STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF AND REACTIONS TO A POLITICAL SPEECH:

HOW COLLEGE STUDENTS HEAR AND TALK ABOUT

PRESIDENT OBAMA

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Jasmón L. Bailey, BHA

San Marcos, Texas
August 2012

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF AND REACTIONS TO A POLITICAL SPEECH:

HOW COLLEGE STUDENTS HEAR AND TALK ABOUT

PRESIDENT OBAMA

Committee Members Approved:

_____
Joseph Kotarba, Chair

_____
Sally Caldwell

_____
Augustine Agwuele

Approved:

_____
J. Michael Willoughby
Dean of the Graduate College

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgment. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Jasmón Bailey, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for educational or scholarly purposes only

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF AND REACTIONS TO A POLITICAL SPEECH:

HOW COLLEGE STUDENTS HEAR AND TALK ABOUT

PRESIDENT OBAMA

by

Jasmón Bailey, BHA

Texas State University-San Marcos

August 2012

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: JOSEPH KOTARBA

Many scholars, both within and outside the social sciences, have examined the
Obama presidency through their particular disciplines. This study extends research on the
Obama presidency by examining the Obama presidency through the perspective of the
sociology of everyday life, and does so with an ethnomethodological framework. From
the sociology of everyday life perspective, the presidency is a social construction, one
created and sustained through everyday interaction. The ethnomethodological
framework suggests that people's social construction of the presidency can be empirically
studied by examining how a person speaks about the presidency. The research reported
here examines the various ways college students respond to and talk about President
Obama's political speech and the Office of the Presidency. In this study, twenty-seven
undergraduate students were shown a video recording of Obama's 2012 State of the

Union Address. The findings suggest that although respondents hear the same speech and can summarize the speech in similar ways, their interpretations of the speech, as well as their interpretations of the presidency, are derived from their memberships in certain social groups.

INTRODUCTION

The research reported here was a qualitative study guided by two related subfields of sociological inquiry, namely the sociology of everyday life and ethnomethodology. The research focused on individual responses to a political speech. More specifically, Texas State University student's perceptions of, and reaction, to the 2012 Presidential State of the Union Address by President Barack Obama.

Many scholars, both within and outside the social sciences, have examined the Obama presidency through their particular disciplines. For example, political scientists have studied public opinions about Obama, before and after his election (Jacobson 2011; Schier 2010). Historians have analyzed the Obama campaign in terms of the historic nature of events such as unprecedented levels of voter turnout and community engagement (Ford, Johnson & Maxwell 2010).

Scholars in mass communications have examined the Obama presidency in terms of events in a news cycle that will generate a response from President Obama (Kushin & Yamamoto 2010). Anthropologists have examined the Obama presidency as an evolutionary stage in terms of ethnicity, democracy, and U.S. culture (Harrison 2009).

Researchers in organizational sciences and business administration have studied the Obama presidency in terms of leadership skills that Obama used to achieve the U.S. presidency (Bligh & Kohles 2009). Even psychologists have studied the Obama

presidency, for example, in terms of its priming effect (i.e. the president's ability to use the media to shape the public's attitudes towards his policies) (Dragojlovic 2011).

Finally, sociologists have studied social perceptions of the Obama presidency in terms of his ethnicity, class and gender (Williams 2011; Hunt & Wilson 2009). This study extends research on the Obama presidency by examining it through the perspective of the sociology of everyday life, and does so with an ethnomethodological framework. The material that follows addresses the literature associated with the sociology of everyday life, ethnomethodology as an analytical framework, and people's reactions to political

CHAPTER 1

LITERATURE REVIEW

The research reported here rests upon the frameworks of the sociology of everyday life, ethnomethodology, and the general topical area of political discourse. The literature review that follows begins with a discussion of the sociology of everyday life with an emphasis on selected studies that illustrate some of the most fundamental tenants of the field. The section on ethnomethodology provides a review of some of the more classic studies of the field, along with some of the more contemporary research examples. Finally, the material on the topic of political discourse represents a focus on studies, although few in numbers, that deals with audience response to political speech.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF EVERYDAY LIFE

The sociology of everyday life is a comprehensive rubric that covers a variety of micro-sociologies, including symbolic interaction, ethnomethodology, dramaturgy, and phenomenology (Adler, Adler & Fontana 1987). With roots that trace back to the creation of symbolic interactionism by Mead in the 1920s and 1930s (Douglas, et al. 1980; Adler, Adler, & Fontana 1987), the sociology of everyday life holds the assumption that social reality is constructed by everyday activities of people trying to make sense of their lives and the social world around them.

Recently published studies based upon the sociology of everyday life include reports on topics ranging from experiencing a hurricane (Smith & Belgrave 1995), phone calls to radio stations (Fitzgerald & Housley 2002), boxing (Wacquant 2004), shyness

(Scott 2005), shopping (Scott 2009), sex-work (Weitzer 2009), Latino music scenes (Kotarba, et al. 2009), and leisure activities (Livingston 2012).

The sociologist who studies everyday life believes that to understand the social world one must study interaction as it occurs in natural situations. Accordingly, studies conducted under the guise of everyday sociology often include reference to the perceptions, feelings, and meanings that individuals experience, as well as the sense of shared reality they create in the process. In short, it is a perspective that assumes that the social order does not regulate social interaction; rather, social interaction shapes the semblance of social order (Douglas 1971).

From the sociology of everyday life perspective, none of the reality building happens in an easy or energy free manner. Rather, people work hard in their daily lives to construct shared knowledge. As numerous observers have noted, shared knowledge is socially developed and exclusive to members of a certain community who share the same historical, cultural and geographic space (Johnson 2008; Hruby 2001; Berger & Luckmann 1966; Taylor 1947). This shared knowledge becomes a foundation for the belief that the world is simple, objective, and universally understandable. It also becomes the basis for what many view as *commonsense* knowledge (Pascale 2007).

In much the same way, Schutz (1953) views shared knowledge as knowledge that people learn over a lifetime, whether passed down by others and/or acquired through personal experience. Through our personal experiences, according to Schutz, we typify the social and natural world. In essence, we categorize things according to typicality— whether a phenomena or event is typical (i.e. familiar occurrences) or atypical (i.e. unfamiliar occurrences).   It is the categorical nature of shared knowledge that allows us

to understand the natural world, and create a sense of stability and order to the world around us.   Given the notion of shared knowledge and the underlying assumptions connected with the sociology of everyday life, it is not unexpected that the topics that are found under the everyday banner are wide ranging in scope.

For example, Scott (1989), in her work: *Meaning Construction and Social Work Practice,* provided an in-depth look at how people define their occupational realities. In her research, by examining how social workers' reality is interpretatively different from the reality of the clients they serve. Scott argued that this assessment is needed in order for social workers to effectively help their clients. Scott indicates that social workers will have to learn and expose themselves to the shared knowledge of the community that they serve.

Goffman's (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* offers the central thesis that social actors present the self to others through *performances*. The actor's performances consist of the everyday social activities that actors conduct with other social actors during interaction, many of which boil down to matters of impression management.

Hall (1990 [1979]), in applying Goffman's model to the presidency, noted that Goffman's theory is helpful in conceptualizing the presidency as a particular set of performances. While the performances of the president have traditionally been measured by political polls, Hall suggests that what is really being measured is impression management.

ETHNOMETHODOLOGY

Ethnomethodology, the second foundational basis of the research, is a method of analysis that was developed by Garfinkel in the 1960s. Ethnomethodology argues that social scientists can empirically study the way *members* make sense of the world around them by examining the way they talk about it. Garfinkel (1984) uses the term *member,* as opposed to individuals, to make the point that we share reality by sharing language with the social groups to which we belong. Because members are people who come from the same social group, their shared knowledge is a consequence of their group membership. It is through shared knowledge that a member is able to establish a shared sense of reality.

To the ethnomethodologist, there are identifiable components that underlie a member's process of reality production. They are: *the documentary method of interpretation*; *indexicality*; *reflexivity*; and *accounting*.

The documentary method of interpretation is the process people use to describe or explain their reality (Garfinkel 1974; Mannheim 1971). It is the process that allows a person to make sense of an event by assuming the existence of the underlying meanings for the event. These underlying meanings can include reasons, explanations, causes and other features of an event, even though they may never be visible in the event.

In short, it is a method of interpretation, based upon what the observer perceives as external phenomenon or event as a symbolic representation of all the intricate meanings and details associated with the external phenomenon or event. As Garfinkel (1984) notes:

"The method is recognizable for the everyday necessities of recognizing what a person is 'talking about' given that he does not say exactly what he means, or in recognizing such common occurrences and objects as mailmen, friendly gestures, and promises (Pp. 78)."

Indexicality is a feature of speech that speakers use to establish a context or create a frame of reference for their utterances (Garfinkel 1984). To index a word or words means to contextualize it so the meaning of the word is much more extensive than the word itself conveys. It means that the meaning of a word is dependent upon the context in which it was used.

For example, if a member makes the statement "it is 105 degrees Fahrenheit outside." One might index the sentence to be "it is hot outside." The terms '105 degrees Fahrenheit' has been indexed or replaced by the word "hot." Clearly, indexing is subjectively orchestrated, as 105 degrees Fahrenheit may or may not be hot to others. In this instance, the member assumes that other people are a part of their own membership group; thus, to them it is reasonable to assume a shared reality. Therefore, within the context of climate, "hot" is 105 degrees Fahrenheit. This assumption is the foundation of ethnomethodological research.

The *indexing* of a word is only successful if the listener is able to perceive the broader context—or a plausible broader context that makes sense. Indexicality allows *members* to communicate very efficiently, using substantially fewer words than may be necessary to create a reality in talk. Therefore, in discourse, members often index words to convey a particular reality, instead of meticulously explaining every detail of a reality

as though the hearer of the discourse is completely ignorant to the reality that is being shared and experienced.

When a member indexes a word in discourse, the recipient of the discourse is engaging in *reflexivity*. Reflexivity refers to the way talk accomplishes two things simultaneously. Talk describes a reality while at the same time creating the reality being described (Mehan and Wood 1975; Cicorel 1973, 1970).

Finally, *accounts* are the stories we tell each other when members interact, the eloquent descriptions that members give to convey their reality (Orbuch 1997; Lyman & Scott 1970). Members work hard to forge accounts in everyday life that are consistent, plausible, understandable, logical, and reasonable. Accounts are the "data" presented by others, that members use to judge the other person and the content of their discourse. The person may or may not be a member of the same social group of the member judging the data.

