5-26-1993

The Concepts of Capitalism and Democracy in Implied Power Relations: Fractionation Philosophy and Theory

Randy Baker
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Baker, Randy, "The Concepts of Capitalism and Democracy in Implied Power Relations: Fractionation Philosophy and Theory" (1993). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4761.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6645>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Randy Baker for the Master of Science in Speech Communication presented May 26, 1993.

Title: The Concepts of Capitalism and Democracy in
Implied Power Relations: Fractionation Philosophy
and Theory

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Leslie T. Good, Chair

L. David Ritchie

Robert Liebman

This research proposes that it is possible to meaningfully examine the differences between subjects' perceptions of concepts at two different levels of analysis. The central theory, called "fractionation", is derived from structuration theory. The theory suggests that there is an important and particular difference between subjects' perceptions of key concepts

at the value (abstract) level, as differentiated from the policy (action) level. The key concepts provided here are capitalism and democracy. Three major stages of data gathering and analysis were conducted. The first stage, carried out in several phases, surveyed 337 college students to gather words commonly associated with two key concepts: capitalism and democracy. These words were then used as items in a multidimensional scaling and cluster analysis. The results were used to represent the relationship between the two key concepts at the value level of analysis. The second stage consisted of gathering policy fragments from two mainstream newspapers. Television advertising was selected as the focal point of this search, to represent one area where democracy and capitalism co-exist. Fragments were taken from the newspapers and compiled into "fragment topics", or pieces of argument about the relationship between capitalism and democracy in television advertising. Stage III was carried out by surveying seventy-three subjects who were presented with the argumentative statements developed in each fragment topic. An assessment was made of the relationship between capitalism and democracy at the policy level based on the argument choices made by the subjects. Stage I resulted in a clear distinction between the two key concepts of capitalism and democracy at the value

level, while Stage III resulted in a conflict between the two at the policy level. The comparison of results between the first stage of the research and the third stage represents the fractionation that was being sought.

THE CONCEPTS OF CAPITALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN
IMPLIED POWER RELATIONS: FRACTIONATION
PHILOSOPHY AND THEORY

by

RANDY BAKER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University
1993

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Randy Baker presented May 26th, 1993.

Leslie T. Good, Chair

L. David Ritchie

Robert Liebman

APPROVED:

Steve Kosokoff, Chair, Department of Speech
Communication

Roy W. Koch, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and
Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their genius, assistance, and support in an unlikely endeavor, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following people:

Leslie T. Good, L. David Ritchie, Robert Liebman,
Douglas Estudillo, Michael J. Dugaw, Amanda Feller,
Douglas Clayton Ehrmantraut, Shawn Rebecca Graham.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Philosophy, Theory, and Practice .	1
Fractionation	4
II PHILOSOPHIES OF FRACTIONATION	6
Fractionation in Philosophy	6
III A THEORY OF FRACTIONATION	19
Structuration and Patterns of Inconsistency	19
Ideology and Interests	22
The Modes of Domination	23
Hegemony	29
Contemporary Fractionation	31
IV PROCEDURES	39
Operationalizations	39
Hypotheses and Stages in Data Collection	40
Stage I: Value Perceptions	40
Stage II: Policy Fragments	46

	Stage III: Policy Perceptions . . .	48
	Summary of Procedures	51
V	RESULTS	53
	Subjects	53
	Stage I: Value Perceptions	54
	Stage II: Policy Fragments	72
	Stage III: Policy Perceptions . . .	74
	Results Summary	81
VI	DISCUSSION	83
	Threats to Validity	84
	Future Studies	87
	Summary	93
	REFERENCES CITED	94
	APPENDICES	
A	DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS	97
B	SUPPLEMENTARY DATA FOR ALL SUBJECTS . .	114
C	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR EARLY AND LATE DATA ANALYSIS . . .	118
D	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR EXPRESSIVE AND PRODUCTIVE DATA ANALYSIS	125
E	LIST OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES	132

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Word Ratios and Occurrences From Separate Surveys	55
II	Word Occurrences and Rankings From Three Survey Instruments	57
III	Derived Key Word Lists	59
IV	Fragment Topics	73
V	Odds of Progressing Through Argument Chain Given Random Data	77
VI	Most Common Option Path	80
VII	Monotonic Scaling (All Subjects) . .	115
VIII	Coordinates (All Subjects)	116
IX	Monotonic Scaling (Early Subjects) .	119
X	Coordinates (Early Subjects)	120
XI	Monotonic Scaling (Late Subjects) .	122
XII	Coordinates (Late Subjects)	123
XIII	Monotonic Scaling (Expressives) . .	126
XIV	Coordinates (Expressives)	127
XV	Monotonic Scaling (Productives) . .	129
XVI	Coordinates (Productives)	130

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Multidimensional Scaling Stress	60
2. Multidimensional Scaling For All Subjects	62
3. Multidimensional Scaling For "Early" Subjects	64
4. Multidimensional Scaling For "Late" Subjects	65
5. Multidimensional Scaling For "Expressive" Subjects	68
6. Multidimensional Scaling For "Productive" Subjects	69
7. Option-path Map of Statements	78
8. Shepard Diagram: All Subjects #1 . . .	115
9. Shepard Diagram: All Subjects #2 . . .	116
10. Tree-cluster Diagram: All Subjects . .	117
11. Shepard Diagram: Early Subjects #1 . .	119
12. Shepard Diagram: Early Subjects #2 . .	120
13. Tree-cluster Diagram: Early Subjects .	121
14. Shepard Diagram: Late Subjects #1 . . .	122
15. Shepard Diagram: Late Subjects #2 . . .	123
16. Tree-cluster Diagram: Late Subjects . .	124
17. Shepard Diagram: Expressives #1	126
18. Shepard Diagram: Expressives #2	127
19. Tree-cluster Diagram: Expressives . . .	128

- 20. Shepard Diagram: Productives #1 129
- 21. Shepard Diagram: Productives #2 130
- 22. Tree-cluster Diagram: Productives 131

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Any pattern has bias. Any system must favor certain processes by including or excluding certain mechanisms. Any structure supports particular functions and constrains others. And while it is possible to alter patterns and even choose new patterns, it is not possible to choose *no pattern* without losing all sense of "system". Herein lies the most troubling aspect of power relations.

PHILOSOPHY, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

Patterns in power relations are troubling because when we defend the necessity of structure, there is the feeling that we must be defending the injustices that are built into the structure. But if we release our predisposition to declare one pattern the "right" pattern, and to artificially fix patterns as certain and immutable, then there may be a way to effectively grapple with the dilemma: The means to do this have been illuminated time and again in various ways by the likes of Socrates, Locke, Marx, and recently by Anthony Giddens.

Note that there is no "way out" of the dilemma, and that in all cases we are dealing with how power is constituted in society. The manner in which power relationships are explored (and whether or not they are explored at all) is at the very heart of the issue. This research makes two parallel explorations of the constitution of power, one philosophical and the other theoretical. It should be seen that the one flows into the other, particularly as the work of Giddens stands at the crossroad of philosophy and empirical social science. It is the work of Anthony Giddens that I argue makes the bridge between a critical interpretive frame (such as provided by Karl Marx), and a predictive model (such as provided by Giddens' structuration theory).

While the relationship between philosophy and theory has important roots and implications, it is the relationship of theory and practice that must ultimately be examined. The first relationship (philosophy and theory) is explored in Chapters II and III, which are devoted to those issues. The *possible* relevance of the second relationship (theory and practice) is be examined initially in this introduction, in the form of a few brief examples. Of course, a more meaningful development of the relationship between theory and practice comes from a thorough examination of the results in Chapter V.

In American public education today, there are two *disservices* that we can provide for our school children with regard to power relations. First, we can fail to teach students the "rules" of power relations that exist in their culture. Second, we can mistakenly teach these "rules" as laws--meaning that we teach them as being somehow right, natural, or immutable. Both disservices occur with remarkable regularity, and there is active debate over which disservice we will embrace as the primary purpose of the educational system.

In terms of the English language, it would be a disservice to our students to fail to teach them the "rules" of English as the current language of power (Hirsch, 1987). The ability to speak American English well constitutes an important element of current patterns in power relationships. If we feel that the pattern of language-power relationships is wrong, denying its existence is not a solution. We would merely be denying valuable knowledge that is needed to combat the "wrongness".

Likewise, if we feel that current patterns of power are "right", and therefore teach the rules of English as "laws", we will have failed to provide our children with the capacity to adapt and to enact change.

As an analogy, if I am taught that being a serf is right, natural, or immutable, I will tend to live my

life in the belief that I will be rewarded for "staying in my place and obeying the duly constituted authorities" (Lerner, 1991). In a more modern context, the "yuppies" of the late 1980's may have suffered from this disservice, becoming adults who in the face of change and unfulfilled promises find themselves clutching a "worthless guarantee from a company that has gone out of business".

Our desire to change or reinforce particular power relationships should not replace learning about those relationships. In our polarizing, dichotomous society, we frequently fail to focus on the nature of power relationships, and instead keep asking "which one is correct?"

If we accept that there cannot be an outside referent, and no outside observer separate from the process of observing, then there can never be a "right", "natural", or "immutable" pattern of power. All patterns, all systems, and all structures, are biased.

FRACTIONATION

Implicit in all of the philosophies and theories alluded to above, is the concept of fractionation. In this work, fractionation is developed as the central feature of the theory being tested. Generically, fractionation refers to the divisions, or "fractions"

that occur in the construction and reconstruction of such things as perception, language, and experience. Often these "fractions" are portrayed as being in conflict. In this generic sense, we might speak of the apparent conflict between what a person thinks they will do, and what they will actually do. There are many philosophies and theories that address the concept, and a generic understanding of the term should not be entirely lost in considering this line of research.

However, as befits an empirical approach, fractionation takes on a much more refined meaning as we move from philosophy to theory. Drawing upon the philosophical heritage of the concept and inspired by recent treatments of power relations, specific theory of fractionation is developed and tested empirically.

The specific theory herein is that the constitution of power relations in American society produces a fractionation between individuals' perceptions of abstract values and their perceptions of action in the world. This is not to say that this work empirically tests the link between power relations and the fractionation, but rather that the type of fractionation sought should be discoverable, given that the theory is sound.

What follows, then, is a search for this predicted variety of fractionation.

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHIES OF FRACTIONATION

The concept of fractionation, in its generic sense, is commonly found in the broad context of philosophy. It is the notion that ideas and values held by members of a society are "fragmented" or "dispersed". People living in our fractionated societies must expend energy to bring these ideas and values into meaningful contact. This does not necessarily mean that these "fractions" have ever been whole, or that some specific pattern of ideas and values has been subsequently broken (although some philosophers do go so far as to make that claim). Rather it means that ideas and values that share meaningful relationships are not perceived as sharing meaningful relationships by members of a society.

FRACTIONATION IN PHILOSOPHY

This central idea is ancient, and to explain its importance is to explain its history. For a western civilized democracy, that history begins with Socrates and Plato in the Athenian democracy of 5th century B.C.

Relevance in Early Democracy

If we are to take Socrates at his word, he was not

a teacher. A teacher in Socrates' day was not a person of great wisdom, nor necessarily a person of great learning, and was not called upon to teach such. A teacher was instead someone who taught according to the short-term demands of the market and thus (according to Plato) achieved a much different result (Golden, 1989: 8). Teachers were sophists.

If Socrates was not a teacher then he was certainly a critic. Socratic dialogue is an endless process of "recollecting" fragmented knowledge. Within a more current framework, dialogue can be seen as an important form of social criticism (McCormack, 1986: 34-42).

Socrates himself described his object as that of a midwife, to bring other men's thoughts to birth, to stimulate them to think and to criticize themselves, not to instruct them. Thus the reader [of Socrates] may be disappointed in finding no solution at the end, but he is encouraged to go on searching for himself (Rouse, 1956: IX).

While Socrates aims for an understanding of truth, he makes no promises. In the same way, social criticism today is described as a process without end. Due to the inevitable tendencies of domination (discussed in Chapter III), criticism becomes a perpetual necessity (Giddens, 1979).

Criticism is sometimes interpreted to mean an all-out attack upon a work, idea or person. That should not be inferred here. Instead, I would draw attention to the word *critical* as meaning vital or important, and

thus interpret criticism as an attempt at illumination that is both constructive and destructive. In the same vein, Socrates sought to assist people in the perpetual reconstitution of meaning.

While dialogue may function generically as criticism, Socrates is more specific about its purpose. Dialogue is the primary means to achieve "recollection". According to Socrates, every person is born with the capacity to know or understand truth. Whatever grip on truth we possess is lost during the trauma of birth--this is fractionation at the personal level. From this perspective, it is our highest priority to recollect what has been "forgotten." If we pay close attention to how Socrates goes about his duties as midwife, a fuller understanding of fractionation is possible.

When you agree to listen to the talk of Socrates, it might seem at first to be nothing but absurdity; such words and phrases are wrapped around it, like the hide of a boisterous satyr. Pack-asses and smiths and shoe-makers and tanners are what he talks about, and he seems to be always saying the same things in the same words, so that any ignorant and foolish man would laugh at them. But when they are opened out, and you get inside them, you will find his words, first, full of sense, as no others are... (Plato, Symposium: Rouse, 1956: 115).

To say that Socrates seeks truth may lead to a less useful conception of dialogue. Socrates does not detach the seemingly distant mysteries of the cosmos from more mundane concerns. The one influences the other, so that

no matter what subject is at hand, Socrates is always capable of discussing how and why we live and breathe. In the course of assisting people with their recollection, Socrates demonstrates that he is not so much focused upon re-remembering as he is upon re-collecting pieces of ideas (fractions) that are lying about unnoticed on the common landscape.

Recollection is then the process of *re-collection*, and that is how I will refer to this concept from here forward. As with the term fractionation, it is not useful to interpret re-collection as meaning that there was some prior "collected" state of affairs. Socrates' assumption regarding a state of total knowledge before birth is unreachable, and unnecessary to the issues involved. What Socrates' perspective illustrates is that people have abstract values and beliefs (that they hold as "truth") that seem to conflict with their perceptions at the experiential level (pack-asses and smiths).

What is important is whether people's perceptions at the abstract level differ from their perceptions at an experiential level.

