

CARSON-NEWMAN



Studies

Table of Contents

| | | | |
|--|----|--|----|
| Editor's Introduction | | "And There Is a Great Chasm Fixed Between the Two": Biblical Scholarship, the Church, and the Great Divide between Them [Russell Bradley Jones Lecture, March 2012] | |
| D. Brian Austin | ii | Chad Hartsock | 47 |
| "Why Are You Here?" [Distinguished Faculty Award Address, August 2011] | | Primary Motivational Factors Regarding School Leadership Candidates' Licensure Aspirations Earnest Walker and Julia Price | 57 |
| Ross Brummett | 1 | Shakespeare's Treatment of <i>Amour Courtois</i> in <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i> Mary A. Ratchford | 63 |
| From Purple to Dead Red: Tennessee Politics, 1966-2012 James L. Baumgardner | 11 | List of Contributors | 75 |
| YouTube as an Educational Tool: Marketing Education in the Classroom Hester Daves Beecher | 26 | | |
| A Miktam for the Road [Baccalaureate Sermon, May 2012] Mark Brown | 35 | | |
| Effective Practicing Ryan Fogg | 41 | | |



CARSON-NEWMAN

A Christian University

CARSON-NEWMAN *Studies*

VOL. XIII, No. 1

FALL 2012

ISSN 1081-7727

D. Brian Austin
Professor of Philosophy
Editor

Kina S. Mallard
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Managing Editor

Carson-Newman Studies is published annually by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee. Correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, P.O. Box 71976, Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, TN 37760.

Opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the editors or of Carson-Newman College. Statements of fact are the responsibility of the individual contributors.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Editor's Introduction | |
| D. Brian Austin | ii |
| “Why Are You Here?” | |
| [Distinguished Faculty Award Address, August 2011] | |
| Ross Brummett | 1 |
| From Purple to Dead Red: Tennessee Politics, 1966-2012 | |
| James L. Baumgardner | 11 |
| YouTube as an Educational Tool: Marketing Education in the Classroom | |
| Hester Daves Beecher | 26 |
| A Miktam for the Road [Baccalaureate Sermon, May 2012] | |
| Mark Brown | 35 |
| Effective Practicing | |
| Ryan Fogg | 41 |
| “And There Is a Great Chasm Fixed Between the Two”: Biblical Scholarship, the Church, and the Great Divide between Them | |
| [Russell Bradley Jones Lecture, March 2012] | |
| Chad Hartssock | 47 |
| Primary Motivational Factors Regarding School Leadership Candidates' Licensure Aspirations | |
| Earnest Walker and Julia Price | 57 |
| Shakespeare's Treatment of <i>Amour Courtois</i> in <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i> | |
| Mary A. Ratchford | 63 |
| List of Contributors | 75 |

Editor's Introduction

Early in the morning, when very few other souls are moving about Carson-Newman's beautiful acres, I often walk past the story-full buildings that house our community of scholars. I walk past the old and the new buildings and reflect on the persons who are inside (or who soon will be) and thank God for the astounding ability and dedication of those persons. And I think back to the persons who used to inhabit those rooms, who have moved on from our immediate environs. Our community is indeed most blessed with past and current scholars who will carry forth C-N's hallowed mission of academic and Christian excellence.

This year's *Carson-Newman Studies* once again highlights that academic reputation and academic promise. And C-N's commitment to her students shines through as well. This edition reintroduces a practice, occasionally followed by my predecessor, of including a quality paper from a young Honors student. As a kind of chronological bookend to that piece, the journal includes a thoughtful look at Tennessee politics by Jim Baumgardner, who began his Carson-Newman teaching career in 1964. And there are quality pieces by scholars whose years amount to more and less than these.

As usual, the journal leads off with the Distinguished Faculty Address, written this year by Professor of Religion Ross Brummett (now also Vice-President for Student Affairs). Dr. Brummett, as well as the rest of this year's contributors, reminds each of us in this community of scholar-teachers *Why We Are Here*.

Once again the college has been recognized by various national publications and agencies for its academic prowess and its commitment to serving others. My hope is that your reading of this year's journal will allow a glimpse of that special mission that thrives vigorously 161 years after C-N's founders first put feet to their vision.

Brian Austin, Editor

“Why Are You Here?”

