faculty Senate but had been brought back for a re-vote in front of the Senate due to the number of written protests regarding the requirement. The resolution which was approved during this discussion is referred to as the substitute.

## CHAPTER SIX:

### CONSTRUCTING DECISIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

According to Shotter (1984), accounts implicate particular notions of accountability or a group's expectations for responsible and moral behavior. In the following case study, the Senate deliberated on a resolution that called for a judgment of a past event. In the process of rendering a judgment, Senators also socially constructed the meaning of this event. The vocabularies of accounts that Senators presented also had implications for defining how administrators and the Senate should act as responsible decision-makers.

#### Resolution Background

In 1994, one of the most controversial decisions in the recent history of the University of Washington was made. In the previous year, the state of Washington approved legislation that resulted in a reduction of the university budget. In response to the budget reduction, some colleges and schools decided to review whether to cut various programs and departments from the university. Within the College of Arts and Sciences, the largest college in the university, six programs were targeted for elimination: the Department of Speech Communication, the School of Communications, the Slavic Languages and Literatures Department, the Systematic Musicology Program, the Fiber Arts Program, and the Applied Mathematics Department.

The announcement of the proposed elimination of these programs was met with great controversy. The university's budget was greater than anticipated at the end of the

academic year, and as a result the whole-scale elimination of all of these programs was not necessary to meet the budget shortfall. In the end, the Speech Communication Department, School of Communications, Slavic Languages and Literatures Department, and Applied Mathematics Department were reduced in size by various degrees. The Systematic Musicology and Fiber Arts Programs were eliminated from the college, however.

The focus of this case study is not on the specific decision to eliminate departments and programs but on a resolution introduced at the January 25, 1996 meeting of the Faculty Senate that pertained to the processes followed. This resolution called for the Senate to express its “strong disapproval” of Faculty Code violations on the part of the Acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, John Simpson, during the program review and elimination process. The resolution was voted down by the Senate; however, the discussion of this resolution has implications for defining a past event in the history of the university, the Faculty Senate, and responsibility for decision-making.

### Analysis

There were a total of 140 utterances during this resolution discussion. Six senators made seven utterances in favor of the resolution (see utterances number 13, 55, 59, 65, 69, 104, and 124 in Appendix D). Ten senators made a total of 13 utterances against the resolution (see utterances number 63, 80, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 114, 116, 118,

122, 126, and 128 in Appendix D). (see Table IV below for the total distribution of utterances)

**Table IV. Distribution of Utterances for Alleged Faculty Code Violations Discussion**

	Number of Utterances
Senate Chair Junker	65
Audience	28
In favor of resolution (6 senators)	7
Against resolution (10 senators)	13
On substitute resolution (1 senators)	1
On amendment (2 senators)	2
Procedural (4 senators)	8
Clarification (1 senator)	1
Informational (2 senators)	3
Miscellaneous (8 senators)	12
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>140</b>

Even though only 20 (14%) of the 140 utterances addressed the resolution directly, there were several account vocabularies utilized by senators. Specifically, these vocabularies consisted of validation of the Faculty Code, administrator accountability, flaws in the code, impossibility of the situation, Senate as responsible, code violations, and being constructive.

### Validation of the Faculty Code

In speaking in support of the resolution, the sponsors defined the resolution as a “validation of the Faculty Code”:

Jonathan Mayer (from utterance #13): So, um, it's [the resolution is] of extreme importance because it speaks to the heart of shared governance which is central to this university and to the nature of the Faculty Code to which all members have agreed to adhere. . . . As the legislators of the Faculty Code, ultimately, this debate here is about the very meaning and viability of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Code.

Larry Willets (from utterance #59): You have before you now a resolution concerning the validity of the Faculty Code, its governing value for the university.

In applying the account vocabulary of the validation of the Faculty Code, Senators Mayer and Willets defined the resolution as not just an evaluation of Dean Simpson's actions during the program elimination and review process. Instead, the resolution was defined as having implications for the character of the university as a whole and its view of the Faculty Code.

Implicitly, in using this account vocabulary, Senators also contributed to the construction of a particular social reality which they asserted to be the relevant one for this resolution discussion. Specifically, the salient social reality was one in which the Dean took particular actions during the program elimination and review process and

these actions were in violation of the Faculty Code. In this vocabulary, particular characterizations of the past event, notions of agency, and notions of the Faculty Code were constructed. The social reality that was implicated was one in which the Dean was characterized as the responsible agent whose actions were in clear violation of the Faculty Code. Although Senators later on during the decision making process did not challenge the importance of the Faculty Code, they did challenge the particular social reality which this account vocabulary constructed.

Senators also directly challenged how this account vocabulary constructed the resolution as a validation of the Faculty Code. While a particular account vocabulary may resonate with a group, this general agreement on an account vocabulary may not necessarily lead to or produce a consensus. Group members may disagree on the applicability of a particular account vocabulary to a given situation. During this process of socially negotiating the meaning and applicability of an account vocabulary, particular notions of social reality are also interactively negotiated.

#### Administrator Accountability

Senator Mayer also presented an account vocabulary that characterizes administrators in a particular way. In doing this, Mayer placed blame or responsibility for the situation upon Dean Simpson:

Mayer (from utterance #13): Our administrators are hired to do an excellent job at administration. Ultimately, they're responsible for their performing their jobs as well as they're responsible. They have an obligation to

follow the Faculty Code to the letter, and must be held accountable for deviations from the Code. . . . Decision-makers must be held accountable not only for their decisions but for the process behind their decisions.

This account vocabulary of administrator accountability functioned to support the earlier account vocabulary regarding the resolution as a validation of the Faculty Code. In addition, this vocabulary contributed to the construction of Dean Simpson as the agent responsible for problems associated with the program elimination and review process. In applying this account vocabulary, the past event was characterized as one in which improper decision-making processes were followed.

#### Flaws in the Code

Other Senators presented a competing account vocabulary to administrator accountability. Specifically, flaws in the Faculty Code were pointed out, and these flaws were blamed for how the program elimination and review process was handled:

Doug Lind (from utterance #63): During the past few days, I reviewed as many documents as I can from the program elimination process. That includes Dean Simpson's letters, it includes various statements and reasons for targeting these programs. It includes also the transcripts of the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that the Senate had about the program eliminations. The flaws that are mentioned in the process that, in both motions, have come through without a clear, let me just talk about something (?). One is that the definition of program in the Faculty Code is (particularly ambiguous)

and not very accurate. Another is that the current process forces the Dean and the College Council into two opposing positions. . . . And finally, the dean and review committees were really answering different questions. And I think that's one of the most (?) flaws in the current system.

Lind's account, supported by a narrative of his information gathering procedures, presented a vocabulary that challenged the notion that Code violations occurred by pointing out the ambiguity in the Faculty Code. In other words, the flaws were not due to Dean Simpson as active, accountable, responsible agent, but instead are a result of the Code itself.

Other Senators' accounts also pointed to flaws in the Code:

James Herrick(?) (from utterance #122): What I see is the proposal was flawed, but it's impossible for me to place the judgment as to who did what wrong and when. When I calmed down and think about it, the only rational thing that I could come up with is the fact that cuts were sorta made for financial reasons, and when you look in the faculty code the dean has to come up with academic reasons. And those aren't comparable. So I don't see anyone performing any better under those circumstances.

Herrick's account points out that the Code was inadequate for handling the situation.

Senator David Boulware (from utterance #126) agrees explicitly with Herrick's account

regarding the inadequacy of the Code. Boulware also states that "those individuals were without (?) attempting as best they could to follow the Code." Rather than place blame on the Dean, Boulware locates blame in the Code itself.

In presenting the account vocabulary of flaws in the Code, Senators challenged the asserted characterization of the problematic event initially. Specifically, within this discourse, the Dean was no longer viewed as the agent responsible for the problems associated with the program elimination and review process. In applying this account vocabulary, the problems were still recognized; however, the Code itself was blamed for those problems.

#### Impossibility of the Situation

Connected directly to the account vocabulary of flaws in the Code was another vocabulary that re-directed blame away from the Dean. This vocabulary differed from blaming the Code in that speakers referred explicitly to the external "situation" or "circumstances" rather than the constraints and ambiguity of the Faculty Code. However, some of the accounts that featured this vocabulary were in support of the resolution, while others are against the resolution:

Mayer (from utterance #13): The circumstances under which he functioned last year were adverse. Almost all of you will remember that the governor ordered all state agencies to prepare for budget reductions. This was transmitted to President Gerberding, and then down the administrative

hierarchy of the university. I feel deeply for the sense of futility that I'm sure our well-meaning administrators felt, including Dean Simpson.

Mayer, while a supporter of the resolution, does acknowledge the difficulty of the situation. Despite this, Mayer privileges the 'administrator accountability' vocabulary over the 'impossibility of the situation' vocabulary in order to support the resolution.

Professor Lind, like Professor Mayer, also points to the difficulties of the situation:

Lind (from utterance #63): Another is that the current process forces the Dean and the College Council into two opposing positions. They act as both prosecutor and judge. There is a rigid time table. And in the events of last year, were forced to make (often) difficult decisions before they even knew the outcome of the final budget. In fact, one of President Gerberding's main rationales for reversing the dean was that by then he did know the final budget, and reversed the decision. And finally, the dean and the review committees were really answering different questions. And I think that's one of the most (?) flaws in the current system.

Like Senator Lind, Senator Boulware's account also blames flaws in the system rather than flaws in the Dean's decision making process:

**Boulware (from utterance #126): It seems to me that an acting dean came into an impossible situation and acted honorably and forthrightly. He did the best he could in an impossible situation.**

**Boulware, to support his account, even describes how the situation could have been much worse if it were not for the Dean's particular choices in the impossible situation.**

**For example, Boulware (utterance #126) stated,**

**he [the Dean] could have simply put forward precisely the number of programs that he needed in order to make his cuts. And provided at that time a complete specification of why he chose, in all the gory detail, and then, we would be here, either now or a few months ago, complaining that the whole process was a charade, that he only put up exactly what he needed to cut. There was never any chance that no matter what the review committee said, those units WOULD BE CUT.**

**The significance of the flaws in the situation account vocabulary was that the criteria for determining whether or not the Dean acted in an accountable manner was altered to take into consideration the various constraints under which he was operating. The notion of accountable decision-making was shifted from focusing on individual choices and agency to incorporating how individuals act within the constraints of a given situation. In addition, this account vocabulary implicitly constructed the Dean's actions as being acceptable. The issue of whether the Code was violated also became less significant given the difficulty of the situation.**

### Senate as Responsible

Several Senators placed blame not on the Dean, Code, or situation, but instead on the Faculty Senate itself as having responsibility for the situation. Many Senators' accounts pointed out that the time for the Senate to take action was in the past:

Doug Lind (from utterance #63): I think the time to raise this issue, the specific issue about the criteria by which these programs were targeted for eliminations, was thirteen months ago, and not now.

Malcolm Parks (from utterance #114): Now, whether or not a violation occurs of course depends in part also on the response to it. So IF you believed, that the so-called criteria were not adequate reasons, then it was the senate's JOB in December 1994, to do this resolution, (.) and to assert the protection of the faculty at THAT point, WHEN it would have made a difference. Part of me wants to cry out to you, and say, 'where were you when we needed you?' This is like a ball that's bounced off the senate's chest and has now dribbled out of bounds.

This account vocabulary expanded the dialogue of what it means to be accountable by including the Senate as a responsible body for the past action being discussed. Given this notion of accountability, the resolution was cast as being inappropriate, because passing the resolution was not an accountable way for the Senate to be involved. The past actions on the part of the Dean were still constructed as being problematic. However, accountability for university decision-making was socially

constructed to include the broader university community, and more specifically, the Faculty Senate itself.

### Code Violations

The account vocabulary that was most significant in supporting the resolution dealt with whether what had occurred in the past constituted a violation of the Faculty Code. Senators disagreed as to whether or not Code violations actually occurred. In arguing over the application of this account vocabulary, Senators also characterized the past events and described what actions constituted either a violation or a fulfilling of the Code.

In arguing that Code violations did occur, the sponsors of the resolution stated, Mayer (from utterance #13): The fundamental facts here are pretty clear. Neither department, neither review committee for the departments, received letters from the Dean of Arts and Sciences specifying why these programs had been selected for review. The Faculty Code requires that such letters be furnished. Clearly, the procedures of the Faculty Code were violated.

Willets (from utterance #59): There's no question that the Code indeed was violated.

The utterances presented by Professors Willets and Mayer utilized an account vocabulary that defined the past events as constituting a violation of the Faculty Code. In presenting their accounts, these Senators went on to provide a narrative description of past events to illustrate how the Code was violated by Dean Simpson's actions.

Professor Phil Bereano also presented an account that functioned to construct the events of 1994-95 as constituting a violation of the Faculty Code:

Bereano (from utterance #55): I just want to inform the members of the Senate that the same kinds of situation that is alleged in this Class C resolution existed in 1983 when we last went through a big round of vertical cuts . . . . And so this seems to be more than just a one shot thing when in fact there is certainly evidence, having lived through it, I can attest to that fact, that this has been an ongoing problem.

While supporting some Senators' arguments to vote in favor of the resolution, this account vocabulary also functioned to construct the past events during the program elimination and review process in a particular way. Specifically, in describing the requirements of the Faculty Code and the past events, some Senators defined the Dean's actions as a violation of the Faculty Code.

Many senators disputed the notion that code violations occurred by describing how the Dean provided his reasons for eliminating programs. One Senator described her own experiences with the program elimination and review process in the Music Department (see utterance number 98). Although this Senator was not a member of the program under review, she described the various reasons and letters that the Dean provided that constituted a following of the Faculty Code. This senator also noted that while programs themselves may feel that the reasons provided were not good reasons, reasons were given that constituted a following of the Faculty Code.

In the following account, a narrative was presented in which Senator Lind defined the past event as following the stipulations of the Faculty Code:

Lind (from utterance #63): I'd like to speak to the motion in front of you from the viewpoint of someone who was on one of the review committees. I was on the fiber arts review committee. The motion talks about serious violations of the code. The dean wrote each member of the committee a letter outlining the specific three criteria to be used in (?) the programs. These criteria were quality, centrality, and instructional responsibilities. In the case of this specific program, we focused on two of those three criteria. He included definitions of these criteria in a series of questions that the committee should ask itself when addressing these issues. He followed up a month later, with a separate letter which expanded on the definition of centrality. Taken together, these and (?) written statements met the requirements of the code.

In the various accounts above, some Senators provided a verbal narration of their involvement in the events of last year to help support their accounts of no code violations occurring. More specifically, these Senators described how the Dean provided reasons for eliminating certain programs and, in this way, fulfilled the requirements of the Code. However, many Senators still defined the Dean's past actions as constituting a violation of the Code. In response to the Senators who argued that Code violations did

not occur, other Senators provided more detail and background information to show that the Code was violated.

For example, Senator Warren Guntheroth made a distinction between giving general versus particular reasons:

Guntheroth (from utterance #65): I think that there is a ton of difference between a (?) particulars and a general statement of the law. To be asked to plead guilty or not guilty without knowing what the charge is. I think there's a very fundamental problem. . . .What we have here are specific parts of the code that have been (?) and have been violated.

Another Senator made a distinction between the different parties which the Dean provided reasons for elimination to and relates this distinction to Code violations:

[Senator from Slavic Languages and Literatures Department] (utterance #104):

But I think there was confusion about which reasons we are talking about. These were the reasons, or the so-called reasons that Dean Simpson supplied to President Gerberding after the Review Committee recommended that the department should be retained. And he went ahead and proposed elimination anyway. Those were probably attempts at giving some reasons, but those were not the initial reasons. All we got as one of the targeted departments, and all every other targeted department got was three criteria, at first, vaguely defined. Later, less vaguely defined, but still very vaguely defined. Those are criteria which

could be used, applied to every department on this campus. It did not say why this criteria should be applied to Slavic, or Applied Math, or any other program which was targeted. So, I can understand that people may feel that maybe some of these are accusations which are not proven, but I don't want people to confuse what Dean Simpson said in the letter to President Gerberding when he went ahead and proposed elimination, despite the recommendations which were against elimination and the reasons which were not given from the very beginning of the elimination process. Okay.

In applying the account vocabulary of Code violations, some Senators provided narratives of what occurred in the past to make explicit certain background details. Other Senators challenged these accounts by re-defining the descriptions of the Code violations:

Robert Goodkin (from utterance #80): (Goodkin), Group Seven, Department of Neurosurgery. I sat in on the meeting of January 8th. I'm a representative to the Senate Executive Committee. I have a problem with this. My problem is that facts are assumed here.

Laurence Yaffe (from utterance #92): (Yaffe), Physics. I'd like to fully agree with the previous speaker. I certainly don't know the full history or many details of this. The opening of this resolution simply asserts that not only were there violations, but claims that there were important violations of

the letter and spirit of (the code?). From what I've heard, I don't feel that there's been a convincing basis been made to that.

Senators Goodkin and Yaffe provided accounts that re-cast many previous accounts as assertions rather than as "facts." In other words, the construction of the past event as a Code violation was challenged and questioned directly. Rather than defining the past events as definitely constituting a Code violation or as definitely not constituting a Code violation, these accounts defined the past events as currently indeterminate with respect to violating the Faculty Code.

In challenging the application of the account vocabulary of Code violations, several Senators presented definitions of the Senate as a legislative and not a judicial body:

[Senator Goodkin (?)] (from utterance #90): [first sentence was inaudible] I was going to say, I'm under the impression that the preamble to the resolution was not with a fact finding committee or whatever group met. It seems to me that the resolution, as stated, although we do disapprove, the fact that the faculty code was not followed when it should have been followed. That the preamble was not (?) by the body (?) it should be, maybe, I feel that it should be placed at the adjudication level. This is a legislative body, and I'm wondering whether it is appropriate for us to vote on this at this time, on the basis of the preamble, and I feel that it belongs at a different level right now.

The above account included the claim that the Faculty Senate is a legislative and not a judicial body to support the earlier accounts regarding the ambiguity of the past facts.

The argument was that past events need to be clarified through a judicial, not legislative body. Because the Senate was defined as a legislative and not judicial body, this particular decision was defined as being inappropriate for the Senate to consider.

In response to certain Senators defining the claims of Code violations as assertions, Willets' account below described the presence of documentation to support the notion of the Code being violated:

Willets (from utterance #124): I would just like to address the question which has been raised about whether or not there's any documentation. There's plenty of documentation on the violation. I would like to point out that first of all, the review committees' reports and the appeal panel reports all address this question of the violation of the code. Secondly, there is the June 8th which, a special meeting of the senate, in which this issue was mentioned again and again, and the resulting statement from Chair Junker was said, and I'll continue the statement, the Dean gave no specific reasons even though they were specifically required to do so by the present code. That lack of specificity tainted the whole process of the review and the appeal from the beginning, and (?) any decision that result. Furthermore, we did ask the Secretary of the Faculty, Professor Vaughn,

whether or not he believed the faculty code had been violated, and he did express the opinion that the faculty code had not been followed (?).

However, despite Willets' description of documentation, his and other Senators' descriptions of Code violations were still challenged:

Boulware (from utterance #126): The findings of fact have not occurred. There is a clear PROCEDURE in the CODE for making those findings of facts. You bring in adjudication. This has not been done. We are being asked to vote on a finding of fact, many aspects of which disputable, in the absence OF, the petitioners here, (?) not petitioners, people bringing the resolution, having gone through the appropriate procedures to bring the finding of fact.