Apart from members' taken-for-granted practices observed in ethnomethodology, it is also apolitical and atheoretical. It generally sees language and interpretations as natural and ahistorical. Accordingly, ethnomethodology is not necessarily concerned with the why or the historical relevance of an interpretation; its main objective is to create awareness of the interpretative procedures that create phenomena in social interaction (Pascale 2007).

In short, ethnomethodology provides a framework for the analysis of how people understand their lived experiences. As with research in the sociology of everyday life genre, ethnomethodological studies cover a wide range of topics. For example, parents with disabled children (Voysey 1975), interactions in traffic court (Pollner 1979), parents

who have children with polio (Davis 1991), doctor-patient interaction (Have 1991), Iran-Contra hearings (Lynch & Bogen 1999), interpretations on race, class, and gender (Pascale 2007), and categorization (Whitehead 2009). A review of one of Garfinkel's (1967) classic studies is particularly helpful in demonstrating the notion of personal social reality from the perspective of ethnomethodology.

In *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Garfinkel 1967), Garfinkel illustrated how members of a social group make sense of the world in which they live. For example, he described coroners who are routinely faced with the task of determining what lead up to the death of an individual, eventually determining the cause of death — suicide. Garfinkel noticed that the coroners' assessment of a dead body was determined by practical reasoning techniques similar to the methodological reasoning sociologists use for studying social phenomenon. To classify the type of death, the coroners examined the remains of the body and its memorabilia for typical clues that might indicate the body's social background, and thus, type of death.

Garfinkel (1967) notes that when the coroners verbally explained how they determined the cause of death, their descriptions illustrated a process that led to the suicide classification given to the body. For Garfinkel, ethnomethodology is the study of the processes people use, as members of a social group, to explain their reality.

Sacks (1972) extends Garfinkel's ethnomethodological approach to include a technique called Membership Category Analysis (MCA). This approach examines the *membership categories* people use in communicative interaction. Membership categories are the words people use to describe or indicate a member or members of the same social

group. Thus, these words and their meanings are often exclusively spoken and understood

by members of the same social group.

By using MCA, Sacks (1972) found that when people give a verbal explanation of

a certain situation, the explanation generally includes reference to a membership

category. For example, consider the statement, "the dog ate my homework." The "dog",

analyzed with MCA, falls under the membership category of household pet. No matter

how one reads the statement (i.e. The dog ate. My homework!) The word dog is placed

under the membership category of household pet, simply because a dog, at least in most

Western societies, is commonly considered as a household pet.

Whitehead (2009), who also falls within the ethnomethodological perspective,

asserts that *membership categories* can behave as references that give meaning to

situations. Whitehead's work on *categorizing the categorizer* examined how members

use membership categories in their speech to avoid being perceived or categorized as a

racist. Whitehead's findings suggest that members' shared knowledge about ethnicity

relations and racism is often presented in the membership categories in their speech,

despite members attempt to express an antiracial image (Whitehead 2009).

Pascale (2007) used ethnomethodology in a study on ethnicity, gender and class in

the U.S. In this study, Pascale (2007) began with assertion that *whiteness* is an ideology

of white supremacy that is overtly and covertly exercised in society. Whiteness creates

boundary benchmarks for the white construction of blackness, and identifies whiteness as

normal and blackness, or non-white, as deviant (Hartigan 1997). Therefore, as it pertains

to ethnic relations, people who fall outside the norm of whiteness are easily recognized.

Pascale (2007) examined how the effects of *whiteness* on shared knowledge are

expressed in a member's speech. Her findings suggest that, as it pertains to a member's shared knowledge, whiteness is naturalized by unmarked, or unspoken, words in discourse. For example, when a participant was asked how she felt about being ethnically mixed (i.e. white and Japanese). The respondent only talked about her feelings in regard to being half Japanese. Pascale concludes that it is through membership categorizations through whiteness, "social relations of power become naturalized" in members' shared knowledge (Pascale 2007:5).

While Pascale (2007) used ethnomethodology to study ethnicity, gender and class, other scholars, such as Davis (1991) and Voysey (1975) used ethnomethodology to study health and families. In Davis' work on the life experiences of people who have polio and their families, he found that the parents often referred back to another child who once had polio to account for their behavior toward the current child with polio. In terms of quality of life, Davis found that the child with polio would account for his\her sense of wellness by the type of interaction he\she had with other people.

Voysey's (1975) work on families with a disabled child is another ethnomethodological piece worth mentioning. In her study, Voysey examines the word choices of parents with disable children, and if those chosen words say something about being a parent with a disable child. She found that the parents in her study used words that constructed a narrative of normalcy. The parents accounted for this narrative of normalcy by describing their behavior with their other child, who was not disabled.

POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND AUDIENCE REACTIONS

The final foundational basis for the research reported here, involves the notion of political discourse and audience reactions. As related to the current study, the literature concerning political discourse and audience reactions is limited in scope.

According to Dijk (2002), political discourse is the speech or text primarily spoken or written by a professional politician. However, political discourse can also be communication between and among members of a society. Political discourse is language that is associated with a social group's shared sense of political order. Political cognition revolves around a social-psychological view of political beliefs, values, and judgments. In political cognition, socio-political attitudes like stereotypes, prejudices, and chauvinism. Dijk indicates that a study that synthesizes political discourse and political cognition will involve a macro-level of political analysis.

Political discourse is base upon shared representation of a political ideology (Dijk 2002). A person's interpretation of a political discourse is vetted through their political cognition. If the information from the political discourse corroborates with the person's political cognition, the person treats that information as factual; and consequently, believes that the politician is telling the truth. If the information does not corroborate with the person's political cognition, the person may present an alternative reality that is in conflict to the political discourse being articulated.

In Dijk's (2002) study, he sought to understand how a person interprets a political speech in light of his/her personal political thought. Dijk (2002) concluded that an individual's political thought is central to his/her ultimate classification of the speech as containing factual information. If judged to contain factual information, the person

making the speech is more likely to be judged as telling the truth. In a similar study, Chang and Glynos' (2011) focused on political speech as presented through popular media outlets. They use Laclau's (1993a, 1993b) theory of discourse and media politics to illustrate how political speeches through the media invokes emotional responses out of audience members of a media outlet.

Chang and Glynos' (2011) used Laclau's (1993b) concepts of *dislocation* and *fantasy* to illustrate how audience members' presuppositions about the social world contribute to their emotional response towards a political speech. Dislocation means that a prized position was stolen. For example, if a media outlet indicated that a political leader was involved in a scandal, the word, "scandal," dislocates morality. Fantasy is a concept that closely relates to Weber's ideal type (Lopreato 1970). It is when people project their idealistic view on a personal reality.

In some cases where a person's fantasy disagrees with the mediatized discourse, a state of ambivalence occurs within that person. The person's ambivalence to the mediatized discourse is a negative or hostile reaction. "This is because the more reality appears to diverge from the [person's fantasy], the more threatening this reality appears to become" (Chang & Glynos 2011:115). Similar to Dijk, Chang and Glynos's concluded that the reaction to the speech is driven through the link between the content of political speech and the audience member's presuppositions.

As noted previously, the research reported here examines the reactions on the part of university students to the 2012 Presidential State of the Union Address by President Barack Obama. The material that follows provides a more detailed statement of the research topic and methodology.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

The central aim of the research was to investigate the manner in which students talk about politics. More specifically, the research focused on student interpretations of and reactions to (1) a speech segment delivered by President Obama and (2) the notion of the in general presidency.

Four specific research questions were posed — two having to do with the speech segment, one having to do with the presidency as a construct, and one research question dealing with both the speech segment and the presidency construct. The specific questions were as follows:

1. What words do the speakers use to summarize the speech segment?

2. When speakers are asked to interpret a speech segment, how do they respond when asked to give a basis for their interpretation?

3. What interpretations arise when speakers are asked to interpret the presidency?

4. What words do the speakers use to substantiate their interpretations of the speech segment and the notion of presidency?

As an example of a political speech, a segment of President Obama's 2012 State of the Union Address was selected for several of reasons. First, the State of the Union Address provides a look at the presidency in something of a structured or formal sense. Because it is outlined in the U.S. Constitution as a requirement, the tradition surrounding the delivery of the speech is fairly well determined. In a sense, this traditional aspect to the

State of the Union Speech opens the door to the possibility of longitudinal research efforts.

Secondly, as far as political speeches go, the State of the Union Address is far removed from the realm of typical political campaign speeches, which are often laced with emotion and hyperbole. Certainly one could argue that a State of the Union Speech could have implications for a future campaign, but it is difficult to see it as a traditional campaign speech (e.g., a speech at a campaign rally). By the same token, the State of the Union Speech is not a media interview or a fund raising speech. In short, the State of the Union Address is in a category unto itself. It is highly structured, formalized, widely distributed and, therefore, suitable for analysis.

DATA COLLECTION

I recruited undergraduate students at Texas State University–San Marcos to take part in the research. The desired sample size for the research was set at 30 undergraduate students, recruited from in introductory sociology course and a criminology course. Using the semi-structured, in-depth-interview method as the major data collection methodology, my objective was to illustrate how speakers (in this instance, university undergraduates) carry out political discourse.

There were 30 potential speakers in the study, but three were ultimately unavailable. As to the 27 students who did participate, their ages ranged from 18 to 60 years of age. The pool of speakers reflected a mixture of class, ethnicity, sex, and sexual preference. Data relative to the speakers are shown in figure 1. The average length of the interviews was 35 minutes. Each interview was audio recorded using a digital recorder.

The speakers were shown a seven-minute video segment of the 2012 Obama State of the Union Address. The segment was played once. The seven-minute segment focused on two main topics, namely higher education and employment. (For the text of the speech segment, see Appendix A.) The topics of higher education and employment were selected because they were deemed to be highly relevant to students. The data collection took place in the Department of Sociology, located in the Undergraduate Academic Center at Texas State University–San Marcos.

The research participants — the students who ultimately became the speakers — viewed the speech segment and were asked to do the following:

1. Summarize the speech – give me a parroted response of the heard speech.

2. Interpret the speech – what does the speech mean, what do you think the president is saying?

3. Complete the semi-structured interview by answering the following seven questions:

   1) What characteristics or qualities represent a good president?

   2) What characteristics or qualities represent a bad president?

   3) What do you think is the job of the president?