Ross Brummett

[Distinguished Faculty Award Address, August 2011]

To compose a Distinguished Faculty Address is a daunting task for any of us, but especially so for one such as me because I am not sure that I have ever had a completely original thought in my entire life. If I have a teaching strength, it is perhaps my ability to take seemingly disparate thoughts or concepts provided by other thinkers and to make connections between them, to weave them together, so to speak, into a pattern or perspective perhaps not previously seen by my students. So when faced with the task of preparing this address I had to decide if I wanted to prove to you by this lecture that I could lecture. For after all, we all want to be erudite without being otiose, sapient without being loquacious, and lots of other big adjectives only we faculty type understand.

Most Distinguished Faculty lecturers precede their lecture by thanking several folks. I'm going to begin mine by telling you 4 folks whom you need to thank. First, you need to thank my dearest friend and mentor, Don Garner, for when I initially toyed with the idea of building this address around many of the aphorisms for which I am known and have collected or coined across the years. Don gently reminded me “Ross, it's going to be published, and your Momma's going to read it.” So I decided against going that route.

You also need to thank my children, Molly and Will, because when I raised the possibility of composing a Powerpoint Presentation as a significant part of this presentation, one with images from the Hubble Telescope and electron microscopes scrolling while one of Mozart's symphonies played, my children IMMEDIATELY exclaimed, “Please Dad, NO! You're no good at that, and Miss Karen and Mr. Tom will both be there. Please don't do that, you'll embarrass yourself!” To them, Miss Karen is Dr. Karen Milligan of our education faculty who is so good that she has forgotten more about educational technology than I will ever know and Mr. Tom is Dr. Thomas Milligan of our Music Faculty, a former recipient of this award and one of the few true geniuses whom I have ever known.

And finally, you need to thank Ken Morton. I seriously toyed with the idea of lecturing on a specific theological topic such as patripassionism or kenotic Christology or perichoretic Trinitarianism. Boy, wouldn't that be fun! But if I did that, I knew many of you would be confused, most of you would be bored, and some of you would get angry. But when asking me how this address was coming, Ken said

2 Carson-Newman Studies

something akin to, “Ross, don’t put too much pressure on yourself. We know you can teach. We won’t remember most of what you said, but we will remember if you said it in under 20 minutes!”

And so, given all those helpful hints of what NOT to do, I have decided to follow my initial instincts and to take another route: Start where I am, with who I am, and my connections to you, my fellow faculty at this beloved place called Carson-Newman College. I don’t wish to sound arrogant, but I know I can teach. I have no need to write a fancy lecture to prove it. And let me say aloud what I have said to many in private: you know and I know, and you know that I know, that there are several folks gathered here who are as worthy or more worthy of receiving this award than I am. I know who you are, for I have voted for you. But I represent US, all of Us who love this place and love to teach and who are good at what we do, as I stand here today. Last night, I timed it at 35 minutes. Today I hope to cover it in less than 20.

William Turner tells the story that:

In response to a friendly critic who commented, “It’s been said better before,” Madeline L’ Engle said, “Of course, It’s all been said better before. If I thought I had to say it better than anybody else, I’d never start. Better or worse is immaterial. The thing is that it has to be said; by me . . .”¹

What follows is what has to be said; by me, out of my narrative in this place. For, as Joan Chittister in her work *Called to Question* has noted:

. . . an excursion into the questions and soul-searching of one person . . . is not, if it is true, only one person’s story. It is every person’s story. Yours as well as mine. And it is not traveled alone, this path to purpose and perception. It happens in conjunction with all the experiences and all the truths of all the rest of the people of my world.

And you, fellow Faculty and Staff, are my world. Listen closely, and in the midst of the journey, you will overhear the seemingly disparate

¹ *A Circle of Quiet* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1972), 28. As cited in William L. Turner, *The Struggle to Believe* (Macon: Smith & Helwys, 1993), 3.

voices of philosophers, theologians, natural scientists, social scientists, political scientists, educational theorists, and at least one musical artist. More importantly, you may well hear your own voice as well. So here goes:

“Once Upon a Time”—most good stories begin that way. So does this one. Go back, go back with me to early last Spring when we all sat in Thomas Recital Hall and at the end of a Town Hall meeting in which our President and colleague, Dr. Randall O’Brien once again modeled transparency in communicating with us. Toward the end of his address, he asked us “Why are you here? “

I ask you, brothers and sisters, colleagues, How did you answer that question? As I recently shared with Ray Dalton, the first thing that immediately popped into my mind was a quote from a character, a minister in Will Campbell’s novel *Brother to a Dragonfly*, who when asked that same question, answered, “Because I was called . . .” and then cursed, using words I won’t use here.