The account vocabulary of Code violations is applied and used in various ways. The process of determining whether or not Code violations occurred was also a process that involved interactively negotiating the meaning of the past events, what it means to violate the Faculty Code, and the identity of the Senate as a legislative, rather than judicial body.

#### Resolution Not Constructive

Rather than challenge the definition of the resolution directly as a validation of the Faculty Code, some Senators used an account vocabulary in which they defined the resolution as not being constructive:

Parks (from utterance #114): My question is really whether or not this is a, uh, an action that in any way either prevents future problems like the ones we went through last year or contributes constructively to their avoidance in the future, and my conclusion frankly has to be that it does not.

Selim Tuncel (from utterance #118): What good does it do to say we express our strong disapproval of these serious violations of the Faculty Code? (.) That's my concern. It's not (?) do this before and uh, but uh, again the only type of action that is being taken didn't work in the past and I would raise questions whether this would work in the future.

Doug Kelbaugh (from utterance #128): Doug Kelbaugh, Architecture. There were flaws to be sure in the process, perhaps infractions, maybe even probably infractions, but I think that the first motion will do little more than provide some after the fact, retroactive satisfaction, rather than redress. I don't think there's any painless way to make cuts. There's no good way, no fair way. We can reform the code, we can chastise some administrator. But the next cut, we'll find new, fresh, unexpected ways to be painful and to be unfair. So I don't think we should belabor this. I will speak in favor of Steven Goldblatt's counter uh resolution. We should look to the future for sure, but not with very high expectations.

In essence, this vocabulary was forward-looking by taking into consideration how the resolution would affect the re-occurrence of future events. Each of these Senators, with

Kelbaugh expressing the most skepticism, asserted that the resolution would not affect future events. In defining the resolution as not being constructive, these senators also implicitly contributed to the construction of the identity of the Faculty Senate and the type of actions which it should take. Specifically, the Senate should take actions that look toward the future of the university. Also, in applying this account vocabulary, Senators did not address the issue of whether or not Code violations occurred. In this respect, the definition of the past event was left vague through the application of the forward-looking account vocabulary.

### **The Construction of Social Worlds**

In discussing this resolution on the Code violations of Dean Simpson, Senators' discourse was not just about whether or not to approve the resolution, but also about describing organizational identity. Specifically, through their accounts, Senators' discursively characterized a particular organizational culture which has implications for identity (RQ4), and Senators' account vocabularies characterized a notion of responsibility as relational (RQ5).

#### **Faculty Senate Organizational Culture**

Despite the widespread disagreement over the resolution, the various account vocabularies of senators pointed toward a bureaucratic conceptualization of organizational culture. According to Birnbaum (1991), bureaucratic colleges emphasize hierarchy and written "rules and regulations [to] guide behavior [and increase] organizational certainty and efficiency . . ." (p. 111). Baxter's (1993) interpretive

ethnographic study of a conflict at a university, which I discussed in the previous chapter, is also descriptive of communication practices and values in a bureaucratic culture.

Baxter (1993) describes two types of university organizational cultures or competing codes of communication: “collegiality” and “professional management.” This latter code I refer to as a constituting bureaucratic culture.<sup>1</sup> Each of these codes implicate particular identities for interlocutors speaking from within those codes. Baxter describes the code of “professional management” as one in which people are regarded as members of category groups (e.g., professional, females, etc.) and as occupants of organizational positions (e.g., assistant professors, department chairs, etc.). “Professional management” code community members believed that written codification of records, policies, and procedures provided maximum protection for the rights of people . . . (p. 318)

The codes of collegiality and professional management are significant for particular notions of identity. In the former code, social actors are viewed as individuals and are treated as unique entities. In the latter code, social actors are viewed for what they are or the roles they occupy.

There were a variety of ways in which Senators’ account vocabularies, regardless of their stance on the resolution, implicated a bureaucratic culture. First, Senators emphasized the Faculty Code—a written document—and its importance in being adhered to and for protecting the faculty. Second, in describing whether or not violations of the

Code occurred, Senators, regardless of their specific stance on the resolution, referred to written documents. Some Senators described letters that, according to these Senators, constituted a following of the Code, and other Senators also discussed letters to demonstrate that the Code was violated. Finally, during the resolution discussion, Senators often referred to the role expectations of administrators and Faculty Senators. In these three ways, Senators' discursive practices constituted a culture of bureaucracy through the privileging of written documents as sources of authority.

Despite the many references to written documents, Senators still emphasized and focused on oral communication as a basis for either supporting or not supporting the resolution. Toward the latter part of the discussion, after the many oral descriptions of written evidence, many Senators still claimed that facts were being "assumed." As one Senator stated (from utterance #92), "From what I've heard, I don't feel that there's been a convincing basis . . . . I've certainly not seen all the documentation on this . . ." However, another Senator who supported the resolution stated (from utterance #96):

I haven't seen the direct evidence myself, but I'm basing this on the conclusions of the duly appointed and duly constituted Review Boards and Appeals panels as per the Faculty Code, chairs, in two cases here, Warren Guntheroth and Larry Willets, and these were the conclusions of the duly constituted appeals panel, were they not? Yes. And so, I trust my colleagues in the sense that I trust that the process followed by them conducting the investigation and conducting the appeals process yielded accurate information.

While written documents are important for decision-making in bureaucratic organizational cultures (Baxter, 1993), oral communication took precedence for Senators in characterizing the resolution and the events related to the resolution. This finding supports Tierney's (1983) conclusion regarding the uses of oral and written communication in Faculty Senate meetings. According to Tierney (1983), "the bulk of the work of the senate is oral and the uses of written materials follow specific rules of interaction . . ." (p. 172).

Even though Senators disagreed widely on whether or not to support this resolution, the various account vocabularies implicated a bureaucratic culture. However, within this bureaucratic culture, although written documents were valued, the meaning, significance, and use of those documents was orally and discursively constructed in social interaction.

### Responsibility

The Senate's discussion on whether or not to approve the resolution on Code violations implicates some particular themes of social accountability, agency and responsibility. Some of the initial account vocabularies defined the Dean as the main, accountable agent for the problems associated with the program elimination and review process. However, subsequent account vocabularies highlighted other features such as blaming the ambiguity of the Faculty Code, the situation, and the Faculty Senate. Taken together, these vocabularies point to the notion of responsibility as being relational.

McNamee and Gergen (1999) define relational responsibility as

a dialogic process with two transformative functions: first, in transforming the interlocutors' understanding of the action in question (the fault, failing, crime, etc.) and second, in altering the relations among the interlocutors themselves.

(p. 5)

McNamee and Gergen develop their concept of relational responsibility by critiquing "the major discourse of responsibility [as] one in which the single individual serves as the critical terminus" (p. 3). This notion of the individual as responsible presumes that individuals act in isolation rather than from within a given context. In arguing for a reconceptualization of responsibility as relational, McNamee and Gergen (1999) call for attention to the ways that context and conversational partners are also responsible agents for a given situation.

Within the discourse of the Faculty Senate, Senators also described a conceptualization of responsibility as relational. The original basis of the resolution was that the Dean should be held solely accountable for the difficulties of the program elimination and review process. However, many Senators countered this notion of accountability by describing how the ambiguity of the Faculty Code, difficulty of the situation, and Faculty Senate itself all contributed to the problematic situation.

### Summary

The discussion of the resolution for the Faculty Senate to express its strong disapproval of Dean Simpson during the program elimination and review process was very contentious. Even though this resolution was voted down, it is significant in

considering how the Senate defined a past event, how the Senate defines itself and the type of actions which the Senate should take for the good of the university. Senators' discourse also implicated a particular notion of the university culture as a bureaucratic one and of accountability and relational responsibility for a problematic situation.

This analysis of the Senate's decision on Code violations is significant for a number of reasons. In deliberating about whether or not to have the Senate express its strong disapproval of Code violations on the part of Dean Simpson, the Senate attempted to define and characterize the program elimination and review process of the previous year. Second, this analysis also illustrates how during decision-making participants socially negotiate what it means to be an accountable or responsible decision-maker. Senators discussed issues such as the importance of upholding the Faculty Code and the Senate's lack of involvement as the program elimination and review process was occurring.

## End Notes

<sup>1</sup> In the educational organization literature, one type of culture described is called a “management” culture. However, Baxter’s “code of professional management” culture has more features in common with “bureaucratic” culture than it does with “management” culture as described in the educational organization literature (see Bergquist, 1992; Birnbaum, 1991). Because of this, I rely on literature that describes “bureaucratic” university cultures as a comparison for the University of Washington Faculty Senate decision-making.

## CHAPTER SEVEN:

### CONCLUSION

The idea for this project was inspired by my involvement in university committees as a graduate student. When I first started to serve on these committees, I had difficulty participating in meetings, because I was unaware of the key terms or account vocabularies that were relevant for a particular group and its decisions. This beginning memory of inarticulateness stayed with me as I continued to participate in other decision-making groups and became sensitive to their account vocabularies. I became aware of how these vocabularies contributed to not only the decision-making process, but also to social construction processes.

My personal experiences led me to apply my scholarly interest in social constructionism to gain a better understanding of decision-making as a socially situated process. This project is the result of those efforts. I began with the thesis that group decision-making is a social construction process. I utilized Shotter's (1993a) Rhetorical-Responsive approach to describe this process by analyzing speakers' account vocabularies. In this chapter, I summarize my responses to the research questions presented in Chapter One. I also discuss the contributions of this project to group decision-making and social constructionism. Finally, I describe the limitations of this project and future research directions.

## Research Questions

### RQ1: How do speakers construct social reality in their decision-making talk?

As described in Chapter One, I posed this first research question as a “how” question to describe the social nature of the communication practices that constitute social construction processes. In addressing my first research question, I began with a hermeneutical approach of going back and forth from analyzing transcripts to theoretical writings in social constructionism. I identified accounts as an important communication practice in the decision-making discourse of my research participants. Accounts are also significant within the social constructionist literature (see Buttny, 1993; Shotter, 1984). The practice of accounting provided me with a conceptual bridge for describing decision-making discourse from a social constructionist perspective.

During decision-making, speakers’ accounting practices contributed to reality construction processes. Accounts offered during decision-making functioned to justify speakers’ positions with respect to a resolution. These accounts also constituted particular aspects of social reality such as the problematic event being addressed, the causes for the problem, and the meaning of the decision or resolution being discussed.

Because there are a variety of ways to analyze accounts from different theoretical perspectives, I needed a unit of analysis appropriate for describing the situationally embedded nature of accounts. In my survey of research approaches to accounts analysis, I identified and turned to account vocabularies for describing the situated nature of decision-making discourse. Accounts as a specific type of communication practice help

inform researchers of how speakers interactively sustain and negotiate particular social realities. Account vocabularies provide insight into the particular social realities that are made meaningful within speakers' discourse.

RQ2: What are the vocabularies of accounts presented by speakers during decision-making?

Account vocabularies consist of key terms or phrases that, as Buttny (1993) describes, “[constitute] the ways we think about, structure, and finally evaluate, our own and others' actions” (p. 7-8). These vocabularies depend upon a group's norms, values, and beliefs for their efficacy.

In analyzing various cases of decision-making, I identified several account vocabularies for different decisions. The discussion of the size of the Faculty Senate utilized the vocabularies of work, representation, and identifying the “real problem.” The Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement resolution discussion focused on the vocabularies of diversity, education, and requirement. The discussion of Code violations foregrounded the vocabularies of validation of the Faculty Code, administrator accountability, flaws in the Code, impossibility of the situation, Senate responsibility, Code violations, and resolution not constructive.

While these vocabularies functioned to justify particular choices, they also were used to negotiate characterizations of specific aspects of speakers' social worlds. The following three research questions address these specific implications. The most

immediate implication deals with how account vocabularies function to construct a particular social reality relevant for the decision.

**RQ3: What meanings of decisions do these account vocabularies implicate?**

I have argued that the process of decision-making is also a process in which speakers discursively construct the meaning of decisions. One way for researchers to describe what decisions mean is to examine the texts of resolutions. However, during decision-making, speakers often negotiated other meanings. From my analysis, I identified three overarching ways in which account vocabularies implicated the meanings of decisions by constructing the problematic event, the cause of the problem, and the resolution itself. The different ways in which account vocabularies function to define meanings of decisions help illustrate Shotter's (1993a) point that

Accounts are such that, in the context of their telling, they are 'self-specifying' in that they work to construct or to specify further that context or setting within which, and by use of which, their telling makes sense. (p. 112)

One feature of accounts is that they are offered in response to a problematic situation. However, as Buttny (1993) points out, accounts also function to construct problematic events by framing a particular version of an event. In each of the cases described in this project, there were different ways in which speakers' account vocabularies defined problematic events. For example, during the Senate size discussion, the sponsors described how a lack of achieving quorum and participation were the problems being addressed through the resolution. However, one Senator re-defined the

resolution as solely addressing the size of the Senate. Other Senators challenged the initial construction of the problem as a lack of participation by re-defining the nature of participation through the account vocabulary of work. Through the use of these various account vocabularies, Senators socially negotiated the meaning of the problematic event being addressed by the resolution.

In the discussion of the CED, supporters described the CED as addressing the problem of how to validate diversity and of preparing students for a diverse workforce. However, many Senators defined the problem as being the CED itself by describing problems that would result from the CED. In the discussion of Faculty Code violations, Senators had different interpretations of the Dean's actions, and they did not agree on whether the Faculty Code was violated. The discussion of the Faculty Code violations is an example of how, during decision-making, a group may reach a decision without reaching consensus or convergence on a single definition of social reality.

In addition to constructing problematic events, account vocabularies function to construct the causes of problems. For the resolution on the size of the Senate, some Senators identified the cause of the problem as being faculty not fulfilling their duties to serve on the Senate. Other Senators were explicit about not identifying a cause due to a lack of data. Uncertainty about the cause of the problem was used as a basis for voting down the resolution. For the CED resolution, causal factors were ambiguous. However, because many Senators shifted the dialogue to describing the CED as the problem, some Senators also defined the CED as a potential cause of future problems

such as reducing graduation rates. In the discussion of Code violations, Senators also disagreed on the causes of the problematic event being address. Some Senators even pointed to the complexities of identifying a single cause by noting the relational or shared nature of decisional responsibility.

Account vocabularies also characterized the resolutions themselves. Senators described the size resolution as being an issue of “representation,” despite statements to the contrary from supporters of the resolution. The Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement was described by some as being “an affirmation of diversity” and by others as a “parochialism requirement.” The sponsors of the resolution to criticize Dean Simpson for Faculty Code violations referred to their resolution as an “affirmation of the Faculty Code,” and others defined the resolution as not being “constructive.”

While account vocabularies function to justify particular stances with respect to resolutions, they also function to construct other elements significant for decision-making such as problematic events, the causes of those problematic events, and the resolutions or choices available. In these ways, speakers’ account vocabularies contribute to social construction processes during the course of decision-making.

Account vocabularies also implicate issues that extend beyond the immediate decision. Through accounting practices, speakers characterized particular identities and conceptualizations of social accountability. These three issues--accounting practices, identity, and social accountability--are interconnected through Shotter’s (1984) “social accountability thesis.” As Shotter describes, “one cannot become the kind of person

required in one's society, i.e., one able to reproduce its social order in one's actions, unless one learns its accounting practices . . ." (p. xi). Accounting practices implicate particular identities for speakers by helping to demonstrate that they are accountable or moral and responsible members of society. The ways in which account vocabularies are interconnected with identity and social accountability are described below.

**RQ4: What conceptualizations of identity do these account vocabularies implicate?**

During resolution discussions, Senators negotiated various identities for themselves. At times, they spoke in ways that highlighted their identity as educators, faculty, or Senators. Also, Senators sometimes assumed the voice of the university in describing the purpose of the university and the type of actions which it should take. These variations in how identity is constructed during decision-making illustrate how identity is situational and relational or defined in relationships during the course of interaction.

In the discussion of the resolution on the Faculty Senate size, Senators described their identity as Senators and as faculty, and in the process of doing this, voiced multiple conceptualizations of the Senate and what it means to be a faculty member. The Senate was defined as a work and representative body with the latter definition being privileged. While both characterizations were affirmed in various ways, faculty emphasized their identity as representatives over their identity as legislators. In highlighting the significance of representation, faculty acknowledged diverse definitions of themselves with respect to the views they represent, the functions they fulfill, and their attitudes

toward serving on the Senate. Faculty also prioritized the importance of maintaining this type of diversity within the Senate.

Although the Senate's discussion on a size reduction most prominently featured issues of identity, this topic was also addressed implicitly in other resolution discussions. During the discussion of the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement, Senators spoke as educators when describing the purpose of higher education and the need for affirming diversity. Alternatively, Senators spoke as legislators when defining the CED as a course requirement. The former identity highlighted the relationship of the university to society at large and to the quality of students' educational experiences. The latter identity highlighted the relationship between the university and its role in the logistics of students' education. In discussing the alleged Faculty Code violations on the part of Dean Simpson, faculty members emphasized their identity as Senators in describing their responsibilities to ensure that the Faculty Code is upheld and in addressing whether the Senate was the appropriate body to address the resolution in the first place.

The analysis of account vocabularies illustrates how, during decision-making, identity may be defined relationally or in relationships with others. The identities that were constructed during the course of decision-making depended upon the specific decisions being discussed. The Size resolution, in addressing a possible structural change within the Senate, fostered an explicit discussion on faculty identity and of their relationship to the Senate. The resolution on the CED fostered a discussion in which faculty highlighted their identity as educators in relation to students and society. The

discussion on Faculty Code violations highlighted the identity of faculty as Senators and their relationship to the Faculty Code. The identity that participants emphasized depended on the parties or entities whom Senators defined as the most impacted by a particular resolution.

The ways in which identity comes into play during group decision-making also illustrates how identity constructing does not just focus on individual identities. In constructing identities, speakers may characterize themselves in ways which indicate identification with the organization or with the roles they are occupying at the time.

RQ5: What conceptualizations of social accountability are implicated by these vocabularies of accounts?

As described earlier, Shotter's (1984) social accountability thesis interconnects accounting, identity, and social accountability. In constructing identity, Senators also implicated particular conceptualizations of social accountability or expectations for responsible behavior. These notions of accountability are linked to conceptualizations of agency and relational obligations.

During the discussion regarding the size of the Faculty Senate, many Senators emphasized responsibility on the part of faculty to fulfill their duties. In turn, structural constraints were de-emphasized as the cause of the problems addressed by the resolution. Within this first case, agency on the part of faculty was emphasized. Faculty were still held accountable for fulfilling their duties; however, because the function of Senators was defined broadly in the work vocabulary, the type of behaviors that would

constitute accountable conduct as a Senator was diverse. For example, it was acceptable for faculty to be “reluctant” to serve on the Senate, because that type of attitude is compatible with the representational purpose of the Senate. However, even though this diversity of accountable behaviors was accepted, the Senate still held faculty accountable for fulfilling their duty to serve on the Senate. Individuality and autonomy were accepted to a certain degree as long as those did not interfere with the collective purpose of the Senate.

The second case study on the Culture and Ethnic Diversity requirement emphasized definitions of faculty as accountable educators. In this case study, faculty were characterized as having various obligations as educators to affirm diversity and help students to graduate in a timely manner. While the various account vocabularies were agreeable to Senators on a conceptual level, Senators disagreed when these vocabularies were applied to the specific case at hand of the proposed CED requirement. For instance, Senators disagreed on how best to affirm diversity and on whether higher education should prepare students for encountering a culturally diverse world or a computer age. In addition, many faculty had difficulty with the idea of creating a new course requirement. In this case study, the most accountable path for Senators was to approve a resolution that affirmed diversity conceptually, and in spirit, but did not mandate a course requirement. Similar to the previous case study in which individuality was validated, the result from this resolution discussion was a decision that affirmed the rights of others not to be impeded.

