



CENTRAL STATES COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

SCHOLARSHIP SUPPLEMENT

OCTOBER 2018, VOLUME 86, ISSUE 3 (SCHOLARSHIP SUPPLEMENT)

Editor's Welcome

Sara Baker Bailey
Southern Connecticut State University

I am pleased to announce that the CSCA book review supplement has expanded its reach to include a wide variety of scholarship that may be of interest to our membership. The scholarship review supplement will now include not only scholarly book reviews, but popular press as well. In addition to book reviews, we are adding spotlight essays from authors published in our CSCA journals and award-winning conference papers.

This issue of the scholarship review includes three books reviews and a series of spotlight essays highlighting recently published scholarship from our CSCA journals: *Communication Studies* & the *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*.

This issue of the scholarship review features:

· An essay from Kody Frey and Jessalyn Vallade recently published in the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*.

· An essay from Yea-Wen Chen & Brandi Lawless and an essay from Eric Karikari & Christopher Brown highlighting their work in the 2018 Communication Studies special issue "Connections and Inclusions: Intercultural Communication in Communication Studies Scholarship" edited by Ahmet Atay and Alberto Gonzalez.

Book reviews:

1. Small (2017) *Someone To Talk To*
2. Kennerly and Pfeister (Eds.) (2018) *Ancient Rhetorics and Digital Networks*
3. Rudick, Golsan, & Cheesewright (2018) *Teaching from the Heart: Critical Communication Pedagogy in the Communication Classroom*



Courtesy of SCSU

Book Review Call: Spring 2019

For the spring scholarship supplement, I am currently seeking reviews for the following books:

Author	Title	Publisher
Dale Hample	Interpersonal Arguing	Peter Lang
Kurt Lindemann	Composing Research, Communicating Results: Writing the Communication Research Paper	Wiley-Blackwell
Keri K. Stephens	Negotiating Control: Organizations and Mobile Communication	Oxford University Press

Additionally, if you have a publication that may be of interest for the scholarship review, please forward your recommendations.

To be considered for a review of the above publications, email Sara Baker Bailey at bakers21@southernct.edu with:

1. Name of the publication you wish to review
2. A brief (200-word) explanation as to how the publication fits within your areas of interest/expertise.

If selected, CSCA will provide a copy of the assigned publication to the selected reviewer. Submissions must not be under review by other publications. Reviews should adhere to the most recent edition of the publication manual of the American Psychological Association. The editor has reserved final discretion regarding the publication of all reviews. I would love to hear from you. Please contact me with questions, comments, and feedback:

Sara Baker Bailey
Assistant Professor, Southern Connecticut State University
Bakers21@southernct.edu
(203) 392-5596

Scholarship Spotlight:

What Happens When the Basic Course Isn't Just About Public Speaking Skills?

At a variety of institutions across the country, the basic course serves primarily first-year students by equipping them with the necessary communication skills to succeed in their academic careers. Generally, the course concentrates on the development of students' public speaking skills; however, several institutions place equal importance on the simultaneous development of students' writing capabilities to reflect changing general education requirements. At the University of Kentucky, this format for the basic course is referred to as the basic composition and communication course (BCCC). Students enrolled in the BCCC take part in a two-course sequence in which they are exposed to both written and oral communication content to build skills in both areas. These skills are then assessed through two major projects in the form of a research-based informative essay and a research-based informative speech, respectively. In a recent article published in the *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, authors Kody Frey and Jessalyn Vallade explore whether this course format is helpful or harmful to student beliefs about their overall growth.

We sought to examine students' reports of self-efficacy over the course of the semester. Although not a direct measure of learning, strong evidence linking reports of self-efficacy to students' actual levels of achievement suggests a promising avenue for those interested in nuanced approaches to their own basic courses. Furthermore, the highly-contextualized nature of self-efficacy allows for the examination of separate developments in both academic domains. Said differently, students may feel competent in one area following instruction (e.g., writing) but less capable in another (e.g., public speaking). Previous research concerning the BCCC shows mixed evidence regarding whether students sustain their newly-developed skills across both content areas. This rationale led to two research questions examining whether writing and public speaking self-efficacy increased from the beginning to the end of the semester.