   4) When you hear the word president, what do you imagine in your mind?

   5) Who is your favorite president and why?

   6) Who is your least favorite president and why?

   7) If you were president of the United States, what would you change and why?

4. Complete the demographic segment of the interview by answering the following questions in writing:

1. What is your name?

2. How old are you?

3. What is your sex/gender?

4. What is your sexual orientation?

5. What is your race/ethnicity?

6. What is your political orientation (circle one)?: Conservative, Moderate,

    Liberal, Other:_____

7. What is the name of your political party?

8. What is your college classification?

9. Where are you from (Hometown and State)?

10. Did you grow up in a (circle one)?: Rural area, an Urban area, or Suburban

area

11. How would you classify your family salary/income growing up?

The fourth question mentioned above, the question regarding the speakers'

demographics, was used for descriptive purposes only (see Table 1). In an effort to ensure

confidentiality, the speakers were assigned pseudonyms. Additionally, Speakers were

asked to sign a consent form acknowledging their voluntary participation in the study.

Table 1 Speaker Demographics

Name	Age	Sex/ Gender	Sexual Orientation	Ethnicity	Political Orientation	Political Party	College Classification	Home town	State	Geographic Upbringing	Childhood Family Salary
Jane	31	Female	Lesbian	White	Liberal	Republican	Senior	Austin	TX	Urban	Middle
Vicky	21	Female	Hetero-sexual	Hispanic	Conservative	Republican	Junior	El Paso	TX	Urban	Lower
Adam	20	Male	Hetero-sexual	White	Conservative	Republican	Freshman	Huntsville	TX	Rural	Lower
Jim	19	Male	Gay	White	Conservative	Republican	Freshman	Dallas	TX	Suburban	Middle
Matt	19	Male	Hetero-sexual	Black	Moderate	Republican	Freshman	Dallas	TX	Urban	Middle
Laura	21	Female	Hetero-sexual	Hispanic	N/A	N/A	Senior	Austin	TX	Suburban	Upper
Will	22	Male	Hetero-sexual	Black	Liberal	Republican	Senior	Dallas	TX	Urban	Lower
Pat	22	Male	Hetero-sexual	White	Liberal	Democrat	Junior	Katy	TX	Urban	Middle
Angel	20	Female	Lesbian	Hispanic	Liberal	Democrat	Sophomore	New York City	NY	Urban	Lower
Nicki	21	Female	Hetero-sexual	Middle Eastern	N/A	N/A	Sophomore	Austin	TX	Suburban	Middle
Josh	44	Male	Hetero-sexual	Black	Moderate	Democrat	Junior	Austin	TX	Urban	Working Poor
Sue	24	Female	Hetero-sexual	White	Mod-Lib	Libertarian	Junior	San Angelo	TX	Rural	Middle Class
Jenny	21	Female	Hetero-sexual	White	Liberal	Independent	Sophomore	Katy	TX	Suburban	Middle Class

Table 1 Participant Demographics (Continued)

Juan	34	Male	Hetero-sexual	Hispanic	Liberal	Independent	Undergrad	Chicago	IL	Urban	Lower-Middle
Carlos	41	Male	Hetero-sexual	White	Moderate	Democrat	Senior	Long Beach	CA	Urban	Middle Class
Ed	60	Male	Male	Black	Moderate	Democrat	Senior	Miami	FL	Suburban	Lower Class
Mary	21	Female	Hetero-sexual	White	N/A	Independent	Senior	Austin	TX	Suburban	Upper-Middle
Brock	25	Male	Hetero-sexual	White	Conservative	Republican	Senior	Taylor	TX	Rural	Middle
Fred	24	Male	Hetero-sexual	Jewish/ Mexican	Liberal	Republican	Senior	San Antonio	TX	Suburban	Lower-Middle
Jack	20	Male	Hetero-sexual	Hispanic	Moderate	Independent	Freshman	Poteet	TX	Rural	Lower
Mark	39	Male	Hetero-sexual	Black	Liberal	Democrat	Senior	Norfolk	VA	Urban	Lower
Janet	20	Female	Hetero-sexual	Asian-American	None	Independent	Senior	Austin	TX	Urban	Middle
Becky	22	Female	Hetero-sexual	Black	Conservative	Democrat	Senior	Nigeria		Urban	Middle
Katie	25	Female	Hetero-sexual	Black	Moderate	Independent	Senior	Houston	TX	Urban	Lower
Bob	23	Male	Hetero-sexual	White	Liberal	Democrat	Junior	Dallas	TX	Suburban	Middle
Sandy	45	Female	Hetero-sexual	White	Conservative	Independent	Junior	El Paso	TX	Urban	Lower
Larry	20	Male	Gay	Black	Liberal	Democrat	Senior	Houston	TX	Urban	Middle
Missing cases: 3											

The data regarding the research speakers are summarized as follows:

Sex and gender: 58% of the speakers self identified their sex/gender as male. 42% of the speakers self identified their sex/gender as female.

Sexuality: 14% of the speakers sexually identified themselves as gay or lesbian. 85% of the speakers sexually identified themselves as heterosexuals. 4% of the speakers included their gender (male) as their sexual orientation.

Ethnic background: 41% of the speakers self-identified their ethnicity as white. 26% of the speakers self-identified their ethnicity as black. 19 % of the speakers self identified their ethnicity as Hispanic. 4% of the speakers self-identified their ethnicity as Middle Eastern. 4% of the speakers self-identified their ethnicity as Asian American. 4% of the speakers self-identified their ethnicity as Jewish and Mexican.

Political orientation: 37% of the speakers self-identified their political orientation as liberal. 22% of the speakers self-identified their political orientation as conservative. 22% of the speakers self-identified their political orientation as moderate.15% of the speakers did not identify with a political orientation. 4% of the speakers self-identified their political orientation as moderate-to-liberal (mod-lib).

Political party: 33% of the speakers self-identified their political party as democrat. 30% of the speakers self-identified their political party as Republican. 26% of the speakers self-identified their political party as Independent. 7% of the speakers did not identify with a political party. 4% of the speakers self-identified their political party as libertarian.

College classification: 48% of the speakers self-identified their college classification as senior. 22% of the speakers self-identified their college classification as

junior. 15% of the speakers self-identified their college classification as freshman. 11% of the speakers self-identified their college classification as sophomore. 4% of the speakers self-identified their college classification as undergraduate.

Hometown and State: 22% of the speakers indicated that they were from Austin, Texas. 15% of the indicated that they were from Dallas, Texas. 7% of the speakers indicated that they were from El Paso, Texas. 7% of the speakers indicated that they were from Houston, Texas. 7% of the speakers indicated that they were from Katy, Texas. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Huntsville, Texas. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Miami, Florida. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Taylor, Texas. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from San Antonio, Texas. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from San Angelo, Texas. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Poteet, Texas. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Nigeria. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Norfolk, Virginia. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from New York City, New York. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Chicago, Illinois. 4% of the speakers indicated that they were from Long Beach, California.

Geographic upbringing: 56% of the speakers indicated that they were raised in an urban environment. 30% of the speakers indicated that they were raised in a suburban environment. 14% of the speakers indicated that they were raised in a rural environment.

Childhood family salary: 48% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the middle class. 33% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the lower class. 48% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the

middle class. 7% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the lower-middle class. 4% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the working poor. 4% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the upper-middle class. 4% of the speakers self-identified that their childhood family income was associated with the upper class.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS

The analysis began with a preliminary review of the recorded interviews. The preliminary review consisted of listening to the recorded interviews twice and listening for reoccurring themes and categories in the speakers' talk. The themes and categories that emerged from the preliminary review were noted.

After the preliminary review, the interviews were transcribed. The next step involved assigning codes to relevant portions of the transcripts. Coding categories were developed as follows:

- Sources of knowledge (i.e., the basis of a speaker's interpretation)

- Membership groups (i.e., reference to a group that the speaker belongs to or references)

- Personal experiences (i.e., reference to some personal event or history)

- Naming of presidents (i.e., reference to one or more presidents)

- Frequently used words (i.e., words that were used by many speakers)

FINDINGS

The over-arching finding of the research was that specific sociological concepts and/or principles are at play when speakers engage in political discourse. The political discourse of undergraduates, at least as expressed in the study reported, is neither true nor false in any objective, universal, or verifiable sense. Rather, a speaker's political discourse is socially constructed. It is shaped and maintained as a result of a variety of

elements, such as interactions with others, individual biographies, membership affiliations, media exposure, and role familiarity. This socially constructed reality is a characteristic of not just how a speaker interprets a speech segment; the socially constructed reality also applies to the speaker's justification for his/her interpretation, as well as his/her images of the presidency in a larger sense.

For example, the data suggest that it is not possible to separate a speaker from his/her personal biography. Elements of that very personal biography will show through, when a speaker is asked to respond to a presidential speech segment or the Office of the Presidency. By the same token, the data suggest that it is not possible to remove a speaker's connections to or interactions with others when asked to respond.

Although a speaker's personal or individual biography and personal or individual social connections are central to interpretations of the social world — what emerges as speakers' reactions to political speech and political notions are not totally individual. Rather, the reactions can be categorized along a continuum and any number of speakers may occupy the same category. As an illustration of this point, I developed typology to reflect the various styles of responses speakers gave when discussing a political speech segment and a political office. Speakers were located in the typology based upon a holistic evaluation by the researcher of their responses to questions regarding the presidential speech segment and the Office of the Presidency.

<u>Typology of Speakers</u>

My typology organizes the various styles respondents talk about President Obama's speech segment on education, their understanding of the presidency, and their perceptions of their selves. By talk, I am referring to the use in conversation of

vocabulary, metaphors, other figures of speech, explanations, and sentence structure to describe their world as they experience it. The typology helps us see how this talk indexes the "commonsense" theories, if you will, that college students use to make sense of these social and political phenomena.

Thus, I am not attempting to judge the adequacy or truthfulness to my respondents' talk. I am exploring the ways they construct meaning for some of the events in the world relevant to them as university students. Consistent with the ethnomethodological tradition, however, it is important to note that the typology simply represents my *subjective interpretation* of the responses given by the speakers. In terms of the specific categories in the typology, I identified them as the following: The *True Believer*; the *Complete Critic*; the *Indifferent*, the *Cynic*, and the *Skeptic*.

The True Believer supports and praises the speech segment delivered by President Obama. He/she does not criticize the president or the president's speech in any substantive way; the president is viewed as someone who, for all practical purposes, could do no wrong. The True Believe is very unlikely to make any observation or take any position that paints the president in a negative light.