Within this context, dialogue becomes the means by which we assemble the meaning that has been broken and scattered, but that is nonetheless available for our illumination. Dialogue then, is a particular form of

criticism.

In penning "the dialogues" (collections of works related to, but not the same as the process of dialogue), Plato performed at least two great services of import for this research. First, he made the wisdom of Socrates available, albeit in a highly fictionalized form. Second, he indicated that dialogue may have value not only at the *individual* level, but also at the *societal* level.

The Great Dialogues of Plato serve as foundational material for the Western world, and are widely recognized for this role (Hutchins, 1952; Rouse, 1956). Therefore, in discussing dialogue, re-collection, and Socratic method, one can speak of the potential applications to both personal discovery and social criticism. These applications have found their way into the heart of the Lockean-democratic value system, and thereby into some of our society's most widely acknowledged values.

Relevance in a Lockean Democracy

"I have always been among those who believed that the freedom of speech was the greatest safety, because if a man is a fool, the best thing to do is to encourage him to advertise that fact by speaking."

--Woodrow Wilson

The concept of fractionation now moves to the level of societal re-collection, in which not just dyadic

interactions, but also social criticism would likely take on the form and purpose of dialogue. And just as Socrates suggested re-collection via dialogue for the maintenance and growth of the individual, so does the Lockean-democratic model suggest re-collection via public discourse for the maintenance and growth of society. In fact, the philosophic basis for both levels of re-collection is the same.

Today we speak of the need to balance individual rights against the security of society. Socrates, Plato, and Locke spoke to the broader spectrum running from Law to Chaos. Law is recognized as providing society with such things as order, stability, security, and predictability. Chaos is recognized as providing individuals with choice, freedom, and change. An extreme amount of Law is called tyranny, and an extreme amount of Chaos is called anarchy.

Democracy in the Lockean-democratic model is a form of government intended to prevent extreme forms of government from occurring: no tyranny, no anarchy. It is a balancing act between Law and Chaos. Therefore, democracy is both the goal of government, and the process of government.

This view of the Lockean democracy speaks well to principals, but it should not be inferred here that a Lockean democracy is necessarily of completely

"Lockean", or even traditional western design. Our nation's founders discovered a functioning democratic government among the Haudenasaunee Six Nations Confederacy, for example, and adapted some of its forms to their own use:

Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and others found the oldest participatory democracies on earth among the American Indians. Their philosophy of liberty was advanced in a series of peace talks focused on the law of the land, the balance of power, and the inherent rights of the people (Schaaf, 1987: 2).

Given the goals of democracy, the question that these philosophers had to answer was, "What might the process look like?", or more to the point, "What means are available for protecting both society and individuals from tyranny and anarchy?". For answers to these questions, the writers of our Constitution ^{didn't} ~~borrowed~~ ^{well} ^{of democracy} ideas from many places.

Interestingly, ^{one would assume a reflection} our Constitution addresses the eternal struggle between Law and Chaos and attempts to resolve it at one stroke. ^{The America-} ~~The~~ first ten amendments to the constitution guarantee, in a *document of Law*, every individual's *right to Chaos*. It is in this Bill of Rights that ^{the America} ~~our~~ chief processes against tyranny and anarchy can be found: Freedom of Speech and of the Press.

Through these ~~two~~ ^{America's} fundamental rights, ~~we~~ are theoretically guaranteed access to the means of public

discourse (or dialogue at the societal level). And access to the means of public discourse, in theory, allows the citizenry to re-collect information (fractions, fragments) lying about on the common landscape.

The assumption is, therefore, that there is important information to be had, and that important dialogues need to take place in order to produce the "well-informed society," which is then empowered to grow and protect itself.

Relevance in Marxist "Method"

Marxism adds several important ideas to the discussion of how to best empower society to grow and to protect itself. Marx does not stop at emphasizing the importance of a healthy process; he goes on to suggest the means by which the process must be continually reviewed and reconstituted. This occurs when power relations are constantly and consciously examined and re-examined, in the certain knowledge that they are

imperfect, biased, and unjust. *problems with systems often inherent in the system
power relations have not been constantly and consciously examined and re-examined*

Marxist philosophy suggests that unlike in the Lockean-democratic view, fractionation cannot be set aside by establishing a "just" system, and letting that system be--there must always be asymmetry in the system.

In speaking of Karl Marx and Marxism, it is often implied that Marx was the first to stress awareness over

content. That is to say that Marx was the first to suggest that regardless of the content of power relations, the most important thing to do is expose them for what they are--to "lay bare" those relationships. More likely, Marx's contribution was so ground-breaking because of its systematic character, not its originality of philosophy (B. Ollman, 1993: 9).

According to Leon Trotsky, "Marxism is above all a method of analysis--not analysis of texts, but analysis of social relations" (quote from B. Ollman, 1993). When Marxism is discussed as "method", it is the "laying bare" of power relations that is being referred to.

How then, does one study the infinitely complex organism that is modern society as it evolves and changes over time? Marxism enters the picture as the most systematic (though, obviously, still incomplete) effort yet undertaken to provide such an analysis (B. Ollman, 1993: 9).

The importance of placing the emphasis on a dialectic between freedom and power, dependent upon awareness, cannot be overestimated. As a philosophy, Marxism is very powerful, but as a "method" has its problems. The primary source of criticism comes from the issue of embeddedness that is unresolved in Marx's work: That all of us, all of the time, are observers of our own actions.

There is a recursiveness to events that forces us to consider not just the power relations of traditional

"domination," but also other power relations, such as hegemony, or self-domination. Interactions are self-referencing, and power suddenly can be seen as both enabling and inhibiting. There is an inescapable disorientation that comes from being both the *interpreter* of the interpretive frame, and being in the interpretive frame.

Marx does not address his own dual role as observer and as actor in what is being observed. As Marx attempts to move from philosophy to theory, the problem with method becomes clear. Not only is society an "infinitely complex organism that...changes over time," but also, the one designing and applying the method of observation is irrevocably trapped within its framework, subject to the influence (bias) of the very power relations that must be "laid bare." In applying Marxism as theory, Marx himself fails to address the bias of his own place in the pattern of power relations.

This is precisely why Anthony Giddens (1990: 1) writes, "These ideas must be radically overhauled today: any appropriation we make from nineteenth-century social thought has to be a thoroughly critical one. This judgement must include the texts of Marx.... no one today, I think, can remain true to the spirit of Marx by remaining true to the letter of Marx." Marx was both a producer and a product of his times.

Relevance in Structuration Theory

Anthony Giddens builds the bridge between philosophy and theory through his theory of structuration. In his book (a collection of integrated papers), entitled Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis, he clearly indicates the link from one realm of thought to another; and at the same time implies the ancient concept of fractionation:

The theory of structuration begins from an absence: the lack of a theory of action in the social sciences.... The philosophy of action, I argue in this book, has typically suffered from two sources of limitation in addition to a failure to theorize problems of institutional analysis. An adequate account of human agency must, first, be connected to a theory of the acting subject; and second, must situate action in time and space as a continuous flow of conduct, rather than treating purposes, reasons, etc., as somehow aggregated together. The theory of the subject I outline involves what I call a 'stratification model' of personality, organized in terms of three sets of relations: the unconscious, practical consciousness, and discursive consciousness. The notion of practical consciousness I regard as a fundamental feature of the theory of structuration (1990: 2).

With the advent of the structuration theory, it becomes possible to build workable theories that test and hopefully explain what the philosophers have been after for a very long time: The nature of fractionated perceptions in the context of power relations.

On the surface it might appear that structuration

is nothing more than a different way of describing systems theory. However, systems theory takes the perspective of an observer outside of the system under observation. Structuration takes the important step of placing the observer inside the system as yet another social actor. Ironically, it may be the agreed-upon patterns of social interaction that constitute accepted means of conducting research that allow the observer to say anything useful on the subject.

Giddens carefully illuminates the most common critique of Marxist philosophy as critical theory (1979: 1-8), which is that Marx implies that it is possible to escape this trap of domination. In structuration theory, it is not possible to "escape the system". While we may in some sense escape a specific dominator, it is not possible to escape the modes of domination, as they are intrinsic to the existence of patterned social interaction. Even in the act of escaping, we are enacting the patterns that will bind us in the future. This indicates that structuration's potential for informing social change lies in enhancing our awareness of the patterns we engage in, and our awareness that we respond to such patterns hegemonically.

And specifically in keeping with the rich history of thought on the subject of fractionation, Giddens points out the direction that theory building must take

to explore these "fractions":

According to the theory of structuration, an understanding of social systems as situated in time-space can be effected by regarding structure as non-temporal and non-spatial, as a *virtual order of differences* produced and reproduced in social interaction as its medium and outcome. Unser Leben geht hin mit Verwandlung, Rilke says: Our life passes in transformation (1990: 3).

It seems fitting that in explaining the philosophical relationships of structuration to philosophy, Giddens draws on William James, and Heidegger, "not so much as an ontology, but as a philosophical source for developing a conceptualization of the time-space constitution of social systems" (1990: 3).

While still within the bounds of this philosophy chapter, I would argue that there is a consistency of interest across the past 2400 years, and frequently, a consistency of conceptualization.

While Giddens implicates three divisions of personality in the fractionation puzzle (the unconscious, practical consciousness, and discursive consciousness), Socrates implicated three divisions of the human "soul": the intellect, the emotions, and the instincts.

CHAPTER III

A THEORY OF FRACTIONATION

Academic research is replete with theories attempting to explain apparent "inconsistencies". Cognitive dissonance theory (Fessinger, 1957) continues to spawn new ways of catching people in the act of being inconsistent. These inconsistencies essentially occur between what is said and what is done, but this is not the only arena. Behaviors frequently appear to be mismatched with behaviors, and words with words. In "structuration theory", as proposed by Anthony Giddens (1973, 1990), some unusual patterns of inconsistency are implied, without which the structuration framework would be in jeopardy. The purpose of this work will be to test the face validity of the structuration framework by testing these patterns of inconsistency.

STRUCTURATION AND PATTERNS OF INCONSISTENCY

Structuration theory argues that the structures and functions of society exist recursively. We are not only mutually referencing in networks of cause-effect relationships, we are also self-referencing; and all social interaction is constantly and concurrently

influencing its own meaning. It can be said that the structures and functions of society are this concurrent and constant interaction. *Our life passes in transformation.*

Giddens argues that "we must grasp the time-space relations inherent in the constitution of all social interaction." He further provides the impetus for structuration by explaining that in social theory, "time is repressed"--meaning that people, places, things and events are fractionated so as to bypass the "problem" of recursiveness (Giddens, 1973, 1990: 1-8).

On the surface it appears that if we embrace concurrent, perpetual recursion we must lose any hope for a rational scientific method. But recursion refuses to be ignored. From "environmental awareness" to folk wisdom to quantum theory, the idea of inseparable interaction butts against our dichotomous and polarizing cultural heritage. Even in a most basic examination of language, such as in an introductory speech course, it becomes clear that "every communication has a past, a present, and a future."

Perhaps more disturbing is the evidence that suggests that our own verbal expressions alter us in blunt fashion (such as physical brain structure) so as to influence our future attitudes and behaviors. Neurons fire, a neural path develops more fully, and the

odds are increased that the neural path will fire again in a similar pattern and sequence. This concept of patterned recursion is quite clear in structuration theory--and it is interesting to note the construction of Giddens' own social theory within a book titled Central Problems in Social Theory.

Implications of Recursion

If everything is continually exposed to mutual and recursive influence, then how can an event be isolated for study? How can a concept be divided from other concepts? How can Occam's Razor be used when the application of it changes not only the subject but the Razor itself?

The obvious implication alluded to is that social theory cannot speak confidently of Truth (as in "absolute Truth"). Scientific method dissolves as it approaches issues of "meaning", and like all communication, is itself symbolic. In other words, the fear of losing our grip on concreteness and the definitiveness of knowledge is not in jeopardy, because it cannot be rationally argued that we ever had such a grip.

Since it cannot be shown that anyone, at any time, has ever known the Truth about anything, we have relied upon negotiated meaning to establish a standard system of rules for research. We have never "known" then, that

"empiricism is valid," but rather have agreed generally to treat it as such, presumably because we find it useful.

Implications of Pattern

Giddens' structuration theory not only argues that social interaction is recursive, but that it is recursive in a particular way. Using the brain-neuron metaphor, we can say that within the recursive processes of social interaction, patterns develop--self-reinforcing patterns like those in the neural pathways. In this sense, structuration indicates the means by which social interaction generates patterns, just as electro- and biochemical interaction indicates the means by which neural networks are generated.

Extending the metaphor one step further, if individuals are actors in a way analogous to neurons in the brain, then we can speak of the recursive patterns that secure the behavioral patterns of individual neurons. In Giddens' structuration theory, these recursive patterns are rooted in ideology, and explicitly described as the modes of domination.

IDEOLOGY AND INTERESTS

Ideology shares a close relationship to *domination*, and helps to establish a framework for the discussion of domination that follows. The concept of ideology can be

used to characterize the manner in which domination is carried out. The *dominant ideology* may be construed as the mainstream occurrence of discourse and action that seeks to sustain the *sectional interests* of dominant groups:

For there is one sectional interest, or 'arena of interests', of dominant groups which is particularly universal: an interest in maintaining the existing order of domination ipso facto involves an asymmetrical distribution of resources that can be drawn upon to satisfy wants (Giddens, 1979: 190).

Every 'section' of society exercises an ideological perspective, but the dominant ideology is that which serves and is promoted by dominant groups. It is the dominant ideology which acts to sustain the dominant order in the status quo (Gitlin, 1982: 240-241). There is no single ideology, nor can there be an "absence of ideology". While the ideological framework is important in defining structuration theory, it is in the modes of domination that the theory speaks to action:

It is obviously not enough to leave matters at this high level of abstraction: we have to try to indicate some of the major ways in which ideology actually operates in society. In doing so we are looking for the modes in which domination is concealed as domination, on the level of institutional analysis: and for the ways in which power is harnessed to conceal sectional interests on the level of strategic conduct (Giddens, 1979; 193).

THE MODES OF DOMINATION

"Domination" is an unfortunate word in |

structuration theory for two reasons: (1) the word itself implies the existence of a specific "dominator", and (2) people tend to use the term with a specific dominator in mind. Contrary to this common understanding of domination, structuration stands directly against the notion of a specific dominator. The recursive nature of social interaction in fact denies the need for any kind of dominator in the familiar sense.