One potential explanation for different levels of development in students' perceived capabilities comes from their individual mastery experiences. Mastery experiences are conceptualized as one's reflection on the success or failure of a task as a means of assessing one's own capabilities in that area. In the BCCC, the researchers reasoned grades provide an opportunity for students to reflect on how well they have mastered material. Thus, students should use their grades on the informative essay and the informative speech in order to interpret their own writing and speaking abilities. This reasoning resulted in two additional hypotheses suggesting that students' grades on the two major projects would be related to the increases they report in writing and public-speaking self-efficacy over time.

Testing the research questions and hypotheses:

The research was conducted from an ongoing assessment project of the first course of the two-semester BCCC sequence. Three hundred eighty students from the course completed an online questionnaire during the first two weeks of the semester (pretest) and again during the final two weeks (posttest). Final grades on the major projects were collected with permission from the individual course instructors.

Research Findings:

- Students reported higher self-efficacy scores for both writing and public speaking self-efficacy at the end of the semester compared to the beginning.
- Informative essay and informative speech grades were positively related to increases (posttest minus pretest) in both writing self-efficacy and public speaking self-efficacy.

What does this mean for instructors teaching the BCCC?

Holistically, the results support the practicality of the BCCC format and suggest several practical implications for teaching both within the BCCC format and in general. First, instructors should consider instituting frequent opportunities for reflection throughout their courses. One strategy for doing so comes from the specific scaffolding of assignments and activities throughout the semester. For example, the BCCC at UK incorporates several opportunities for reflection, including post-essay and post-speech videos. Simply providing students with opportunities for mastery may not motivate them to enhance their efficacy, so strategic reflective activities prior to the completion of major assignments help students reflect on their performances adaptively.

Second, it is important for instructors and course directors to remember that grades function as more than just outcomes. For many students, grades are an important part of the learning process that can motivate individuals to increase or decrease their own efficacy beliefs. Instructors should be mindful of this in the way they present feedback to students as well as when they are training new instructors on techniques for effective feedback.

Finally, the importance of grades as mastery experiences means instructors should consider ways in which they discuss grades with their students. Ideally, instructors will emphasize the students' role in their success; success stems from students' adaptive performances on the various smaller assignments leading to the major projects. Such an approach may help limit the effects of the grade-oriented and academically entitled students permeating today's classrooms.

(Continues on page 5)

There are several limitations to the research. Future assessment may want to consider the impact of individual course and instructor differences on student outcomes. BCCC instructors receive standardized training for the course, yet a limited amount of time is allotted to grade norming practices among instructors. Moreover, the basic course across institutions remains in a state of flux. Students can choose to enroll in hybrid, online, honors, or discipline-specific sections that may influence their motivation and efficacy. There is potential to account for these effects through hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), though future research is needed to investigate this possibility.

Ultimately, we hope that individuals at institutions with a course format similar to the BCCC can use this information to spark a conversation surrounding the best practices for assessing student outcomes. In doing so, we can continue to forward communication as an integral discipline to our universities and enhance the value of our basic courses in preparing students for future success.

About the authors: Kody Frey is a doctoral student in the College of Communication and Information at the University of Kentucky. Jessalyn Vallade is the Director of Assessment for the College of Communication and Information at the University of Kentucky. This essay is based on the published article: Frey, T. K., & Vallade, J. (2018). Assessing students' perceptions of writing and public speaking self-efficacy in a composition and communication course. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, 1, 27-39. doi:10.31446/JCP.2018.08

Scholarship Spotlight:

"SWAP-ping" the Communication Classroom to Promote Difficult Conversations

Conversations about difference, power, and (in)equity are more important than ever, especially in today's politically uncertain time. Yet, such conversations can be upsetting and have been challenging and difficult in the mainstream communication classroom within U.S. colleges and universities. For instance, when framed through a lens of political neutrality, instructional communication research that privileges discourses of civility, teacher immediacy, and/or instructor credibility, without considering differentially positioned bodies and voices within the classroom, can function to censor, if not silence, such conversations. We, the authors, consider this problem within the space of a 2018 special issue published in *Communication Studies* dedicated to "Connections and Inclusions: Intercultural Communication in Communication Studies Scholarship." Specifically, we were inspired to respond to guest editors Ahmet Atay and Alberto Gonzalez's call to examine "connections between intercultural communications scholarship, and scholarship in other areas of the communication studies." In doing so, our essay brings together intercultural and instructional communication research to (re)think how to better promote difficult conversations in the mainstream communication classroom.

To achieve that end, we propose "SWAP-ping" the communication classroom to facilitate a collaborative and supportive climate in which instructors, facilitators, and students become co-learners who strive to speak as whole persons and be heard on their own terms. Our proposal builds on overlapping pillars of both critical intercultural communication and critical communication pedagogy (e.g., power and culture, identity and intersectionality, context and interaction, and praxis and social justice). Specifically, SWAP stands for: Shift the center and the margins; Will yourself to listen as a feeler/thinker/doer; Articulate intersectional reflexivity and inquiry; and Partner for social justice. Given the interlocking and differential systems of power and privilege (e.g., race, gender, class, and others), it is necessary to note that the intellectual/emotional/physical labor required of each member of a SWAP-ped classroom would vary.

Shifting the center and the margins: Challenging the invisible cultural norms in the mainstream communication classroom that privileges Eurocentrism and reifies whiteness/heterosexism/classism, conscious, and intentional efforts are needed to shift and (re)shuttle the often unchallenged relationship between the center and the margins in the mainstream communication classroom. Through pedagogical practices such as critical reflections, services learning, and simulations, every member of each class has opportunities to experience both their privileged and/or marginalized identity positions at various intersections. We urge instructors to centralize voices from the margins when selecting course materials and include readings from authors who identify as women, people of color, international, transgender, differentially abled, non-Christian, and more.

Willing oneself to listen as a feeler/thinker/doer: Resisting a narrow view of rationality that is rooted in the enlightenment tradition and has governed interactions within U.S. higher education, we extend active listening to conceptualize listening “in as a feeler/thinker/doer who attends to interplays of emotions, reflections, and actions” (Chen & Lawless, 2018, p. 381). Our conceptualization is informed by theories of affect and embodiment that prioritize lived experiences and approach the body as a vehicle, text, and site of knowledge construction about the self, others, and the world. In this view, the classroom becomes a space in which co-learners understand not only our own affective and embodied responses but also listen in to the lived/felt/enacted experiences of others.

Articulating intersectional reflexivity and inquiry: Responding to new challenges of an increasingly global and diverse world, we argue for a different kind of reflexivity that we term “intersectional reflexivity and inquiry.” As an ongoing process and deeply reflexive practice, articulating intersectional reflexivity and inquiry encourages co-learners in the communication classroom to reflect on their own voices and subjectivities; to consider how they help (re)shape the constructions and negotiations of others’ subjectivities; to gain critical consciousness of how our interactions are enabled/constrained by larger societal ideologies; and to participate in reflexive dialogues.

Partnering for social justice: Believing that social justice-based learning can better serve students and society’s best interests, partnerships in all types, shapes, and forms are required to help advance social justice work inside and outside the communication classroom. In one sense, intercultural communication and instructional communication teachers and scholars are natural partners in this endeavor. In another sense, local communities and nonprofit organizations are great partners for social justice to help expose stereotypes and misconceptions about people living in/on/across the margins. In still another sense, partnering for social justice centers on partnerships between, betwixt, and in-between differences.