McNamee and Gergen's (1999) notion of responsibility as relational is prominent in the last case study on Faculty Code violations. In this discussion, faculty pointed to multiple sources of responsibility such as the Faculty Code, external circumstances, and the Faculty Senate. During the discussion of Code violations, some faculty emphasized the responsibilities of the Senate during the program elimination and review process. The Faculty Senate was even criticized for failing to recognize its responsibilities during the time of those procedures and for failing to take action then. By emphasizing relational responsibility during the program elimination and review process, the Senate described how multiple parties and entities were responsible for the difficulties of that process.

During the process of decision-making, Senators' account vocabularies implicated particular notions of social accountability to various parties such as students, other faculty, and society. These conceptualizations of accountability ultimately emphasized the fostering of individual responsibility or agency.

### Summary

Each of the decision-making cases illustrates the various ways that account vocabularies function to construct different aspects of social reality. The case on the Senate size highlighted issues of faculty and Faculty Senate identity. The case on the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement featured the social negotiation of a decision's meaning for participants. The final case on the alleged Code violations of Dean Simpson foregrounded notions of decisional responsibility. Across these cases, Senators' account

vocabularies functioned to implicate the problematic event being addressed, causes of the problematic event, and the resolution. Depending on the specific decision, Senators constructed their own identities in various ways by speaking within a specific role or by identifying with the organization. These conceptualizations of identity were also interconnected with issues of social accountability.

### **Contributions to Decision-Making**

In reviewing the group communication decision-making literature in Chapter One, I highlighted two perspectives on the relationship between communication and decision-making: communication as a medium and communication as constitutive. In the former perspective, communication is viewed as a conduit for conveying information. In the latter perspective, communication is viewed as constructing social reality. This project is an example of research from the latter perspective.

Even though other decision-making approaches, such as Symbolic Convergence Theory, Structuration Theory, and the Bona Fide Groups perspective, view communication as constitutive, the approach used in this project explores avenues that have not been addressed in these previous approaches by analyzing account vocabularies. Within this section, I relate this study to the other communication-as-constitutive approaches in order to describe the contributions of this project to understanding group decision-making.

Within Symbolic Convergence Theory, researchers analyze fantasy themes that, according to Bormann (1983),

[consist] of a dramatizing message in which characters enact an incident or a series of incidents in a setting somewhere other than the here-and-now of the people involved in the communication episode. (p. 107)

As described by Bormann (1986), a group's fantasies influence the decisions which that group makes.

There are three ways in which this project extends the SCT perspective. First, I identified a unit of analysis that is different from fantasies and that provides an understanding of how communication is constitutive of reality during decision-making. Within the cases described in this project, speakers rarely referred to fantasies or stories. However, during decision-making, speakers did provide accounts and, in doing so, utilized particular account vocabularies. The unit of analysis identified in this project may be more widely applied than fantasy themes in analyzing group decision-making.

Second, for this project I analyzed naturally-occurring decision-making talk. Bormann (1986) suggests that for fantasy theme analysis, non-participants . . . must reconstruct the fantasy episodes by studying written or electronic records of the communication, or by using either individual or focus interviews or pencil and paper tests . . . (p. 227)

By analyzing naturally-occurring talk as opposed to re-constructions, I was able to describe the socially negotiative aspect of decision-making and how participants responded to, modified, or extended various account vocabularies. In this respect, I described meaning-making in decision-making as a social accomplishment. Fantasy

theme analysis which focuses on re-constructions is limited in its capability to describe decision-making as a social process.

A third way in which this study extends the SCT perspective is by paying attention to the multiplicity of realities constructed by participants during decision-making. SCT focuses on the dominant fantasy themes of a group. However, for certain decisions, there is a variety of vocabularies that may be used to justify a particular choice such that multiple identities and ambiguous realities may be constructed. Fantasy theme analysis does not elaborate on these complexities associated with reality construction during decision-making.

In the application of Structuration Theory to group decision-making, two lines of research have developed (Poole & Hirokawa, 1996). The first line of research focuses on lines of argumentation in groups, and the second line focuses on the use of computer technology in group decision-making (Poole & Hirokawa, 1996). Even though Structuration Theory has an inherently ethnographic orientation to it (see Giddens, 1993) neither of the group decision-making research lines have developed this cultural orientation for decision-making. Through this project, I address this gap in Structuration research by foregrounding the description of decision-making as a local, socially-situated practice. In analyzing vocabularies, I describe a group's specific meanings in decision-making rather than quantify interactions or describe argument structures.

As stated in Chapter One, this project in many ways is compatible with the Bona Fide Groups perspective and mainly functions to support many of its propositions.

Putnam and Stohl (1990, 1996) describe that there are complex relations that occur within and between groups. These authors specify how, with respect to within-group interactions, scholars should examine the boundaries that members construct for a group through conflicting roles, representatives roles, changes in membership, and group identity formation. In examining between-group connections, Putnam and Stohl (1996) describe how intergroup communication, coordination between groups, negotiation of jurisdiction, and interpretations of intergroup relationships are significant for understanding how naturalistic groups operate.

As an analysis of a bona fide group, this study helps to illustrate and support some of the features which Putnam and Stohl identified as important for understanding bona fide groups. Within the group, faculty often took on various roles by constructing their identities as Senators, faculty, and educators. These particular identities also contributed to the formation of a group identity by defining the Senate. Although I did not observe between group communication directly, there were several ways speakers' accounting practices addressed intergroup relationships. For example, Senators defined what decisions they felt were appropriate for them to address and in this way, negotiated their jurisdiction. Senators also described various obligations that the Senate had to other groups such as students and other faculty.

I explained in Chapter One that by applying a social constructionist perspective to decision-making, my purpose was to describe decision-making talk as constitutive of social reality. This position was advanced in contrast to a perspective on decision-

making that views communication representationally. In treating communication in decision-making as constitutive of social reality, I also wished to make explicit the subjective nature of the choices available to speakers. Once this aspect of choices is made explicit, a number of more specific contributions may be made to decision-making.

By becoming aware of the dominant vocabularies of a group, individuals may be better able to participate in the decision-making process, because they will be able to speak in ways that demonstrate their accountability or legitimacy to speak. Second, individuals may be better able to negotiate and construct choices that address and acknowledge the competing vocabularies of a group. An example of how this was accomplished successfully is in the case in which Professor Bereano presented a substitute resolution to the CED requirement. Professor Bereano in his opening statement addressed the various account vocabularies from the first discussion of the CED and explained how those vocabularies were incorporated into his resolution. Significantly, no one challenged the resolution or any of the statements made by Bereano.

A third contribution to the understanding of decision-making that this project makes is that, through the analysis developed, both researchers and practitioners may become more aware of the multiplicity of account vocabularies and the dominance in a given context of certain vocabularies over others. This awareness may better enable researchers and practitioners to engage and address explicitly disparate account vocabularies as a way of opening up dialogue among different parties involved in

decision-making. I did not apply this awareness toward this end in this project, but the method of analysis developed here may be used in future projects that address the bridging of vocabularies. This type of engagement is an example of what McNamee and Gergen (1999) refer to as an “orienting practice” or “set of theoretical intelligibilities that may help us position conversational participants so as to generate alternative ways of indexing actions, open new domains of curiosity, and provoke catalytic questions” (p. 19).

### **Contributions to Social Constructionism**

There are two main ways in which this project contributes to social constructionist thought. First, the method of analysis used in this project provides a way of understanding and describing group realities. Second, in this project I expanded upon a research method which may be used in other empirically based social constructionist projects.

#### **Understanding Group Realities**

McNamee and Gergen (1999) argue that “languages of group interaction are also valuable resources in moving from rituals of individual blame into the relational sphere” (p. 15). Even though understanding group realities is important to social constructionism, most social constructionist research in communication has focused on interpersonal communication. For example, the application chapters in Leeds-Hurwitz (1995) discuss topics such as rapport (Jorgenson, 1995), interpersonal communication

(Carbaugh & Hastings, 1995), relationships (Sigman, 1995), and narrative in interpersonal relationships (Bochner & Ellis, 1995).

One consequence of this focus on interpersonal relationships is that social constructionists have tended to emphasize the construction of personhood. For example, Gergen's work discusses the implications of social constructionism for personhood (Gergen & Davis, 1985) and relationships (Gergen, 1994), and Shotter (1993a, 1993b) also privileges selfhood, personal relationships, and psychological contexts. Shotter (1993a) does address other contexts such as managerial relations and civic society; however, these works are conceptual rather than empirical.

There are some exceptions to this point that social constructionist research has been oriented toward interpersonal communication. For example, Smith and Turner (1995) discuss a "social constructionist reconfiguration of metaphor analysis" in organizational socialization. Their research however is metatheoretical rather than empirical. Trujillo and Dionisopoulos (1987) describe the "social construction of organizational drama," and their work is a good example of the utility of applying social constructionism to non-interpersonal contexts.

This dissertation contributes to social constructionist understanding through the analysis of group rather than individual or interpersonal identities. McNamee and Gergen (1999) describe how the notion of group realities is important for moving the discourse of responsibility from the individual to the group. By analyzing account

vocabularies in decision-making discourse, I provide insight into the ways in which identity may be conceptualized as a relational and group phenomenon.

### Epistemological Issues in Social Constructionist Research

The second major way this project contributes to social constructionism is through its research methodology. A great deal of social constructionist writing has tended to be conceptual rather than empirical. For example, Stewart (1995) develops and justifies the philosophical assumptions of social constructionism. Gergen (1994) and Shotter's (1993a, 1993b, 1995) work also provides primarily an intellectual basis for social constructionist thought. One limitation of writing on social constructionism is that it provides little guidance for addressing how to conduct empirical research consistent with social constructionist assumptions.

The analytic procedures that I followed provide one example of how to conduct empirical social constructionist research. I primarily relied on Buttny's (1993) conversation analytic social constructionist approach. Buttny describes seven steps which combine the methodological procedures of conversation analysis with the assumptions of social constructionism. Although Buttny provides very useful guidelines, there were some ways in which I had to modify those guidelines in my actual research process. These ways center on identifying account vocabularies and incorporating the concept of utterances or responsiveness into my data analysis and display.

Because social constructionism emphasizes the description of how social actors "come to describe, explain, or otherwise account for the world in which they live"

(Gergen, 1985, p. 3), I analyzed transcripts of naturally occurring discourse. I focused my analysis on accounts as one important type of concrete communication practice. In order to describe how these communication practices implicate particular social worlds, I analyzed on account vocabularies. This latter move added to Buttny's (1993) procedures by providing a way not just to describe the interactional structuring of accounts, but also to describe how accounts implicate particular definitions. The concept of account vocabularies provided a useful tool for understanding the specific key terms that were important for participants during decision-making. Speakers' account vocabularies function as a specific unit of analysis which enabled me to make the "implicit explicit" (Buttny's seventh step) in a more systematic way than is described by Buttny.

A second way in which this project contributes to Buttny's (1993) procedures is through the active incorporation of the concept of the utterance into my data analysis procedures and data display. An utterance, by definition, is responsive to previous utterances. Because Buttny's analyses mainly focus on the interactional telling of a single account, I had a difficult time applying his procedures to examining how speakers' multiple accounts contributed to reality constructing processes. The concept of responsiveness was crucial in describing how, within a single communication event, multiple accounts operated together in speakers' negotiation of meaning. By examining and tracing a specific account vocabulary across utterances, I was able to describe social

constructing processes. As an account vocabulary recurred across utterances and across accounts, its re-telling functioned to sustain or negotiate its meaning.

I incorporated the concept of responsiveness also into my data display by presenting the utterances relevant to a particular account vocabulary in the chronological order in which they occurred during the decision-making discussion. In this way, the reader could also examine the formative nature of communication in reality constructing processes.

In conducting this project, I wished to illustrate one way to apply social constructionism in the analysis of empirical data. In Chapter Two, I described a social constructionist perspective on epistemology and made explicit a social constructionist stance on validity. I also discussed various ways that social constructionists may apply their assumptions regarding epistemology to empirical research. Specifically, social constructionists strive for trustworthiness and emphasize process and understanding. My general method of analysis and rhetorical strategies in describing my research incorporated these principles.

In addressing trustworthiness, I attempted to make my method of analysis “visible” (Mishler, 1990) to the reader. Specifically, I endeavored to increase the trustworthiness of my interpretations by prominently displaying and making available my data. As I described each account vocabulary, I provided quotations to support my interpretations. I also included transcripts of each resolution discussion in my appendices. By making my analytic procedures explicit, I attempted to supply enough

information to the reader so that he or she may assess the trustworthiness of my claims. In this respect, I also treat the research process as an ongoing enterprise by writing in a way which promotes a type of dialogue between the reader and my analysis.

In emphasizing understanding, I focused my research claims on particular contexts and situations. Although I used my interpretations to comment on more general concepts such as identity construction and social accountability, these interpretations were used to present some ways in which discursive practices contribute to identity and social accountability.

#### Limitations

There are two main limitations of this project from a social constructionist perspective. The first deals involves how discursive practices are constrained, and the second concerns social constructionist assumptions regarding research.

Shotter (1993a) describes how ideologies both enable and constrain discourse. In applying this concept to my research project, I described how certain account vocabularies were enabled or promoted by being responded to positively by other group members. However, some Senators articulated particular account vocabularies for which there were no verbal responses. For these account vocabularies, it was difficult to discern if this was because Senators agreed with those vocabularies or because they did not view those vocabularies as legitimate. Because of this circumstance, my project is limited in describing how particular account vocabularies were constrained. There are ways however to understand how this dynamic works through the use of other social

constructionist research strategies. These ways are discussed in the following section.

A second limitation of this project involves the type of social constructionist research practices in which I engaged. Interpretive analyses may vary along a continuum of being participant, participant-observation, or observation oriented. Some social constructionist projects are more participant or participant-observation oriented by collaborating actively with subjects on the type of research questions asked and the analysis of data. My project was observation oriented, and I did not actively involve my participants in the research process. Because I was interested in how Senators presented themselves as being socially accountable, I was interested primarily in analyzing the public and official decision-making discourse of the Senate that occurred during resolution discussions at meetings. Involvement of participants by, for example, conducting interviews would have provided me with additional data to describe participants' interpretations. However, this information would not have aided me in answering my primary research question regarding the description of the interactional processes involved in the social construction of reality in a particular context.

#### **Future Directions**

One future research avenue is to continue to examine decision-making within university contexts. For example, faculty senates at other universities may be analyzed in order to examine the similarities and differences across universities. Other decision-making groups within university settings may be examined such as departments or

university committees. Both of these directions can help to provide greater insight into decision-making within universities and into university cultures.

A second approach for further developing this project is to examine other contexts. There are many ways in which university organizations differ from other types of organizations (see Baldrige, 1983). By exploring other contexts, researchers may gain a greater understanding of other organizational cultures and what factors are relevant for those cultures in making decisions.

A related option would be to examine situations in which different groups meet to make decisions. For example, within a university setting, a research project could describe social construction processes when student groups interact with administrative groups. By examining how different groups interact with respect to making decisions, researchers can describe how different cultural norms shape how decisions are made and the role of power differences in decision-making.

Another way to expand this project is to involve participants more actively in the research process. Some scholars argue that social constructionism may help to “invite, encourage, or suggest alternative forms of action” (McNamee & Gergen, 1999, p. 10). One way to do this is to discuss interpretations of decision-making discourse with participants. This may help participants to become more aware of the implications of their own discursive practices. When different groups are involved, members of these groups may become better aware of how different worldviews affect their decision-making. As many feminist researchers have pointed out, the research process itself is one

that involves power issues between the researcher and researched. The involvement of participants allows the research process to become a more collaborative endeavor and open up dialogue such that participants may become more actively involved in the authoring of their own lives (see Acker, Barry, & Esseveld, 1991).

In addition to benefiting research participants, this move could also benefit the researcher. Earlier, in describing the limitations of this project, I stated how some account vocabularies were met with silence. By discussing his or her analysis with research participants, the researcher could gain more data to help interpret the cultural significance of various account vocabularies.

In my own future research, I plan to analyze situations in which different groups come together to make decisions and to involve research participants more actively in the research process. Both of these moves would assist me the most in addressing the limitations of this current project. The primary context that I am most interested in analyzing for the future is the university context, partially because of my membership in the university community and partially because of the many complexities of university organizations (see Baldrige, 1983).

#### **Concluding Remarks**

This project began with my desire to describe the group specific meanings in decision-making discourse. By understanding the social construction processes during decision-making, researchers and practitioners may gain a greater understanding of both group decision-making and social construction processes. This type of understanding

can provide insight into the subjective nature of choices so that those choices may be challenged or expanded. The application of a social constructionist perspective to decision-making can also provide insight into the requirements of a group for participating accountably and legitimately in the decision-making process. When these demands are made explicit rather than kept “rationally invisible” (Krippendorff, cited in Penman, 1992, p. 241), the possibility for participation and dialogue may be opened. This project is a first step toward this goal. By recognizing how group decision-making is also a social construction process, researchers and practitioners may gain a greater understanding of how language practices during decision-making do not just involve a choice of words but also a choice of social worlds.

## References

- Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1991). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. In M. M. Fonow, & J. A. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research (pp. 133-153). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Antaki, C. (Ed.). (1988). Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods. London: Sage.
- Atkinson, P. (1988). Ethnomethodology: A critical review. Annual Review Of Sociology, 14, 441-465.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson, & M. Holquist (Eds.), V. W. McGee (trans.), Speech genres and other late essays (pp. 60-102). Austin: University of Texas.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1983). Organizational characteristics of colleges and universities. In J. V. Baldrige, & T. Deal (Eds.), The dynamics of organizational change in education (pp. 38-59). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Baxter, L. (1993). "Talking things through" and "putting it in writing": Two codes of communication in an academic institution. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21, 313-326.
- Benoit, W. L. (1995). Accounts, excuses, and apologies : A theory of image restoration strategies. Albany: State University Of New York.
- Bergquist, W. H. (1992). The four cultures of the academy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (1995). Telling and living: Narrative co-construction and the practices of interpersonal relationships. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 201-213). New York: Guilford.

Bormann, E. G. (1983). Symbolic convergence: Organizational communication and culture. In L. L. Putnam, & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach (pp. 99-122). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bormann, E. G. (1985). Symbolic convergence theory: A communication formulation. Journal of Communication, 35, 128-138.

Bormann, E. G. (1986). Symbolic convergence theory and communication group decision-making. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (pp. 219-236). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bormann, E. G. (1996). Symbolic convergence theory and communication in group decision making. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (2nd ed.) (pp. 81-113). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bormann, E. G., Cragan, J. F., & Shields, D. C. (1994). In defense of symbolic convergence theory: A look at the theory and its criticisms after two decades. Communication Theory, 4, 259-294.

Brewer, J. D. (1990). Talking about danger: The RUC and the paramilitary threat. Sociology, 24, 657-674.