When *modes of domination* are addressed as Giddens describes them, a very different understanding of domination arises. A *mode of domination* is a pattern of social interaction that tends to reinforce those modes of interaction that are "dominant". The recursiveness should again be apparent, but it is not circular as it might at first appear. Structuration theory proposes that patterns of interaction today are shaped by patterns of interaction in the past, and that all of these interactions shape the interactions of tomorrow.

As presented in Central Problems in Social Theory (Giddens, 1973, 1990; 193-195), the modes of domination are as follows:

1. *The representation of sectional interests as universal.*
2. *The denial or transmutation of contradictions.*
3. *The naturalization of the present.*

Asymmetry or imbalance is inherent in any social organization at least to the extent that individuals and

groups differ. A social organization cannot serve all differences equally in terms of the distribution of resources or power. In any social organization in which the distribution of resources and power are viewed as important, asymmetry will exist. Those favored by the current social organization will likely seek to preserve or enhance those aspects of the structure that are advantageous to them. Such *dominant groups* will be seeking to increase their potential for domination, and they will have superior resources at their disposal. Domination is a circumstantial *tendency*, in the same sense that "power tends to corrupt."

The concept of fractionation is most obviously embodied in the second of the three modes of domination, but it plays a significant role in each. That is not to say that one form of domination is more important than another, but rather that *these three modes are not truly separate*. Each supports and influences the operation of the others in a manner consistent with the idea of structuration--that is to say that the influences are concurrent and mutual as opposed to linear and segmented (Dahlgren, 1981: 101-113). In this sense, Giddens escapes the mechanistic tendencies of systems theory and allows for the existence of hegemony as an inherent part of domination.

1. *The representation of sectional interests as universal interests.*

The representation of sectional interests as universal interests intermingles with fractionation in many ways. In order to sustain the claim that dominant structures are *acting in everyone's interests*, or that dominant political forms are *necessary to defend the nation*, threatening discourse must be denied or transmuted.

In modern politics...the need to sustain legitimacy through the claim to represent the interests of the community as a whole becomes a central feature of political discourse.... The most important ideological struggles still turn upon concealment versus disclosure of class domination as at the origin of the capital accumulation process (Giddens, 1979; 193).

Two important aspects of domination are thus indicated. First, dominant forms represent their interests as being everyone's interests. Second, dominant forms seek to deny and obscure discourse that speaks to the contrary.

2. *The denial or transmutation of contradictions.*

"It is normally in the interests of dominant groups if the existence of contradictions is denied or their real locus is obscured" (Giddens, 1979: 194).

This is the primary function of fractionation. The examples that Giddens gives by way of explanation are critically relevant to this research:

In capitalist society, this applies particularly to the primary contradiction

between private appropriation and socialized production. I should want to argue that one of the main features of political ideology which serves to disguise the location of this contradiction concerns the domain that is allocated to the 'political', as distinguished from the 'economic'. The authority systems of industrial enterprise are protected from the potentially explosive convergence of contradiction and class conflict in so far as industrial conflict is 'kept out of politics'--or 'politics is kept out of the workplace' (Giddens, 1979: 194).

This fractionation of economic and political spheres of interests is explored in this research in the operationalization of value perceptions and policy perceptions; the key concepts are "*capitalism*" and "*democracy*". Value and policy are presented here from a rhetorical tradition, wherein value speaks to philosophy and abstraction, while policy speaks to action and realization.

3. *The naturalization of the present.*

To the extent that the status quo seems natural, it will seem unavoidable--a matter of evolution or fate or divine will that is pointless to resist. Thus, the dominant forms of the past have argued that the aristocracy is naturally suited to rule by 'birthright', that people of color are poor because they are naturally less capable, and that women do not need expansive rights because the female sex is unsuited to them by nature.

Whatever the state of the status quo, those

privileged by it will tend to use the resources of the privileged to sustain it. "Forms of signification which 'naturalize' the existing state of affairs, inhibiting recognition of the mutable, historical character of human society thus act to sustain such interests" (Giddens, 1979: 195).

It is not necessary that there be a "conspiracy of dominators" who are consciously "dominating" other individuals for their mutual benefit. Rather, modes of domination are those patterns by which we all engage in dominating each other and ourselves. The modes of domination equate to these patterns of self-reinforcing recursion.

According to Giddens, it is the asymmetry of existing patterns that demand the existence of dominant interests and dominant ideologies (Giddens, 1979, 1990: 190).

At this point, the concept of hegemony (participation in one's own domination) becomes relevant--so relevant that Dennis Mumby (1988: 86) indicates that it might be considered a fourth mode of domination. Within structuration, hegemony means that all social actors participate in their own domination--without exception.

HEGEMONY

At this point there is an overlapping relationship among the three modes of domination, and within this context I have specifically chosen to privilege the concept of fractionation. While the fractionation of discourse can support any mode of domination, it is important to place both fractionation and domination within another overarching concept that is vital to them both: *Hegemony*. Fractionation at the societal level is inextricably tied to the concept of *hegemony* (Mumby, 1988: 86).

The concept of hegemony is most simply described as *participation in one's own domination*. This brief definition is consistent with the works of Anthony Giddens and Dennis Mumby. But this oversimplification implies a linearity and direction that deprive the term of its full meaning. It is not that the implied linearity or direction is incorrect, but rather that it is only a part--or an isolated moment--of any system of hegemonic influence. Hegemony is fundamental to human societies; in keeping with the notion of structuration, it both describes and is described by human activity. Todd Gitlin (1982: 240) clearly indicates the more obscure, reciprocal and recursive dimensions of hegemony:

By hegemony I mean the process in which a

ruling class--or more likely an alliance of class factions--dominates subordinate classes and groups through the elaboration and penetration of ideology into their common sense and everyday practice....

Gitlin describes this process as one in which the dominant groups must depend on skilled cultural practitioners--such as television producers and writers--to articulate the ideals and understandings of the elites. At the same time, these cultural practitioners depend upon the elites for their livelihood and ability to practice their craft.

The content of the resulting cultural system is rarely cut and dried, partly because the cultural practitioners have their own values, traditions and practices, which may differ from those of the elites, and partly because market constraints exist that keep the hegemonic ideology flexible.... Ideological domination, in other words, requires an *alliance* between powerful economic and political groups on the one hand, and cultural elites on the other--alliances whose terms must, in effect, be negotiated and, as social conditions and elite dispositions shift, renegotiated....

Hegemony encompasses the terms through which the alliances of domination are cemented; it also extends to the systematic (but not necessarily or even usually deliberate) engineering of mass consent to the established order (Gitlin, 1982; 240-241).

Fractionation occurs as a feature of *hegemonic influence*, whereby people participate in their own domination, and thus participate in fractionation. In order to protect their livelihood, cultural practitioners may be called upon to deny or transmute

contradictions.

CONTEMPORARY FRACTIONATION

There is a universe of ideas to be explored that could fall under the banner of "fractionation", as could be gathered from Chapter I. The term is generic, and I have not found a more specific term to replace it. For that reason, the specific manifestation of fractionation in this theory needs to be explored: In making the move from philosophy to theory (and from past to present), the concept of fractionation must become more concrete. Fractionation in structuration theory takes on a form that can be attached directly to examples of power relations in contemporary American society.

As an example, let us simplify the field of academic research to three "actors": a publisher, an editor, and an author. Further, let us assume that the social interaction involves the process of bringing a piece of research from pre-written to published form. Structuration tells us that each actor mutually restrains each other actor, concurrently and constantly, via the modes of domination. These modes of domination come into play because of expectations built upon previous patterns of interaction.

In this interaction the author participates in his own "domination" by adhering to accepted forms of

presentation and writing. The editor does the same by applying accepted forms of presentation and writing to her analysis of what has been written. The publisher participates in the mutual domination by deciding what to publish and what not to publish on the basis of previous patterns in academic publishing.

It is important to note that intrinsic to the idea of hegemony and mutual concurrent domination is the notion that any or all of these people would perhaps rather be behaving in a different manner--or operating under new and different patterns of social interaction. In the sense that all of them are mutually restraining, none of them can be considered the "dominator" in the traditional sense. Rather it is the nature of social interaction itself that contains the modes of domination. Dominant "interests" can now be seen as systemic, and not necessarily located in an individual person.

The discrepancies between how people perceive interaction in an abstract, ideal, or "value" sense, and how they perceive actual interactions gives rise to *fractionation*.

Fractionation specifically refers to the apparent inconsistency between an individual's perception of abstract values and perception of concrete policies. In the theory presented here, the subject is conscious of

each perception as described separately, but may not be aware of the apparent inconsistency. Fractionation refers only to stated perceptions, and not to other actions that may be related to those perceptions. Matters of conscious vs. unconscious, stated vs. acted upon, etc., are the stuff of other research.

This approach to fractionation is intentionally narrow, due to the complex interactions inherent in the structuration framework. This can be seen in Chapter IV, in terms of the care that must be taken in even asking subjects about their policy perceptions.

Provided that structuration theory is valid, it should be possible to measure fractionation in terms of the *discrepancies* between value perceptions and policy perceptions. These discrepancies constitute the inconsistencies referred to at the start of this chapter. Structuration would predict particular patterns of fractionation between the two levels of analysis. It is this prediction that is at the heart of the hypotheses tested herein.

In summary of the theoretical approach so far, the following pieces have been assembled under the auspices of structuration:

1. Social interaction is recursive.
2. There are patterns of recursion.
3. The patterns of recursion are reinforcing.
4. The means of reinforcement are described as modes of domination.
5. The processes of recursive social interaction

generate the phenomena herein referred to as fractionation.

6. Fractionation may be measured as observable patterns of inconsistency between value and policy perceptions.

Value Perceptions

In looking for an arena to test fractionation, many viable value/policy dilemmas present themselves: The environment, nuclear technology, discrimination, violent crime, the role of public education, and notions of patriarchy might be likely choices. Socrates, for example, clearly recognized fractionation issues between the concepts of *education* and *market*, demonstrated by the nature and frequency of his attacks upon the sophists (Golden, 1989: 8).

Two vital ideas on our common (U.S.) landscape today are democracy and capitalism, and because of the philosophic evolution of fractionation it seems appropriate to choose these ideas as a research focus. Certainly the implicit power relations in the two terms are true to the spirit of Marx and Locke. Many critical works have argued that these are the two most important value systems at work in our society (eg., Bowles & Gintis, 1986; Dahlgren, 1981). But it is not necessary that they be the most important. It is enough to say that they are very important, particularly in how they relate to each other--or in how they are perceived to relate.

In evidence of the significance of this relationship stands an entire body of literature that concerns itself with the relationship between governance and economy. This body of literature is obviously inclusive of political-economy and Marxist theory. Some of the questions at hand are:

- "How do these two value systems relate?"
- "How is this relationship manifested in public discourse?"
- "How do individuals perceive the relationship?"
- "How do these abstract perceptions compare to perceptions of these concepts in action?"

This final question is the one that points toward the operationalization of the concepts built into this theory. Fractionation theory predicts that there will be meaningful differences between a measure of value perceptions and a measure of policy perceptions.

Policy Perceptions

The role of television will be explored as a policy-perception focus that brings democracy and capitalism together. To clarify the term "policy", the term here refers to an the ancient distinctions made by Antonius centuries ago (Clarke, 1962). The distinction between fact, policy and value are in this sense, matters of emphasis. Where value speaks to questions of philosophy and morality in the general sense, policy speaks to questions of action, whether purposeful, accidental, or as an artifact of a system. To address

policy perceptions is to address the level of standard operating procedures, patterns of action, and the "realization" of values in action.

To ask subjects about policy perceptions, then, is to ask about perceived relationships of action, primarily by asking about specific examples.

Fractionation theory would predict the following: Subjects will report value perceptions of democracy and capitalism that are "distinct" and do not meaningfully "interact". Subjects will also report that at the level of policy, these two values do interact, and may indeed be in conflict.

This would be a telling pattern of inconsistency, fulfilling in part the prediction that there will be meaningful differences between a measure of value perceptions and a measure of policy perceptions.

Television provides a focal point where these two apparently distinct value structures possibly meet, overlap, and conflict. As a focus of controversy, television is particularly important as it may be seen as a part of the means for producing and reproducing culture (Dahlgren, 1981; Gitlin, 1980).

An argument for cultivation theory is not being made, here. Rather, cultivation theory indicates television as a likely place to look for an intersection of the two important value structures, democracy and

capitalism.

The repetitive pattern of television's mass-produced messages and images forms the mainstream of common symbolic environment (Gerbner et al., 1986).

Thus the cultivation body of research presents a recursive pattern of media influence across time that is remarkably consistent with fractionation, making this an attractive starting point for fractionation research.

Combining the general argument with the specific example, the thrust of this research might be phrased as follows: The value structures of capitalism and democracy are in conflict with regards to available means of public discourse. The specific means discussed here is television. Issues of conflict between the two value structures constitute *possible chains of discourse* (possible arguments or fragments) that are fractionated by the processes of domination. Such fractionated arguments cannot effectively challenge dominant power relations.

In the producing and reproducing of culture, dominant interests promote the fractionation of capitalism-democracy chains of discourse, and also act to keep them broken. This artificially separates the two value structures, and serves to hide and dislocate conflicts between the two. Also in the producing and reproducing of culture, the dominant forms provide preferred explanations of the incoherence that has been

generated by scattering arguments that call attention to possible conflicts between democracy and capitalism.

This process is the cultivation of a mainstream reality (Signorielli & Morgan, 1990; Gerbner et al., 1986) .

CHAPTER IV

PROCEDURES

Fractionation theory presents several interesting challenges. As the discussion moves from theory to explicit operationalizations, these challenges begin to take form. For example, there is a need for relational data, without which the results might be reduced to merely peculiar variations among unassociated items. Also, the relationships between hypotheses need to be made clear in terms of the larger argument, since no single hypothesis addresses fractionation theory as a whole. In the descriptions that follow, these and other concerns are addressed in a step-by-step format, presented in the order that the data collections were actually carried out.

OPERATIONALIZATIONS

While fractionation is operationalized in terms of the interaction of the hypotheses given below, value and policy perceptions are operationalized *within* the hypotheses.