The ultimate goal of SWAP-ping the mainstream communication classroom is to better facilitate identity-based conversations across differential power relations in order to promote diverse voices, inclusive processes, and more just practices. U.S. higher education is undergoing great changes, and it is critical that communication scholars take this issue seriously. We the authors hope that our theoretical proposal can serve as a catalyst to instigate more and further conversations and collaborations between intercultural communication and instructional communication teachers and scholars to make communication classroom work for everyone.

About the authors: Yea-Wen Chen is an Associate Professor in the School of Communication at San Diego State University. Brandi Lawless is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of San Francisco. This essay is based on the article: Chen, Y.-W., & Lawless, B. (2018). Rethinking “difficult” conversations in communication instruction from an intercultural lens: Pedagogical strategies for “SWAP-ping” the communication classroom. *Communication Studies*, 69(4), 372-388. doi:10.1080/10510974.2018.1472117

Scholarship Spotlight:

Sensemaking in Turbulent Contexts

As a modern continent, Africa has been shaped largely by its unsettling encounter with the West through slavery, colonialism, and the postcolonial order precipitating the depletion of Africa's resources. This condition has also resulted in the 'othering' of non-Western leadership approaches, particularly in formal organizational settings. In a 2018 published article in the special issue "Connections and Inclusions: Intercultural Communication in Communication Studies Scholarship" published in *Communication Studies*, Drs. Eric Karikari and Christopher Brown contribute to the leadership and postcolonial scholarship by highlighting the leadership approaches of African student leaders in U.S. universities and how they make sense of their own organization's identity within a postcolonial context. We argue that the sensemaking process among leaders who operate in turbulent contexts is likely to deviate from traditional models of leadership practice. Such contexts include those of people from former colonial territories exhibiting sensemaking processes that are mediated, substantially, by impulses from the historically-situated colonial relationships as well as individuals' engagement with globalized, more dominant models of leadership.

In our study, we conducted in-depth interviews with seven leaders of African student organizations in the U.S. The aim of the study was to reveal the ways in which leaders' identities as Africans and their unique positions as neocolonial subjects complicate the approach of exercising leadership in their respective student organizations. They employed a postcolonial approach to show how these student leaders make sense of their position as the "other" in relation to their understandings of representation, culture, and identity.

Hybridized Voices and Discourses of Colonialism

We illuminated the connection between hybrid identities and resistance to – or accommodation of – colonial discourses that otherize Africans and other racial and ethnic minority groups in the U.S. We explained that leaders of African organizations are able to navigate their leadership practices by leveraging their hybrid identities – which largely result from a combination of their indigenous African cultures and the impulses of former colonial cultures. This enables them to talk simultaneously about the remnants of colonial discourses and existing forms of oppression that impact African people while problematically accommodating colonial discourses through mimicry. For instance, we discussed that these student leaders were concerned about negative African stereotypes that hinder the formation of healthy intercultural relationships with U.S. Americans, and generally positions Africans as uncivilized and mysterious, and therefore unfit for intercultural alliances. However, several of these leaders typically accommodated colonial discourses of African inferiority, particularly when engaging leadership practices that legitimized Western rationality and voices within narrowly constructed discursive spaces that privilege these forms of leadership.

Leadership as a Sensemaking Process

Globally, the literature on leadership and management is dominated by Western narratives which usually conceptualize leadership as embodied by an individual and enacted in a sufficiently structured environment. In this study, we analyzed how the leadership approaches of their study participants, while sometimes accommodating, still challenged Western forms of leadership within in these turbulent contexts. They explained that the contexts in which African student leaders operate are turbulent because they require the navigation and negotiation of their own identities, while also creating a coherent understanding of organizational vision, and organizing for collective action in an environment that tends to marginalize African forms of cultural expression. For instance, these student leaders consciously make it part of their leadership agenda and vision to emphasize counternarratives that highlight successful economic, social, and cultural ventures of African people that are often ignored within dominant Western narratives. For these student leaders, leadership is a complex process through which they must not only act on the basis of ethnic and cultural identities, but must also negotiate leadership practices that serve those who are nominally privileged within these turbulent contexts. Leadership in such terrains therefore proceeds through a sensemaking process that circumvents but also appropriates Western discourses.