- Brinberg, D., & McGrath, J. E. (1985). Validity and the research process. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Burke, K. (1969). A grammar of motives. Berkeley: University of California.
- Burr, V. (1995). An introduction to social constructionism. London: Routledge.
- Buttny, R. (1993). Social accountability in communication. London: Sage.
- Carbaugh, D. (1995). Decision-making. In R. Harré, & P. Stearns (Eds.), Discursive psychology in practice (pp. 137-163). London: Sage.
- Carbaugh, D., & Hastings, S. O. (1995). A role for communication theory in ethnographic studies of interpersonal communication. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 171-187). New York: Guilford.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administration Science Quarterly, 17, 1-25.
- Cragan, J. F., & Wright, D. W. (1990). Small group communication research of the 1980s: A synthesis and critique. Communication Studies, 41, 212-236.
- Dickson, R. E., Manusov, V., Cody, M. J., & McLaughlin, M. L. (1996). When hearing's not believing: Perceived differences between public and private explanations for two compliance failures. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 15, 27-39.

Dudley, P. (1996, January 2). CED debate continues: Requirement undecided [34 paragraphs]. In The Online Daily of the University of Washington [On-line].

Available: [http://www.thedaily.washington.edu/archives/1996\\_Winter/January211996/ced2.html](http://www.thedaily.washington.edu/archives/1996_Winter/January211996/ced2.html).

Ellis, D. G., & Fisher, B. A. (1994). Small group decision making: Communication and the group process (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frank, A. W. (1979). Reality construction in interaction. Annual Review of Sociology, 5, 167-191.

Frey, L. R. (1996). Remembering and "re-membering": A history of theory and research on communication and group decision making. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (2nd ed.) (pp. 19-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gadamer, H. G. (1975). Truth and method (G. Barden & J. Cummings, Trans.). New York: Seabury.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Geist, P., & Chandler, T. (1984). Account analysis of influence in group decision-making. Communication Monographs, 51, 67-78.

Gergen, K. (1985). Social constructionist inquiry: Context and implications. In K. J. Gergen, & K. E. Davis (Eds.), The social construction of the person (pp. 3-18). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gergen, K. (1994). Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction. Cambridge: Harvard.

Gergen, K. J., & Davis, K. E. (Eds.). (1985). The social construction of the person. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Giddens, A. (1976). New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretive sociologies. New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1984). The constitution of society: Outline of a theory of structuration. Berkeley: University of California.

Giddens, A. (1993). Problems of action and structure. In P. Cassell (Ed.), The Giddens reader (pp. 88-175). Stanford: Stanford University.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order. New York: Harper and Row.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Harré, R., & Secord, P. F. (1972). The explanation of social behaviour. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams.

Hopper, J. (1993). The rhetoric of motives in divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55, 801-813.

Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1980). Structure of conversational argument: Pragmatic bases for the enthymeme. Quarter Journal of Speech, 66, 251-65.

Jarboe, S. (1996). Procedures for enhancing group decision making. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision making (2nd ed.) (pp. 345-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1994). Joining together: Group theory and group skills (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jorgenson, J. (1995). Re-relationalizing rapport in interpersonal settings. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 155-170). New York: Guilford.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1995). Introducing social approaches. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 3-20). New York: Guilford.

Lincoln, E. G., & Guba, Y. S. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lindlof, T. R. (1995). Qualitative communication research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mills, C. W. (1975). Situated actions and vocabularies of motive. In D. Brissett, & C. Edgley (Eds.), Life as theater: A dramaturgical sourcebook (pp. 162-170). Chicago: Aldine.

Mishler, E. G. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. Harvard Educational Review, 60, 415-442.

McNamee, S., & Gergen, K. J. (Eds.). (1992). Therapy as social construction. London: Sage.

McNamee, S., & Gergen, K. J. (1999). Relational responsibility: Resources for sustainable dialogue. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, W. B. (1992). A "camper's guide" to constructionism. Human Systems: The Journal of Systemic Consultation and Management, 3, 139-161.

Pearce, W. B. (1995). A sailing guide for social constructionists. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 88-113). New York: Guilford.

Penman, R. (1992). Good theory and good practice: An argument in progress. Communication Theory, 2, 234-250.

Perelman, C. H., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, Trans.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.

Philipsen, G. (1975). Speaking 'Like a Man' in Teamsterville: Cultural Patterns of Role Enactment in an Urban Neighborhood. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61, 13-22.

Poole, M. S., & Hirokawa, R. Y. (1986). Communication and group decision-making: A critical assessment. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (pp. 15-34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Poole, M. S., & Hirokawa, R. Y. (1996). Introduction: Communication and group decision making. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (2nd ed.) (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Poole, M. S., Seibold, D. R., & McPhee, R. D. (1986). A structural approach to theory-building in group decision-making research. In R. Y. Hirokawa, &

M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (pp. 237-264).

Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Poole, M. S., Seibold, D. R., & McPhee, R. D. (1996). The structuration of group decisions. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (2nd ed.) (pp. 114-146). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Putnam, L., & Stohl, C. (1990). Bona fide groups: A reconceptualization of groups in context. Communication Studies, 41, 248-265.

Putnam, L., & Stohl, C. (1996). Bona fide groups: An alternative perspective for communication and small group decision-making. In R. Y. Hirokawa, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Communication and group decision-making (2nd ed.) (pp. 147-178). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Putnam, L. L., Van Hoeven, S. A., & Bullis, C. (1991). The role of rituals and fantasy themes in teachers' bargaining. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 55, 85-103.

Rodriguez, J. (1996, March 25). Broadened diversity requirement misses the point [10 paragraphs]. In The Online Daily of the University of Washington [On-line]. Available: [http://www.thedaily.washington.edu/archives/1996\\_Spring/March251996/cedagain.html](http://www.thedaily.washington.edu/archives/1996_Spring/March251996/cedagain.html).

Sarbin, T. R., & Kitsuse, J. I. (1994). A prologue to "Constructing the social." In J. I. Kitsuse (Ed.), Constructing the social (pp. 1-18). London: Sage.

- Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. American Sociological Review, 33, 46-62.
- Semin, G. R. (1990). Everyday assumptions, language and personality. In G. R. Semin, & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), Everyday understanding: Social and scientific implications (pp. 151-175). London: Sage.
- Shotter, J. (1984). Social accountability and selfhood. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Shotter, J. (1985). Social accountability and self-specification. In K. J. Gergen, & K. E. Davis (Eds.), The social construction of the person (pp. 167-189). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Shotter, J. (1993a). Conversational realities: Constructing life through language. London: Sage.
- Shotter, J. (1993b). Cultural politics of everyday life: Social constructionism, rhetoric, and knowing of the third kind. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Sigman, S. J. (1995). Order and continuity in human relationships: A social communication approach to defining "relationship." In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 188-200). New York: Guilford.
- Smith, R. C., & Turner, P. K. (1995). A social constructionist reconfiguration of metaphor analysis: An application of "SCMA" to organizational socialization theorizing. Communication Monographs, 62, 152-181.

Stewart, J. (1994). An interpretive approach to validity in interpersonal communication research. In K. Carter, & N. Presnell (Eds.), Interpretive approaches to interpersonal communication (pp. 45-81). Albany: State University Of New York.

Stewart, J. (1995). Philosophical features of social approaches to interpersonal communication. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), Social approaches to communication (pp. 23-45). New York: Guilford.

Sullivan, J. (1996, March 1). Faculty senate approves CED requirement [25 paragraphs]. In The Online Daily of the University of Washington [On-line]. Available: [http://www.thedaily.washington.edu/archives/1996\\_Winter/March111996/ced30196.html](http://www.thedaily.washington.edu/archives/1996_Winter/March111996/ced30196.html)

Taylor, C. (1975). Interpretation and the sciences of man. Review of Metaphysics, 25, 3-51.

Tierney, W. G. (1983). Governance by conversation: An essay on the structure, function, and communicative codes of a faculty senate. Human Organization, 42, 172-177.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1983). Account analysis of organizations: Decision making and identification. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach (pp. 123-146). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Toulmin, S. (1969). The uses of argument. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Trujillo, N., & Dionisopoulos, G. (1987). Cop talk, police stories, and the social construction of organizational drama. Central States Speech Journal, 38, 196-209.

University of Washington Faculty Senate Office. (1996). The Faculty Senate [On-line]. Available: <http://weber.u.washington.edu/~fachome/guide.html#facsen>

Williams, K. R. (1973). Reflections on a human science of communication. Journal of Communication, 23, 239-250.

## Appendix A:

## Transcript of Discussion on Senate Size Reduction Resolution

Meeting date: November 30, 1995

NOTE: "ON" in the speaker column indicates an observational note.

Utterance

No.    Speaker    Remarks

- 1)    **JUNKER:** The Class C resolution is effecting, upon adoption by this body. Steve Warren a senator from Group three, proposed to the Senate Executive Committee, that there be a resolution regarding the size of the faculty senate. You have a copy of that resolution. Since it is not endorsed nor turned down by the Senate Executive Committee, it needs to be moved in order for it to be before you. Steve?

ON: brief pause

- 2)    **WARREN:** I'm proposing to reduce the size of the Faculty Senate by about half. And to do this would require a task force to work out a plan for reapportioning the senators among the various programs. Two years ago I asked the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs to consider this proposal and they did, but their feeling was that the senate should not be reduced in size. However, a number of individual senators have expressed a little bit of support for this idea. And so now I'm bringing this issue to the full senate to find out whether you all are in favor of such a change. So this is the motion, and I move, just a Class C resolution, that a plan should be developed to reduce the size of the faculty senate by half of the current membership from one senator for every fifteen faculty members to one for every thirty. The task force would be appointed by the senate chair to formulate a plan to reapportion the senators (?) and to formulate a process with the transition occurring over a period of four years. The task force would include at least one member from each of the eight faculty groups. And the task force report would be prepared in the form of a proposal of a Class A legislation to be presented next May, 1996.
- 3)    **JUNKER:** Is there a second?
- 4)    **ON:** Cannot hear anyone, but Junker states that the motion has been "seconded."
- 5)    **WARREN:** O.K. so I just make briefly an argument in favor of it.
- 6)    **ON:** Cannot hear what Junker says in response.

- 7) **WARREN:** Number one, many departments have trouble finding volunteers to fill up the senate. Secondly, the attendance of the senate meetings is often poor. However, there are some senators who are more committed and interested in the work of the senate, and they will constitute a large fraction of the (?) to make this change. The inventory is as follows, and Ron Dear who was chair of the senate last year pointed out that the size of the Faculty Senate actually exceeds that of the Washington state legislature.
- 8) **ON:** Audience laughs after the previous comment. Warren continues on.
- 9) **WARREN:** For example, I think of (?) sciences they have 23 senators, but I think that our interests could be adequately represented by 11.
- 10) **JUNKER:** Thanks Steve. Is there any discussion? Yes?
- 11) **?:** I support this resolution-
- 12) **ON:** Junker interrupts to have a microphone brought to the senator.
- 13) **?:** Never has so little power been distributed among so many people.
- 14) **ON:** Audience laughs.
- 15) **?:** I don't think it's a question of democratic representation. Many people consider it a duty to be endured. Even a hardship. I think we'll get more effective leadership with a leaner, smaller senate. It's consistent with the sorta downsizing of most institutions. Albeit it has some (economy?) associated with it. And I think it will result in a livelier, more vital senate.
- 16) **JUNKER:** Ah, yes?
- 17) **ANDERSON:** I'm Anderson, and I'm not sure what my department is right now. I can appreciate the need to reduce the total number to guarantee that we can have a quorum and get some things done, but I think that the reduction is maybe more severe than might need be because any reduction at all is a loss of representation. And, reducing from one senator for every fifteen to one to thirty is more than necessary. I could see something such as one to twenty, one to twenty two or something and see if that wasn't enough to avoid the quorum issue. There's an awful lot of committees and councils associated with the senate, and they have to recruit every year people to fill all those spots. And the smaller the senate gets, it becomes ultimately increasingly difficult to fill those positions. So I would prefer personally a reduction, but somewhat less severe.
- 18) **JUNKER:** Ah yes, Dave Cohen?
- 19) **COHEN:** I'd be very interested to know what the arguments of the Council on Faculty Affairs were when they rejected the previous proposal. I would like to oppose this motion as it is because it presumes that we shall cut it

in half. It does not address the issue of what should we do, what is the appropriate size, what is the appropriate mode of organization. Now, I'm not wedded to this one. I don't know what the right number is. I do agree with a couple of the comments that were made that all of these items actually play both ways. I would not be terribly comfortable with the senate composed solely of people who were eager to serve in it.

- 20) ON: Audience laughter after the previous comment.
- 21) COHEN: Serving in the senate is one of the duties that we as faculty members have. The lack of a quorum reflects our own failings as a body as much as the size of the body. That things come to us not fully prepared. Things come to us pushed by some body who thinks they KNOW what the right answer is, but that doesn't really reflect the larger views of the faculty. Having more of us here tends to ensure that if it comes out of this body at least it will be more likely chance of being acceptable to the faculty at large. So I would like to urge that we turn this down, and I don't think another task force is appropriate at least until we have views from Faculty Affairs as to why it was that they turn that down and what the nature of those arguments were, because the real debate here is to what extent should we organized. So I urge us to vote us down.
- 22) JUNKER: Thank you (?). We need a microphone down here in front please. Thank you.
- 23) STEPHENOPOLOUS: Christine Stephenopolous from Political Science. I would also urge us to turn this proposal down. One of the things that I'm very concerned about is the assumption that meaner and leaner is necessarily better and that's potentially what our function is. I think one of the important functions of the Faculty Senate is that it's a kinda training ground for new faculty who come in. Sometimes it takes us a while to understand what's going on and feel for the processes and feel for the university as a whole. Faculty who are quiet, who are less aggressively involved in the activities of the senate to begin with may take some time to get up to speed, so it's not clear to me at all that just because we have a large body that every body isn't always aggressively participating that we have a problem.
- 24) JUNKER: Thank you. Jim.
- 25) HERRICK: Jim Herrick, Social Work. I also think we need to turn this down. I think we need to gather data on the problem here. I think we need to do that by going to our departments and getting some sense of what are the reasons for not wanting to (?).
- 26) JUNKER: Yes, Professor Bereano?

- 27) **BEREANO: Phil Bereano, Engineering.** Ah John, am I correct that the quorum issue is being reviewed by some committee or group given the controversy that arose from the (?) meeting last year?
- 28) **JUNKER: Yes, the quorum issue is being reviewed by committee of the Senate Executive Committee.**
- 29) **BEREANO: So some recommendations will be made or might be made?**
- 30) **JUNKER: Yes. (sentence is inaudible, something to do with making recommendations)**
- 31) **BEREANO: Well it seems to me that then people should not view this as a way of dealing with the quorum problem. That the quorum problem is one that (?) discussed in some detail on its own when those recommendations (?) and that people should keep this as a size recommendation, not a quorum recommendation and vote it up or vote it down (?).**
- 32) **JUNKER: I don't intend this as a comment on the merits of this, but my solution to the quorum problem is either to have long and exciting meetings or short, dull meetings. No long, dull meetings.**
- 33) **ON: Audience laughter.**
- 34) **JUNKER: I had in mind today was going to be short and dull. But I guess maybe it's going to be short and lively if we can put this behind us, and we have only some reports which you can read (?), and we'll be out of here, I estimate as early as four. I'm happy to do that. Yes, Vivian?**
- 35) **WOLF-WILLETTS: I would also not be in favor of this motion without some data. I think now what happens is that we frequently have one person from a department or in some cases two. And they convey a lot of information about the senate decisions coming up and ask people to think about issues. If we go to (?) members, we can't be sure without some study what the distribution of the senate would be among the departmental groups and it may have a very averse effect on representation. I don't know. I'd like more data before I vote in favor of such a move.**
- 36) **JUNKER: I sense that we're ready to vote on this. All those in favor of the motion, say 'ay.'**
- 37) **ON: Several senators say 'ay.'**
- 38) **JUNKER: All those opposed?**
- 39) **ON: More senators say 'nay.'**
- 40) **JUNKER: Motion fails.**

## Appendix B:

## Transcript of Discussion on the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement Resolution

Meeting date: February 29, 1996

UtteranceNo.    Speaker    Remarks

- 1)     **JUNKER:** The next item of business is Class B legislation relating to the Cultural and Ethnic Diversity Requirement. You received a handout at the door, with a letter from Fred Campbell to me relating to today's issue. Before I ask Joan to move the legislation, we asked a number of folks here who have information about this, to remain to question as the discussion continues. They include Shawn Wong, who was chair of the Culture and Ethnic Diversity Task Force; Fred Campbell, the Dean of Undergraduate Education; Tim Washburn, the Executive Director of Admissions and Records; Linda Richter, the Assistant to the Dean of Undergraduate Education; and Jan Carline, who presents the reasons for the legislation being proposed to you. In addition, we have many guests, including the students who are here, and I have asked if one of them could speak to you. I ask for this because it's up to you whether that person may speak. James Rodriguez is the person who will be here presenting the views of the GPSS and the ASUW. In the absence of no outcry against, I will assume that we will extend that to him. I will now recognize Joan to present the motion.
- 2)     **MARTIN:** On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, I move that the Senate approve the Class B legislation that adds a cultural and ethnic diversity requirement to the general graduation requirements.
- 3)     **JUNKER:** Jan Carline, the Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, where this recommendation comes from, will present the reasons for it. You have a copy of the legislation as a attachment to your agenda, item number 8.
- 4)     **CARLINE:** My first (?) a bit of time to relax after the Senate Executive Committee passed that the language that you see in front of you, and I started pondering on what all of this actually meant, and I think that with all the years involved in this discussion, all the task forces, all the meetings of the Senate, all the meetings of my own council, and the debates we've had before, 61 words are present before you. It's certainly amazing. I hope that (?) colleagues (?) too short. Before I talk more

about the proposal, I would like to give a number of thanks. Specially, I would like to thank Shawn Wong, the faculty students and staff who worked on the task force on introducing the final program report you received. I would like to thank Tim Washburn and his staff in the registrar's office, and Gerry Gilmore out of the Office of Educational Assessment, for providing some additional data and analyses for us. I'd like to thank Fred Campbell, Undergraduate Dean, Debra Friedman and Linda Richter who also really provided a great deal of work in the last few weeks to get us a final report. And finally, I would like to thank members of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards for their long tolerance and many long meetings discussing this issue that's before you. Now, my first comments really are (?) the CED. We've had a long history of student and faculty interest in these matters. They have been concerned that the academic community address issues of diversity and having our students be exposed to an intellectual approach around those issues, so that indeed our institution has some critical, reasoning skills, where they have some chance to exercise those skills around diversity. We had also seen in Shawn's report that many students who complete these courses currently really do feel that they are of value to their education and their futures out in the world. Further, we know that in our university mission statement, there is an interest in providing our students with critical abilities, with independent judgments to deal with issues of diversity and achievement called for in the liberal arts and sciences. Our mission statement also talks about a sense of value in experiences as (?) other cultures, asking to think critically about these issues. So in our current mission, we currently do have statements around the issues of diversity. The other last reason for thinking about this requirement now is that in the world that we are facing in the United States with questions and concerns from potential employers of our undergraduates, the ability to think clearly about diversity issues really will be a skill that is needed by our undergraduates going off into to the workforce. As you know, our concerns at the initial discussion of what the Faculty Council is proposing to you, it has three main features. First that it focuses on critical thinking, which is an academic concern. We're not out to change attitudes, opinions, we are really out to have students deal with critical reasoning skills which really do come under the way the university has been. It is not just one issue of diversity that we're dealing with. It's not just racism or sexism, but it represents a list of well-discussed and accepted concerns around diversity that have been the issue of discussions since 1988 and before that. And thirdly, it is, it does have a focus on interpreting our students' experiences around diversity within

our own country. Let me take a moment, or a little bit longer to discuss that last point.