Bear in mind that value and policy describe places of emphasis on a continuum that runs from the abstract

to the concrete, from the general to the specific. The policy emphasis in the procedures used is much more specific and concrete than the key value terms "democracy" and "capitalism", but this does not mean that elements of this study are either utterly abstract or utterly concrete. The distinction between values in the abstract and policies in action is not an "either-or" proposition, as the rhetorical tradition of the two terms indicates. Rather, a distinction is being made between levels of abstraction (or, if we prefer, levels of concreteness).

HYPOTHESES AND STAGES IN DATA COLLECTION

The procedures for the research are broken down into stages, with each stage relating to specific hypotheses.

STAGE I: VALUE PERCEPTIONS

The purpose of Stage I was to test hypotheses regarding the value (abstract) level of subject perceptions. As presented, fractionation and cultural hegemony predict that subjects would report capitalism and democracy as distinct and independent value structures.

Given that multidimensional scaling uses "proximities among any kind of objects as input"

(Kruskal & Wish, 1976: 7), this technique was employed to evaluate the perceived relationship between the two key concepts. The two key concepts were first represented by lists of associated words, then these words were "mapped" using multidimensional scaling. This created visual representation of democracy and capitalism in conceptual space. This method seemed particularly appropriate since the data for comparison needed to be relational.

To generate such a map of the two key concepts, lists of words were required for subjects to sort into groups. The process of generating the word lists for a cognitive-space data interpretation is also useful for testing the abstract distinctions subjects make between these two concepts. The initial data collections and hypotheses were aimed at producing the word lists used in the later procedures.

Data Collection #1

The first data collection involved two surveys, one for capitalism and one for democracy (Appendix A). The democracy survey elicited words and phrases relating to the concept of democracy, while the capitalism survey elicited words and phrases relating to the concept of capitalism. If the two lists of words thus produced did not share common words between them, then this would be one measure of the distinction between the two concepts

at the abstract semantic level.

The most frequently occurring words were used to establish a word list for each key concept. No words were counted as important if they occurred fewer than ten times. This arbitrary limit was set conditionally to allow for the possibility of some more "natural" breaking point within the data--such as would occur if the subjects wrote so much that even unimportant words showed up ten or more times.

Data Collection #2

To reinforce the distinction between democracy and capitalism, a second data collection was conducted that allowed subjects to see the two concepts together in the same survey (Appendix A). Different subjects were surveyed from the same population. Each subject in this data collection was asked about both concepts, each in two different questions intended to elicit relevant words and phrases. If the two word lists generated from these data produced no common words between them, then the distinction between the two concepts at the abstract level would be strengthened further. The analysis of the word lists for capitalism and democracy in each of the first two data collections provided the data for testing hypothesis 1:

- H₁ Words that appear on the list for capitalism will not appear on the list for democracy.

The data analysis includes a scoring for each word that establishes a weighted ratio between the frequency of occurrence on each word list and the absolute number of occurrences.

Data Collection #3

To reinforce this distinction still further, a third data collection was done that allowed subjects to see the two concepts together in the same survey, and in the same questions (Appendix A):

1. What do democracy and capitalism mean to you?
2. When you think about capitalism and democracy, what are some words or phrases that come to mind?

Again, different subjects were used. Each was asked about both key concepts (democracy and capitalism), in a single question intended to elicit relevant words and phrases. This made the opportunity for interaction between the two concepts obvious.

At this point, the three lists of most frequently occurring words can be compared to discover whether the lists change depending on the format of the survey instrument. Provided that the list of words generated from this data collection match the lists generated in the first and second data collections, it can be said that there was no perceived relationship between the two concepts. The analysis of the word lists generated in the second and third data collections provided the data

for testing hypothesis 2:

- H₂ Words that appear on the separately generated lists for capitalism and democracy will also appear on the list generated for capitalism and democracy together.

The data analysis includes a scoring for each word that establishes a weighted ratio between the frequency of occurrence on each word list and the absolute number of occurrences.

Data Collection #4

The next step was to have subjects perform card sorts using the subject-generated words. This provided the basis for the multidimensional scaling mentioned previously. The multidimensional scaling method uses a spatial analogy to represent *difference* as *distance*. This allows the construction of an actual "map" of distances between items, where the greater the distance, the greater the difference between those items. Ten words (items) were selected from each list (for the sake of keeping the total number of words to a reasonable level) based on their frequency of occurrence in the concept surveys (Data collections 1, 2, and 3). The combined twenty words were printed on index cards and subjects were asked to sort the twenty words into piles in any way that made sense to them.

The subjects were given no references to the initial concepts of democracy and capitalism, to ensure

that such knowledge did not bias their sorting.

Whenever a subject sorted any two words into the same pile, this was counted as a "match" (a single co-occurrence) for those two words. From all of the co-occurrences of all subjects, a co-occurrence matrix was constructed, establishing a measure of similarity between each word and each other word. By treating these co-occurrences as distances (where more co-occurrences equates to less distance), a cognitive map can be built.

Hierarchical cluster analysis was also performed to aid in interpretation of the cognitive-space mapping. Cluster analysis is able to use the same co-occurrence matrix, but interprets the data in a much different way. Instead of a map, a hierarchical cluster "tree" is produced that reveals word "groupings". This analysis does not generate a spatial analogy for words, but rather generates a relative scale of association for words. Where the multidimensional scaling reveals relative differences between individual words, the cluster analysis reveals how the words tend to associate.

After the multidimensional scaling and the cluster analysis were complete, the clustering "tree" was translated onto the cognitive map. This procedure gives the appearance of topographical lines, revealing how the

words on the map associate into clusters.

Several other tests for parsimony, interpretability and validity were conducted to establish the stability of the cognitive-space solution.

The analysis of the card sorts provided the data for testing hypotheses 3 and 4:

- H₃ The multidimensional scaling of subjects' word groupings will produce a stable multidimensional solution.
- H₄ Hierarchical cluster analysis will produce that words on the capitalism list cluster separately from words on the democracy list.

STAGE II: POLICY FRAGMENTS

The purpose of Stage II was to generate the fragments that subjects encounter in Stage III of the study. Two newspaper sources were used to generate the fragments: The Oregonian, and The New York Times. As The Voice of Record, the Times was expected to be representative of the mainstream press. The Oregonian seemed particularly appropriate due to the fact that a majority of the subjects were to be drawn from the local area. While this research does not go so far as to argue for a relationship between the media and fractionation specifically, the data collected might be useful for future studies in that area.

Data Collection #5

The procedure for locating potential fragments

began with a scanning of articles from both papers that addressed the general subject area of television advertising. For both The Oregonian and The New York Times, this scan was conducted by a computer search covering the last three years of the relevant databases at the library. "Television" and "advertising" were used as the initial key words in the computer search.

Once a set of articles was generated from each newspaper (Appendix E), the next step was to track occurrences of the words generated in Stage I of this study. The marked words and phrases were then used as a guide to identify statements pertaining to capitalism and democracy. General categories of statements, or fragment topics were developed, covering a range of possible views and positions about the nature of television advertising.

Specific fragments were then derived, that when taken together demonstrate important interaction or conflict between the concepts of capitalism and democracy.

The large amount of interpretation required in this phase of the research was expected to be self-regulating: If the fragments offered for subjects to examine were not reasonable or related, the subjects would not choose them or relate them. Given a range of statements, representative of pieces of argument found

in the mainstream press, the subjects would indicate the viability of the fragments by their choices or lack of choices. This is explained in terms of the instrument in the sixth data collection.

STAGE III: POLICY PERCEPTIONS

The purpose of Stage III was to test hypotheses regarding the less abstract, policy level of subject perceptions. Fractionation, via the rhetoric of cultural hegemony, predicts that subjects would perceive the fragments gathered in data collection #5 as grouping or "chaining" into coherent relationships; that is to say that given the opportunity, subjects would choose to relate the fragments in such a way that consistent relationships are formed (arguments are constructed).

A survey composed of randomly shuffled items or pair-by-pair word comparisons would probably not be appropriate to collect these data, for some of the same reasons that a survey must give way to cognitive-space mapping in Stage I of the study: The data gathered must have the opportunity to interact. In a more typical survey design, the designer would try to avoid the possibility of one survey item influencing another item, so that the subjects would not simply follow the pattern of their initial choices throughout the instrument. Here, the subjects must be given the opportunity to

determine (from among a selection of fragments) what (if any) "interaction" exists.

Any design that did not allow the subjects to choose a series of relationships from among a selection of fragments was assumed to be inappropriate, in light of the comparison being sought.

A modified survey design answers this need.

Data Collection #6

Using the fragments gathered in Stage II, a survey was constructed with one "fragment topic" being the subject of each survey item (Appendix A). Each survey item thus consists of several interpreted variations of the fragment topic. In addition, every survey item includes options that allowed the subjects to indicate that none of the fragments presented were adequate or reasonable.

In other words, each page of the survey presents a list of options to the subjects and asks them to choose the fragment that they find most reasonable. If none of the fragments seem reasonable, they may "opt out". Also, if the subjects have reservations about the meaning or wording of a particular statement, they may explain those reservations. Assuming that appropriate fragments have been identified, the prediction was that subjects would not "opt out", nor would they frequently express reservations.

In the instrument used, the choice made on one page determines which set of choices the subject encounters next, where the options presented are predicated on the fragments already selected. Using this instrument, subjects built "arguments" by selecting fragments, thus choosing which "chains" of argument to construct or NOT to construct. Argument chains constructed in this way are not necessarily relational, and this procedure is not asking subjects to respond to a whole argument. Rather, subjects are making choices about fragments of possibly larger arguments, and their choices will reveal whether or not they choose fragments that bring capitalism and democracy into conflict.

The reason that whole arguments were not presented to subjects is twofold: First, fractionation theory (which operates hegemonically) assumes that responses to a whole "un-fractionated" argument would likely reflect mainstream explanations. In other words, subjects would respond by "explaining away" or denying contradictions, naturalizing the present, and by otherwise participating in the modes of domination. In assessing individual elements, they may instead reveal basic conflicts or relationships that would otherwise remain hidden. Second, the presentation of the possible variations of the whole arguments would likely be huge. If there were just five fragment topics with three to five statements

for each topic, the number of arguments would be in the hundreds, perhaps thousands.

The analysis of the argument chains provided the basis for testing hypothesis number five:

- H₅ Subjects will choose subject fragments for democracy and capitalism that interact.

The analysis of the fragment survey data was measured by the relative frequency of subjects choosing to construct arguments whose end-points result in a conflict between the value-level concepts of democracy and capitalism. In addition, a graphic representation of the data was created for interpretation.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES

Recall that fractionation can be discussed as a process, or as a state of affairs, and that this research is aimed only at testing whether or not evidence can be found to support fractionation as a state of affairs. The process itself, (as derived primarily from Anthony Giddens) may be inaccessible to us, but the "fractionated" perceptions of individual subjects hopefully is not.

Such a fractionated state would be represented by measurable disparity between two levels of analysis. The five primary hypotheses used here to test this state of affairs are:

- H₁ Words that appear on the list for capitalism will not appear on the list for democracy.
- H₂ Words that appear on the separately generated lists for capitalism and democracy will also appear on the list generated for capitalism and democracy together.
- H₃ The multidimensional scaling of subjects' word groupings will produce a stable multidimensional solution.
- H₄ Hierarchical cluster analysis will produce that words on the capitalism list cluster separately from words on the democracy list.
- H₅ Subjects will choose subject fragments for democracy and capitalism that interact.

Given that each hypothesis supports the larger theory under study, all five hypotheses must be validated in order to lend empirical weight to the concept of fractionation. The results are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

To keep the results from each data collection clear, the initial results are presented in an order and manner similar to Chapter IV: Procedures. A more general examination of the results follows, delving into the relationships between the hypotheses.

SUBJECTS

The subjects for all of the data collections were drawn from a sample of convenience, most of them first or second year students in introductory college speech courses. Within the sampling frame that subjects were drawn from, there is interesting variance, however.

About half of the subjects were community college students, the other half from universities. The stated majors, ages, and occupations vary widely, and some of the detailed results from demographics breakdowns are worth examining.

Approximately 50 percent of the subjects were approached at the start of their speech course, while the rest were approached in the middle or toward the end. This, combined with the diversity of declared

majors and occupations among the subjects, makes it less likely that simply being in a speech course would influence the results.

Still, this is a limitation of the sample: It is possible, for example, that a common frame of mind develops merely from entering an introductory speech course environment. In an effort to eliminate as much of this limitation as possible, the results from the cognitive-space maps and of the "option-path" surveys are examined with care.

STAGE I: VALUE PERCEPTIONS

Data Collection #1

In the first data collection, 70 subjects responded to the capitalism survey and 72 subjects responded to the democracy survey. The results clearly support the first hypothesis, and additionally it is worth noting that for many of the words associated with one concept, there is no association with the other concept.

For the purposes of selecting words to use in the card-sort data collections that follow, it can be seen in Table I that none of the top ten words from either list are the same. The majority of occurrence ratios

TABLE I
WORD RATIOS AND OCCURRENCES
FROM SEPARATE SURVEYS

Words Frequently Occurring	Dem/ Cap Ratio	Cap/ Dem Ratio	Occurrences in Democracy Survey	Occurrences in Capitalism Survey
Freedom ₁	.93		66	5
Government	.93		51	4
Public	.94		45	3
Choice	.90		36	4
Right	.89		33	4
Vote	1.00		28	0
Free speech ₂	1.00		27	0
Represent	1.00		20	0
(Election) ₃	1.00		12	0
Politics	.85		11	2
Decision	.79		11	3
Equality	1.00		10	0
Business		1.00	0	41
Money		1.00	0	41
Enterprise		.96	1	25
Economic		.92	2	24
Success		1.00	0	16
Power		.75	5	15
Supply		1.00	0	12
Market		1.00	0	12
Individual		.73	4	11
Competition		1.00	0	9
Unregulated		1.00	0	9
Buy		1.00	0	8
Sell		1.00	0	7

- 1 The word "freedom" was distinguished from the word "free" in counting occurrences. The reason is that the word "free" appeared almost universally in conjunction with other words (i.e. "enterprise" and "speech").
- 2 The word "Speech" was universally preceded by the word "free", and since the meaning of the lone word is different from the phrase, the phrase was kept.
- 3 The word "election" appeared almost universally with "vote" and "decision". The term was eliminated for the purposes of the card-sorting because of this redundancy.

measure 1.00, meaning that most terms appear only with reference to one concept, and not at all with reference to the other. The lowest ratio is 0.73, showing the greatest amount of interaction between the two concepts to center around the term "individual". Due to this low ratio, it was expected that this term would be more likely than other terms to "cross-over" from one concept to the next: A term that appears with similar frequency in the capitalism word surveys and in the democracy word surveys may not definitively associate itself with one concept or another. As seen later in Stage III, this "cross-over" is precisely what happened.