The Complete Critic, on the other hand, offers nothing in the way of support or praise for President Obama or his speech. For the Complete Critic, the president can do no right. In contrast to the True Believer, the Complete Critic offers few, if any observations that paint the president in a positive light. Accordingly, the Complete Critic is not inclined to state any position that supports the president in any way.

In contrast to both the True Believer and the Complete Critic, the Indifferent speaker is neither supportive nor critical of the president or anything he said in the speech

segment. His/her neutral position reflects an almost ambiguous or indifferent characterization of the speech.

Finally, some speakers could be classified as Cynics, while still others are perhaps more correctly viewed as Skeptics. The Cynic is the message recipient who emphasizes the perceived motivation implicated in the political speech segment, as opposed to the content of the speech. Accordingly, the Cynic sees such motives as a desire to spread propaganda or a desire to simply woo voters. Whether his/her commentary paints the president's speech in a positive or negative light, the bottom line issue, at least for the Cynic, is the motivation. The Skeptic, like the Cynic, may harbor mixed feelings toward the president's speech, but the hallmark of the Skeptic is an emphasis on a perceived lack of practicality in the speech.

Where a speaker was located in the typology was a function of the language that the speaker used, whether summarizing a speech segment, interpreting it, or providing a justification of the interpretation. Key language components were as follows:

1. True Believer: Use of positive, affirming, and/or supportive words and phrases.

2. Constant Critic: Use of negative, critical, and/or non-supportive words and phrases.

3. The Indifferent: Use of ambiguous and/or indifferent words and phrases.

4. The Cynic: Use of word or phrases that connote artificiality, insincerity, and/or disingenuousness.

5. The Skeptic: Use of words or phrases that connote impracticality or unreasonableness.

The message recipient typology in the research reported here is illustrated in 11 tables below (tables 2 – 12), each containing information about a participant and their response to President Obama's speech segment. The tables that follow provide a summary of the typology categories with examples of a speaker who represents the category. In addition to the reference to an individual speaker, the block segment includes reference to the type of words used (i.e., connotations) as well as the context in which the reference was made (i.e., in response to the request for an summary and interpretation, and a request for a basis of an interpretation, along with an explanation as to why the basis was offered).

Table 2 Typology of Speakers - The True Believer

	Descriptors	
	Connotations	Positive, affirming, and/or supportive words and phrases
The True Believer Mary	Summary & Interpretation	"He started talking about how teachers need to do better and how we need more and better teachers for high school. Then he started talking about tuition …that was good. He tried to make it cheaper [he's trying to make tuition cheaper for college students]… and schools that don't [follow his policy] are going to have less taxpayers' money, which would be interesting. And illegal immigration, how we let them go to school here and deport them as soon as they finish which means they're going to do better in their own country and we might need them here if they do something really smart and inventive…. This makes me appreciate him…"
	Basis	"He's trying to make us better. I know that right now the U.S. is ranked really low compared to other countries. The fact that you can't drop out until your 18."
	Explanation	"The commercial showing that we are rank pretty low… than other countries. I mean I love America but I just get it mostly from …commercials and other people saying it. But I know our students are not the best. I mean its just like High School… in my high school., my English teacher was not the best .she was nice and everything but she didn't care, she just would pass you just to pass you… she was a cheerleading coach."

Table 3 Typology of Speakers - The True Believer

		Descriptors
The True Believer Will	Connotations	Positive, affirming, and/or supportive words and phrases
	Summary & Interpretation	"Education is key to a successful future. He hit on education and employment. He talked about how a good teacher is necessary for a student to be successful. He plans on using his administration to create reform."
	Basis	"Because he says if you give the people the right chance especially teachers… and the right students, regardless of the race and sex…they will be like the next Steve Jobs – I believe that."
	Explanation	"As a student, I am definitely in support of him for that lower interest rate on student loans and for me…it motivates me to work that much harder to support him just to see those things come through."

Table 4 Typology of Speakers - The True Believer

		Descriptors
The True Believer Josh	Connotations	Positive, affirming, and/or supportive words and phrases
	Summary & Interpretation	"He's for college. Because we have so many factors against us that it makes us not even want to go [to college]... He is saying all should have equal rights- A woman could do a job just a well as a man. The immigration thing - I agree [with him], its wrong. Then he talked about mandatory schooling for kids in high school – I agree."
	Basis	"Because he said he wanted to lower the interest rate on the loans and make college affordable. Women don't get paid the same as men. He also said he wanted to make High school mandatory until the age 18."
	Explanation	"It's the glass ceiling theory where women are still not getting paid as much as men. Making high school mandatory is a good idea because the drop out rate is out of control. We as Americans are lazy. so quick to quit. It's not fair to send someone back home, especially when they've been here their whole life. It's wrong."

Table 5 Typology of Speakers - The True Believer

	Descriptors	
The True Believer Juan	Connotations	Positive, affirming, and/or supportive words and phrases
	Summary & Interpretation	"He started off talking about job reform and trying to create a new system to create more jobs. Then he went in to education talking percentages and how much money it would take to change it. Then he started talking about teaching and how teachers can affect a student's life and so on… Then he asked for states to implement a no drop out policy until 18. Then he went in to immigration and how people should not worry about deportation."
	Basis	"Education means a lot to me being that I'm a student right now. For them to work to be a citizen. Equal rights to become better citizens and better people. He's looking at it from our perspective…"
	Explanation	"It's inspiring to hear a person of his status. It means to me that more people like me to try to go to school and they're trying to make it equal…The immigration does not mean too much to me because I was born here. He wants women to have equal pay that means he's looking at it from our perspective. Hearing it in his voice makes me feel like he is talking to people like me directly…"

Table 6 Typology of Speakers - The True Believer

	Descriptors	
The True Believer Becky	Connotations	Positive, affirming, and/or supportive words and phrases
	Summary & Interpretation	"He talked about school in general starting from high school. At least trying to get students through HS and graduate. The fact that, I guess, after high school getting into College is hard. Most students don't even go at all because of the price. He is trying to find a way that he can still provide for those students enough they can make it through college with out coming out with a loan or not even going at all because they don't even have the means to get there. And I guess the other one would be on immigration or at least, immigrants that are here … for some reason have their documents expire after getting an education and then sent back to their country… some type of law that protects them to the country that gives them the opportunity to be here in the first place."
	Basis	"He's trying to help everybody. Give recognition that deserves it. I guess some type of second chance or some type of route to help them…"
	Explanation	"Certain classes of people cannot afford getting an education… [He is trying to give everyone] a chance to get their... He wants to keep more teachers by paying them more or recognizing the ones that are good. He wants to cut down college tuition. Maybe that will make more college students stay in college and graduate. And some type of protection for immigrants that come here, or at least the ones that actually come for the right reasons – get an education, become something and actually benefit the country after…"

Table 7 Typology of Speakers - The Complete Critic

The Complete Critic Vicki	Descriptors	
	Connotations	Negative, critical, and/or non-supportive words and phrases.
	Summary & Interpretation	"All he said was a bunch of fluff, all fluff. He says college is imperative, [no]… it's a privilege."
	Basis	"Because that's what he said in the speech we just heard…"
	Explanation	"… he did not explain or propose anything. All he wants to do is force states to do things... as it pertains to immigration, I'm from a border town… it's not secure – its unsafe…"

Table 8 Typology of Speakers - The Complete Critic

The Complete Critic Jim	Descriptors	
	Type	Negative, critical, and/or non-supportive words and phrases.
	Summary & Interpretation	"He had a lot of grandiose ideas but not a lot of follow through. He wants to shift the burden of education to states. He wants to keep college tuition cost down…they are doing that. He mentioned the DREAM ACT but not directly."
	Basis	"Colleges are dealing with an influx [of people]…. less people are crossing the border because the economy sucks."
	Explanation	"More students are attending college so cost is going to go up because you have to pay for more teachers and their salaries… There are economic indicators that show less illegal immigrants… its not him… it's the economy."

Table 9 Typology of Speakers - The Indifferent

The Indifferent	Descriptors	
		Descriptors
	Connotations	Ambiguous and/or neutral words and phrases
The Indifferent Janet	Summary & Interpretation	"The main points that he talked about was immigration and education, because that hit home to me …Obama wanted to increase creativity -- in classroom. In education, I see a change. With illegal immigration, I agree, we should not send them home…People who are already in the United States they should be able to become citizens…I don't think I agree with that. Creativity could mean good and bad to me. It has holes for flaws. I wish he would be more strict on what he meant by creativity…"
	Basis	"There was a change between Bush (Jr) and Obama... As it pertains to immigration… I have a lot of friends that are illegal immigrants. It's Texas come on it's Texas."
	Explanation	"I graduate college in 2009. So, I had the Bush financial aid and then it switched to Obama's administration. With the Bush administration I had a lot of money, I mean a lot of money and I blow some of it...well most of it. With the Obama administration, I had much less, but it was enough. With immigration, I can relate well not really relate but I can understand more. Because some of the people that were brought here, well most of the people I know didn't have a choice. It's not like they put their hand up like I 'I want to go to America'. I have friends that go to UT… I don't know how they did it! It's going to suck when they have to go home"

Table 10 Typology of Speakers - The Indifferent

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="5">The Indifferent
Fred</td><td colspan="2" align="center">Descriptors</td></tr>
<tr><td>Connotations</td><td>Ambiguous and/or neutral words and phrases</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary &
Interpretation</td><td>"He is trying to rally the troops. He is trying to get people on this sort of future game plan...[This is just] my interpretation play on politics... Trying to get the students ... He jumped on reform, for some weird reason…"</td></tr>
<tr><td>Basis</td><td>"Rallying the troops get people to see what he would like. to see over the next few years. He's touch on people's political hot buttons that are one people's minds right now… Gather a following to assist him in his re-election. A lot of people don't like what's going on with on the boarder…"</td></tr>
<tr><td>Explanation</td><td>"It just seems that way … maybe [it's] his forced convictions. The way he delivers him self – It seems like he's trying to get people to back him. A high percentage of our population is college students…[a hot button is] …like student loans, or how college students will make a living when they get out of college… That to me is a hot button, if you put me in a hot seat that's would be the problem that I would say is an issue for me as a college student. These things are hot buttons its gets a lot of media coverage. Not just local Media but media all over the world. They can see it interfere with their daily lives… affects us… issues it divides us. If you look at the issue in New York – the occupy movement."</td></tr>
</table>

Table 11 Typology of Speakers - The Cynic

		Descriptors
The Cynic Laura	Connotations	Artificiality, insincerity, and/or disingenuousness word or phrases
	Summary & Interpretation	"President Obama is just telling everyone what they want to hear. Just telling us education should be first and we should give the money to students so they can learn and create jobs in the future, cause children are the future. He talked about immigration and the threat of deportation…He did not finish what he was going to do for people who have the threat of deportation. As for women with equal pay – how is he going to do that?"
	Basis	"Because he was saying a lot of things that people want to hear … like woman should get paid equally. On the surface I was really excited but I haven't seen anything happen."
	Explanation	"I have not seen any changes like the passing of the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act…we're they basically say they have the power to detain anybody that is presumed to be a threat to the United States – So if your talking blasphemy about the United States, they can detain you. Anywhere around the world."