[END OF TAPE ONE; SIDE TWO]

[BEGINNING OF TAPE TWO; SIDE ONE]

**CARLINE:** (missed part of what speaker was trying to say because of a change in tapes) university in our own nation in (?) setting. Although there may be people who may like to think that our own students will be able to take information about other cultures in other times and us that information to help them interpret their experiences, the Council is still very concerned that unless some formal aspect of instruction requires such reflection, it may not occur. We are not asking for courses, that are eligible for the CED, to reflect only or to focus solely on issues currently in the United States. We are not looking for just a straight, simple U.S. requirement. We are requesting however that an eligible course at least has a formal component, whether it be small or large, that either exposes the students to ideas about diversity in the United States or requires students to reflect on their own experiences in light of diversity concerns in other times and places. So although our wording in the requirement focuses on U.S. society, it is not meant to exclude discussions of diversity in other cultures in other times as well. The last thing that we are very concerned about in the Council is that this new requirement does not unnecessarily impede the progress of the student towards graduation. If you look on the reverse side of the proposal as included in your packet, you'll see the full wording of what the Council forwarded to the Executive Committee. Unfortunately, one thing was left out in the wording of the Class B legislation, and that is that this requirement may also be used to fulfill other requirements. We do not see adding onto the curriculum of students another five hours worth of credit. We also know, and you can see that reflected in the letter from Fred Campbell to John Junker, that currently we do have insufficient classes to allow students easy access to these courses. Consequently, the two year request, a two year delay in implementation is requested, hopefully to allow us some time to develop the course spaces needed to meet that need. One last comment, is that, we are concerned as a faculty council, that this requirement be implemented with review and controlled by faculty members and in our whole proposal we suggest that the selection of courses or the implementation of courses remain in the hands of the Faculty council. And that we periodically review and provide information back to the Senate regarding the implementation of the requirement. Thank you.

- 5) **JUNKER:** Thank you Jan. With respect to the one point that Jan made, having to do with the applicability of the CED requirement to meet other

requirements, this is a version of the legislation that (?) with the addition of the following paragraph, which, uh, as you can see, in effect, says that any courses that a student might take to fulfill the general education requirements or (?) reasoning or (?) requirements could also be a course that also fulfills the CED requirement. So that you do not have any requirements in addition to the ones that are already on the left side of the page for example. It simply specifies that within those requirements, the a, b, and c on the left side of the document that you have as the attachment to this agenda item. Within those courses, you are specifically required to, if this proposal were to pass, the students would be required to take courses that meet also the CED requirement. So, if the body deems it an appropriate addition to be made to the legislation that has been proposed to you sometime during the course of this debate, that last paragraph could be moved as an amendment. Secondly, I'd now like to ask James Rodriguez to speak to the body on behalf of the student body. Yes, please. [pause] Mr. Rodriguez is a member of the board of the GPSS and is here speaking also on behalf of the ASUW.

- 6) **RODRIGUEZ:** Thank you. I wasn't prepared to do this. Kerry Woolsey, the president of the GPSS, came to me and said (?), so, I kinda haven't had a chance to figure out what to say about this agenda item. I've been following the meetings of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards meetings on it, and I've been following it for a while. I'm going to try to be brief, or I will be brief actually. This, uh, the CED requirement is presently both supported by the GPSS and the ASUW, and what I was told was that even though I'm the representative of GPSS, I am basically speaking right now on behalf of both GPSS and ASUW. Both of us openly, both ASUW and GPSS passed resolutions supporting the CED and I'm not going to read to you the entirety of it, I'm just going to jump to the bottom, where, where (?) we support (?). The ASUW and GPSS supports the United States based cultural and diversity requirement which concentrates on the examination of people's experiences along race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation and class. The ASUW and GPSS supports a CED requirement which does not add to the total general distribution total credit hours, and that any class fulfilling such a requirement shall be allowed to overlap with existing credit requirements. The ASUW and GPSS supports efforts by the university to transform curriculum in all disciplines to better address concerns involving race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation and class, in both size and scope. (?) those, this ASUW resolution and the GPSS resolutions are essentially saying. With that, the only thing I wanted to say is basically two messages. The first message is that I expect, I hope, that there's going to be some debate about this. There has been for a number of years

now. And I think that what is the discussion I'm sure is going to be about a requirement, it's going to be about logistical questions, and things like that. But what is at issue here is diversity, how we think about it and how we feel about it as a society. That's the bottom line on this and that's what we're talking about. And basically, I think that as students what we're saying is that we as a university community need to take this debate, the debate that you're going to be having here about diversity, we need to take this debate and bring it into the classroom, bring it to the curriculum. So that's the first message I want to make. The second message I wanted to make was that I think it also, again, ASUW and GPSS as members of this university community, really also hold the university accountable. We are accountable to value diversity. We see posters every where that the University of Washington values diversity, and I think that the second message that I have is that we need to live up to that. I think there's no better way to show that you value diversity than by requiring that diversity be studied. So, as I've said, we support it, and I hope that it passes.

- 7) **JUNKER:** Thank you James. Let me just remind you of how a Class B legislation works since this whole process is so arcane. Sometimes (?). Today, this is here to be voted up or down, or referred, or deferred. If it is voted in favor of by the majority of this body, then it is published and the faculty have 14 days? 21 days at the end of which if 5% of the faculty or 135 faculty object, then it is back to us for reconsideration. If we re-affirm it, then it goes down to a full faculty vote at which point it would have to be approved by 2/3 of those voting. So, um, the floor is open for discussion. Yes?
- 8) **VAN DEN BERGHE:** My name is Pierre van Den Berghe, sociology, and speaking for myself and for 67% of the faculty who voted down a nearly identical requirement four years ago, I am not speaking for my department, as a whole, there is a division of views in my department on the subject. Now, I've devoted my entire academic career to this idea of teaching diversity. So obviously I must speak on the subject, the subject is extremely moot, and extremely fascinating. But I am opposing the requirement. Basically, I'm saying that it's too good of a subject to be spoiled by a requirement. I have four reasons for opposing, at least four reasons for opposing this requirement. The first one is that it is based on the rather naive conception of the university as a place to foster self-esteem or political consciousness or whatever. That the university is kinda a (?) psychological (?) place, rather than a place for state public education. Now, diversity with a capital D is clearly a (?) topic to expose to students in the K-12 system, and students are already bombarded with multiculturalism in the K-12 system, and I think it insults the intelligence

of our students, at the ages 18-20, that they haven't discovered that the United States is a diverse society yet. It really insults the social intelligence to make it a requirement. Second, the requirement is passionately pushed by a very small minority who cares very passionately about this largely for political reasons, but then everything is politics, so I don't blame them for being political. But the point is that it's a very undemocratic agenda which has been already opposed by 2/3 of the faculty and which would I assume by the majority of the students (?) students' agenda. So, whenever the ASUW and other student so-called representatives claim to speak for the majority of the students, they do nothing of the sort. This has never been put to a (?). It's a very small minority agenda in which student, so-called representatives presume to speak for the silent majority which is at best indifferent, and I would suggest which is, in any case, opposed to such a requirement. Thirdly, I think it's naive to believe that such a requirement would improve the divide of race and ethnic divisions amid campuses and in this one in particular. I think that there's a strong probability that it may have the opposite effect that there would be a backlash from the approximately half the students who would be forced to take it and would be irritated by having the faculty dictate what is good for them. It's a demeaning (?) which students resent. What students like requirements? It's utterly inconceivable that the majority of students would be in favor of any kind of requirement, this one included. And, finally, I think this is really a (?), as proposed, particularly with the last clause, in U.S. society, the requirement is not in fact a diversity requirement, it's a parochialism requirement. The last thing our students need to do is to have their noses rubbed yet more in their own society. They need to learn about other societies. Now, what kind of diversity requirement is it that focuses on 5% of the world's population? So I would find this proposal much less objectionable if the last three words of the first paragraph were deleted, so that, instead of, (?) in U.S. society, it would read on planet earth or something like this.

- 9) ON: Audience laughter after "planet earth."
- 10) VAN DEN BERGHE: This would be indeed a diversity requirement. The present proposal is not a diversity requirement, it's a parochialism requirement. In short, I urge you to vote not in favor of therapy, but to vote for education, and to vote it down. Thank you.
- 11) JUNKER: Is there other discussion? Yes?
- 12) ALLAN: I would like to support Prof. Der Berghe's remarks-
- 13) JUNKER: Your name.

- 14) **ALLAN:** Graham Allan, representing the Chemical Engineering department. I believe that education is on the verge of cataclysmic changes with the advent of the personal computer, and I think that the Faculty Senate and the faculty should be directing its attention to what education is going to be like in the 21st century, rather than on what it was in the last fifty years. Because of the intensity of feeling which has been associated with this proposal, I specifically canvassed all the members of the Chemical Engineering faculty and only one spoke in favor of it. In my chemical engineering class at the moment which has 15 students, all vigorously opposed. I think that the point which Prof. Der Berghe makes about the students wanting is a very valid one and I'm going to suggest to the proponents of this that they conduct a referendum with the students. I personally believe that they would find (?) to be constantly diminishing rather than augmenting, so I will be voting on behalf of the Chemical Engineering department against this proposal.
- 15) **JUNKER:** Yes, Prof. Gallant? Right behind you there, thank you.
- 16) **GALLANT:** John Gallant, Genetics. I'm in favor of the proposal in principle, but I'd like to amend it to meet some of the objections that have been made. Is this the right time to offer an amendment?
- 17) **JUNKER:** Yes.
- 18) **GALLANT:** I'd like to offer two very simple one word amendments. Do I make them separate amendments?
- 19) **JUNKER:** Try two and we'll see what happens.
- 20) **ON:** Audience laughter after Junker's remarks.
- 21) **GALLANT:** Alright, one is categories of acceptable kinds of diversity should be expanded to include disability. So, I would suggest adding disability.
- 22) **BEREANO (?):** Second.
- 23) **GALLANT:** Do I need a second on that?
- 24) **JUNKER:** There has been a second. Where would you like to add?
- 25) **ON:** Audience laughter after Junker's comment.
- 26) **GALLANT:** Before religion or after sexual orientation.
- 27) **JUNKER:** Right after sexual orientation. Thank you.
- 28) **GALLANT:** The second part of my amendment is I'd suggest in order to avoid ruining the diversity of the diversity requirement, we replace the word U.S. by human.
- 29) **ON:** Someone seconds? Not sure.

- 30) GALLANT: (something about human)
- 31) ON: Someone seconds.
- 32) JUNKER: That's been moved and seconded to add the following amendments to debate, that the word disability be added after the words sexual orientation and before the word religion, and that the letters U.S. be stricken and that the word human be inserted. The debate is now on the amendment.
- 33) BEREANO: Point of procedure John.
- 34) JUNKER: How did I know?
- 35) ON: Audience laughter after John's remarks. Probably because Bereano often has a point of procedure to make re. the Senate meetings.
- 36) BEREANO: You would probably feel naked without my talk. I'd like to rule on separability of these two items.
- 37) JUNKER: Are you requesting?
- 38) BEREANO: I'm requesting a ruling on the chair on severing these two items.
- 39) JUNKER: They are separate thoughts, so we will take them up in order, starting with disability.
- 40) BEREANO: As separate motions?
- 41) JUNKER: Yes. (brief pause) So the discussion is now on whether the paragraph should be amended by adding the word disability. (brief pause-no one says anything) There is no further discussion on that issues. We will vote on that amendment. All those in favor, please say ay.
- 42) ON: Several senators say ay.
- 43) JUNKER: Those opposed?  
ON: No one says nay.  
JUNKER: The motion carries. The second amendment is to add, or to strike the word U.S., and to add in its place the word human. The discussion is on that. Yes, thank you.
- 44) ?: Kristin (?), from Nursing. I would just like some clarification on why the word human? As manifest in society would seem sufficient.
- 45) ON: Someone makes a comment about animal societies.
- 46) ?: We may learn something.
- 47) ON: Audience laughter.

- 48) **JUNKER:** I take the comment as indicating that the word is superfluous. Is there other discussion with respect to this amendment? (pause) Seeing none, I will assume that you are ready to vote on the amendment. All those in favor of striking the words U.S. and substituting the word human, please say ay.
- 49) **ON:** Several senators say ay.
- 50) **JUNKER:** Those opposed.
- 51) **ON:** Some senators say no.
- 52) **JUNKER:** I think the motion carries. If any one wishes a vote by cards, you do? Alright, those in favor of the amendment, please raise your cards.
- 53) **ON:** pause while counting
- 54) **JUNKER:** We're now adding them now, put them down. Those opposed, raise your cards. Motion carries. So we are now back to the discussion of the main motion as amended by the words disability and human. Yes?
- 55) **ODA:** Dolphine Oda-
- 56) **JUNKER:** Hold on, there's a microphone right behind you.
- 57) **ODA:** Hi. Dolphine Oda, School of Dentistry. I would like to make one more amendment. Since we're adding words, can we add the word 'age' after disability?
- 58) **JUNKER:** It's been moved that the word age be added after the word disability.
- 59) **ON:** Someone seconds.
- 60) **JUNKER:** There's a second. Discussion is now with respect to that amendment. (pause)
- 61) **ON:** During this pause, there is a lot of muttering going on between senators.
- 62) **JUNKER:** Seeing no one wishing to address that issue, therefore we will vote. All those in favor of the amendment, to add the word age, please say ay.
- 63) **ON:** Several senators say ay.
- 64) **JUNKER:** Those opposed?
- 65) **ON:** A small number of senators say nay.
- 66) **JUNKER:** Motion carries. The relevant section now reads, expand the student's ability to think critically about one or more contemporary issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age, religion, and class differences and similarities as manifested in human society. Yes?
- 67) **CLARK:** Edward Clark, Microbiology. I just need a point of clarification. It's hard for me to be clear about really how much this is going to impact the

students. I need some sense of what kind of courses we're talking about. I mean, if in fact we now broaden this amendment to include every kind of niche in our society, and animal behavior and whatever-

- 68) JUNKER: Well the animal-
- 69) CLARK: Well, we didn't quite make that but-
- 70) ON: Laughter from the audience.
- 71) CLARK: But, uh, it just seems like, probably the impact is not going to be so great such that it would overlap with the Individual and Society or the Individual and Performing Arts sections in the General Requirements, that's kinda my impression. I was asking about that because it seems like for the sciences, from the microbiology undergraduate major point of view, it seems like there is additional requirements that is going to impact the science sector in particular because the students say who are already philosophy are going to immediately distributing their coursework in an anthro class are going to be able to just take their classes not having an impact really on probably what they're going to take anyway whereas the science students are. So, so I find it (?) evaluate or have some idea about what kind of courses we're talking about.
- 72) JUNKER: Obviously, we just expanded the criteria and therefore the list of classes that the letter from Dean Campbell to me is based on the assumption that we're working with the list, the unamended list, but as you add these other issues of disability and age and also, take out the restriction on U.S. society, there are now many more courses. We haven't looked at it obviously, but there would be many more courses that would be available.
- 73) CLARK: I understand that the, the way it says, it says one thing in here, and then depending on what the courses are (?). So the courses are going to take this requirement-
- 74) JUNKER: That's right, the courses-
- 75) CLARK: We could add every kind of work on this or whatever and what is really going to make the requirement will be the courses (?)
- 76) JUNKER: That's right, and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards will provide us with an implementation mechanism that will be, that Council will establish which courses meets this criteria.
- 77) CLARK: And will that say (?) every language, will say, for example, it seems like, if I were to study Spanish, I might have a better understanding of Hispanic thinking.
- 78) JUNKER: Well, I can't tell you how they're going to define-

- 79) **CLARK:** It's really hard for me to know what this all means-
- 80) **JUNKER:** Well-
- 81) **CLARK:** And how this is going to impact science students without having a sense of what we're talking about.
- 82) **JUNKER:** Well, I think a more relevant response to you is to look on this (?), the one you have in your agenda. You'll see that there are ten credits each in the Natural World, the Individual and Societies, and the Visual/Performing Arts course requirements, and that there a total (?) credits of writing and five credits of reading that are required. And this final paragraph, if it were added, would mean that any courses taken to meet those requirements, if they were within the definition that were working on today, would also satisfy this definition, so that the likelihood of there being any additional impact on science students is low. Is that true? Would you concur with that Fred? Could we get a microphone? Down here. I'm sorry.
- 83) **CAMPBELL:** I think that there are two issues that are being raised that are important. As you pointed (?), this requirement does have an effect on students, let's say, in the biological sciences. The assumption is that students will pick up this course as they are picking up their other General Education requirements, and take this along the way. So, they do have an extra course, but it would require that student would have to obviously make that selection very carefully. Only some of the courses would count both for a CED requirement and let's say, one of the General Education requirements. So a student will have to look across the curriculum, if you will. Now, of course, how these courses are available to the student to choose from is the unanswered question. You can't answer that unless you know what the requirement is. Now that it's changed substantially, (?) expanding it to human societies, that will open up a large number of courses to students that have been (?). Eventually, some committee, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, will have to sit down and make the determination about what courses actually do count. Up until then, all we can make is just estimates.
- 84) **JUNKER:** Thank you Fred. Yes?
- 85) **SIDLES:** I'm John Sidles, School of (?). I requested from the Provost's office some numbers that bear on the question asked by my colleague in biology, and I requested these numbers because they were promised us at the last meeting when proponents for this said that they would come to this meeting prepared with numbers that would address whether this requirement would effect the four year graduation rate. And this is in a context where the mechanical engineering department, where I just came

from consulting my colleagues, reduced their requirements from 205 credit hours to 192 specifically because their four year graduation rate was too low. So, the bottom line of the numbers of the task force seems to be that for the (?) schools in the College of Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and also Computer Science, for people with fewer than 45 credit hours transferring to the university, the unanswered question is, then, what about students arriving with credits from other universities, how do we know whether they fit under this umbrella? So, if you just restrict yourself just to students with a completely U.W. transcript, in the present graduating class within Engineering, about 30% would presently pass the CED requirement, and about 70% would not. So, it does seem that there would be an adverse impact on the 4 year graduation rates, a substantial impact within the College of Education. We have taken one step to mitigate that impact by broadening the umbrella of the CED, the amendment at the bottom of the page, if enacted, would be another step, but I concur with my colleague in Chemical Engineering, that the faculty and students within the College of Engineering would prefer to take these courses on a wholly voluntary basis.

- 86) JUNKER: The question implicit in what you just said could be addressed by Fred or by Tim Washburn who is here with respect to whether it will effect the time for graduation.
- 87) WASHBURN: Well, the issue that we, that a student would face, if this body, if the faculty of course decides what the curriculum is for the university, if the faculty were to decide that there would be a requirement, the students are obviously effected. We would anticipate that students would have a problem with what courses to take. As you can see from the first count that we did however is based on the requirement that you passed in 1994 that we were about a third short in terms of the number of seats available (?). We estimated that before the start of adding to the list, we were short about 2,500 seats. And, those courses would have to be developed, alternate courses expanded in size. Otherwise students would have, would be faced with a requirement that they couldn't meet (?). I would obviously encourage the faculty to make sure that there are courses available, if they're going to require that the students take them. That was the point I guess of the two year delay, was an attempt to put on line the additional necessary courses. Again, now that this has been modified, the count will be quite different. If you were to take off human society, there are really are quite a number of courses available in animal society.
- 88) ON: Audience laughter after the last remark.
- 89) JUNKER: Ah, yes, Prof. Bereano?