Data Collection #2

The second data collection was gathered from 44 subjects. It allowed them to respond to the concepts separately (democracy and capitalism) on the same survey, giving the two terms another opportunity to interact.

The first hypothesis, already supported in part by the first data collection, predicted that there will still be no important interaction:

H₁ Words that appear on the list for capitalism will not appear on the list for democracy.

This prediction is confirmed by the data, which reveal that the differences are slight between the word rankings of the first and second data collections.

The occurrences and rankings for all three of the initial data collections are shown in Table II.

Data Collection #3

The third data collection asked subjects to respond to the two terms together, maximizing the chances of interaction. This data collection was drawn from 151 subjects chosen by convenience from the college student population.

TABLE II
WORD OCCURRENCES AND RANKINGS FROM
THREE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Rank Order by Total Frequency	Most Common Words	Occurrences in Data Set			Total Occurrences In All Data Sets
		#1	#2	#3	
1	Freedom	71	40	72	183
2	Government	55	41	51	147
3	Money	41	27	37	105
4	Public	48	19	24	91
5	Choice	40	16	28	84
6	Business	41	22	16	77
7	Vote	28	25	24	77
8	Right	37	18	16	71
9	Free speech	27	20	19	66
10	Enterprise	26	15	19	60
11	Economic	26	10	18	54
12	Individual	22	8	22	52
13	Power	20	11	21	52
14	Represent	20	10	16	46
15	Decision	14	10	15	39
16	Success	16	9	13	38
17	Supply	12	12	12	36
18	Competition	10	6	17	33
19	Politics	14	12	5	31
20	Market	12	7	12	31
21	Equality	10	3	15	28
22	Opportunity	3	3	17	23

The 20 most frequent words generated by all three data collections (Table II) reveals that there was some movement in the rankings from one data collection to the next, however this movement was not substantial enough to introduce much change to the list. While there is deviation in terms of rank-order from one set of data to the next, none of the words that appeared in the second data set or the third were new.

The most surprising movement among those words already associated with the two terms is the word "opportunity". This word appeared just three times in the first data set, and three times in the second (in both cases with reference to capitalism). The way the term was discussed by subjects in the third data set suggests that it is associated more strongly with capitalism than with democracy, which is consistent with its appearance in the first data set.

Ultimately, the interaction between the two value-level concepts is not important in terms of introducing new words, and the second hypothesis is strongly supported:

- H₂ Words that appear on the separately generated lists for capitalism and democracy will also appear on the list generated for capitalism and democracy together.

Data Collection #4

Based on the results of the above data collections,

twenty words were selected to represent the two concepts, capitalism and democracy.

These are the words that appeared most commonly in the total of all data sets. The same words found to be most common in the first data set are the same words that are derived from the total of all data sets.

Once the words were selected, multidimensional scaling and cluster analysis were used to build a

TABLE III
DERIVED KEY WORD LISTS

DEMOCRACY	CAPITALISM
Choice	Business
Decision	Competition
Freedom	Economic
Free speech	Enterprise
Government	Individual
Politics	Market
Public	Money
Represent	Power
Right	Success
Vote	Supply

cognitive-space map of the twenty identified words. The data for the mapping was gathered by supplying 139 subjects with decks of cards, each card in each deck bearing one of the twenty words. The data were used to create a

As the third hypothesis predicts, a stable, multidimensional solution is derived. A two-dimensional solution best fits the criteria of parsimony, stability,

and interpretability, as can be seen in Figures 1 and 2 (Kruskal & Wise, 1976).

Figure 1. Multidimensional scaling stress.
The greater the number of dimensions, the less stress; but the results become less interpretable.

The term "stress" refers to the amount of distortion necessary to represent the items in n -dimensional space. A rating of zero would represent that there is no stress in the spatial representation. As a way to visualize what is meant by stress in n -dimensional space, picture an actual map of physical space--a map of United States cities for example. In strictly two-dimensional space, there will be some stress inherent in the map, because some cities sit at

higher or lower elevations than a flat piece of paper can represent. A three-dimensional map of United States cities would have zero stress: The map would perfectly represent the relative proximities on some scale.

While the three-dimensional solution reveals a lower level of stress, the resulting cognitive-space maps are more difficult to examine, and there is very little advantage. The difference between the two solutions is that the lower right sub-cluster of words on the two-dimensional map is revealed to lie slightly "behind" the other major clusters. This difference does not substantially aid in interpretation, since the lower cluster is already distinct in the two-dimensional solution.

The cognitive maps provided here include the results of the hierarchical cluster analysis, which are not inconsistent with the multidimensional scaling itself. If the topographical lines rendered by the cluster analysis become too complex or entangled, this is evidence that the two procedures are in conflict--or at the very least that the graphic interpretation of the cognitive dimensions are not compatible with the cluster analysis in merely two-dimensional space.

In each of the cognitive-space maps generated for this research, the cluster analysis provided very clean

Figure 2. Multidimensional scaling for all subjects. This figure shows the cognitive space mapping for the capitalism and democracy word lists in two dimensions.

groupings that were largely consistant from map to map.

"Early" and "Late" Sub-group Analysis

In order to reduce the impact of the limited sample (students from introductory speech courses), a multidimensional scaling and cluster analysis was performed dividing out two relevant sub-groups. The two groupings, called "early" and "late", were split from the total sample on the basis of when subjects were asked to perform their card sorts: At the start of the speech course, or at the end.

Subjects who were sampled within the first two weeks of a course were labeled "early" (Figure 3), while those who were sampled within the last two weeks of a course were labeled "late" (Figure 4). Sixty-eight (50%) of the subjects from the total sample were "early", fifty-one (35%) "late", and the remaining twenty (15%) indeterminate (and thus not included in the solutions).

Figures 3 and 4 are both two-dimensional solutions, like the solution for the combined total data. The comparison of the "early" sub-group to the "late" sub-group reveals them to be quite similar. Distances remain virtually unchanged, as do the major clusters; there are only minor differences among sub-clusters.

One difference that appears to be interesting

Figure 3. Multidimensional scaling for "early" subjects. This figure shows the cognitive space mapping for the capitalism and democracy word lists in two dimensions.

Figure 4. Multidimensional scaling for "late" subjects. This figure shows the cognitive space mapping for the capitalism and democracy word lists in two dimensions.

is the movement of the term "power" among the "late" subjects. While power is no closer to the "politics" and "government" sub-cluster, it does have greater distance from the major capitalist cluster ("money", "economic", etc).

One possible explanation is that during an introductory speech course, there is a shift in the conception of power, away from business interests and towards government, vote, rights, and free speech. It is not unreasonable to guess that the "power" of participation is a common enough subject during such a college course. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine with these data if the shift is important, or long-lasting. This is clearly a subject for further study.

Taken as a whole, the early and late sub-groups differ by very little. Hypotheses 3 and 4 are supported. The scaling distances and clustering appear to be stable across the duration of a speech course.

"Expressive" and "Productive" Sub-group Analysis

Since subjects' perceptions of values in this research are vital, and since the hypotheses predict a stable division of the two key concepts (capitalism and democracy), it seems reasonable to break out sub-groups for analysis that might yield different results.

One might expect that people who are interested in

business or professional studies would perceive *different* relationships than would be perceived by artists and people studying the humanities.

On the other hand, as can be inferred from fractionation theory, the solutions should be stable across these boundaries. That is to say that while clusters may differ within the two sets of words, there will still be few words that cross from one major cluster to another.

Out of 139 total subjects, fifty-one declared one of the expressive majors, while seventy-three declared one of the productive majors. As can be seen in Figures 5 and 6, the two solutions for "expressives" and "productives", respectively, show few interesting changes--with one important exception. Those declaring a more expressive major detached the term "power" from the major capitalism cluster, and instead attached it to the lower right democracy sub-cluster. By itself, this suggests that among the expressive majors, power is perceived as being more strongly associated with democracy than capitalism at the value level.

In conjunction with the results from the *early* and *late* sub-groups, there is an even more compelling possibility: that being in an introductory speech course influences students toward the more "expressive" cognitive scheme. While an intriguing idea, larger and

Figure 5. Multidimensional scaling for "expressive" subjects. This figure shows the cognitive space mapping for the capitalism and democracy word lists in two dimensions.

Figure 6. Multidimensional scaling for "productive" subjects. This figure shows the cognitive space mapping for the capitalism and democracy word lists in two dimensions.

more meticulous data collections would need to be performed on these sub-groups to validate the interpretation. It is a leap of faith to stretch the already broad meaning of "expressive major" to support this notion without more specific evidence.

The apparent movement of the term power is primarily indicated by the cluster analysis, whereas the multidimensional scaling does not reveal much movement in the spatial analogy: While the term clusters differently, it does not move much in its similarity or difference to other terms. This makes a "power-shift" interpretation suspect without further evidence.

At the same time, the differences between the *expressive* sub-group and the *productive* sub-group are not inexplicable and are certainly not substantial in terms of the hypotheses of this research. The shifts in the term "power" invite speculation, but these shifts are far from extreme. In the *expressive* solution (Figure 5), "power" is the most isolated term in the democracy cluster--even though it has crossed-over, it has done so reluctantly. The change is subtle.

Multidimensional and Cluster Analysis Summary

The third and fourth hypotheses are confirmed in the various mappings and analysis:

- H₃ The multidimensional scaling of subjects' word groupings will produce a stable multidimensional solution.

- H₄ Hierarchical cluster analysis will produce that words on the capitalism list cluster separately from words on the democracy list.

The first data collection analysis indicated that the term "individual" would be most likely to "cross-over" from one cluster to the another in the card sorts, and in the resulting multidimensional scaling. This did in fact occur. The term "individual" stands out as being the only term not to cluster with its fellow words, as gathered in the initial surveys (data collections 1, 2).

There is an explanation for this movement that is supported by the data. When subjects are asked to think of words relating to democracy and capitalism, they freely associate the word "individual" with capitalism. This is because capitalism can easily be identified with autonomous efficacy. On the other hand, the term occurs less frequently associated with democracy because democracy is perceived as including both autonomous and collective efficacy. The use of the term "individual" is only partly relevant to democracy.

When the subjects are given the generated words to sort in the fourth data collection, they are no longer constrained to think in terms of the two global concepts of capitalism and democracy. Instead of producing two major clusters, they have really produced three (Figure 2). There is an autonomous capitalist

cluster, an autonomous democracy cluster, and a collective democracy cluster. Democracy divides into two clear parts on the basis of autonomous vs. collective efficacy, and the term "individual" is most clearly associated with autonomous democratic efficacy.

STAGE II: POLICY FRAGMENTS

Data Collection #5

Fragments of potential arguments at the policy level were gathered from The Oregonian and The New York Times. Table IV shows the general fragment topics derived from surveying the articles, ostensibly about television advertising; the table also lists the statements interpreted from the articles. Note that in the first fragment topic area, there are no statements about television advertising influence worded any stronger than "has at least some influence". This is because more definitive and powerful statements were not commonly present or implied in the articles.

Appendix E gives a listing of the specific articles referenced in the process of following the database searches of the two magazines.

Many more articles from The New York Times fit the search parameters than from The Oregonian. In part this may be due to the indexing capabilities of the databases available, and in part this is simply an artifact

TABLE IV
FRAGMENT TOPICS

-
- 1 (Starting point from which subject selects a statement in the first fragment topic).
- TELEVISION ADVERTISING INFLUENCE
- 3 TV advertising has no influence on people who are exposed to it.
- 4 TV advertising has at least some influence on people who are exposed to it.
- 5 As above, but with reservations.
- TELEVISION ADVERTISING INFLUENCE UNIQUENESS
- 7 The influence of TV advertising is not different from the influence of other forms of advertising.
- 8 The influence of TV advertising is at least somewhat different from the influence of other forms of advertising.
- 9 As above, but with reservations.
- TELEVISION ADVERTISING EXPOSURE TIME
- 11 The influence of TV advertising occurs primarily after short-term exposure.
- 12 As above, but with reservations.
- 13 The influence of TV advertising occurs primarily after long-term exposure.
- 14 As above, but with reservations.
- TELEVISION ADVERTISING INFLUENCE CONSISTENCY
- 16 TV advertising does not tend to consistently influence those exposed to it in a particular way. The influence is arbitrary.
- 17 As above, but with reservations.
- 18 TV advertising does tend to consistently influence those exposed to it in a particular way. The influence is not arbitrary.
- 19 As above, but with reservations.
- TELEVISION ADVERTISING INTERESTS
- 21 TV advertising does tend to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.
- 22 As above, but with reservations.
- 23 TV advertising does not tend to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.
- 24 As above, but with reservations.
- NECESSITY OF A WELL-INFORMED SOCIETY
- 26 It is not important to have a well-informed society to make good decisions.
- 27 It is at least somewhat important to have well-informed society to make good decisions.
- 28 As above, but with reservations.
- NECESSITY OF MANY VIEWS AND INTERESTS (a large quantity of views from any number of sources)
- 30 A well-informed society does need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.
- 31 As above, but with reservations.
- 32 A well-informed society does not need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.
- 33 As above, but with reservations.
- NECESSITY OF DIVERSE VIEWS AND INTERESTS (any number of views from a large quantity of sources)
- 35 The views and interests that a well-informed society is exposed to need not be diverse.
- 36 The views and interests that a well-informed society is exposed to must be diverse.
- 37 As above, but with reservations.
-

Under each of the eight fragment topics, one option is always "None of these options seems reasonable". These statements are numbered 2, 6, 10, 15, 20, 25, 29, 34.

of the sizes and scopes of the two newspapers. In any case, locating words and concepts relating to capitalism and democracy was not difficult, even in articles that only briefly touched on television advertising as a specific area of content. The fragment topics were interpreted into specific statements to provide the potential pieces of argument.