Navigating Identities Through Discourse

The biggest challenge of leading in such turbulent contexts is the process of negotiating the organizations' vision – and identities – through what the authors termed postcolonial leadership. In our study, this leadership type corresponds with an approach where “leaders have to negotiate their own presence in White-dominated academic institutions and the postcolonial enactment of leading an organization that reflects their national and cultural identities.” This is also why these student leaders engage in a sensemaking process that allows them to unearth and stabilize the organization's purpose in conjunction with the aspirations and goals of the organizations' members. The sensemaking process enables leaders to retrospectively identify their organizations' goals and to situate them within the context of political consciousness about Africa and its relationship with the West. African student discourses of postcolonial leadership reveal that they engaged understanding and practices of leadership through their work in student organizations by challenging dominant discourses and ideologies through their work within their student organizations.

The focus on sensemaking is to emphasize the significance of context in leadership. That is, different leadership contexts require different skills and approaches. Particularly in such contexts as discussed above, the sensemaking process is useful for labeling organizational prerogatives. We sought to draw attention to the role of communication in bringing different theoretical concepts together to explain complex leadership experiences of African student leaders in U.S. universities. We argued “that communication is the linchpin that connects leadership to discourse within specific political, social, historical, or cultural contexts because it provides an important resource for creatively navigating such organizations.”

In conclusion, we assert that African students' postcolonial leadership and retrospective sense-making is a product of shifting and fluid sociohistorical circumstances impacted by the interplay of dominant understandings of leadership, colonialism, and globalization.

About the authors: Eric Karikari is an Assistant Professor in the Communication Studies Department at Towson University. Christopher Brown is an Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Communication Studies Department at the Minnesota State University, Mankato. This essay is based on the article: Karikari, E. & Brown, C. (2018). Sensemaking in turbulent contexts: African student leadership in a postcolonial context. *Communication Studies*, 69(4), 439-452. doi:10.1080/10510974.2018.1472126

Book Review:

Small (2017) *Someone to Talk To*

We confide in people on a regular basis, yet often without thoroughly examining why we chose that person to confide in. Scholars in Communication Studies have long been interested in disclosure (Wheeless & Grotz, 1976) and the management of private information (Petronio, Olson, & Dollar, 1989). As Small addresses in the beginning of his book, we often think of confidants as those we are close to and trust, and in fact in 1985 the General Social Survey added a question asking individuals to name those whom they had discussed important matters with (Small, 2017). The goal of this question, and the research resulting from it, assures us that individuals have a few close confidants who they confide in, spouses, family members, and best friends. Small argues that while this approach seems like common sense, that there are reasons to be concerned with these conclusions, (1) that what we think we do doesn't always match with reality, (2) that telling those we are closest to often poses the biggest risk, and (3) that we may be more willing to trust weak ties than we think we are. It is easy to assume that we only tell the people closest to us the important things in our life, but what about when we talk to our hairdresser about our marriage, or another academic about something that only another academic could understand? These people might not be the ones we label as confidants, yet circumstances and similarities provide an opportunity to confide in weaker ties. This book is dedicated to understanding how we choose people to confide in and is divided up into three main parts.

Part I: The Question

Part I is devoted to exploring the reason for this book, why confidants are important, the history of strong and weak ties, and the potential for exploring the nature of confidants in a more in-depth manner. The second portion of Part I is devoted to setting up the methodological process for exploring the changing nature of confidants. Specifically, Small and his research team interviewed whole cohorts of graduate students in three different areas: a laboratory science, a social science, and the humanities. The students were interviewed shortly after starting the program, 6 months into the program, 6 months after that, and then the final interview was one year later. The benefit of following graduate students is the amount of change they will experience in a short amount of time, and the opportunities they will have to seek help and guidance. Specifically, graduate students are "at greater risk for mental health issues than those in the general population. This is largely due to social isolation, the often abstract nature of the work and feelings of inadequacy -- not to mention the slim tenure-track job market" (Flaherty, 2018, para. 1). Not only does this book serve as a multi-method source on confidants, but also provides a realistic assessment of the challenges graduate students face. As scholars in a field where one of the areas we focus on is relationships, we have a unique ability to address some of the challenges graduate students face when confiding in those around them. Part II is an in-depth look at who graduate students label as confidants.