Table 12 Typology of Speakers - The Skeptic

		Descriptors
The Skeptic Jenny		Descriptors
	Connotations	Impracticality or unreasonableness
	Summary & Interpretation	"He started out talking about high school education. We have to raise the bar for high school education. And he talked about rewarding teachers that teach creatively. He moved to college education and making it more affordable and giving incentive to institutions who can lower their tuition. He wants to lower the college interest rates, but that's going to be difficult to control… It's uplifting but it's a lot of work. He mentioned the interest rates going up but what's going to happen to people who already have so much debt and their interest rates are going to stay the same?"
	Basis	"For college education is basically an monopoly and the price is only going to go up. If the schools can lower their tuition then they will get tax money and if they can't lower tuition then they won't get any tax money…. So it's kind of like an incentive. Lower. There are so many people in America that that have college debt…they're probably gonna die with their debt…"
	Explanation	"Instead of like No Child Left Behind… We have to raise the bar not just to teach students how to pass the test… but to teach students creatively. Obama wants to stabilize the interest rates but they are people who may have high interests rates from the past and there are those who have the interests rates he is trying to stabilize."

In order to examine each category in the typology, I selected one speaker from each category to describe in greater detail. The five speakers include: Josh, Jim, Janet, Jenny, and Laura.

Josh's remarks about the speech are classified under the True Believer category. Josh said:

"He's for college. Because we have so many factors against us that it makes us not even want to go [to college] spend so much money. He is saying all should have equal rights… A woman could do a job just a well as a man. The immigration thing - I agree [with him], its wrong. Then he talked about mandatory schooling for kids in high school – I agree."

Josh's summary of the speech and his interpretation of the speech are intertwined. Josh's response is filled with direct statements and reasons to why Obama is saying what he is saying. Josh's statement: "he is for college" is an assessment of who he believes Obama is. He gives his basis for the statement by saying: "because we have so many factors against us that it makes us not even want to go [to college]." This statement suggests that Josh believes that President Obama is aware of the factors against the members in his social group.

Josh then states that President Obama: "is saying all should have equal rights." And following this statement he says: "A woman could do a job just a well as a man." By these statements, it seems that Josh is making a parallel between equal rights and gender-employment equality. Josh explains his interpretation by saying: "it's the glass ceiling theory where women are still not getting paid as much as men."

Josh's explanation of his interpretation of the speech contains Cotter et al's (2001) the glass ceiling effect, which illustrates an academic view regarding women and social inequality. Josh is a True Believer message recipient of President Obama and his political speech. Josh's response appears to be all accolades and no criticisms regarding president Obama and the political speech.

Similar to Josh, Jim's summary and interpretation are intertwined. However, unlike Josh, Jim's response to the political speech is classified as the Complete Critic message recipient. Jim states:

"He had a lot of grandiose ideas but not a lot of follow through. He wants to shift the burden of education to states. He wants to keep college tuition cost down…they are doing that…"

Jim's "grandiose" statement appears to be saying that President Obama maybe overly ambitious. Following the statement he uses the idiom: "follow though" in his response, which seems to infer that in addition to Obama being overly ambitious, his ideas are incomplete. Jim disagrees with President Obama that college tuition cost is becoming more expensive. He states that colleges are keeping the cost of tuition down. His basis for this statement was that: "colleges are dealing with an influx [of people]…"

After presenting the basis for his statement, Jim states his interpretation: "… more students are attending college, so cost is going to go up because you have to pay for more teachers and their salaries..." For Jim, college tuitions are increasing due to more students enrolling into colleges.

Jim's response also appears to contain some contradictory statements. He states that colleges are keeping tuition down. However, in his explanation he describes why

college tuition is rising. Jim's response is critical and non-supportive of President Obama and Obama's speech. Thus, Jim is classified as the Complete Critic message recipient.

The typology as a continuum shows Josh's and Jim's types are on the opposite ends of the continuum; whereas Janet's type, is located at the mid-point of the continuum, as her response and opinions toward President Obama and his speech appears to be generally neutral. Therefore, she is classified as the Indifferent message recipient. Janet says:

> "The main points that he talked about was immigration and education, because that hit home to me …Obama wanted to increase creativity -- in the classroom. In education, I see a change. With illegal immigration, I agree, we should not send them home…People who are already in the United States they should be able to become citizens."

Janet's summary and interpretation of Obama's speech includes the idiom: "it hit home". This suggests that the topics regarding immigration and education had a strong impact on her understanding of the speech. She talks about seeing: "*a change*" in education but she does not reference the speech. Janet indicated that she supported President Obama's immigration stance and gave her opinion that: "people who are already in the United States they should be able to become citizens." This statement differs from her statement regarding education as she connects her opinion to her description of Obama's speech.

Later in the interview, Janet elaborates on what she meant by: "in education I see a change." She indicates: "…there was a change between Bush [Jr] and Obama." She explains this statement by saying:

"I graduated high school in 2009. So I had the Bush financial aid and then

it switched to Obama's administration. With the Bush administration I had a lot

of money, I mean a lot of money… and I blow some of it...well most of it. With

the Obama administration, I had much less, but it was enough. [As it pertains to

creativity in the classroom] I don't think I agree with that. Creativity could

mean good and bad to me. It has holes for flaws. I wish he would be more strict

on what he meant by creativity."

Janet's explanation on noticing a change in education was referenced to her experience

with financial aid. Janet then gives a critique about the word creativity. She believes that

the word: *"creativity"* is ambiguous and that it may cause problems. Janet's response

falls under the Indifferent message recipient category, because her summary and

explanation did not praise the speech and Obama like Josh's response, nor does she

criticize Obama and supply counterarguments against his speech like Jim's response.

Unlike Janet, Laura's response connotes that President Obama and his speech are

disingenuous. Laura's response, is classified as the Cynic message recipient. She said:

"President Obama is just telling everyone what they want to hear. Just

telling us education should be first and we should give the money to students so

they can learn and create jobs in the future, c'ause children are the future."

Laura's summary and interpretation contains the adverb: "just", which might suggest that

for her, Obama is merely "telling everyone what they want to hear." In her response she

states: "…c'ause children are the future" to explain Obama's motivation behind wanting

to "give the money to students" to learn and create jobs. She states again that Obama is:

"…saying a lot of things that people want to hear." However, to support her basis she gives an example: " … like woman should get paid equally."

Laura makes the statement that: "on the surface" she was excited, but she has not: "seen anything happen." She explains her response by referencing past legislation under the Obama presidency. Consider the following:

> "I have not seen any changes like the passing of the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act…we're they basically say they have the power to detain anybody that is presumed to be a threat to the United States – So if your talking blasphemy about the United States, they can detain you… anywhere around the world."

Laura's explanation for not noticing a change was grounded in her reference to the National Defense Authorization Act. For Laura, President Obama appears to be promoting propaganda, by making statements that are socially desirable, yet insincere and disingenuous. She substantiates her interpretation by citing legislation.

Lastly, Jenny's interpretation of Obama's political speech is typed as the Skeptical message recipient. She responses favorably toward the speech, but she questions its practicality. She said:

> "He started out talking about high school education. We have to raise the bar for high school education. And he talked about rewarding teachers that teach creatively. He moved to college education and [talked about] making it more affordable, and giving incentive to institutions who can lower their tuition. He wants to lower the college interest rates, but that's going to be difficult to control."

Jenny's summary and interpretation of the speech appears to be very sequential in nature. She says: "he started out," indicating that the first thing that President Obama spoke about was college education. Jenny then starts to interpret the speech by stating the words: "raise the bar." This suggests that she believes that Obama wants to raise the educational standard. She transitions to the next subject in the speech by using the words: "he moved to." As she describes the speech, she also critiques the speech. She says: "he wants to lower the college interest rates, but that's going to be difficult to control." Jenny then explains her critique by asking a rhetorical question:

> "…It's uplifting but it's a lot of work. He mentioned the interest rates going up but what's going to happen to people who already have so much debt and their interest rates are going to stay the same?"

Jenny explains why she feels that President Obama will have a: "difficult" time trying to lower: "college interest rates." She supports this statement by asking rhetorical questions that she believes makes the lowing of college interest rates difficult. Jenny's summary and interpretation of the speech suggest that she is skeptical towards the speech. She believes that the speech is uplifting, but she questions how Obama will get his proposals done.

As noted previously, and as reflected in the discussion of the speaker typology, the language that speakers use when reacting to a political speech is not really individualized. Rather, reactions can be categorized along a continuum and any number of speakers may occupy the same category. The underlying principles appear to be the notions of truth telling (was the content of the speech truthful), the purpose of the content

(why did the president say what he did), and practicality (what will be done, if anything, to realize any goals laid out in the speech segment).

Membership Categories

As noted previously, the speakers can be located in a category of the typology interpretations of a political office, specifically, the presidency. In this case, the similarities between speakers' interpretations of Obama's political speech segment, and their interpretations of the Office of the Presidency, are found in the multiple references that they make to a variety of membership categories. As used here, membership categories are the words or phrases speakers use to reference a social group of some sort when asked to characterize the presidency and/or Obama's political speech. As such, a membership category is commonly linked to a speaker's personal biography or sphere of interaction.

Indeed, when speakers characterized the presidency and/or Obama's political speech, several specific membership categories were present in their discourse. Several speakers cited personal membership categories as relevant to their perceptions of the presidency and/or Obama's political speech; these are: The Patriot and The Nationalist, College Major, The Republican and The Democrat, Religious Man, Employment Status, and Class. Additionally, several speakers cited other membership categories as relevant to their own perceptions of the presidency and/or Obama's political speech; these are: Educator, Ethnicity, Father and Team Lead, as well as, College Dean.