- 90) **BEREANO:** As another representative from the College of Engineering, I guess I have to differ with my other colleague and report that I don't believe this feeling unanimous in the College of Engineering. Engineering students must take certain General Education courses, many of which would qualify for this, so there's absolutely no reason conclude, it's illogical, that the passage of this would unnecessarily extend anyone's time for graduation. They have to be up on what their requirements are. They have to have good advisors, which I know that the College provides, as you know.
- 91) **ON:** Audience laughter.
- 92) **BEREANO:** And they have to be clear on which courses will satisfy a multiplicity of requirements. Most of these kinds of courses here, seem to me, fall into, whatever they're calling it now, the Social Sciences requirement. And so, I think it's an illogical conclusion, and I don't think that it is held uniformly in the College of Engineering. In fact, I'm sure that it's not.
- 93) **JUNKER:** Is there further discussion? Yes?
- 94) **HENDERSON:** Jeff Henderson, from the department of Medicine. I'm speaking out strongly in favor of this requirement, and I'd like to make several points relative to it. The first point I would like to make is that the discussion that I'm hearing and the tactics that are taken by those who would oppose such a measure are common tactics relative to any situation in which there is a clear high road and there is a low road. And when you're on the high road, the main tactics that people would try to use are to blur the lines. We have a blurring of what it is that we're really talking about. To take this issue and couch it in terms of dollars, space, four year graduation rates, etc., and to bring it out of its real life, that of the importance of a deep appreciation and understanding of the uniqueness of the diversity of the individuals in this country or colleagues or other students or future co-worker and colleagues. I'd like to address several points that Prof. Van den Berghe raised since he appears to be the banner carrier, for the most part, for the opposition group. Prof. Van den Berghe, both in his comments to us here today and in an email message which he sent to the general Faculty Senate listserv, states that he's fascinated and intensely interested in the subject of diversity having taught it for some 25 years, having written or edited some 22 books. With such quote, current fascination and intense interest, I can only think that Prof. Van Den Berghe takes a very romantic attitude toward the subject of diversity. Secondly, Prof. Van Den Berghe states that this is very naive motion that we have before us, and that it is not this university's place to help assist, enhance, or otherwise support the self-esteem of the students

nor to provide any comfort for them. Reading from his very last line in his email message, 'good education is not about feeling good about oneself and others,' end quote. Well, while I would not say that that's not exactly not true, good education certainly is not about feeling bad about one's self or others. Instances of which we have numerous and repeated documentations of on this campus, both through time and currently. I'll also state, to his comment that, or to his comments that the majority of the students aren't likely to support such a measure, the ASUW, the GPSS, the Black Student Union, MECHA, several of the Native American student groups who have come out in support of this requirement are themselves representatives, elected representatives, of those groups, much as, we as faculty sitting here, are representing the larger faculty in whole. (?) when he tried to make the point, that just because most all of the major student groups do not generally reflect the students at large. This, this is real interesting debate. Having obtained my master's in public health here, in the School of Community Health, I probably one of many such instances in a course, in a seminar format course, where the students were elected, were asked to lend input as to the topics that we would cover in the seminar, among the topics, that is, for the last two places for this quarter long seminar were the topics of impoverished and disadvantaged and ethnic minorities in this country. One of my colleagues during the class, a master's students, raised his hand and said, 'well, why don't we don't just clump ethnic minorities and the disadvantaged together? It's all one and the same anyway.' This for a one and a half hour topic time for the course. Also in the course of having returned and obtaining my master's in public health, I can tell you that there's not been one course that I've taken here, and I've taken courses not only in the School of Public Health, but throughout the university, which I haven't at some point or another had to speak up to something that either the professor or lecturer was saying which was just an absolute perpetuation of a myth or stereotype widely ignored, and probably no more common of such a myth or stereotype that I've had to fight against as a Lakota Sioux Indian person is the myth of the populating of the West, of the settling of the West, of the expansion across the West, of those hearty pioneers. As I told one lecturer, I said, 'excuse me, but I feel compelled to mention to you that the West was nicely settle prior to the migration of the visionaries and the so-called pioneers westward.' Now I understand that I'm taking it to a level that we don't necessarily need it to be at either, but those are the feelings that I have relative to this subject. Don't let the lines be blurred, and what it is that we're really talking about. If this university truly does value diversity, it will find some way to deal with the space, the dollar, the

potential impact on graduation rates, etc. etc. Don't let yourself be (?) believing otherwise. Follow your hearts.

- 95) JUNKER: Prof. Ladner wishes to speak.
- 96) LADNER: I'd like to agree with Prof. Bereano. This proposal or requirement might be very beneficial to the students in the College of Engineering. And I will support it. I think that the whole university should as well. Particularly the College of Engineering (?).
- 97) JUNKER: Yes sir?
- 98) MARGLIN: Marglin, Department of Radiology. I'm concerned when we make a list and add and modify the list that it really becomes much more rigid than I think this whole problem or discourse if you will warrants. My first response was to move that we consider obesity-
- 99) ON: Some audience laughter.
- 100) MARGLIN: Height, or the lack thereof, or the presence or absence of beards as being worthy items to include in the list, and attempting to get in front of Prof. Bereano, my willingness to separate and vote on them sequentially. But having said that, it seems to me that it would make much more sense to modify this and say 'think critically about issues of diversity, such as . . .' therefore, leaving some flexibility that faculty might desire and students might wish that goes beyond the simple categories that we enumerate. And, so I would move that we modify the document in front of us to "expand the student's ability to think critically about issues of diversity such as' colon, and then keep these examples.
- 101) JUNKER: Is there a second?
- 102) ON: A pause of a few seconds while someone seconds the motion.
- 103) JUNKER: Is that a second? Yes. It's been seconded. Is there discussion? Joan?
- 104) MARTIN: (cannot hear Martin's comment. I think it was a question about the proposed amendment.)
- 105) JUNKER: I believe it's simply to add the words, the words diversity and such as. (pause) If there is no further discussion, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor, please say ay.
- 106) ON: Some senators say ay.
- 107) JUNKER: Those opposed?
- 108) ON: Some senators say no.
- 109) JUNKER: Motion fails. Is there further discussion? Ah, yes, Lou?

- 110) **WOLCHER:** My name's Lou Wolcher, from the Law School. And I would like to say that for me the important aspect of this proposal is to think critically about anything at all.
- 111) **ON:** Audience laughter.
- 112) **WOLCHER:** I think that coming from a Law School, a profession that is designed to train lawyers to serve people in a society in which lawyers are hired by the marketplace. To think critically about society leads inevitably back to questions about race, ethnicity and gender. I'm wondering to myself as I hear the discussion how it's possible to pose this concept. And a couple of examples I'd like to give to you from the history of Law, in the Dred Scott decision, the Supreme court of the United States said that (?) the black man has no rights which a white man is bound to respect; in (?) vs. Illinois, the Supreme Court in the 19th century said married women were not fit to be lawyers because they were endowed by nature with a delicate disposition.
- 113) **ON:** Audience laughter.
- 114) **WOLCHER:** In the State vs. (?), which is a decision of our own Washington Supreme Court decided in 1919, Native Americans were described as dangerous child of nature whose land was there for the taking by white men in the interest of civilization. Barely 10 years ago, the United States Supreme Court decided a decision, made a decision in the Bowers vs. Hardwell case, which held that consensual gay sex was punishable and was not protected by the constitution simply because for 200 years the state legislatures have chosen to condemn it. If we study these subjects without reference to these criteria, the students that we would turn out at the Law School would be technocrats without a heart or without a soul. They would not be (?); they would be uneducated technocrats, and it seems to me that a university, in the service of a 200,000 year Western tradition of critical thought, taking very little for granted about what is discussed, should embrace a requirement which requires people to think critically about their culture and their society in depth. And for that reason as well as my own observation that the Law School students that we entertain and used to be undergraduates at this university, they haven't the foggiest ideas about the issues that are raised in this proposal, I think we do ourselves a terrible disservice if we think that somewhere along the line the students that we have custody over that we (?) protect and further their education will somehow acquire critical thinking ability about these most important issues in our nation at some time and place, and for that reason I'm going to support this proposal, and I urge you all to do so.
- 115) **ON:** A senator asks about calling the question.

- 116) **JUNKER:** Actually, you can't just call the question. You can get the floor and move the previous question, and then we'll have the vote. It takes two-thirds to stop the discussion, so if you want to do that, you gotta raise your hand. Yeah?
- 117) **BEAME:** This is just kinda a technical thing, I just noticed we haven't actually, this is Paul Beame, Group Six, we haven't actually moved the amendment that's at the bottom of that slide (?), and I just thought I'd actually do that before the question's called. So I move the amendment on the last two lines of that screen.
- 118) **JUNKER:** It's been moved that the proposal be amended by the last three lines on the overhead. Is there a second?
- 119) **ON:** A few senators second.
- 120) **JUNKER:** Is there any discussion? Yes, Steve?
- 121) **STEVE:** Isn't it already in the (?)
- 122) **ON:** A few senators say no.
- 123) **JUNKER:** Ah yes, it's in the overhead, but it's not in the proposal. Uh, James, did you want to be heard on this on the amendment?
- 124) **ON:** Someone (James?) asks a question.
- 125) **JUNKER:** Before us is the amendment to add these bottom three lines. Seeing no further discussion, all in favor of the amendment, please say ay.
- 126) **ON:** Several senators say ay.
- 127) **JUNKER:** Those opposed?
- 128) **ON:** No one says no.
- 129) **JUNKER:** Motion carries. We now have an amended proposal which I assume you all have tracked this far. (We've added?) disability, age, human, and these last three lines. Is there any further discussion on this proposal? Yes, we have a (?)
- 130) **CRNKOVIC:** Gordana Crnkovic, Group One, Slavic. I must say that I'm much happier with it the amended proposal than I was with the proposal that we originally had. One other things that my department and my students were opposing was this limitation to U.S. society, and we talking a lot about it, but there's a huge difference between those in the who (?) and those who don't, which is the majority. One can learn a lot about one's self through learning other people's categories of thought and practice and also our students are not just American citizens within the internal political arena, they are very much entrenched in what is going on in the world whether we want to be a super power or used to be, and invest

things all over the world. The U.S. is really every where. And, I really like the fact that the diversity requirement is not going to be any more, actually able to be bound with a actually very unified core of courses. That was my major problem. There were a couple of courses (?) American, American, American, with this huge number of people in them, and it seemed to me that a diversity requirement would also require diversity of courses, so that each of our students could actually choose their own way, given that this is a requirement, that students could actually be invited to go and study maybe Japanese or Chinese or Swahili and maybe that way could have access to the diversity of human society or the diversity of what is meant by the U.S. society. My one comment then at this point, everything so far I was very happy about, I think we could keep on adding categories to this list, such as, let's say, nationality, or region, or educational background, and I also feel quite uncomfortable, as the speaker before the previous one, about us actually making a very rigid list, and I was wondering if we could keep our catalogue, and rather than adding things, but also, in order to avoid really finalizing the list, because categories keep cropping up. It was not always these things. Some things may have been newer. I also don't know much about what maternal class means cause I've heard a lot of different definitions, but I'm not going to go into that. I would like to make a proposed amendment that we keep the catalogue and that at the end, say something like, or any other category which reflects cultural diversity and similarities, or cultural differences and similarities. (?) sense to, but to me it would make sense so that the students could actually-

[END OF TAPE TWO; SIDE ONE]

[BEGINNING OF TAPE TWO; SIDE TWO]

CRNKOVIC: issues of ethnicity and gender but deal with some other cultural differences that they may think are very appropriate, could actually use the courses of, I don't know, regional differences or whatever in fulfilling this requirement.

- 131) JUNKER: Well, subject to being challenged, I'm going to rule that that is essentially the motion that was the amended that was made and rejected by the body. Yes.
- 132) CRNKOVIC: O.K.
- 133) JUNKER: Uh, yes, Prof. Beame?
- 134) BEAME: Calling on the last point, I'd actually like to understand one point more clearly. Is language considered something that would be covered by that? It actually doesn't seem to be, and I just want to make sure that

that's not something that we would be considering in this requirement.  
It's not my understanding, and that's what I want to say.

- 135) JUNKER: It's not my understanding of it.
- 136) WOLF-WILETS: In the interest of not loosing our voting constituencies, I would like to call the question to see if we have a point reached in which we should vote.
- 137) JUNKER: The question has been called. It is not debatable. It requires two-thirds vote. All in favor of ending the debate, please say ay.
- 138) ON: Several senators say ay.
- 139) JUNKER: Opposed?  
ON: Silence.
- 140) JUNKER: Motion carries. We are now voting on the amended motion. Is there anyone who is in doubt as to what that motion now finally is? I'm going to ask for a show of hands. All in favor of the amended motion, please raise your hand, the blue card.
- 141) ON: Brief pause.
- 142) JUNKER: Thank you. Those opposed?
- 143) ON: Brief pause.
- 144) JUNKER: The motion carries.

## Appendix C:

Transcript of Second Discussion on the  
Culture and Ethnic Diversity Requirement Resolution

Meeting date: May 23, 1996

Utterance

No.    Speaker Remarks

- 1)    **JUNKER:** Motion carries. We will now turn to item seven on our agenda. [brief pause as senators turn agenda pages] I think you have a cover memo to this from me citing how we got to where we are today, and I think folks pretty much know that anyway. That memo states that comments submitted by the Faculty Executive proposal were attached, they were inadvertently omitted and copies should have been distributed at the door as you came in. A pre-option, as I had suggested in the email message to you, are under code, item to amend this legislation, which puts it back into the Class C loop. Which means that it would be (?) by a vote of five to ten, which seems predictable given that there was a vote of 38 to 10 in the senate to bring it here today. Secondly, the senate can re-affirm the version that it approved on February 29th, as it appears in our agenda attachment, and that would send it to the faculty for a vote under the Class A procedures which is to say, it needs two-thirds vote to enact it. Now the Code is ambiguous about this. It doesn't say you could do anything other than those two things, but I don't take the silence of the Code on this to mean that you couldn't just table it or that no motion would come up, if that were your wish. That would have the effect of killing this proposal at this point. Today it comes to you from the Senate Executive Committee without a recommendation, so it is going to be before you or any action, someone would have to move it or some version of it in order to do that. [long pause] Uh, yes, Mister van de Berghe?
- 2)    **VAN DEN BERGHE:** Pierre van den Berghe, Sociology here. I move that we approve (?) because I think it's high time that we dispose of this matter, that the faculty vote it down for the third time. So, (?).
- 3)    **JUNKER:** Is there a second?
- 4)    **ON:** A senator immediately seconds the motion.
- 5)    **JUNKER:** It's been moved and seconded that the Faculty Senate re-affirm its actions of February 29th, and send this material, this legislation on to the faculty for a second vote. Is there discussion? Yes? Phil.

- 6) **BEREANO:** Phil Bereano. On behalf of myself and three other colleagues, although we haven't (?) to handle this, I'd like to move the resolution which we distributed at the door as a substitute.
- 7) **JUNKER:** It's been moved that a substitute that you have received be a substitute motion substituted for the motion made by Senator van de Berghe. Is there a second?
- 8) **ON:** Several senators second the motion.
- 9) **JUNKER:** Do you all have copies of that resolution? Are there extra copies? O.k., we'll have to share. We can read that. Do you mind reading that Phil? Joan give the mike to uh.
- 10) **BEREANO:** This is moved as Class C resolution which means that it is just voted here because its a recommendation as you'll see, so it does not have to go to the faculty at all (?) just die. [Reading from the resolution] Whereas the Faculty Senate supports in principle the stated purpose of the Cultural and Ethnic Diversity Requirement Code to enhance students' abilities to think critically about issues of diversity, and whereas the Senate debate surrounding the proposed requirement is evident of broad faculty consensus that the curriculum of the university should provide a rich array of courses that explicate those issues, now therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend, one, that the faculty of each department, school, and college review its curriculum (a) to ensure the existence of a broad spectrum of courses that contribute to each students' ability to think critically about issues of diversity, and (b) if necessary, develop plans to enhance or revise that curriculum in order to attain its definition of that goal, and two, that the president mandate to deans and directors of colleges and schools to facilitate and support such curriculum reviews and to report their progress reporting those reviews at any curricular needs thus identified by June 15th, 1997, and three, that the administration should provide funds required to support new curricular initiatives of colleges and schools that result from this plan. That actually should read for any department, colleges, and schools.
- 11) **JUNKER:** Thank you.
- 12) **BEREANO:** And may I talk very briefly?
- 13) **JUNKER:** Of course.
- 14) **BEREANO:** I think that the purpose, certainly that I had, and I believe my colleagues had in doing this is as follows. Many people who opposed the CED said that its already available, and all that this suggests is that departments give some time and attention, and schools and colleges, to whether or not the exposure for students, the opportunity for students, to

develop critical thinking skills about diversity issues are available, and if they are not, whether they can be feasibly entered into that unit's curriculum. The critical distinction here is that nothing is mandated by anyone, other than that there be a report. Also, is that, (?) support fund if indeed let's say a department feels, or say a school, feels that it needs to develop a course and so forth and so on. Frankly, the advantage to this, given the, uh, pretty contentious and unpleasant situation many of us feel the faculty has gotten itself into, and embarrassing to be honest, which I think whichever (?) on, one can concede that's an embarrassment, is that this enables smaller units that may have more homogeneity on the faculty working together to look at this, at this question, not under any kind of gun, any kind of requirement, and in good faith, try and address some of the concerns that have been raised, and do what they can do and just make a report on it, and without any coercion.

- 15) JUNKER: Is there any further discussion of the, uh, substitute motion.
- 16) SENATOR: Point of order, is there a second?
- 17) JUNKER: Yes.
- 18) ON: As Junker answers, several senators say 'second' any way.
- 19) SENATOR: O.k.  
[long pause]
- 20) JUNKER: Ah, yes, President McCormick?
- 21) MCCORMICK: Well I sure like the spirit of this and it's academically sound. But it's perhaps not as innocuous or uncoercive as just observed. Point three got my attention.
- 22) ON: Audience laughter
- 23) MCCORMICK: The uh, as you know, and this is not an argument for or against the CED, but my administration, particularly Fred Campbell's office, devoted a good deal of energy to costing it out, as it were, and we drew the conclusion that those costs would be manageable. Please don't misunderstand, the cost information is not an academic argument pro or con the curriculum, but for your information, we costed it out and it was, roughly speaking, manageable. I have no idea what the budgetary consequences of this would be and so I have some concerns. Though the spirit is terrific, and the academic ideals behind it may be very good, there's that sorta cart blanche open ended quality to part three that I, well, I must place before you, as a, I think you'll agree, a legitimate concern of the administration.
- 24) JUNKER: Yes, Prof. Allen?