Part II: The First Year

Part II comprises the bulk of this book, with Chapters 2-6 focusing on the experiences of the graduate students in the three different programs. In chapter 2, Small focuses on the individuals who the graduate students label as part of their “core discussion network”, and how long they keep those ties. On page 41, he presents a graph of the first three waves of interviews, with lines indicating how long confidants were named. Although we may consider individuals in our core discussion network to be strong ties, Small finds that with the graduate students those individuals who they have important conversations with are often not those who they have the strongest ties with. Small suggests that there are three patterns to what happens with these individuals, students will (1) keep, (2) drop, and/or (3) replace confidants throughout their grad school experience. Chapter 3 explicates the difference between who we believe we will talk to, and who we actually talk to. In Chapter 4, Small goes on to discuss specific reasons why we may avoid confiding in those we are close to, with Chapter 5 summarizing why we specifically seek out weak ties to confide in. Finally, in Chapter 6 Small discusses how many times we don’t actively seek to confide in people, but rather circumstances happen that give us an opportunity to share private information we had no intention of disclosing.

Part III: Beyond

Graduate Students

In the final section of the book Small addresses the concern that graduate students are not like the general population. Using data from national surveys, Small concludes that the way in which graduate students decide to disclose information is similar to that of the general American population. I appreciate the multi-method approach that Small takes in this book, and that he starts by acknowledging the limitations of social network analysis, and the information inherently missing when looking at strong ties. Although I found the book interesting, and the graduate students’ experiences resonated with me, I’m not convinced that this book adds much in the way of new information to research in Communication Studies.

I would recommend this book to graduate students who are interested in hearing about the challenges other graduate students face, and to faculty members who are teaching an interpersonal class and would like to include a related book that approaches private information and confidants from a social network perspective. Overall, this book is a great in-depth look at the experiences of graduate students and an interesting read on confidants.

References

Flaherty, C. (2018, March 6). Mental health crisis for grad students. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/03/06/new-study-says-graduate-students-mental-health-crisis>

Petronio, S., Olson, C., & Dollar, N. (1989). Privacy issues in relational embarrassment: Impact on relational quality and communication satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports*, 6, 21-27.

Wheeless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1976). Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, 2, 338-346.

Kaitlin Phillips received her B.S. and M.S. from Texas Christian University and her PhD from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. She is an Assistant Professor of Communication Studies in the Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies Department at Utah State University, where she researches the interplay between family and personal identity focusing on how people create family identity and solidarity, and the perceptions of difference in relational quality across family members

Book Review:

Kennerly and Pfeister (Eds.) (2018) Ancient Rhetorics and Digital Networks

Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) do a superb job and brings together two concepts for the reader that easily allow the connections between ancient rhetoric and digital networks to be clearly understood and explained. In *Ancient Rhetoric and Digital Networks*, Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) combined together eleven essays that explore different methods, applications, and conversations regarding how theoretical frameworks and classical understandings of the ancient rhetorics can be used and applied to understanding the implications and applications of digital networks in the 21st century. This edited volume serves as a means for the reader to find the inscribed and underlying paths (Poroi) that exist in the vast seas (Pontos) that are our incredibly interconnected digital dependent world, as Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) explain in the introduction of this text.