The Patriot and the Nationalist

When Adam was asked about the presidency, in terms of, what qualities represents a bad president? He responded that a bad president was someone who did not have the best

intentions for the people of America. He stated the President Obama falls under this assessment. Adam supports his statement by referencing the economy. He said:

"…we have gotten to the point we're we are not at the forefront of economic strength like we used to be. I don't mean to say that in a nationalistic type of way, but in a patriotic way."

Adam refers to President Obama as someone he considers a bad president. Adam's basis for his response was that the U.S. is not "at the forefront of economic strength" like in the past. Adam uses two membership categories to explain the basis of his interpretation of what represents a bad president: nationalistic and patriotic. Both of these membership categories represent certain members from two distinct groups — the nationalists and the patriots. Perhaps Adam shares Orwell's (1945) distinction between nationalism and patriotism. Orwell defines nationalism as chauvinism and patriotism as the adoration for one's country without being chauvinistic. If this is indeed the case, Adam has categorized his response as patriotic, a member who loves his country without being chauvinistic.

As it relates to the typology, Adam as a speaker is an example of the Cynic. This is not because Adam stated that Obama is a bad president. On the contrary, Adam's response is associated with the Cynic because of his statement about what makes a bad president. The underlying principle in his response is "purpose" — the perceived motivation behind a bad president's ill intentions toward the U.S. Adam falls short of the Complete Critic type, because the underlying principle behind his response did not appear to be "truth-telling."

College Major

As might be expected, several speakers used the membership category of *college major* in their descriptions of the president's speech and the presidency. The college major membership category was utilized to describe the speakers for two distinct purposes. (1) To lend support to President Obama's political speech. (2) To support a description about the presidency. For example, after watching and listening to President Obama's speech, Nicki comments:

> "I'm a psychology major. [If I were President] I would change tuition too.
> It's ridiculous that we have to spend all this money on undergraduate school and
> we cannot do any thing with a bachelor's degree especially in psychology,
> which is my major. So I have do go on and get a Ph.D and its difficult to get
> into some of the better schools because they take a hundred apps and only
> accept ten. And if you are one of those ten then you have to spend hundreds and
> thousands of dollars. I don't understand why we have to pay so much."

Nicki establishes her membership in the Psychology Department by stating that she is a psychology major. The membership category of a college student is inferred from her identification as a psychology major. Nicki uses this membership category to justify and support President Obama's speech regarding the rising cost of college tuition. She stated that, just like President Obama, she would "change college tuition." Nicki's explanation about her statement, regarding wanting to change college tuition shows two functions: (1) it shows how Nicki uses her personal biography and member affiliation to support her statement pertaining to wanting to change college tuition. (2) While supporting her statement, Nicki's explanation also acknowledges and gives credence to Obama's speech.

As it relates to the typology, Nicki as a speaker is an example of the True Believer. Nicki's response is associated with the True Believer because of her response indicates her supports and confirms Obama's statement regarding rising tuition cost. The underlying principle in her response is "truth-telling" — President Obama is telling the truth because her college tuition is rising.

In contrast, Carlos uses his major as support for his assertion regarding what qualities represent a bad president. Carlos states:

> "I'm a criminal justice major… and I believe this… you have so many white collar crimes going on lucrative deals going on… an example, Halliburton and Cheney… it's shady, it's locative. It goes back to the 50s and 60s the unions were real big… they had their hands in everything that's how people get voted into office."

Carlos establishes his membership in the School of Criminal Justice. He uses this membership category to ground his belief that politicians partake in criminal activity to get elected into office. Although Carlos does not state this specifically about the presidency, we can assume that his claim of criminal activity could also apply to presidents.

The Republican and the Democrat

As might be expected, Republican and Democrat membership categories permeate the data in the study. The speakers in this study used these membership categories to show group conflict and/or group cohesion in terms of the presidency. Adam's description of the Office of the Presidency indicates his desire for the president to unite the republican and democratic party. Adam said:

"This will be a shock, being a college republican… is just how… I guess divided… we're so ready to just jump at each other and point the figure and say well this is that way because conservative done this and liberals done that… and yeah that is in certain cases true because of policies and different leaders. But in most cases it's not… if we would just stop pointing fingers and take good ideas from this group and good ideas from that group, whether liberals or conservatives, republicans or democrats and any other kind of political belief in there minus the commies - come on…"

Adam's description is full of political membership categories: liberals, conservatives, republicans and democrats. It appears that he wants a presidency that is all-inclusive, with an exception – the commies. Adam gave a disclaimer that the words he was about to speak was going to be a "shock," due to the fact that he is as a college Republican. Based on this statement it would appear that his response regarding bipartisanism might deviate from his shared knowledge as a member of the Republican Party. The disclaimer may have several meanings, one of which could be, Adam questioning the practicality of his political party's ideology in trying to get laws passed and leaders elected. It appears from his response that he does not think that partisanship is effective in getting legislation passed.

As it relates to the typology, and within this context of group conflict and/or group cohesion, Adam as a speaker is an example of the Skeptic. Adam's response is associated with the Skeptic because of his disclaimer he mentions at beginning of this response. Interestingly, Adam's disclaimer also infers that he would categorize his response as anti-republican. The underlying principle in his response hints at

"practicality" —Adam appears to question how practical it is for political groups to remain disagreeable and pass legislation.

Similar to Adam's description, Ed uses political membership categories in his response to construct an image of compromise between the presidency and the two political parties:

> "…in this country we cannot have a situation where one party imposing all their ideas on society… it's gotta be a balance somewhere. Even I'm a democrat, I would hate to see democrats get their own way… where everything is going one way."

In this description, Ed acknowledges his membership to the Democratic Party. Ed's response illustrate that he is against a totalitarian regulated government. His acknowledgement of his membership anchors his response for an anti-totalitarian government.

Fred, on the other hand, uses the membership category of *Democrat* to talk about his dislike for the Republican president, George W. Bush. He said:

> "At the risk of sounding like a democrat...some of the things he [George W. Bush] did weren't smart for the future of the country. Some of the things he did was out right lies. That level of unabashed unresponsiveness, that level of deceit… he didn't care where we would be in then next ten years the certain actions he took. Whether it was in foreign policy or domestic policy – I'm speaking of specifically towards marriage and the definition of it."

By using the membership category *Democrat*, Fred indicates that what he is about to say is a normative evaluation of the George Bush Jr. presidency made by members of the Democratic Party. Fred also uses the term *risk* at the beginning of his response. It would appear that if Fred agreed with the meaning traditionally associated the term risk, which is exposure to danger or harm. Then it would appear that Fred might not identify himself as a member of the Democratic Party. It also suggests that Fred might harbor some sort of ill will against the Democratic Party. However, Fred's statement can also be taken to be an acknowledgement of Democrats' descriptions of the George Bush Jr. presidency.

As it relates to the typology, Fred as a speaker is an example of the Complete Critic. Fred's response is associated with the Complete Critic speaker because his response contains negative, critical, and non-supportive words and phrases regarding the Bush Jr. presidency. Fred's response is full of criticism. The underlying principle in his response is "truth-telling" — Fred's belief that President George Bush Jr was not truthful during his years in Office.

Jane's use of membership categories is similar to Fred's response. Like Fred, Jane uses a membership category to illustrate what membership category of which she is not a member. As it pertains to the Clinton presidency, Jane stated: "He lied every in the face of all America, the country… He's an embarrassment…it has nothing to do with him being a Democrat." In Jane's response, she critiques the Clinton presidency and then she indicates that her critique does not pertain to Clinton's membership to the Democratic Party. Jane's remark using the Democrat membership category, suggests that she is not a member of the Democrat Party; but neither is her critique a prejudgment based upon Clinton's party affiliation.

The Religious Man

A few of the speakers used the membership category of the religious man in their descriptions of the presidency. Typically, the religious man membership category was something of a two-way street. When a research participant voiced expectations that the president should be a religious man, it was accompanied by a religious man declaration on the part of the research participant.

Mark believed that the president of the U.S. should display a moral character that was biblically based, and he made reference to his own belief system in the process. Consider the following from Mark:

> "A Godly moral conduct must be displayed by the president. I'm a man of faith so I look for biblically based qualities in a president…I believe that every president needs supernatural help, they need to believe in God. They need to depend upon his wisdom. They need divine intervention because I need it on the level that I'm on right now [laughing]… I just have my few at the house and he taking care of a nation... a divine source is needed."

As it relates to the typology, Mark as a speaker would be typed as the Indifferent speaker. Mark's response is associated with the Indifferent speaker because of his response about the presidency is not an evaluation, but a description of what the presidency means to Mark. The words in the response do not indicate a criticism about the presidency. The underlying principle in his response is "truth-telling" —in terms of religious morality.

Juan also referenced the religious man membership category, but did so in the context of his characterization of President George W. Bush. For Juan, Bush Jr. was his favorite president because "he's a very religious man and I am religious too." Once

again, Juan's commentary reflects what appears to be the two-way street nature of the religious man membership category. When a study participant expresses a belief that a president is or should be *a religious man*, it is often connected to the speakers own membership in the *religious man* category.

<div align="center">

Employment status

</div>

For speakers, Mark and Ed, membership in a specific employment status category appeared to be central to their reactions to President Obama's speech. Where the influence of the respondent's employment status would take him/her in response to the president's speech might vary, but the importance of employment status rings whenever it is mentioned.

Mark, for example, indicated that he supports president Obama's notion that education changes the trajectory of a person's life. Consider the following:

> "… I'm a firm believer that if you are armed with knowledge you can make something happen for you… create your own reality. A personal testimony of my own I was a construction worker in my past life, and I used to see people with suits and ties at a distance. I used to say 'I want a job where I can wear nice clothes.'…I started to go back to school and work on an associate degree… I got some knowledge about a trade and then got a better job. With the new job, I had to change my old attire. The way I dressed… gave me a boost of self-confidence."

Mark's employment membership category of *construction worker* is what he offers as supportive evidence to his interpretation of president Obama's speech. Mark believes what he believes because of his *employment status* membership category.