- 25) ALLEN: Can I just (?) an amendment in the light of what President McCormick's suggestion that we just eliminate item three (?)
- 26) JUNKER: Is there a second to that?
- 27) ON: One senator says "second."
- 28) JUNKER: Is there a discussion about the amendment to the resolution? Yes, Prof. Stygall?
- 29) STYGALL: Well maybe an alternative to simply getting rid of number three, these things don't work unless their funded. Since the administration just mentioned that they had costed out, and have the number in mind as to what would have happened had we put a CED into effect, maybe make that a limit rather than getting rid of any possible support to enhance a curriculum. Things happen when they're funded. They're not funded, they don't happen.
- 30) JUNKER: Could you hand the microphone over to the gentleman in the third row?
- 31) ON: Audience laughs. It seems as if Junker said his remark to the previous speaker?
- 32) CAMPBELL: I'm not sure, there are actually courses on this campus [?] So it's probably doable.
- ON: Could not hear on the tape what Campbell said, but according to the senate's minutes of the meetings "Campbell indicated that he thought the budgetary effect of the resolution would still be manageable since it was likely not to offer significantly greater costs than those projected for the earlier, narrower definition of the new CED graduation requirement."
- 33) JUNKER: I will say that firstly I welcome the implication of the President's statement that a resolution passed by this body has a mandatory character.
- 34) ON: A great deal of audience laughter.
- 35) JUNKER: Yes? Jan Carline in the back.
- 36) CARLINE: Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, the body from which the resolution originally came. You already introduced me so I won't say it again. I am very pleased to see the alternate resolution. In fact the report from Shawn Wong and his task force stated clearly that he hoped that at some point in the future that the kind of requirement that was proposed by the council would in fact be unnecessary by virtue of adequate courses having content that was appropriate to represent diversity. So I really am pleased to see the resolution as given by Dr. Bereano. My second comment, I'm referring to the proposed

amendment, is, I do agree with the last comment that if there's not going to be (?) an activity, it's much less likely to occur, [last portion is inaudible?]

- 37) JUNKER: Ah yes? Mark McDermott?
- 38) MCDERMOTT: Mark McDermott, Physics. I think we do need to look carefully at the preamble of that last portion that says "now therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend," and, as you pointed out, that carries compulsion whatsoever, and I assume that these requests for these [?] will be considered along with other forms of enhancement of our curriculum and judged thereby and perhaps funded and perhaps not funded, so I think that it's perfectly reasonable to leave number three in and turn down this proposed amendment.
- 39) JUNKER: [?] that we amend the resolution, moved by professor Bereano, by eliminating the paragraph [?] three. I see no more folks wanting to discuss it, so I will call the vote. All of you in favor please say 'ay.'
- 40) ON: Several senators say 'ay.'
- 41) JUNKER: Those opposed?
- 42) ON: More senators say 'nay.'
- 43) JUNKER: Motion fails. We're back to discussing the motion. If I [recall?] procedure right, we have to vote on whether to substitute. If there's no further discussion on whether we substitute this class C resolution from the motion made by Prof. van de Berghe. All those in favor of substituting the Class C motion, please say 'ay.'
- 44) ON: Several senators say 'ay.'
- 45) JUNKER: Those opposed?
- 46) ON: Several, but not as many, senators say 'no.'
- 47) JUNKER: Motion carries. It has been subtitled. The motion is now on the substance of that motion. All those in favor of adopting the resolution as distributed to you, please say 'ay.'
- 48) ON: Several senators say 'ay.'
- 49) JUNKER: Those opposed?
- 50) ON: Several senators say 'no.'
- 51) JUNKER: Motion carries. And we are just about on schedule.

## Appendix D:

## Transcript of Discussion on Faculty Code Violations Resolution

Meeting date: January 25, 1996

Utterance

- | <u>No.</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Remarks</u>   |
|------------|----------------|--|
| 1)         | JUNKER:        | Item 5a is a resolution that you will have received a copy of as you entered. (?) by John (?) I guess, I'm sorry (?). I'm gonna catch on.  |
| 2)         | MAYER:         | Thank you Dr. Junker. I'm Jonathan Mayer, Department of Geography, and an adjunct in the health sciences in four departments, I think. And group four rep. to the Senate Executive Committee. And, I'd like to depart from my normal way of speaking by actually giving a prepared note concerning this resolution. And that is, I wish to introduce the proposed class c resolution. It's of extreme importance |
| 3)         | JUNKER:        | John, just to be punctilious about procedure here, I think you should move it ahead, second it and then, you can carry on.   |
| 4)         | MAYER:         | Alright. So I ah, you've read the motion, or you've read the class c resolution. Um, I move that the faculty senate adopt the class c resolution.  |
| 5)         | JUNKER:        | Is there a second?   |
| 6)         | ON:            | Motion is seconded.  |
| 7)         | JUNKER:        | Um, [to Mayer] I do not mean that you have to give up the microphone. I mean that we just had to take care of that piece of legislation.   |
| 8)         | ON:            | Laughter from several members of the Senate.   |
| 9)         | JUNKER:        | So, you may proceed now.   |
| 10)        | MAYER:         | If somebody wants to call the question . . .   |
| 11)        | ON:            | Laughter again   |
| 12)        | JUNKER:        | [inaudible]  |
| 13)        | MAYER:         | So, um, it's of extreme importance because it speaks to the heart of shared governance which is central to this university and to the nature of the faculty code to which all faculty members have agreed to adhere. Let me note that in my further comment, administrators aren't just administrators. They're members of the faculty as well, and carry the  |

privileges, but also the obligations and responsibilities of being faculty members. The Class C resolution was written and revised by Professors Warren Guntheroth, of the Department of Pediatrics, and Professor Emeritus Larry Willets, Nuclear Physics. Both of whom chaired appeal panels last year, the Communications Department and Slavic Languages and Literature Department. They're both within the College of Arts and Sciences. Another version of this resolution came to my attention in early January where Warren and Larry both of whom served on the board of the U.W. Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, with me, I'm the President of the U.W. chapter, brought the matter to the attention of the Board. The AAUP, by the way, sponsored, did not sponsor the resolution, but did pay for the distribution of the resolution and the (?). the fundamental facts here are pretty clear. Neither department, neither review committee for the departments, received letters from the Dean of Arts and Sciences specifying why these programs had been selected for review. The Faculty Code requires that such letters be furnished. Clearly, the procedures of the faculty code were violated. This resolution is not about Dean Simpson's integrity, personal qualities, or qualifications. Though I've never met him, he's liked and respected by his colleagues, and he's been a good Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The circumstances under which he functioned last year, were adverse. Almost all of you will remember that the governor ordered all state agencies to prepare for budget reductions. This was transmitted to President Gerberding, and then down the administrative hierarchy of the university. I feel deeply for the sense of futility that I'm sure our well-meaning administrators felt, including Dean Simpson. I never want to be in their position. My strength is not in administration or politics, but in teaching and research. However, our administrators are hired to do an excellent job at administration. Ultimately, they're responsible for their performing their jobs as well as their responsible. They have an obligation to follow the faculty code to the letter, and must be held accountable for deviations from the code. President McCormick, last November, in a speech to the university community, warned that further re-organization in the university is inevitable. Thus, situations such as those of last year will recur. They must be handled with courage and with excellence. Decision-makers must be held accountable not only for their decisions but for the process behind their decisions. As the legislators of the faculty code, ultimately, this debate here is about the very meaning and viability of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Code. For these reasons, I introduce and support the Class C resolution. The sort of violation described herein is too important to ignore. Scrupulous adherence to due process must never be sacrificed. Now with the permission of you John, Larry Willets is here and wishes to speak, and

Warren Guntheroth was going to arrive right around 3 and since they're the ones who actually authored the the Class C resolution, but are not members of the Senate, I wonder if there's a way to arrange for them to speak.

- 14) **JUNKER:** Um, you need more than my permission, you need the permission of the body. I think if there's no objection with recognizing Larry Willets and/or Warren Guntheroth at some time during the discussion. However, it might be appropriate to open the matter up for discussion. At this moment, I see no objection to passing those- yes? [to an audience member]
- 15) **GOLDBLAT:** I'm ah- [inaudible]
- 16) **JUNKER:** It would be appropriate to do that now.
- 17) **GOLDBLAT:** Steve Goldblat, the Department of Architecture. And, uh, Group II rep. to the Executive Committee. John, I move to substitute for the proposed Class C resolution another Class C motion. Uh, and I'd like copies distributed while I read it's four, short sentences. [Reading from resolution] Whereas recent experience has shown that the current procedures for program eliminations are flawed in many ways. Program reductions or eliminations should be carried out using specific criteria and reasons based on accurate information available to all parties; and whereas the Subcommittee on the Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs is now working on how to remedy these flaws; Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the Subcommittee on the Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs to vigorously solicit faculty views on flaws and shortcomings in the current process for program eliminations, and to use these views when formulating the revisions it will propose.
- 18) **JUNKER:** Is there a second?
- 19) **?:** I second.
- 20) **JUNKER:** It's been move and seconded that the resolution you have just heard about and which you are getting a copy be substituted for the resolution introduced by Jonathan MAYER. Um, warned that this was going to happen, let me describe, uh, what I understand to be parliamentary procedure that we now should follow. Uh, the ultimate question is whether to substitute, what I'm gonna call the substitute resolution. Um, part of that time, discussion, debate will be (?) on either of the resolutions. And amendments to either of the resolutions will also be in order if any wishes to make them. Ultimately what we want to arrive at is, a version of each of them that has been amended to the body's satisfaction so that they can be compared to one another and proceed to

debate whether to substitute the substitute motion or not. A vote to substitute the substitute motion kills the original motion. If you vote not to substitute it, uh, then of course we still have the original motion. It is still necessary after voting to substitute then to vote on the merits of that motion. Um, so, yes, did you wish to say something to this group? [to a senate member]

- 21) [GOLDBLAT(?): Greatly. (?) has prepared just one minute or less.
- 22) JUNKER: Fine. Yes.
- 23) [GOLDBLAT(?): While I share the concerns (expressed?) in the original proposal, this substitute resolution one, recognizes the ongoing subcommittee's work. Two, is forward looking, not punitive. And, three, increases the likelihood that we won't relive last year's experiences.
- 24) JUNKER: Thank you. Is there any discussion on either of the resolutions? Yes, (?) [to a senate member]. Here come's the mike.
- 25) BEREANO: (?) Group Eight representative. John, I was wondering if you can treat those as two separate motions with two separate discussions and two motions?
- 26) JUNKER: I, ah, my ah understanding of the parliamentary rules is that we ought to do as I suggested [audience laughter]. That, what the body is supposed to do is to decide between the two versions. Otherwise, it is obliged to make a judgment about one and then about the other. Whereas this way, they get to compare. Uh, yes, Professor Bereano?
- 27) BEREANO: I also share the concern of the previous speaker. I don't think that these are conflicting and therefore should both be voted on. And I think perhaps the parliamentary way to deal with it is to have a chair make a definitive ruling, and assuming that the chair rules that it is a substitute, have one of us appeal the ruling of the chair and argue that in fact they are two separate motions that can both be voted on. And then the body, if it chose, would have the option of voting on both of them up or down rather than on only one of them. So, may I ask the chair for a ruling?
- 28) JUNKER: I certainly want to facilitate the discussion of the subject at hand. It was proposed as a substitute. (I'm?) following the rules having to do with substitutes, it appears to me to be a substitute. I will rule that it is. And I'd be perfectly happy to have that challenged.
- 29) BEREANO: Well, um, with all due respect John, (as to?) further discussion of this body, I challenge the ruling of the chair.
- 30) JUNKER: (?)
- 31) ON: Some audience laughter.

- 32) JUNKER: I'm not certain whether this is debatable?
- 33) ON: A lot of audience laughter.
- 34) JUNKER: Let's assume that it is not. I believe-
- 35) ON: Remark interrupted by more audience laughter.
- 36) JUNKER: Uh, all those wishing to sustain the chair, that this is a substitute-
- 37) BEREANO: John, if I may make a suggestion. In other bodies that I'm in, is that the chair asks for like a one minute or a thirty second statement by each side, pro or con. The chair may chose to speak or may have a champion speak for them.
- 38) ON: Some audience laughter.
- 39) BEREANO: That's what happens in other groups I'm in.
- 40) JUNKER: Um, well this is sorta, yes, there's no discussion, but we're gonna have a statement.
- 41) ON: Audience laughter.
- 42) JUNKER: Uh. Well, it seems to me that the point has been brought to you and (?) you is that these are not in conflict. Therefore it's pointless to substitute one for the other. As the author of the substitute, Steve, I assume that that's what you want it to be?
- 43) GOLDBLAT: (I don't want) to debate.
- 44) JUNKER: Alright, let's vote. A vote on it is to sustain the chair's ruling that it is a substitute motion. All those in favor say ay.
- 45) ON: Several audience members say 'ay.'
- 46) JUNKER: Those opposed.
- 47) ON: Several audience members say 'no.' Some say no very loudly. Audience laughter.
- 48) JUNKER: Um, yes, let's do a show of hands, a show of blue cards. All those in favor of sustaining the motion of the ruling of the chair.
- 49) ON: Audience raises blue cards to vote.
- 50) JUNKER: Uh, those opposed.
- 51) ON: Audience raises blue cards to vote.
- 52) JUNKER: Uh, the chair is not sustained. We are not substituting motions. And uh now I have to decide how we handle two pending motions.
- 53) ON: Audience laughter.

- 54) **JUNKER:** Uh, I guess I will ask the body to advise me as to what order you wish to take these up. Because the first motion is not a substitute. The second motion is out of order, and so the discussion is on the original resolution. Uh, yes, Professor Bereano.
- 55) **BEREANO:** On a substantive point now. I just want to inform the members of the senate that the same kinds of situation that is alleged in this Class C resolution existed in 1983 when we last went through a big round of vertical cuts. That is to say that there is no, in many instances, there was no obvious procedure by which the deans evaluated the very programs and departments within their jurisdiction. And on the basis of some articulated criteria, chose the programs to be, inelegantly terms, **TAR**geted for review. And so this seems to be more than just a one shot thing when in fact there is a certainly evidence, having lived through it I can attest to that fact, that this has been an ongoing problem.
- 56) **JUNKER:** Is there further discussion? Professor Willets?
- 57) **WILLETS:** Yes, as one of the -
- 58) **JUNKER:** Is that microphone on?
- 59) **WILLETS:** Can you hear me now? You have before you now a resolution concerning the validity of the faculty code, it's governing value for the university. I think that Jonathan put it very well, I would just like to add a few things. The process of drafting amendments to the faculty code is a long and tedious process and it involves shared governance from committees, councils, the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate, the faculty itself, and the President. This particular section is probably looked over in considerable detail by these bodies. There's no question that the code indeed was violated. In various review committees and appeal panels, appeal boards, received copies of the faculty code, and questioned the dean at length on the issue involved. Namely, the reason for targeting or pinpointing particular programs. The reports of the committees and appeal boards stressed this violation. On June 8th, there was a special meeting of the senate which many of you attended to discuss the process itself. Again and again this issue came up. And of particular note is a statement by our chair, John Junker, a very strong statement on the violation which was in the minutes of that meeting and which you will find on the second page of the class C resolution. I recommend that you (?). You might ask why we've come so late to discuss the (?) procedure with all due haste. On June 8th was the special session of the senate. In (?), the president made his own decision on the elimination. This was during the summer. In the fall, the AAUP met with the senate leadership, Professor's Junker and (?), and this (?) was chaired by Professor Joan Martin, whom I will hasten to add, put in the disclaimer, that she was not

representing either the position of the Senate Vice-Chair or the (?) AAUP. As a result of these discussions, the AAUP executive committee encouraged a draft by Professors Guntheroth and myself. The draft was later reversed by the senate executive committee, unanimously, and also a later version of the draft. As a courtesy to the Senate Executive Committee, it was presented to the Senate Executive Committee with the statement that the (?) version would be brought to the senate. The Executive Committee failed to pass it on to the senate. The discussion (?) were very helpful and it was re-drafted and the offensive C word was removed. Now it is before the full Senate. You can do with it as you like. I hope you will accept it as it is. It is not a, uh, it is really a statement, I shouldn't say really, cause it is a statement of a re-affirmation of the Faculty Code. The alternative would send a wrong message which we do not have to. Thank you.

- 60) JUNKER: Any further discussion? Uh, yes? Professor (?)
- 61) LIND: (Lind ?) of the Math Department, and Group three representative on the Senate Executive Committee. Um, I'd like to speak against this motion, and in favor of Steve Goldblatt's motion whenever that comes up, and John, I'd presume that'd come up under new business now under parliamentary procedure?
- 62) JUNKER: I guess you're right.
- 63) LIND: During the past few days I reviewed as many documents as I can from the program elimination process. That includes Dean Simpson's letters, it includes various statements and reasons for targeting these programs. It includes also the transcripts of the June 8th meeting that the Senate had about the program eliminations. The flaws that are mentioned in the process that, in both motions, have come through without, a clear, let me just talk about something (?). One is that the definition of program in the faculty code is (particularly ambiguous) and not very accurate. Another is that the current process forces the Dean and the College Council into two opposing positions. They act as both prosecutor and judge. There is a rigid time table. And in the events of last year, were forced to make (often) difficult decisions before they even knew the outcome of the final budget. In fact, one of President Gerberding's main rationales for reversing the dean was that by then he did know the final budget, and reversed the decision. And finally, the dean and the review committees were really answering different questions. And I think that's one of the most (?) flaws in the current system. I'd like to speak to the motion in front of you from the viewpoint of someone who was on one of the review committees. I was on the fiber arts review committee. The motion talks about serious violations of the code. The dean wrote each

member of the committee a letter outlining the specific three criteria to be used in (selecting) the programs. These criteria were quality, centrality, and instructional responsibilities. In the case of this specific program, we focused on two of those three criteria. He included definitions of these criteria in a series of questions that the committee should ask itself when addressing these issues. He followed up a month later, with a separate letter which expanded on the definition of centrality. Taken together, these and (?) written statements met the requirements of the code. (One could argue that?) the dean should have been more specific and more detailed. Perhaps required to submit a (?) of particulars (?) June meeting. This is one of the many issues the subcommittee now formed will be dealing with. Let's also remember that this was the first time these procedures were actually ever used, with the exception of the non-controversial elimination of nuclear engineering a couple of years back. There were no precedents to guide us. I think the time to raise this issue, the specific issue about the criteria by which these programs were targeted for eliminations, was thirteen months ago, and not now. I believe our energies are better directed at helping the subcommittee fix the problems that have been so apparent. And I urge you to consider rejecting this motion and passing the one that Steve mentioned.

- 64) JUNKER: Is there further discussion? Yes, Mr. Guntheroth? There's a mike right behind you.
- 65) GUNTHEROTH: I think that there is a ton of difference between a (?) particulars and a general statement of the law. To be asked to plead guilty or not guilty without knowing what the charge is. I think there's a very fundamental problem. I don't think giving a, keeping the law, is giving criteria, is quite satisfactory. I think that I would agree that we ought to strengthen the code. I've already personally sent in my suggestions, and I think that's a separate issue entirely. What we have here are specific parts of the code that have been (?) and have been violated. And I think if we ignore that, then the question comes up, why spend time revising the code, cause we spent a whole lot of time writing the code. There were a lot of faculty involved in the hearings in terms of the reviews committees and appeals committees. My committee had at least ten individuals on it. That a lot of man power, a lot of time (?) down the drain if we don't pay attention to the code. So I think we need to revise the code, but we need to have some kind of posture that says the code should be observed.
- 66) JUNKER: Is there further discussion? Yes, uh, (?)
- 67) [ODA(?)]: (name?), School of Dentistry and Group eight representative. I actually have a comment and a question to you John.