The fifth data collection provides the basis for "option-path" surveys, the results of which are discussed next.

STAGE III: POLICY PERCEPTIONS

Data Collection #6

The instrument (Appendix A) for testing policy perceptions asks subjects to evaluate which statement in each fragment topic seems the most reasonable. For example, the first fragment topic is "television advertising influence". There are four options for this fragment topic, listed here in the order that they actually appear in the survey:

- (3) TV advertising has no influence on people who are exposed to it.
- (4) TV advertising has at least some influence on people who are exposed to it.
- (5) As above, but with reservations.
- (2) None of these options seems reasonable.

The numbers to the left are included for comparison to Table IV, and do not appear in the actual survey.

Each subject responded to this set of fragments by

choosing the statement that was most reasonable to them. Depending on the statement selected, the subject would continue on to another set of fragments, or would be finished with the survey. As shown in Table V, there are two ways to be finished with the survey after the first fragment topic: by choosing #3 (no influence) or by choosing #2 (none of these options seems reasonable).

Figure 7 reveals that 80-89% of the subjects chose option #4, and continued on to the next set of statements listed under the next fragment topic.

The ability to "opt out" by choosing option #2 is present in every fragment topic. The idea was to ensure that if the selection of fragments topics or derived statements was not "likely" or reasonable, the data would reveal the problem--in the form of many subjects "opting out" or explaining reservations about the statements.

Through the series of fragment topics presented, it was possible for subjects to chain together pieces of argument by selecting certain options one at a time. The *option-path* survey instrument was designed with the idea in mind that in order to reach certain conclusions, a number of fragments (derived from the mainstream press) are necessary. In structuration theory, ideas, knowledge, and lived experience are "fractionated" by the modes of domination. This means that subjects would

evaluate the pieces of an argument differently than they would evaluate a simple conclusion to a particular argument. It was predicted in the fifth hypothesis that through this piecemeal approach, subjects would reveal conflicts in policy that do not seem to be present at the level of value.

H₅ Subjects will choose subject fragments for democracy and capitalism that interact.

The "chaining" of statements in the survey means that it is difficult to reach the end points of the chains presented. Given the statements present in the instrument, certain choices will deflect the subject away from the rest of the argument chain. Table V shows the odds of "opting out" on a given fragment topic if the data were random.

In the very first set of statements, for example, half of the options available (50%) will result in the argument progressing no further toward the end of the chain. Random chance would dictate that the odds of making it through every set of statements to reach the end of the chain is 192 in 10,000 (or about 1 in 50).

The end of the chain represents the highest level of conflict in democracy and capitalism as brought together in the elements that make up the chain: At this point, subjects have argued for the existence of advertising influence, the consistency of its effects, the peculiarity of its interests, and then have went on

TABLE V
ODDS OF PROGRESSING THROUGH ARGUMENT
CHAIN GIVEN RANDOM DATA

Fragment Topic	Odds
TELEVISION ADVERTISING INFLUENCE	50%
TELEVISION ADVERTISING INFLUENCE UNIQUENESS	75%
TELEVISION ADVERTISING EXPOSURE TIME	80%
TELEVISION ADVERTISING INFLUENCE CONSISTENCY	80%
TELEVISION ADVERTISING INTERESTS	80%
NECESSITY OF A WELL-INFORMED SOCIETY	50%
NECESSITY OF MANY VIEWS AND INTERESTS	40%
NECESSITY OF DIVERSE VIEWS AND INTERESTS	50%

to argue with other fragments that a publicly influential medium must represent diversity, not speciality. This is, of course, limited to television advertising; but even in this area of focus there is implied conflict that was not revealed in the newspaper articles. It would appear that many people perceive a narrow range of interests in television advertising that precludes the form of capitalist competition whereby the public is sufficiently informed to make good decisions.

Figure 7 graphically displays the frequency of "paths" (chains of statements) actually chosen by

Figure 7. Option-path map of statements.

subjects in the sixth data collection.

This representation indicates that from 40 to 49 percent of the seventy-three subjects selected statements from those presented so as to finish the fragmented argument in its entirety. The actual number of subjects reaching statement #36 at the end of the chain is 35 of the 73 subjects, or 47.9 percent.

Table VI lists the fragments of the most common option path chosen. None of the most common fragments are "with reservations", and none of them is a dead end. This tends to support the notion that the fragments gathered from the mainstream press are not perceived as unreasonable.

One unintended consequence of the option-path design revealed itself in subjects' occasional decisions to "opt out" by choosing statement number 2. In the very first set of statements provided, a total of seven subjects chose the option "None of these statements seems reasonable". This seemed quite dismaying at first--the implication being that a number of subjects were not inclined at all to follow the argument chain being developed. Upon inspection of their stated reasons for "opting out", however, a very plausible explanation arose.

All seven subjects remarked that television advertising has a tremendous influence on those who are

exposed to it. One subject wrote, "TV advertising has an extreme effect on those who see it". Another reported, "U.S. commercials with repetition frequently have a brainwashing effect".

The logical option for these subjects to have chosen is #4 ("Television advertising has at least some influence on people who are exposed to it"), but because the statement was not strong enough, it did not seem reasonable to them.

It would probably lead to clearer responses in the option-path surveys if a fuller range of options was

TABLE VI
MOST COMMON OPTION PATH

1	(Starting point).
4	TV advertising has at least some influence on people who are exposed to it.
8	The influence of TV advertising is at least somewhat different from the influence of other forms of advertising.
13	The influence of TV advertising occurs primarily after long-term exposure.
18	TV advertising does tend to consistently influence those exposed to it in a particular way. The influence is not arbitrary.
21	TV advertising does tend to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.
27	It is at least somewhat important to have well-informed society to make good decisions.
30	A well-informed society does need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.
36	The views and interests that a well-informed society is exposed to must be diverse.

provided. However, it would be more difficult to remain true to the spirit of the newspaper articles used to gather and interpret fragments. There just were not any articles among those surveyed that suggested a "brainwashing effect", or anything else that strong.

At the policy level of perceived power relationships, in the specific instance examined, these data suggest that subjects view capitalism and democracy as interacting strongly. As much of the political-economy literature suggests, the means of public discourse are largely privately owned and controlled; or at least, many people perceive the situation this way.

The high percentage of subjects reaching the end of the option-path lends strong support to the fifth hypothesis.

RESULTS SUMMARY

Sample limitations and a few surprises notwithstanding, these data can be discussed and described in many ways. The cognitive-space maps alone constitute grounds for other lines of analysis. By itself, the option-path highlights some interesting perceived relationships that speak to several theories, including cultivation theory and cognitive dissonance. More investigation is warranted, and these topics are discussed in the final chapter.

In terms of the hypotheses and purposes advanced herein, the specific theory of fractionation is supported by the results. Combining the Stage I results with the Stage III results, the predicted relationships hold. Subjects perceptions of capitalism and democracy at the more abstract value level differ substantially from perceptions at the more specific policy level.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Fractionation is a large concept. Certainly it is too large to do it justice with a single narrow approach using one specific example. But these initial data are promising, and lead in a number of different directions. Critical theory, empiricism and philosophy have all contributed to the conceptualizations of this work, and it is my hope that the results speak meaningfully to all of three.

In the spirit of structuration, there is no reason that one method of coming to knowledge should not be used to inspire or inform another. More likely, it is impossible for philosophy, critical theory and other ways of thinking to avoid interaction. To isolate them unnecessarily is to promote a variety of fractionation that should be of particular concern in academic research.

Seen in this way, there is no reason to fault Marxist criticism as method, for example, merely because it does not come prepackaged to fit scientific method. On the contrary, if the ideas in a philosophy or theory seem important, we can search for ways to translate them

into various modes of expression. The evidence found here suggests that there is a conceptual link between Socrates, Lockean democracy, Marxist theory, and Giddens' structuration theory. A link with such broad implications ought not be limited to a single framework, particularly since that would be contrary to its diverse origins.

Beginning with a discussion of the limitations of these results, the remainder of this chapter is devoted to ideas for improvements and new directions of study.

THREATS TO VALIDITY

This initial attempt to approach a coherent fractionation theory leaves much room for improvement and refinement. Fortunately, most of the limitations provide the impetus for further investigation of the subject, rather than delivering confusing and discouraging results.

The largest limitation is probably the sample, which leaves the results unable to speak reliably beyond United States students in their first two years of college. The degree to which this limitation undercuts the value of the work depends a great deal upon what happens next. Fractionation theory predicts that these data would be reproduced with a wide array of subjects including any individuals likely to be

found in a general sample of the U.S. population. Even among the population represented here, more subjects would be needed in the sample sub-groups to verify what the results imply: For instance, that "power" is perceived differently at the abstract level by people with "expressive" majors as opposed to "productive" majors.

Another problem is that the option survey needs to be refined. As it is written, a tenth of the subjects (seven of seventy-three) were unable to find a "reasonable statement" in the first fragment topic area. The explanations given by the subjects are extremely interesting, as every one of them was looking for *stronger* statements that could only have strengthened the option-path results. This clearly indicates the link to media framing that was implicated in the theory chapter: Some subjects apparently perceive that television advertising is profoundly powerful and profoundly narrow in its representations. The difficulty is that there is really no way to know what the subjects would have done if they had actually been given some stronger statements to choose from.

As a final note on the limitations of this work, there was one notable instance where a subjects seemed reluctant to express opinions about the subjects addressed in the surveys. This reluctance did not come

from any aversion to the survey instrument. Rather the subject seemed to believe that she was not competent to express opinions on the subject matter. In the combined key word survey described as data collection #2, this subject wrote nothing on the survey except, "I don't know enough about politics".

On the one hand, it is tempting to pass quickly over this response, though it is appealingly consistent with the modes of domination: Society has convinced someone that they don't know enough to express an opinion--very powerful fractionation indeed. It is possible that if this sort of feeling runs generally through the population, many subjects might be reluctant to choose a strong position. It is possible that this one subject expressed what many more were thinking and feeling. And it is exactly this sort of difficulty that might confound the results: Subjects may for various reasons respond to the surveys in ways that do not reflect their perceptions. At this time there is no way to know for sure.

The indications, however, are that if anything the opposite problem was predominant: Subjects wanted to argue stronger statements, and were not generally afraid of expressing a definite point of view. This idea is supported by the subjects who opted out at the start and explained that none of the options seemed reasonable

because none of the statements were strong enough. The likely conclusion is that there were some subjects who experienced reticence about expressing their views, and there were some subjects who wanted to take very strong positions. Most of the subjects were somewhere in between.

In keeping with the concurrent and reciprocal notion of structuration, the reluctant subject in some ways speaks volumes. In telling me that she does not know enough about politics to respond usefully to the capitalism and democracy survey, she is telling me that she interpreted the survey as being about politics (not about economics or philosophy, but specifically about politics--a key word in the democracy word list). This could be a sign of fractionation writ large.

One cannot not communicate.

FUTURE STUDIES

Primarily, replication is called for. By relying on different subject samples, by choosing different value concepts and policy fragments, and by expanding the option-path survey form to include a fuller range of options, the scope of this work can be greatly enhanced. The issues at stake are certainly relevant enough to warrant the effort.

In the process of conducting this research, a

number of intriguing and unexpected avenues of investigation cropped up. Some avenues seem to lead away from the specific fractionation theory and others seem to support it fully. A few of the major possibilities are described below.

Graduate Student Seminar Project

Before this research had taken form as a thesis, some preliminary work was conducted as part of a graduate level class project. There were only fourteen subjects, but the format of the project was basically the same as has been presented here, using multidimensional scaling and the option-path style surveys. The subjects were all speech communication graduate students from two different groups; a graduate study group and a class seminar. In this case, the topics and fragments were somewhat different, having been selected without reference to any newspaper articles.

Even with this small sample and less formal procedures, the cognitive space map was very similar to the one generated here: There was a major cluster for democracy and capitalism respectively (with democracy broken into two major sub-clusters), the word "individual" crossed over to the democracy side of the map, etc. One person even "opted-out" at the first set of statements, with the following explanation, "I don't

see my point of view here."

If the expressive/productive split has any meaning, then these speech graduates were "expressives"--they associated power very strongly with the collective democracy sub-group that included government, public, representation, vote, and politics.

This points to several interesting possibilities. Primarily, it would be worth examining several educational levels: no college education, Bachelor's, Master's, Ph. D., etc. The nature of the cognitive space map may be importantly tied to the level of education, or just as likely to the subject's field of study.

If such important relationships were found, the explanation might tend to strengthen or weaken fractionation theory. I suspect that a refinement would result that would narrow the definition of what constitutes fractionation.

Multidimensional Scaling Interpretations

In analyzing the cognitive-space maps generated through multidimensional scaling, the fourth dimensional solution showed promise. One of the maps generated indicated that in four dimensions, there is a perspective from which the clusters take on an interesting configuration. In the fourth dimension the capitalism cluster, the autonomous democracy cluster,

and the collective democracy cluster appear to be in a straight line. Capitalism and autonomous democracy are on either end, with collective democracy in between them. Given that the data consists of words derived from two key concepts, and that the multidimensional solutions reveal three important clusters rather than two, this relationship bears examination. The middle cluster stands *between* the other two, as if capitalism and autonomous democracy are only related through collective democracy. It is tempting to interpret the collective democracy cluster as being a conduit, a mediator, or even a blocker: Perhaps it is the case that collective power, or government, mediates and communicates between social and economic concerns. Perhaps the three clusters resolve into the equivalents of "social", "political", and "economic" interests.

Whether this interpretation has validity would require a more discriminating study, particularly since this perspective does not appear until the fourth dimensional solution. The relationship appears to be quite subtle.

Media Framing

Without extending the multidimensional scaling at all, further research could shed some light on the modes of domination merely by performing a more thorough and rigorous exploration of the mainstream press. It is

interesting that many subjects are inclined toward the missing option (something like "TV advertising has a huge influence on people who are exposed to it") in the option-path survey, and yet such a position is not widely supported in the rhetoric of mainstream newspapers.

The most intriguing explanation is that the means of public discourse (in this case mainstream mass media) are privately owned and controlled, resulting in media portrayals of TV advertising that do not represent or speak to the views of large sectors of the public. What makes this so interesting is that it precisely describes the type of "clash" between democracy and capitalism that subjects were asked to examine in the option-path survey.