The essays that are presented within the edited volume put together by Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) serve as a general overview and orientation to the different methodological and rhetorical approaches that can be used and applied to current phenomena pertaining to digital networks and how they influence, interact with, and shape our social and interconnected world. From essays on general overviews and orientations to the digital network field, to rhetorical applications for media studies, digital biology, and mediated multiplicity, the essays contained within Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) text serve as conversational starter pieces on each topic area that is presented by the authors of each individual essay. While some essays contained within the text seem to be more of a theoretical conversation piece regarding either ancient rhetoric or digital networks, without any clear or concrete connections or applications between the two areas, others provide in-depth and rich articulations of how ancient rhetorical theories and methods can be used to understand specific instances and phenomena regarding the impact and influence that digital networks have on our 21st century society. Specifically, this reviewer was very pleased to see how many of the traditional rhetorical methods that we often see discussed in our undergraduate rhetorical theory classrooms, or in the sections of our intro to communication courses that cover the traditions in ancient rhetorical theories, are discussed and used at length within the essays contained within this edited volume.

When reflecting upon how one could use this text in their teaching and research practices, this reviewer feels that this text could be used quite well in either an undergraduate or graduate classroom setting. All of the essays that are contained within this edited volume are written in a matter that they could be clearly understood and reflected upon in a junior or senior level undergraduate class, as well as within a graduate classroom that would allow for a more particular focus and lens of attention to be turned to the interconnections that exist between

ancient rhetoric and digital networks as it is presented within this book. Again, while some of the essays contained within this edited volume are not as clearly articulate in the application and connection of a theoretical understandings that exist between ancient rhetoric and digital networks, the ability to use this text as either an overarching text for an undergraduate class, or as an introductory text to a more advanced graduate course on ancient rhetoric and digital networks is clear. Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) have put together an edited volume that would serve well in the higher education classroom setting.

Looking at this volume from a research and professional application standpoint, Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) have clearly shown and articulated to this reviewer that works pertaining to the interconnections and interplay that exist in the 21st century between digital networks and ancient rhetorical methods are an area that communication scholars and practitioners should invest more time and attention towards. Understanding how ancient rhetorical theory is still applicable in a variety of venues and research areas, including those of new digital media technologies and contemporary public culture as is the focus of this text, helps to clearly articulate the fundamental role that a clear understanding and respect of ancient rhetorical theory still has for all of us within our discipline. Regardless of our content areas, methodological expertises, and dispositions towards either ancient rhetorical theory or digital networks and digital media research, Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) make the need for this text and the understanding of the interconnection between ancient rhetoric and digital networks explicitly clear by showing the reader the sensible nature that exists from applying ancient rhetorics within the interconnected web that is digital networks in the 21st century. The grounding that is provided within this work, and the orientation that this collection provides for the reader between the historical understandings that are required of ancient rhetorical theory and the contemporary applications and articulations of the influence and impacts that digital networks have today provide a reinvigoration and a reimagination of the application potential of ancient rhetorical theories in a variety of contexts and constructs across the communication discipline.

Overall, Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) provide an edited volume of eleven essays that not only spark interest in the interconnection between ancient rhetoric and digital networks, but also provide a means of furthering conversations and research regarding the essays and topic areas that are presented within this text. This reviewer wholeheartedly believes that this text could be used quite successfully in both undergraduate and graduate research and theory classes, as well as be used as a tool for those of us within the discipline to better hone our own individual crafts and provide ourselves with a better understanding of our own ways of using ancient rhetorics or other methods in new ways that allow us to better understand, interpret, critique, and communicate about the world that we live in. It is works such as the edited volume of *Ancient Rhetoric and Digital Networks* by Kennerly and Pfeister (2018) that provided this reviewer with hope that scholarship, research, teaching, and pedagogy within our discipline will continue to grow and flourish.

(Continues on page 16)

References

Kennerly, M. & Pfister, D. S. (2018). *Ancient Rhetorics and Digital Networks*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Keith Bistodeau received his B.S. and his M.A from North Dakota State University in Communication Studies. He is currently working on his Ed.D. in Educational Leadership at Hamline University. He is an instructor at Anoka Ramsey Community College, where his teaching focuses on introductory communication theory, interpersonal communication, and rhetorical communication. His research includes projects focusing on narrative analysis and the influence of whiteness.