In Ed's commentary, however, he referenced the membership category of *manager* to support his interpretation of president Obama's speech.   More specifically, it was Ed's membership in the *manager* category that Ed used to validate his views about gender inequality in the workforce and how he viewed President Obama's position on workforce equality. For example, Ed said:

> "Being in the managerial position I am privy to conversations that most people don't hear. My bosses all ways talk about how they would feel if a woman was in charge over them and also if a woman got paid more than them. In the board meetings, they are always saying sexist and derogatory things about women…but as soon as the board meetings are over, they are all in the women's faces be all nice and cordial…They pretty much make it so that the woman is not on the same level as the man. It sickens me."

Class

As might be expected, class membership categories frequently came into play in the respondents' discussions of the president, the presidency, and the president's speech. As to the issue of class, several speakers linked it to their expectations as to what the presidency should be. Several speakers, for example, voiced their disfavor toward a president who would support only one class of people. Jack's expectations about the presidency, along with his characterization of the Bush, Jr. Presidency, illustrate the point:

> "I'm not trying to pick on President Bush but for example, he went to the dinner party one time and he said that it was good to be amongst his kind of people: the have's and the have mores… even though it was meant as a joke,

but still… it wasn't a joke. See that does not reach out to everyone…wasn't

meant as a joke…Because it benefited those have's and the have mores…This

shows that their president, or the person that holds the position of being in

charge of the country is on their side and everything is just fine. It alleviates that

status anxiety where we're in control, everything is fine… there's no anxiety on

their behalf because the rule maker is on their side."

As noted previously, the research speakers made use of numerous membership categories

when they were asked to respond to the various questions that were posed to them about

the president's speech and the presidency. For many speakers, membership categories

were based upon a familiar social role.

Educator

In Fred's response about the Office of the Presidency, he referenced the

membership category of *the educator*. He stated that he was fond of Lyndon B. Johnson

(LBJ) because he (LBJ) was a strong advocate for education. Consider the following

from Fred:

"…everything I learned about LBJ I really liked. I like a lot of thing about

LBJ and his great society and being an educator. I really like the idea of an

educator in office. Somebody who've interacted and seen the youth up to his

age…An educator is a teacher especially in a classroom format. He [LBJ] was

like this middle class teacher. Teachers are something to be valued. I only

remember the good teachers that influenced my life growing up."

Fred's use of the membership category *educator* makes reference to a member of a group

whose goal is to facilitate learning on the part of people outside her/his membership

category. Therefore, as it pertains the presidency, it appears that Fred prefers notions such

as, "presidential educator" or education president. Interestingly, Fred supports the

education president description by including his experience with teachers during his

childhood. Perhaps Fred's past student-teacher interaction anchors his perspective of the

LBJ presidency.

As it relates to the typology, Fred as a speaker would be typed as the True

Believer. Fred's response is associated with the True Believer because of his response

indicates his praises and does not critique the LBJ presidency. The underlying principle

in his response is "truth-telling" — Fred believes that LBJ was an educator and that he

has interacted with the youth.

<div align="center">Ethnicity</div>

Similar to speakers' utilization of class membership categories, speakers also used

ethnic membership categories in their discussions of the president, the presidency, and

the president's speech. However, respondents indicated that ethnicity was not central to

their interpretations about the president, the presidency, and/or the president's political

speech.

When asked about the Office of the Presidency, for example, Jane indicated that

the job of the presidency was explained in the Constitution. Then she stated that the

president: "can veto and sign things into law." Jane then moved on to a discussion of the

president as "the face for the United States. From that point, and even though the

reference was vague, it was but a small step to the matter of ethnicity:

> "He can talk all day long like he just did… but ultimately who is making
>
> those decisions. So everything he's taking about he doesn't vote on that… I

would say he's the face of the United States – he's what the entire world would

perceive the U.S. as… so how he speaks, if he were illiterate and he were to go

to Iran...to try to negotiate nuclear powers that they're trying to create and he

couldn't speak correctly everybody would say all of us are this way. That's just

the way people are… And so I think that because of who we elect into office…

its gonna be somebody who the entire world is going to perceive the United

States as… I don't necessarily say like color, their skin color or ethnic

background…"

Father and Team Leader

The view of the president as father was explicit in Mark's commentary.   For

example, Mark said:

"…he is a leader as I am a father. You always have people watching… not

only do my kids expect me to lead…they expect me to know how to do

something just because I'm in the role I'm in the position as head of

household… I and I'm daddy, I'm their father… So it's like in this country we

look to the president like a father… sort to speak…what are we going to do

now… the economy is in this situation what are you going to do… Just my

children…if there's no food in the house, Dad…what's up, what are you going

to do about this?"

In Mark's response, the father is a membership category because a father is a member of

a social institution. According to Mark, the father's prescriptive role is providing for his

family. Similarly, the president is a member of an institution, and as such, the prescriptive

role that applies to the president is similar to a father. For Mark, president is also a provider, and the president's job is to provide for the American people.

Similar to Mark, Pat also speaks about the president being a leader, but he uses a sports metaphor to explain his view of the presidency. He states: "I mean even in sports if you can't get your team to side with you, you are not going to do anything. And [when I say] your team I don't mean… like your party… you have to get congress…[congress is] basically your team."

College Dean

Closely related to Pat's response regarding the presidency and congress, Carlos uses the role of a college dean to illustrate his view of what the relationship should be between the presidency and congress:

"The Dean of the college still has to answer to other people in the college, such as the President has to [answer to] the senate and congress… [I] understand that…but they're not working together…"

In Carlos' response, the college dean is a membership category because a college dean is a member of an institution. According to Carlos, the college dean's prescriptive role is to be held accountable to other members in the institution. Similarly, the president is a member of an institution. For Carlos, the prescriptive role that applies to the president is also similar to the college dean, the president is accountable to other people in the institution, for Carlos, these people are congressmen.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The research discussed here focused on the ways how college students hear and talk about President Obama's political speech. It also included an exploration into student perceptions about the presidency as an office. In terms of the sociology of everyday life perspective, the research project was an attempt to gain an understanding of how students construct certain elements of their personal political reality. It also included an exploration into student perceptions about the presidency as an office. In terms of the central question that drove the research, it could be summarized as follows: How is it that students make sense of the political world around them?

When asked to summarize a political speech segment, respondents mentioned three characteristics, as observed in the actual words they used:

1. Some students used words like: "he was talking about…" indicating that they were citing or summarizing the speaker of the political speech segment.

2. A few students used words like: "he's for college…" the use of these words indicates that what they heard is a personal attribute to the speaker of the political speech segment.

3. Other students used words like: "all he said was a bunch of fluff…" these words indicate that the words in the speech segment were irrelevant to the students who heard them.

It is important to note, when students were asked to summarize the speech segment, some students also included their interpretation within their summary. When the students were asked to interpret a speech segment, students who included their interpretation in their summary often referenced the speech segment as the basis for their interpretation. While other students who gave their interpretation of the speech segment referenced their social memberships as college students for the basis of their interpretation.

For example, some students stated that the president's statement about education was important to them since they are college students. Other students based their interpretations by describing the political speaker's motivation behind the speech. For example, one student stated that the speech segment was the political speaker's effort to "rallying the troops…"

When the students were asked questions about their interpretations about the presidency, their responses were often grounded in membership categories. The students utilized the membership categories in their response in three ways:

1. Membership categories were used to explain or justify their interpretation of the presidency. For example, some students referenced their membership to their political party to indicate their interpretations of the presidency. There were frequent responses that indicated that students who self identified as a member of a political party, interpreted the Office of the Presidency as a person that is who not biased toward a particular political party.

2. Membership categories were used to describe the presidency. For example, some students referenced ethnicity as a membership category to describe the

presidency. The students' responses indicated that: "race" played no particular relevance to the presidency.

3. Membership categories were used to reference the presidency and the speech segment. For example, some students referenced their profession to lend support to the content in the speak segment as well as to illustrate their expectation of the presidency.

In short, the interpretations of the presidency as a leader who is bipartisan, ethnically diverse, and a working professional, were some of the positive interpretations that emerged in the student's responses. Respondents who gave negative interpretations of the presidency described a president who is a liar, unpatriotic, and illiterate. Additionally, students also used membership categories to substantiate their interpretations of the speech segment and their notion of presidency. Some students also used the media and/or popular culture to substantiate their interpretation of the presidency. Other students talked about their personal experience, or previous presidents to support their interpretation of the presidency.

The choice of words that the students used also helped substantiate the speech segment and the presidency. The students' used their words in varying degrees to substantiate their interpretations. Therefore, how students talked about the speech segment and the presidency contributes to their efforts in creating and sustaining a coherent interpretation. For example, a student stated that the U.S. is performing poorly in education compared to other nations. The student substantiates her interpretation of the U.S.'s sub-par education standard by referencing commercials and her past interactions with friends.

The relevant literature indicates that people or members of a social group, use their shared knowledge to understand, interpret, and talk about reality. In other words, the person who listens to and interprets a political speech does not do so in isolation or apart from his/her connections to the larger social world. Additionally, proponents of the ethnomethodological tradition suggest the nature and content of the shared knowledge is evident in how people talk. In other words, it is how people express themselves that gives us a clue to their personal social reality.

It would be difficult to consider the data that formed the basis of the research and not come away with a sense that both the sociology of everyday life, as a theoretical perspective, and the ethnomethodological tradition, as a methodology, received validation. Moreover, it would be difficult to consider the data without concluding that the sociological perspective is not something possessed by the sociologist, alone.

Rather, the casual observer of society — the person who is asked to listen to and react to a political speech — is not that different from the sociologist. The sociologist's analytical advantage is to be the ability to observe all varieties of perceptions of the president in a typology. The person of commonsense typically operates in one of the categories only.

Indeed, the content of what the casual observer may not reflect the same content that a professional sociologist might use, but the process or form of the thought would be very similar. In the final analysis, typologies, membership categories, roles and the like belong to all of us. Yes, they are the bread and butter of the professional sociologist, but they are the building blocks of reality for the person on the street.

APPENDIX A – REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

These reforms will help people get jobs that are open today. But to prepare for the jobs of tomorrow, our commitment to skills and education has to start earlier.

For less than 1 percent of what our nation spends on education each year, we've convinced nearly every state in the country to raise their standards for teaching and learning -- the first time that's happened in a generation.

But challenges remain. And we know how to solve them.

At a time when other countries are doubling down on education, tight budgets have forced states to lay off thousands of teachers. We know a good teacher can increase the lifetime income of a classroom by over $250,000. A great teacher can offer an escape from poverty to the child who dreams beyond his circumstance. Every person in this chamber can point to a teacher who changed the trajectory of their lives. Most teachers work tirelessly, with modest pay, sometimes digging into their own pocket for school supplies -- just to make a difference.