From the political-economy perspective or the cultivation theory perspective (Bowles & Gintis, 1986; Gerbner et al., 1986), this simply means that politics and economy are not the separate entities that we imagine them to be in the abstract. This is probably the most compelling idea to come of this examination of fractionation, because it removes some of the narrow constraints built into the design of this thesis.

Specifically, it may not be necessary to scrupulously avoid implying particular actors in power relations. The modes of domination, discussed

conservatively in Chapter III, may begin to be seen as being significantly acted on by identifiable interests. If in further study, the power relations move from the implicit to the explicit realm, then we will understand a great deal more about fractionation and its unique forms in this society.

The Subtleties of Power

Power is a term that draws interest. The multidimensional scaling revealed that power shifts subtly depending on the sub-group being examined. Assuming that power is an important term in interpreting the key concepts of capitalism and democracy, then there are other investigations that might illuminate this more clearly.

One approach might be to collect information regarding the subjects' socio-economic backgrounds. An examination of wealthy professionals might compare very interestingly with an examination of inner-city low income earners. Fractionation theory suggests that both groups would deliver similar results in some ways: The major clusters should not change too much in the multidimensional scaling. The option-path surveys may look very different however. It is also possible that while two such groups agree generally about the state of affairs between the two key concepts, their explanations of how or why would be very different. In any case, the

word "power" would hopefully be highlighted by the results, and self-efficacy might prove an important consideration in how power is conceptualized.

SUMMARY

The borders of fractionation are wide open. It might happen when economic issues are unrealistically separated from politics and social issues. It might happen when network news broadcasts or U.S. News and World Reports portray the 1991 Los Angeles riots as a "race conflict" rather than as a class conflict--in spite of the fact that the rioters were not only black, but also Hispanic, white, and a number of other ethnic groups. The possibility that the common denominator was (and is) disenfranchisement (not skin color), is perhaps being overlooked in the re-collection processes of American culture.

If so, then there is a great deal of work to be done. It will not be work ending in utopia the moment that hidden power relationships are laid bare. Rather, it will be the perpetual work of structuration in process, the endless dialogue that Socrates recommended to us all. And if Socrates is to be believed, then the work is its own reward. The utopia we can live without.

REFERENCES CITED

- Boggs, C. (1980). Gramsci's Marxism. Southampton, Great Britain: The Camelot Press Limited.
- Boggs, C. (1984). The Two Revolutions: Gramsci and the Dilemmas of Western Marxism. Boston: South End Press.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1986). Democracy & Capitalism: Property, Community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Clark, D. L. (1957). Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dahlgren, P. (1981). *TV News and the Suppression of Reflexivity* (pp. 101-113). In E. Katz & T. Szecsko's Mass Media and Social Change. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N. (1986). *Living with Television: The Dynamics of the Cultivation Process*. In Perspectives on Media Effects, eds. J. Bryant & D. Zillmann. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Hirsch, E. D. (1987). Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hutchins, R. M., Editor in Chief. (1952). Great Books of the Western World: Locke, Berkeley, Hume. Includes: *A Letter Concerning Toleration*; *Concerning Civil Government, Second Essay*; *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, by John Locke. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Hutchins, R. M., Editor in Chief. (1952). Great Books of the Western World: Plato. Includes: *The Dialogues of Plato*, translated by B. Jowett; *The Seventh Letter*, translated by J. Harward, reprinted from *The Platonic Epistles*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

- Giddens, A. (1979). Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. Reprint, 1990. Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). The Whole World is Watching: The Mass Media and the Making and Unmaking of the New Left. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1982). *Television's Screens: Hegemony in Transition*. In American media and Mass culture. D. Lazere, Ed. (1987). Berkeley, California: University of California Press. Excerpted from Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, ed. Michael W. Apple (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982).
- Golden, J. L., Berquist, G. F. & Coleman, W. E. (1989). The Rhetoric of Western Thought, Fourth Edition. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Kruskal, J. B. & Wish, M. (1976). "Multidimensional Scaling." Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Application in the Social Sciences, 07-011. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.
- Lerner, M. (1991). Surplus Powerlessness: The Psychodynamics of Everyday Life...and the Psychology of Individual and Social Transformation. New Jersey and London: Humanities Press International, Inc.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1990). Inquiry and Change. New York: Vail-Ballou Press
- McCormack, T. (1986). *Reflections on the Lost Vision of Communication Theory* (pp. 34-42). In Ball-Rokeach, S. J., & Cantor, M. G. (Eds.), Media, Audience and Social Structure. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mumby, D. (1988). Communication and Power in Organizations: Discourse, Ideology and Domination. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Ollman, B. (1993). Dialectical Investigations. New York ■ London: Routledge.

- Rouse, W. H. (1956). Great Dialogues of Plato.
Warmington, E. H. & Rouse, P. G., Eds. (1984). New
York: New American Library.
- Schaaf, G. (1978). The Great Law of Peace and the
Constitution of the United States of America.
Pamphlet: Tree of Peace Society.
- Signorielli, N, Morgan, M., eds. (1990). Cultivation
Analysis: New Directions in Media Effects Research.
Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

BASIC INFORMATION

D

Age: _____

Sex: M [] F []

Formal Education (years past high school): _____

Major (if applicable):

☐ Business	☐ Engineering
☐ Fine and Performing Arts	☐ Humanities
☐ Mathematics and Science	☐ Professional
☐ Social Sciences	☐ Other _____

Primary Occupation (current or most recent):

☐ Administration/management	☐ Student
☐ Artist, musician, performer	☐ Education
☐ Homemaker	☐ Military
☐ Manufacturing, blue collar	☐ Professional
☐ Clerical, sales, services	☐ Other

Ethnicity:

☐ Asian or Asian-American	☐ European-American
☐ African-American	☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American	☐ Other

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What does democracy mean to you?

2. When you think about democracy, what are some words or phrases that come to mind?

 BASIC INFORMATION

C

Age: _____

Sex: M [] F []

Formal Education (years past high school): _____

Major (if applicable):

☐ Business	☐ Engineering
☐ Fine and Performing Arts	☐ Humanities
☐ Mathematics and Science	☐ Professional
☐ Social Sciences	☐ Other _____

Primary Occupation (current or most recent):

☐ Administration/management	☐ Student
☐ Artist, musician, performer	☐ Education
☐ Homemaker	☐ Military
☐ Manufacturing, blue collar	☐ Professional
☐ Clerical, sales, services	☐ Other

Ethnicity:

☐ Asian or Asian-American	☐ European-American
☐ African-American	☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American	☐ Other

 QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What does capitalism mean to you?

2. When you think about capitalism, what are some words or phrases that come to mind?

BASIC INFORMATION

DC1

Age: _____

Sex: M [] F []

Formal Education (years past high school): _____

Major (if applicable):

☐ Business	☐ Engineering
☐ Fine and Performing Arts	☐ Humanities
☐ Mathematics and Science	☐ Professional
☐ Social Sciences	☐ Other _____

Primary Occupation (current or most recent):

☐ Administration/management	☐ Student
☐ Artist, musician, performer	☐ Education
☐ Homemaker	☐ Military
☐ Manufacturing, blue collar	☐ Professional
☐ Clerical, sales, services	☐ Other

Ethnicity:

☐ Asian or Asian-American	☐ European-American
☐ African-American	☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American	☐ Other

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What does capitalism mean to you?
2. When you think about capitalism, what are some words or phrases that come to mind?
3. What does democracy mean to you?
4. When you think about democracy, what are some words or phrases that come to mind?

BASIC INFORMATION

DC2

Age: _____

Sex: M [] F []

Formal Education (years past high school): _____

Major (if applicable):

☐ Business	☐ Engineering
☐ Fine and Performing Arts	☐ Humanities
☐ Mathematics and Science	☐ Professional
☐ Social Sciences	☐ Other _____

Primary Occupation (current or most recent):

☐ Administration/management	☐ Student
☐ Artist, musician, performer	☐ Education
☐ Homemaker	☐ Military
☐ Manufacturing, blue collar	☐ Professional
☐ Clerical, sales, services	☐ Other

Ethnicity:

☐ Asian or Asian-American	☐ European-American
☐ African-American	☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American	☐ Other

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do democracy and capitalism mean to you?

2. When you think about capitalism and democracy, what are some words or phrases that come to mind?

BASIC INFORMATION

Age: _____

Sex: M [] F []

Formal Education (years past high school): _____

Major (if applicable):

☐ Business	☐ Engineering
☐ Fine and Performing Arts	☐ Humanities
☐ Mathematics and Science	☐ Professional
☐ Social Sciences	☐ Other _____

Primary Occupation (current or most recent):

☐ Administration/management	☐ Student
☐ Artist, musician, performer	☐ Education
☐ Homemaker	☐ Military
☐ Manufacturing, blue collar	☐ Professional
☐ Clerical, sales, services	☐ Other

Ethnicity:

☐ Asian or Asian-American	☐ European-American
☐ African-American	☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American	☐ Other

INSTRUCTIONS:

- I. Please respond to the demographics information at the top half of this form.
- II. The cards you have been given have words on them. Please sort these words into piles, in a way that makes sense to you. You may have as few or as many piles as you like, with as many or as few words as you like in each pile.
- III. When you are finished sorting, please mark the WORD LIST (second page) sheet as follows:
 - A. Take your first pile of words--it doesn't matter which pile it is. Find each word in that pile on the list of words provided. In the blank next to each of those words, write in the number "1".
 - B. Take your next pile of words, and follow the procedure above, except that you should write the number "2" in each blank. Continue until each word in each pile has a number written next to it on the sheet provided.

WORD LIST

_____ BUSINESS
_____ CHOICE
_____ COMPETITION
_____ DECISION
_____ ECONOMIC
_____ ENTERPRISE
_____ FREEDOM
_____ FREE SPEECH
_____ GOVERNMENT
_____ INDIVIDUAL
_____ MARKET
_____ MONEY
_____ POLITICS
_____ POWER
_____ PUBLIC
_____ REPRESENT
_____ RIGHT
_____ SUCCESS
_____ SUPPLY
_____ VOTE

BASIC INFORMATION

Age: _____

Sex: M [] F []

Formal Education (number of years past high school): _____

Major (if applicable):

☐ Business	☐ Engineering
☐ Fine and Performing Arts	☐ Humanities
☐ Mathematics and Science	☐ Professional
☐ Social Sciences	☐ Other _____

Primary Occupation (current or most recent):

☐ Administration/management	☐ Student
☐ Artist, musician, performer	☐ Education
☐ Homemaker	☐ Military
☐ Manufacturing, blue collar	☐ Professional
☐ Clerical, sales, services	☐ Other

Ethnicity:

☐ Asian or Asian-American	☐ European-American
☐ African-American	☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American	☐ Other

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

This is an opinion questionnaire.

On the following page you will find a set of statements.

Please decide which statement is the most reasonable in your opinion.

Place an "X" on the line next to the statement you've chosen.

Then proceed to the next page indicated by the statement you've chosen. Please, do not turn to other pages.

There will be another set of statements for you to choose from on each indicated page.

There will be instructions at the end, indicating that you have finished the questionnaire.

If you have any questions about these instructions, please ask.

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?	
☐	Television advertising has NO influence on people who are exposed to it. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 18.
☐	Television advertising has AT LEAST SOME influence on people who are exposed to it If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 10.
☐	As above, but with reservations. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 5.
☐	None of these options seems reasonable. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.
Page 1	

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?	
☐	The influence of TV advertising IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT different from the influence of other forms of advertising. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 2.
☐	As above, but with reservations. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 21.
☐	The influence of TV advertising is NOT different from the influence of other forms of advertising. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 2.
☐	None of these options seems reasonable. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.
Page 10	

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?	
☐	The influence of TV advertising occurs PRIMARILY AFTER SHORT-TERM exposure. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 20.
☐	As above, but with reservations. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 6.
☐	The influence of TV advertising occurs PRIMARILY AFTER LONG-TERM exposure. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 20.
☐	As above, but with reservations. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 19.
☐	None of these options seems reasonable. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.
Page 2	

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?	
☐	TV advertising DOES NOT tend to consistently influence those exposed to it in any particular way. The influence IS arbitrary. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 16.
☐	As above, but with reservations. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 11.
☐	TV advertising DOES tend to consistently influence those exposed in a particular way. The influence is NOT arbitrary. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 16.
☐	As above, but with reservations. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 9.
☐	None of these options seems reasonable. If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.
Page 20	

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?	
☐	TV advertising DOES TEND to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 3.
☐	As above, but with reservations.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 17.
☐	TV advertising DOES NOT TEND to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 3.
☐	As above, but with reservations.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 22.
☐	None of these options seems reasonable.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.
	Page 16

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?	
☐	It is NOT important to have a well-informed society to make good decisions.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 18.
☐	It is AT LEAST SOMEWHAT important to have a well-informed society to make good decisions.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 7.
☐	As above, but with reservations.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 15.
☐	None of these options seems reasonable.
	If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.
	Page 3

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?

☐ A well-informed society DOES need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 14.

☐ As above, but with reservations.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 4.

☐ A well-informed society DOES NOT need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 18.

☐ As above, but with reservations.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 12.

☐ None of these options seems reasonable.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.

Page 7

In your opinion, which statement is the most reasonable?

☐ The views and interests that a well-informed society is exposed to MUST be diverse.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 18.

☐ As above, but with reservations.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 8.

☐ The views and interests that a well-informed society is exposed to NEED NOT be diverse.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 18.

☐ None of these options seems reasonable.

If you choose this statement, please proceed to page 13.

Page 14

When you are finished here, please continue to page 10.

The statement you have chosen is:

Television advertising has AT LEAST SOME influence on people who are exposed to it.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 5

When you are finished here, please continue to page 2.

The statement you have chosen is:

The influence of TV advertising IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT different from the influence of other forms of advertising.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 21

When you are finished here, please continue to page 20.

The statement you have chosen is:

The influence of TV advertising occurs PRIMARILY AFTER SHORT-TERM exposure. As above, but with reservations.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 6

When you are finished here, please continue to page 20.

The statement you have chosen is:

The influence of TV advertising occurs PRIMARILY AFTER LONG-TERM exposure.
As above, but with reservations.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 19

When you are finished here, please continue to page 16.

The statement you have chosen is:

TV advertising DOES NOT tend to consistently influence those exposed to it in
any particular way. The influence IS arbitrary.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 11

When you are finished here, please continue to page 16.