Book Review:

Rudick, Golsan, & Cheesewright (2018). Teaching from the Heart: Critical Communication Pedagogy in the Communication Classroom

Critical communication pedagogy (CCP) challenges instructors to examine and respond to power through the examination of communicative practices (Fassett & Warren, 2007). In their book, *Teaching from the Heart: Critical Communication Pedagogy in the Communication Classroom*, Rudick, Golsan, and Cheesewright (2018) articulate a means by which instructors can work toward accomplishing this goal. Following the challenge of their late mentor, John T. Warren, the authors published this book as a means to continue “his legacy as a communication scholar who was deeply invested in continuing conversations about oppression and privilege through the communication class” (2018, p. 1).

The book is presented as a dialogic endeavor to introduce neophyte instructors to CCP and its social justice goals through the analysis of privilege and oppression. At times, the work reads like a textbook. At others, it reads like a scholarly conversation about inequality and social justice. This book is unique in that it provides readers with an autoethnographic approach to the application of CCP in the classroom. Each chapter begins with a reflexive account of one or more of the authors’ experiences, difficulties, and/or challenges relating to the chapter content. This approach demonstrates the authors’ vulnerability as teachers and learners and provides an effective introduction by emphasizing the idea that pedagogical acts are both nuanced and inherently laden with power.

Although instructors recognize the value of examining hegemonic action, they often experience difficulty facilitating it in the classroom (Kahl, 2017). For this reason, the real strength of this book is that avoids discussing CCP as a nebulous concept. Rather, the authors demonstrate CCP’s theoretical rigor and offer an applied approach to its facilitation. Thus, this is not simply a book about CCP; it is a book about how to do CCP. The authors accomplish this through a two-fold organizational structure.

The first part of the book (seven chapters) is dedicated to the examination of CCP. These chapters succinctly and effectively outline key questions that instructors must consider when attempting to employ CCP in the classroom. In the first section, the authors discuss important questions about the implementation of CCP (chapters 1 and 2), the importance of the seemingly mundane pedagogical choices (chapter 3), the role of assessment (chapter 4), the critical role of mentoring (chapter 5), pitfalls that can occur when attempting to engage in critical dialogue (chapter 6), and a discussion of the role of reflexivity in the communication classroom (chapter 7).

The second part of the book provides the means by which instructors can pragmatically facilitate CCP. In this section, the authors include 16 activities that instructors can use to employ CCP in the areas of relational orientation, institutional orientation, and cultural orientation. These activities were authored by myriad instructors who adopt a social justice perspective and actively integrate CCP into their classrooms.

The book has the potential to provide utility for a wide variety of audiences. Because of its accessible, clearly defined language, the book is appropriate for an advanced undergraduate audience. Also, because of the depth at which it addresses questions of power in the classroom, it is appropriate for a graduate seminar and as a scholarly resource for critically minded academics to inform their pedagogy and research.

Rudick, Golsan, and Cheesewright have succeeded in producing a succinct discussion of CCP and its pragmatic application. In the foreword of the book, Deanna Fassett articulates the goal for the text, saying, "This book will help you build and refine a vocabulary for reflexive analysis of what happens in classrooms" (2018, p. xiii). The authors have met this goal. *Teaching from the Heart: Critical Communication Pedagogy in the Communication Classroom* succeeds in assisting both new and experienced teachers in reflexively examining and responding to power through the examination of communicative practices.

References

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

David H. Kahl, Jr. received his B.A. in economics from Concordia College, MN, and his Ph.D. in Communication from North Dakota State University. He is currently an Associate Professor of Communication at Penn State Erie, The Behrend College. He produces scholarship in the area of critical communication pedagogy. Kahl is interested in the ways in which CCP can be used to respond to hegemonic forces in society, namely instances of economic and cultural hegemony.

Central States Communication Association

Newsletter Staff & Executive Director



Stephen A. Spates
Missouri State University
CSCA Newsletter Editor



Sara Baker Bailey
Southern Connecticut
State University
CSCA Scholarship
Supplement Editor



Chad Edwards
Western Michigan University
CSCA Executive Director