- 68) JUNKER: O.k.
- 69) [ODA(?): My comment is, uh, the Class C that we have in front of us here is not something that's brought up after thirteen months, it's for the future. History has a tendency to repeat itself. So it's more or less protection for our future if we allow this happen. If we allowed this to happen a few months ago, it may happen again in a few years, and then, are we going to do the same thing and say, why we act now after a year? So it's more, a future. The question that I have for you Junker is, I have the minutes from June 8th in front of me, so I'm reading from the minutes. It says "Junker acknowledged that, in his, he could not imagine how the current round of eliminations could have been conducted more badly"--this latter part typed from the minutes of June 8th.
- 70) ON: Audience laughter.
- 71) JUNKER: Um, well, the only conflict I feel is that, uh, I don't think as chair that I should be involved in the merits of the issue. And the only response I can make would put me on one side or the other. I would prefer just to stand by the record. Any further discussion? Yes sir? Virginia, (?)
- 72) [MARGLIN(?): (name?), Radiology. I would speak in favor of the (?) amendment. It strikes me that to ignore it or patch it over, or say that our focus is in the future, loses sight of the past. That one of the purposes of the faculty code is protection of the faculty. If the faculty is unhappy about the way that those rules were interpreted or applied, they do themselves, but more importantly, their successors a great disservice by ducking the serious question of whether it was imperfectly handled. I would however make the friendly amendment to the motion. But before making the amendment, I'll explain the reasons for it. My understanding is that the whereas's go on endlessly in many amendments or in many motions and resolutions are lost once the motion is voted. That may or may not be true in this body, but it is in others. And I find the therefore statements to be incomplete and in a sense, somewhat confusing. For that reason, I would propose as an amendment that the therefore statement read 'the faculty senate expresses its strong disapproval of the fact that the provisions of faculty code 24 dash 41b1 and 2641 dash b7 were not followed in the recent process for program eliminations in the College of Arts and Sciences.
- 73) JUNKER: Uh, thank you. Is there a second to that?
- 74) ?: Second.
- 75) JUNKER: I'm going to ask the secretary of the faculty to comment on the way in which resolutions are kept and published in our procedures. We don't strip the words out.

- 76) VAUGHN: No. I will publish the entire resolution if it's passed by the senate.
- 77) JUNKER: Is there any discussion with regards to this? Yes sir?
- 78) ON: Brief pause. Someone utters something. Unsure of what is happening now. Maybe the microphone is being transported to someone.
- 79) JUNKER: The discussion is on the amendment.
- 80) GOODKIN: (Goodkin?), Group Seven, Department of Neurosurgery. I sat in on the meeting of January 8th. I'm a representative to the Senate Executive Committee. I have a problem with this. My problem is that facts are assumed here, which I believe this is a legislative body, and I believe that if there's this kind of complaint that's going to be put into our minutes in the senate-
- 81) JUNKER: Professor (?), I'm going to have to rule that your comments are premature. We have a pending amendment that we have to dispose of first, then we'll get back to the main resolution. Is there any further discussion regarding the amendment which adds words to the therefore clause of the resolution that has been proposed. My recollection of the added words are that the Senate expresses its strong disapproval of the violation of the two code sections that are stated in paragraphs two and three of the resolution. Is that correct?
- 82) GOODKIN: [inaudible]
- 83) JUNKER: Right, uh, further discussion on the amendment? Yes, Vivian.
- 84) VIVIAN: I would like to speak against the amendment. I'm Vivian Willetts, School of Nursing. And the reason I would is the following. I think the drafters of the main motion carefully worked out the statement so that people would understand why the statement is being made. The amendment strips all of that away, as I understand it.
- 85) JUNKER: Is there any further discussion on the amendment? [brief pause] All those in favor of the amendment, please say 'ay.'
- 86) ON: No senators respond 'ay.'
- 87) JUNKER: Those opposed, say 'no.'
- 88) ON: Several senators say 'no.'
- 89) JUNKER: Amendment fails. The discussion is on the main motion, resolution. And I will recognize Professor (?).
- 90) [GOODKIN(?): [first sentence was inaudible] I was going to say, I'm under the impression that the preamble to the resolution was not with a fact finding committee or whatever group met. It seems to me that the resolution, as stated, although we do disapprove, the fact that the faculty

code was not followed when it should have been followed. That the preamble was not (?) by the body (?) it should be, maybe, I feel that it should be placed at the adjudication level. This is a legislative body, and I'm wondering whether it is appropriate for us to vote on this at this time, on the basis of the preamble, and I feel that it belongs at a different level right now. And after the body has met that deals with this problem, because we have made some accusations in the preamble. I don't know the dean. I don't know all the facts, except what's stated here. And I feel very uncomfortable with placing this into the senate's minutes or resolution (?) passed legislation when I haven't heard the facts from the dean himself as to why he made his decisions the way he did, and we are now placing him within our minutes with a condemnation. That's all I have to say.

- 91) JUNKER: Any further discussion on the resolution? Yes sir? [brief pause] Right behind you John [referring to where the microphone is]
- 92) YAFFE: (Yaffe?), Physics. I'd like to fully agree with the previous speaker. I certainly don't know the full history or many details of this. The opening of this resolution simply asserts that not only were there violations, but claims that there were important violations of the letter and spirit of (the code?). From what I've heard, I don't feel that there's been a convincing basis made to that. I've certainly not seen all the documentation on this. I have recently re-read at least one of the letters the dean wrote after the review committee for Slavic Languages reported. Contrary to the third paragraph here, it certainly, in my interpretation did include his reasons for ruling as he did in that case. So, it seems to me that this is a vindictive, dangerous precedent which I would prefer just not to support.
- 93) JUNKER: Is there further discussion? Uh, yes, (?)
- 94) ?: (?), Psychology. I would like to support the (previous speaker?). I don't think this is vindictive, but I do think it is dangerous. We have allegations. They may or may not be true. We certainly should not be acting on the grounds that an allegation has been made.
- 95) JUNKER: Further discussion? [Calls out a name of a senator] Virginia [to indicate to a microphone person] Maybe the thing to do is to raise your blue card and that might be a better way to get the attention of the microphone monitors.
- 96) [HUNT(?)]: I haven't seen the direct evidence myself, but I'm basing this on the conclusions of the duly appointed and duly constituted Review Boards and Appeals panels. As per the Faculty Code, chairs, in two cases here, Warren Guntheroth and Larry Wilets, and these were the conclusions of the duly constituted appeals panel, were they not? Yes. And so, I trust

my colleagues in the sense that I trust that the process followed by them conducting the investigation, and conducting the appeals process yielded accurate information. I have no evidence to the contrary. Yes, I would've liked to have heard from Dean Simpson as well. But, we haven't, and he was invited to the Senate Executive Committee, and I assume he was invited here today, and he decided not to come. End of story.

97) JUNKER: Uh, yes, Professor (?)

98) ?: Thank you. I'd like to speak from a different perspective than I think anyone else in here has spoken to so far which is, I'm sorry, my area is Music History. I'm in the School of Music. And, my unit is one of the units that had a program that was cut, and we were one of the very few programs that (ended up finally being cut at the end of the?) process. It was a very rough, frustrating process for those who were directly effected by the final decision. They were not satisfied with the decision. And, (?) continue being frustrated by the events that happened. But, for my unit, for myself, I want to speak against this resolution that you have before you. The reason is, I want to echo two of the recent speakers to this, who addressed the question of the veracity of the accusations that were made in this. The claim in particular that no reasons were offered in regard to the elimination, proposed elimination of the program. I went back to look at the letter we received which covers different programs, additional programs that were cut in my own unit, and found a, from Dean Simpson, this was a letter from Dean Simpson, to the President, regarding one unit that was proposed for being cut. Dean Simpson said, this unit was less appropriate or central to the liberal arts and higher educational objectives of the college. And for another program he said, the size of the faculty is too large for its instructional responsibilities and should be reduced. Now, I can speak for my own unit, and say to you, the reasons we were given were not reasons we liked. But, if a program is being eliminated, there is never going to be a reason good enough for your own program, and I think (anyone here would agree to that). There are not strong enough reasons for any of us that we could agree with with the elimination of our own program. But, reasons were provided. And the reasons are in the Dean's letter to the President.

99) JUNKER: (?) yes. I beg your pardon?

100) ?: I would like to-

101) JUNKER: Can you wait for a minute please?

- 102) ? : My name is (?), and I'm from Slavic, and I would like to address the issue of reasons because both examples which were cited were examples from Slavic L and L.
- 103) ? : No they were no.
- 104) ? : But I think there was confusion about which reasons we are talking about. These were the reasons, or the so-called reasons that Dean Simpson supplied to President Gerberding after the Review Committee recommended that the department should be retained. And he went ahead and proposed elimination anyway. Those were probably attempts at giving some reasons, but those were not the initial reasons. All we got as one of the targeted departments, and all every other targeted department got was three criteria, at first, vaguely defined. Later, less vaguely defined, but still very vaguely defined. Those are criteria which could be used, applied to every department on this campus. It did not say why this criteria should be applied to Slavic, or Applied Math, or any other program which was targeted. So, I can understand that people may feel that maybe some of these are accusations which are not proven, but I don't want people to confuse what Dean Simpson said in the letter to President Gerberding when he went ahead and proposed elimination, despite the recommendations which were against elimination and the reasons which were not given from the very beginning of the elimination process. Okay.
- 105) JUNKER: Uh, yes, Professor Gowen?
- 106) GOWEN: John Gowen, (?). My understanding is that the question at issue is not reasons provided to the president, by the dean, but reasons provided by the dean to the REview committees. This (resolution) was drafted by the chairs of the review committees who (?). Now, since the dean is not present to explain what he did or did not tell the review committees, I wonder if we could invite the Acting Provost, Dr. Thorud, to provide that information to us for our consideration. Thank you chair.
- 107) ON: Some audience laughter.
- 108) JUNKER: Provost, would you care to talk.
- 109) THORUD: I don't think I have a comment. The administration-
- 110) JUNKER: You might want to have a mike for this no-comment.
- 111) ON: A great deal of audience laughter.
- 112) THORUD: We, ah, relied very heavily on the schools and colleges to apply the code, and made no attempts to micro-manage that process. Our belief at the time was that the schools and colleges and faculty there, and the

faculties within the schools and colleges were in the best positions to decide how to deal with these critical (?), and the administration should not micro-manage that process.

- 113) JUNKER: Uh, yes, I'm trying to select people who haven't spoken before. Mac Parks. (?) John (?)
- 114) PARKS: Thank you. My name's Mac Parks. I'm from Speech Communication, and I've also come from one of the units that was targeted, and so, I suppose I should be wet for blood here. I will tell you that this was a miserable year. And that were still trying to figure out how to rebuild. My question is really whether or not this is a, uh, an action that in any way either prevents future problems like the ones we went through last year or contributes constructively to their avoidance in the future, and my conclusion frankly has to be that it does not. I will say that I do believe that the spirit and very possibly the letter of the code was violated. Now it's important to understand that we have two very different pieces of the code being wrapped together in one resolution here. We are talking in twenty six, forty one b one about an action that was taken several months, almost six months before the action referenced in twenty six, forty one b seven, and so we really are talking about two very different things. In any case, I believe at least on the first one, that the generic reasons, quote unquote, that were provided for all of the departments were in fact the same. And, uh, didn't provide any particular information from which one could understand why that unit was placed on a hit list. And that certainly violated the spirit of (it). Now, whether or not a violation occurs of course depends in part also on the response to it. So IF you believed, that the so-called criteria were not adequate reasons, then it was the senate's JOB in December 1994, to do this resolution, (.) and to assert the protection of the faculty at THAT point, WHEN it would have made a difference. Part of me wants to cry out to you, and say, 'where were you when we needed you?' (1) This is like a ball that's bounced off the senate's chest and has now dribbled out of bounds.
- 115) ON: Some audience laughter.
- 116) PARKS: Are people going to be protected? No, they're gone. It's done. (1) Will it help us in the future? Well, it may? But more likely, we ought to revise the code. So I see this as a place where the responsibility for the violation of the code is quite frankly, mutually shared, uh, and I find it somewhat insincere that this is being brought up at this time.
- 117) JUNKER: Is there further discussion on the resolution? Uh, yes, um (name?)
- 118) TUNCEL: I was uh, in the discussion of the various hearings and the final report, and uh, I guess my question uh, is also on the issue at hand might

be similar to the discussion here. I guess my question is what good does it do to the fact that we did this in the past? What good does it do to say we express our strong disapproval of these serious violations of the faculty code? (.) That's my concern. It's not (?) do this before and uh, but uh, again the only type of action that is being taken didn't work in the past and I would raise questions whether this would work in the future.

- 119) JUNKER: Uh, thank you. Uh, yes?
- 120) HERRICK: What I can't help noticing is that-
- 121) JUNKER: I'm sorry (?), can you (?)
- 122) HERRICK: We're all very angry about what happened last year. We're all very sad about what happened last year. It was wasted time, wasted energy. And I don't know who to blame whether to blame the dean, the central administration, the legislature. What I see is the proposal was flawed, but it's impossible for me to place the judgment as to who did what wrong and when. When I calmed down and think about it, the only rationale thing that I could come up with is the fact that cuts were sorta made for financial reasons, and when you look in the faculty code the dean has to come up with academic reasons. And those aren't comparable. So I don't see anyone performing any better under those circumstances. And to address this resolution here, it really does seem to me that we're coming up with a scapegoat after the fact, and I agree with many of the speakers that we should move on and accept what we have and (?) place the blame on the person who was, so to speak, put on the spot. Just look ahead, and try to move on. So I encourage everyone here to vote against this.
- 123) JUNKER: Yes, Professor Willetts? And then David (?)
- 124) WILLETTS: I would just like to address the question which has been raised about whether or not there's any documentation. There's plenty of documentation on the violation. I would like to point out that first of all, the review committees' reports and the appeal panel reports all address this question of the violation of the code. Secondly, there is the June 8th which, a special meeting of the senate, in which this issue was mentioned again and again, and the resulting statement from Chair Junker was said, and I'll continue the statement, the Dean gave no specific reasons even though they were specifically required to do so by the present code. That lack of specificity tainted the whole process of the review and the appeal from the beginning, and (?) any decision that result. Furthermore, we did ask the secretary of the faculty, Professor Vaughn, whether or not he believed the faculty code had been violated, and he did express the opinion that the faculty code had not been followed (?). At the June 8th

meeting, the question came up, what does Dean Simpson have to say? On two occasions of the June 8th meeting, I asked him point blank why he did not give specific reasons. And he refused to say anything. He even refused to say that he would not say anything. (We were) just completely stonewalled so that the secretary, the chairman of the meeting, turned to the Dean and said, would you care to comment on this? and he did not even comment on his lack of comment. So this was a complete stonewall. If you want to know what the dean feels, that is (what I'd say).

125) JUNKER: Uh, David?

126) BOULWARE: David (Boulware?), Physics. I think our colleague from mathematics really put his finger on the crux. The process was driven by budgetary considerations. We all know that. We knew it then. We know it now. We knew it at every stage of the process. The CODE as he said, requires that the cuts be addressed in academic terms. There was a clear disjunct between the requirements of the code and the acts of the situation. In the conversations that I had with various people along the way, both in the central administration and the dean, members of the review committees, it was my understanding that those individuals were without (?) attempting as best they could to follow the code, to (?) this really unfortunate situation. This is now before a committee, or is it a task force? anyway, which is a committee, which is charged to address that problem. Now what did John Simpson do as dean? He could have simply put forward precisely the number of programs that he needed in order to make his cuts. And provided at that time a complete specification of why he chose, in all the gory detail, and then, we would be here, either now or a few months ago, complaining that the whole process was a charade, that he only put up exactly what he needed to cut. There was never any chance that no matter what the review committee said, those units WOULD BE CUT. He did not do that. I honor him for that. Having put up MORE units than needed to be cut, and many of those units were in fact not cut, he was then faced with the problem of what do I say? Many of these units will not be cut. The mere fact of putting them up hurts those units. Spelling out in detail why he put them up, would hurt them further. Yes, I agree, the spirit of the code was not followed. I believe that every effort to follow the letter of the code was followed. In his letter to the appeals committees, he did enunciate, and I have read it recently, I have not read (?) the other documents. But my view to be a quite admirable statement of the reasons for the choices that he made. We have heard members of the appeals committee say that the code was clearly violated. We have heard members of the review committees say that the code was clearly violated. We have heard

members of the review committees and members of the appeals committees say, no, the code was not violated, it was a question of judgment as to the extent to which he followed the spirit, but it is not clear that the code was violated. I see people shaking their heads, I know I heard people from the review committee, I thought I heard someone from an appeal committee. I'm sorry Doug (?) is a member of a review committee said he felt the code was not violated. I can't remember that off-hand, (whether there was anyone there). But I've read the reports to the appeal boards. Now, what should be done? (.) It seems to me that an acting dean came into an impossible situation and acted honorably. And forthrightly. He did the best he could in an impossible situation. This resolution started out as a censure against that dean, because of objections within the Executive Committee, it was watered down to be simply, we express our strong disapproval. The findings of fact have not occurred. There is a clear PROCEDURE in the CODE for making those findings of facts. You bring in adjudication. This has not been done. We are being asked to vote on a finding of fact, many aspects of which disputable, in the absence OF, the petitioners here, (?) not petitioners, people bringing the resolution, having gone through the appropriate procedures to bring the finding of fact. I urge us to vote this down, and I hope that you will vote for Steve Goldblatt's measure later on this meeting.

127) JUNKER: Uh, yes sir, far left?

128) [KELGAUGH(?): Doug (?), Architecture. There were flaws to be sure in the process, perhaps infractions, maybe even probably infractions, but I think that the first motion will do little more than provide some after the fact, retroactive satisfaction, rather than redress. I don't think there's any painless way to make cuts. There's no good way, no fair way. We can reform the code, we can chastise some administrator. But the next cut, we'll find new, fresh, unexpected ways to be painful and to be unfair. So I don't think we should belabor this. I will speak in favor of Steven Goldblatt's counter uh resolution. We should look to the future for sure, but not with very high expectations.

129) ON: Audience laughter.

130) JUNKER: Ah, it's, the question has been called. The uhm (.) I take that away. I take that is a motion is to cut off debate. Is there a second?

131) ON: Motion is seconded.

132) JUNKER: To not debate more requires a two thirds majority. Those in favor of calling the question, uh, please say ay.

133) ON: Several audience members say 'ay.'

- 134) **JUNKER: Those opposed?**
- 135) **ON: Silence from audience.**
- 136) **JUNKER: Motion carries. (2) The uh question before you is whether to adopt the proposed Class C resolution concerning violations of the faculty code during recent eliminations. (See) the copy which you all have. Uh I think I want to do this by a show of hands. Those in favor of the resolution, please raise your blue card.**
- 137) **ON: Audience votes via cards. Silence while cards are being counted.**
- 138) **JUNKER: Uh, those opposed?**
- 139) **ON: Audience votes via cards. Silence while cards are being counted.**
- 140) **JUNKER: Uh, motion fails.**

## VITA

Theresa Rose Castor  
10/1/99

Education

Doctor of Philosophy, 1999  
Speech Communication  
University of Washington  
*Areas of Specialization: Social Constructionism, Qualitative Research  
Methods, Philosophy of Communication Theory and Research*

Master of Arts, 1993  
Rhetoric and Communication  
University of California, Davis  
*Areas of Specialization: Ethnography of Communication, Philosophy of  
Communication Theory and Research, Interpersonal  
Communication*

Bachelor of Arts and Science, 1991  
Biochemistry, and Rhetoric and Communication  
University of California, Davis

Employment

Visiting Instructor  
Acting Director of the Oral Communication Program  
Department of Theatre, Speech, and Dance  
The College of William and Mary, 1998-2000.

Visiting Instructor  
Department of Communication  
Wake Forest University, 1997-1998.

Graduate Teaching Assistant  
Department of Speech Communication  
University of Washington, 1993-1997.

Graduate Teaching Assistant  
Department of Rhetoric and Communication  
University of California, Davis, 1991-1993.