The statement you have chosen is:

TV advertising DOES tend to consistently influence those exposed in a
particular way. The influence is NOT arbitrary.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 9

When you are finished here, please continue to page 3.

The statement you have chosen is:

TV advertising DOES TEND to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 17

When you are finished here, please continue to page 3.

The statement you have chosen is:

TV advertising DOES NOT TEND to represent the views and interests of particular people in our society.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 22

When you are finished here, please continue to page 7.

The statement you have chosen is:

It is AT LEAST SOMEWHAT important to have a well-informed society to make good decisions.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 15

When you are finished here, please continue to page 14.

The statement you have chosen is:

A well-informed society DOES need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 4

When you are finished here, please continue to page 18.

The statement you have chosen is:

A well-informed society DOES NOT need to be exposed to many viewpoints and interests.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 12

When you are finished here, please continue to page 18.

The statement you have chosen is:

The views and interests that a well-informed society is exposed to MUST be diverse.

What are your reservations about this statement?

Page 8

You have finished the questionnaire!

Your assistance is appreciated greatly, and on behalf of academicians everywhere, I thank you for participating in this research.

Please turn in your questionnaire to the administering person(s).

Page 18

When you are finished here, please continue to page 18.

The statement you have chosen is:

None of these options seems reasonable.

Are there ideas, statements, or options that ought to be included here?

What other ideas occur to you that might be relevant to the subject of television advertising?

Page 13

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA FOR ALL SUBJECTS

This appendix presents detailed data regarding the multidimensional scaling and cluster analysis solutions for all subjects.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING AND CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR ALL SUBJECTS

TABLE VII

MONOTONIC SCALING (ALL SUBJECTS)

ITERATION	STRESS	ITERATION	STRESS
0	.087	8	.062
1	.074	9	.062
2	.068	10	.062
3	.065	11	.062
4	.064	12	.062
5	.063	13	.062
6	.063	14	.062
7	.062		

STRESS OF FINAL CONFIGURATION IS: .06181

Figure 8. Shepard diagram: All Subjects #1. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

Figure 9. Shepard diagram: All subjects #2. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

TABLE VIII

COORDINATES (ALL SUBJECTS)

VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION		VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION	
		1	2			1	2
X(1)	A	-1.06	.15	X(11)	K	-1.11	.10
X(2)	B	.98	.45	X(12)	L	-.92	.11
X(3)	C	-.95	.31	X(13)	M	.21	-1.01
X(4)	D	.72	.54	X(14)	N	-.39	-.66
X(5)	E	-1.02	-.12	X(15)	O	.59	-.55
X(6)	F	-1.01	.24	X(16)	P	.62	-.73
X(7)	G	1.01	.36	X(17)	Q	1.02	.33
X(8)	H	1.02	.25	X(18)	R	-.41	.67
X(9)	I	.22	-1.05	X(19)	S	-1.18	.10
X(10)	J	.73	.70	X(20)	T	.92	-.17

Figure 10. Tree-cluster diagram: All subjects. Complete linkage method (farthest neighbor).

APPENDIX C

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR EARLY
AND LATE DATA ANALYSIS

The following sets of tables and figures were derived by separating two sub-groups from the total subject pool. The "Early" sub-group is composed of subjects who performed card sorts at the start of their college speech course. The "Late" sub-group is composed of subjects who performed their card sorts at the end of their college speech course.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING AND CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR EARLY SUB-GROUP

TABLE IX

MONOTONIC SCALING (EARLY)

ITERATION	STRESS	ITERATION	STRESS
0	.088	7	.068
1	.077	8	.068
2	.072	9	.068
3	.070	10	.068
4	.069	11	.068
5	.068	12	.068
6	.068		
STRESS OF FINAL CONFIGURATION IS:		.06750

Figure 11. Shepard diagram: Early subjects #1. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

DISTANCES

SIMILARITIES

Figure 12. Shepard diagram: Early subjects #2. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

TABLE X

COORDINATES (EARLY SUBJECTS)

VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION		VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION	
		1	2			1	2
X(1)	A	-1.11	.11	X(11)	K	-1.10	.03
X(2)	B	.93	.52	X(12)	L	-1.01	.21
X(3)	C	-.91	.23	X(13)	M	.24	-1.04
X(4)	D	.63	.64	X(14)	N	-.14	-.45
X(5)	E	-1.04	-.20	X(15)	O	.57	-.73
X(6)	F	-1.04	.27	X(16)	P	.72	-.65
X(7)	G	.97	.36	X(17)	Q	.92	.46
X(8)	H	.90	.24	X(18)	R	-.38	.69
X(9)	I	.28	-1.07	X(19)	S	-1.18	-.07
X(10)	J	.80	.65	X(20)	T	.94	-.20

Figure 13. Tree-cluster diagram: Early subjects. Complete linkage method (farthest neighbor).

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING AND CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR LATE SUB-GROUP

TABLE XI

MONOTONIC SCALING (LATE SUBJECTS)

ITERATION	STRESS	ITERATION	STRESS
0	.086	7	.063
1	.074	8	.063
2	.069	9	.063
3	.066	10	.063
4	.065	11	.063
5	.064	12	.063
6	.064		

STRESS OF FINAL CONFIGURATION IS: .06303

DISTANCES

Figure 14. Shepard diagram: Late subjects #1. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

DISTANCES

Figure 15. Shepard diagram: Late subjects #2. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

TABLE XII

COORDINATES (LATE SUBJECTS)

VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION		VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION	
		1	2			1	2
X(1)	A	-1.04	.08	X(11)	K	-1.10	.16
X(2)	B	.99	.37	X(12)	L	-.95	-.01
X(3)	C	-.97	.26	X(13)	M	.18	-.99
X(4)	D	.81	.52	X(14)	N	-.49	-.69
X(5)	E	-.99	-.13	X(15)	O	.61	-.41
X(6)	F	-1.04	.17	X(16)	P	.63	-.76
X(7)	G	1.04	.33	X(17)	Q	1.02	.25
X(8)	H	1.07	.37	X(18)	R	-.53	.68
X(9)	I	.28	-1.02	X(19)	S	-1.07	.29
X(10)	J	.65	.68	X(20)	T	.90	-.17

Figure 16. Tree-cluster diagram: Late subjects. Complete linkage method (farthest neighbor).

APPENDIX D

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR EXPRESSIVE AND PRODUCTIVE DATA ANALYSIS

The following sets of tables and figures were derived by separating two sub-groups from the total subject pool. The "Expressive" sub-group is composed of subjects who declared the following majors in their demographics data: Fine and performing arts, social sciences, or humanities. The "Productive" sub-group, in contrast, declared these majors: Business, math & science, engineering, or professional.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING AND CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR EXPRESSIVE SUB-GROUP

TABLE XIII

MONOTONIC SCALING (EXPRESSIVES)

ITERATION	STRESS	ITERATION	STRESS
0	.080	7	.060
1	.070	8	.059
2	.065	9	.059
3	.062	10	.059
4	.061	11	.059
5	.060	12	.059
6	.060	13	.059
STRESS OF FINAL CONFIGURATION IS: .05913			

DISTANCES

Figure 17. Shepard diagram: Expressives #1. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

DISTANCES

Figure 18. Shepard diagram: Expressives #2. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

TABLE XIV

COORDINATES (EXPRESSIVES)

VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION		VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION	
		1	2			1	2
X(1)	A	-1.06	.08	X(11)	K	-1.10	.11
X(2)	B	.89	.49	X(12)	L	-.95	.20
X(3)	C	-.96	.03	X(13)	M	.24	-.93
X(4)	D	.85	.57	X(14)	N	-.20	-.87
X(5)	E	-1.03	-.09	X(15)	O	.69	-.52
X(6)	F	-1.01	.27	X(16)	P	.57	-.75
X(7)	G	.97	.39	X(17)	Q	.96	.45
X(8)	H	.93	.32	X(18)	R	-.59	.60
X(9)	I	.31	-.99	X(19)	S	-1.14	.21
X(10)	J	.78	.69	X(20)	T	.87	-.26

Figure 19. Tree-cluster diagram: Expressives. Complete linkage method (farthest neighbor).

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING AND CLUSTER ANALYSIS FOR PRODUCTIVE SUB-GROUP

TABLE XV

MONOTONIC SCALING (PRODUCTIVES)

ITERATION	STRESS	ITERATION	STRESS
0	.089	8	.066
1	.077	9	.066
2	.072	10	.066
3	.070	11	.066
4	.068	12	.066
5	.068	13	.066
6	.067	14	.066
7	.067		
STRESS OF FINAL CONFIGURATION IS:			.06600

DISTANCES

Figure 20. Shepard diagram: Productives #1. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

DISTANCES

Figure 21. Shepard diagram: Productives #2. Points are labeled with first object in pair.

TABLE XVI

COORDINATES (PRODUCTIVES)

VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION		VARIABLE	PLOT	DIMENSION	
		1	2			1	2
X(1)	A	-1.08	.15	X(11)	K	-1.13	.02
X(2)	B	.99	.47	X(12)	L	-.94	.08
X(3)	C	-.96	.28	X(13)	M	.36	-1.02
X(4)	D	.63	.52	X(14)	N	-.43	-.52
X(5)	E	-1.01	-.24	X(15)	O	.63	-.50
X(6)	F	-1.07	.22	X(16)	P	.81	-.62
X(7)	G	.99	.35	X(17)	Q	.92	.44
X(8)	H	1.01	.31	X(18)	R	-.55	.60
X(9)	I	.42	-1.03	X(19)	S	-1.13	-.09
X(10)	J	.54	.70	X(20)	T	.98	-.11

Figure 22. Tree-cluster diagram: Productives. Complete Linkage method (farthest neighbor).

APPENDIX E

LIST OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

1990

- "G.M.'s Response to 'Roger and Me'". The New York Times. January 31, 1990.
- "Super Bowl Ads Still Pull Well". The New York Times. January 31, 1990.
- "Broadcast TV Revenue". The New York Times. March 7, 1990.
- "G.M. is Top Spender". The New York Times. April 25, 1990.
- "Proctor and Gamble Pulls Some TV Ads Over Slur to Coffee". The New York Times. May 12, 1990.
- "Creativities Big Test: Surviving Research". The New York Times. May 21, 1990.
- "U.S. Ads Increasingly Attack Japanese and Their Culture". The New York Times. July 11, 1990.
- "Sell Cars, Not Racism". The New York Times. July 19, 1990.
- "Madison Avenue, Where Humor Can Get Some Respect". The New York Times. August 19, 1990.
- "Poll Says Young Watch Less TV than Thought". The New York Times. Sept 13, 1990.
- "Ads on Values by Burger King". The New York Times. November 5, 1990.

1991

- "Better Results on Super Bowl". The New York Times. February 1, 1991.
- "Ads During War News". The New York Times. February 20, 1991.
- "New Chanel Men's Scent Gets Provocative Campaign". The New York Times. March 5, 1991.
- "The War in Military Ads: What War?" The New York Times. March 8, 1991.

"Study Shows Power of Public Service Ads". The New York Times. April 8, 1991.

"Study on Children's TV Ads". The New York Times. April 22, 1991.

"Kid Consumers Pack Wallop and Learn to Discern". The Oregonian. June 17, 1991.

"AMC's 'Media Policy Committee' Workshop to Showcase 'Family Circle' Study: Key Media directors to Attend". The New York Times. August 10, 1991.

"We're Asking Too Much of Parental Responsibility". The New York Times. August 18, 1991.

"Commercial Clutter Up on Big Three Networks". The New York Times. October 4, 1991.

"2 Advocacy Groups Set for TV Duel". The New York Times. October 25, 1991.

"Bikini Ad Prompts Lawsuit". The New York Times. November 9, 1991.

"Talk Host Has Big Effect on News at 5". The Oregonian. November 14, 1991.

"And That Ten Yard Loss Was Brought to You By". The New York Times. November 19, 1991.

"Women's Beer-Commercial Lawsuit Taps Potential Flood of Censorship". The Oregonian. December 1, 1991.

1992

"CBS's Success in Super Bowl". The New York Times. January 24, 1992.

"High Recall Rate for Super Bowl Ads". The New York Times. January 30, 1992.

"'91 TV Revenue Off: First Drop Since '71". The New York Times. March 5, 1992.

"Mademoiselle Dumps Fiction for Fashion". The Oregonian. March 9, 1992.

"TV Cartoon Plans are Dropped". The New York Times. March 31, 1992.

"Tough Sell For Late News Shows". The New York Times. April 8, 1992.

"Americans for the Ancient Forests; Wilderness Society". The New York Times. April 30, 1992.

"Commercial Clutter is Still on the Rise". The New York Times. June 9, 1992.

"Putting the (Olympic) Torch to the Games' Commercials". The New York Times. August 11, 1992.

"Hollywood Discovers that a Picture is Worth 1000 Words". The Oregonian. August 30, 1992.

"American Express's Second Phase of Ads". The New York Times. August 31, 1992.

"What Does it Take to Get a Commercial on the Air?" The New York Times. September 27, 1992.

"Oregon Constitution Stars on First No on 9 Ad for TV". The Oregonian. September 29, 1992.

"The Stepford Channel: Informercials Have Lulled, Soothed and Mesmerized Americans into Forgetting the Difference Between Advertising and Entertainment". The New York Times. October 4, 1992.

"OCA Issues New Series of TV Ads in Favor of Measure 9". The Oregonian. October 22, 1992.

"Coors vs. Anheuser: One More Round". The New York Times. November 11, 1992.

"No Accounting for Taste; and Agency Gives it a Shot". The New York Times. November 23, 1992.

"1992: The Year the Mundane Became Commonplace". The New York Times. December 31, 1992.

1993

"Drug Industry Exerts Influence Over Medical System Making Medicine". The Oregonian. January 4, 1993.

"The Quintessential Consensus Builder". The Oregonian. January 17, 1993.

"The Long and Short of Increasingly Infrequent 15-second Spots". The New York Times. January 27, 1993.

"Few Advertisers for Gay Programs". The New York Times. January 28, 1993.

"Meet Some Other Super Sunday Losers: Pepsi and Nike for Instance". The New York Times. February 2, 1993.

"Fewer TV Messages During Prime Time". The New York Times. February 10, 1993.