Teachers matter. So instead of bashing them, or defending the status quo, let's offer schools a deal. Give them the resources to keep good teachers on the job, and

reward the best ones. (Applause.) And in return, grant schools flexibility: to teach with creativity and passion; to stop teaching to the test; and to replace teachers who just aren't helping kids learn. That's a bargain worth making. (Applause.)

We also know that when students don't walk away from their education, more of them walk the stage to get their diploma. When students are not allowed to drop out, they do better. So tonight, I am proposing that every state -- every state -- requires that all students stay in high school until they graduate or turn 18. (Applause.)

When kids do graduate, the most daunting challenge can be the cost of college. At a time when Americans owe more in tuition debt than credit card debt, this Congress needs to stop the interest rates on student loans from doubling in July. (Applause.)

Extend the tuition tax credit we started that saves millions of middle-class families thousands of dollars, and give more young people the chance to earn their way through college by doubling the number of work-study jobs in the next five years. (Applause.)

Of course, it's not enough for us to increase student aid. We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money. States also need to do their part, by making higher education a higher priority in their budgets. And colleges and universities have to do their part by working to keep costs down.

Recently, I spoke with a group of college presidents who've done just that. Some schools redesign courses to help students finish more quickly. Some use better technology. The point is, it's possible. So let me put colleges and universities on notice: If you can't stop tuition from going up, the funding you get from taxpayers will

go down. (Applause.) Higher education can't be a luxury -– it is an economic imperative that every family in America should be able to afford.

Let's also remember that hundreds of thousands of talented, hardworking students in this country face another challenge: the fact that they aren't yet American citizens. Many were brought here as small children, are American through and through, yet they live every day with the threat of deportation. Others came more recently, to study business and science and engineering, but as soon as they get their degree, we send them home to invent new products and create new jobs somewhere else.

That doesn't make sense.

I believe as strongly as ever that we should take on illegal immigration. That's why my administration has put more boots on the border than ever before. That's why there are fewer illegal crossings than when I took office. The opponents of action are out of excuses. We should be working on comprehensive immigration reform right now. (Applause.)

But if election-year politics keeps Congress from acting on a comprehensive plan, let's at least agree to stop expelling responsible young people who want to staff our labs, start new businesses, defend this country. Send me a law that gives them the chance to earn their citizenship. I will sign it right away. (Applause.)

You see, an economy built to last is one where we encourage the talent and ingenuity of every person in this country. That means women should earn equal pay for equal work. (Applause.) It means we should support everyone who's willing to work, and every risk-taker and entrepreneur who aspires to become the next Steve Jobs.

REFERENCES

Adler, Patricia A., Peter Adler and Andrea Fontana. 1987. "Everyday Life Sociology."
Annual Review of Sociology 13:217-235.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality; a*
Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann.
Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1966; [1st ed.]

Bligh, M. C. and J. C. Kohles. 2009. "The Enduring Allure of Charisma: How Barack
Obama Won the Historic 2008 Presidential Election." *Leadership Quarterly*
20(3):483-492.

Bogen, David and Michael Lynch. 1989. "Taking Account of the Hostile Native:
Plausible Deniability and the Production of Conventional History in the Iran-Contra
Hearings." *Social problems* 36(3):197-224.

Cicourel, Aaron V. 1973. "Cross-Modal Communication: The Representational Context
of Sociolinguistic Information Processing." Pp. 187-222 in *Report of the Twenty-*
Third Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies:
Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects:, edited by R.W. Shuy, C.N. Bailey
and E. Haugen. Wash., D.C.: Georgetown U.P.

------. 1969. "Language as a Variable in Social Research." *Sociological Focus* 3(2):43-52.

Dahlberg, Lincoln and Sean Phelan. 2011. *Discourse Theory and Critical Media Politics.*
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Davis, Fred. 1991. *Passage through Crisis: Polio Victims and their Families.* New
Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Dijk, Teun A. v. 2002. "Political Discourse and Political Cognition." Pp. 203-237 in
Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse, edited by P.A.
Chilton and C. Schäffner. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Douglas, Jack D. 1980. *Introduction to the Sociologies of Everyday Life / Jack D.*
Douglas and Patricia A. Adler ... [Et Al.]. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, c1980.

------. 1971. *American Social Order; Social Rules in a Pluralistic Society, by Jack D.*
Douglas. New York, Free Press [1971].

Dragojlovic, N. I. 2011. "Priming and the Obama Effect on Public Evaluations of the United States." *Political Psychology* 32(6):989-1006.

Fitzgerald, Richard and William Housley. 2002. "Identity, categorization and sequential organization: the sequential and categorical flow of identity in a radio phone-in." *Discourse & Society* 13(5):579.

Ford, P. K., T. A. Johnson and A. Maxwell. 2010. ""Yes we can" or "Yes we did"?: Prospective and retrospective change in the Obama presidency." *Journal of Black Studies* 40(3):462-483.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall [1967].

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1959.

Hall, Peter M. 2006. "The Presidency and Impression Management." Pp. 365-377 in *Life as Theater: A Dramaturgical Sourcebook (2nd ed.).*, edited by D. Brissett and C. Edgley. New Brunswick, NJ US: Aldine Transaction.

Harrison, Faye V. 2009. "The Paradox of Democracy in the New Racial Domain." *Anthropology News* 50(1):15-15.

Hartigan Jr., John and Ruth Frankenberg. 1997. "Locating White Detroit." Pp. 180-213 in "Locating White Detroit."

Have, Paul t. 2004. *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology / Paul Ten Have.* London; Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publications, 2004.

Hruby, G. 2001. "Sociological, postmodern, and new realism perspectives in social constructionism: Implications for literacy research." *Reading Research Quarterly* 36(1):48-62.

Hunt, Matthew O. and David C. Wilson. 2009. "Race/Ethnicity Perceived Discrimination, and Beliefs about the Meaning of an Obama Presidency." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 6(01):173

JACOBSON, GARY C. 2011. "Legislative Success and Political Failure: The Public's Reaction to Barack Obama's Early Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 41(2):220-243.

Johnson D. 2008. "Contemporary Sociological Theory: An Integrated Multi-Level Approach."

Kotarba, Joseph A., Jennifer L. Fackler and Kathryn M. Nowotny. 2009. "An Ethnography of Emerging Latino Music Scenes." *Symbolic Interaction* 32(4):310-333.

Kushin, M. J. and M. Yamamoto. 2010. "Did Social Media really Matter? College Students' use of Online Media and Political Decision Making in the 2008 Election." *Mass Communication and Society* 13(5):608-630.

Laclau, Ernesto. 1993. "Power and representation." *Politics, Theory & Contemporary Culture* 277-96.

------. 1993. "The signifiers of democracy." *Democracy & Possessive Individualism* 221-33.

Livingston, Eric. 2012. "Games, Pastimes, and Leisure Pursuits." *American Sociologist* 43(1):109-124.

Lyman, Stanford M. and Marvin B. Scott. 1970. *A Sociology of the Absurd [by] Stanford M. Lyman [and] Marvin B. Scott. Foreword by Rom Harré.* New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts [1970].

Mannheim, Karl and Kurt H. Wolff. 1971. *From Karl Mannheim. Edited with an Introd. by Kurt H. Wolff.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Mehan, Hugh and Houston Wood. 1975. *The Reality of Ethnomethodology / Hugh Mehan, Houston Wood.* New York: Wiley, [1975].

Orbuch, T. L. 1997. "People's Accounts Count: The Sociology of Accounts." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:455-478.

Pascale, C. M. 2007. *Making Sense of Race, Class, and Gender: Commonsense, Power, and Privilege in the United States.* CRC Press.

Pollner, Melvin. 1979. "Explicative Transactions: Making and Managing Meaning in Traffic Court." Pp. 227-255 in *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology.*, edited by G. Psathas. New York: Halsted (Irvington).

Sacks, Harvey. 1972. "On the Analyzability of Stories by Children." Pp. 325-346 in *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication.*, edited by J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schier, Steven E. 2010. "Obama's "Big Bang" Presidency." *Forum (1540-8884)* 8(3):1-10.

Schütz, A. 1953. "Common-sense and scientific interpretation of human action." *Philosophy and phenomenological research* 14(1):1-38.

Scott, Susie. 2009. *Making Sense of Everyday Life.* Polity.

------. 2005. "The Red, Shaking Fool: Dramaturgical Dilemmas in Shyness." *Symbolic Interaction* 28(1):91-110.

Smith, Kenneth J. and Linda L. Belgrave. 1995. "The Reconstruction of Everyday Life: Experiencing Hurricane Andrew." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 24:244-269.

Taylor, C. C. 1947. "Sociology and common sense." *American Sociological Review* 12(1):1-9.

Turner, Roy, Ed. 1974. "Ethnomethodology / Ed. Roy Turner."

Voysey, Margaret. 1975. *A Constant Burden: The Reconstitution of Family Life.*Oxford England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wacquant, Loïc J. D. 2004. *Body & Soul : Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer / Loïc Wacquant.* Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press, 2004.

Weitzer, Ronald J. 2009. *Sex for Sale: Prostitution, Pornography, and the Sex Industry / Ronald Weitzer.* New York, NY : Routledge, 2009; 2nd ed.

Whitehead, K. A. 2009. ""Categorizing the Categorizer": The Management of Racial Common Sense in Interaction." *Social psychology quarterly* 72(4):325-342.

Williams, Johnny E. 2011. "'Change you can Believe in,' you Better not Believe it." *Critical Sociology*.

VITA

Jasmón Le Shaun Bailey was born in Austin, Texas, on November 13, 1984, the son of Beverly Renee Hill Bailey and Ricardo Cortez Bailey. After completing his work at John B. Connally High School, Austin, Texas, in 2003, he moved to North Carolina to attend college. After his freshman year of college, Jasmón moved back to Texas and transferred to Texas State University- San Marcos, where he received Bachelor of Healthcare Administration degree in August 2007. During the following years, he was employed as a compliance analyst at a behavioral health company in Austin, Texas. In August 2010, he entered the Graduate College of Texas State University – San Marcos. Jasmón's anticipated graduation date is August 2012, with a Master's of Arts degree in Sociology.

Permanent E-Mail Address: Mr.ShuanBailey@gmail.com

This Thesis was typed by Jasmón L. Bailey.