How did you answer that question back last spring, when Randall asked us? I answered it initially, immediately with the first thought that came to my mind, namely “Because I was called.” That answer, colleagues, came in the midst of the worst, the most internally tumultuous semester, I have ever experienced in my 24 years here. To be truthful, to give honest witness, I must tell you that last semester was so bad internally for me, that for the first time in my 24 years, my overworked, underpaid, underappreciated soul was, like many of yours, quite weary. Moreover, it now had recently become a grossly misunderstood soul. And so I considered leaving my beloved Carson-Newman College. And the most difficult part was not thinking about leaving. The most difficult part was *even thinking about thinking about leaving*. If you have been there, you know what I mean. That turmoil was pure hell. I will spare you the details of a difficult but fruitful Lenten Season inside my soul. I will merely say that I reflected on the question, “Why am I here?” and the corollary question Randall also asked us that day, “What has God called you here to do?” A LOT throughout much of the spring semester and have done so oftentimes since, including, obviously, the vocational decision I had to make three weeks ago.

I come today to give you this Interim Report of one pilgrim on the Journey alongside you.

First, I am here because I get to help undo Original Sin and Re-live History. Not every profession gets to do that!

4 Carson-Newman Studies

I'll share with you a quote, remind you of some history, and then share my conviction.

The quote comes from Abraham Joshua Heschel, a profound Jewish rabbinic scholar and philosopher, who marched with Dr. King during the Civil Rights Era. It can be found in his work, *God In Search of Man* and is printed at the top of my syllabus for my Introduction to Systematic Theology class:

The Hebrews learned in order to revere.

The Greeks learned in order to comprehend.

The modern (man) person learns in order to use.

Heschel poignantly argues that the loss of wonder and awe is the root of *all* sin. I argue that the Hebrews had it right and we moderns are worse off in our too often strictly utilitarian view of education. Learning ought to invoke Awe and Wonder.

The history, highly overly simplified, is this: Four centuries ago, at the beginning of the 17th century, a major shift took place in Western thought and its understanding of the role and interplay of faith and reason. Prior to this time, for centuries it was widely believed that things “out there” were as we perceived them to be, that Reality and our Perception of that Reality were one and the same. But two technological advances shattered that tightly-held belief: namely the telescope and the microscope. As Trevor Hart (and others) insightfully notes, the creation of the astronomically useful telescope by Galileo forced two major adjustments. First, there was a cosmological shift from geocentric to heliocentric. Second, there was an epistemological shift in that he proved that our sensory experience was capable of fraud on a grand scale. The second technological advance, the microscope, further enhanced this epistemological shift.

Ironically, these two advances simultaneously exponentially multiplied the amount of information and knowledge available to humans while at the same time decreasing our confidence in the certainty of the knowledge we claimed. The territory of human knowledge had been expanded, but the integrity of it had been called into question. The saddest part of this very key moment in time was that the people most hesitant to embrace this newfound knowledge were the religious, particularly church authorities and theologians. Indeed, the story is told that when invited by Galileo to look through the telescope, the local bishop refused to do so. He KNEW the truth, and no new insight would be allowed to call it into question.

I will not monopolize your time with a quick overview of the history of epistemology over the past four centuries and Western

humanity's quest for absolute certainty of knowledge, with the roll call of names such as Descartes, Hume, Locke, Kant, and others. There are several excellent treatments of this available, one of the best being by our own Brian Austin in his work *The End of Certainty and the Beginning of Faith: Science and Religion in the 21st Century*. We have, I hope more than I think, arrived at a place in time within Western thought, in our teaching of post-modern Millennials, where we can get past the arrogance of absolutism on either side of the faith/reason, science/ religion, reason/revelation, seeing/hearing debates. That is epochal and it provides us as educators, particularly as educators in church-related colleges, a phenomenal opportunity.

You and I get to go back and relive the 17th century, except we get to undo the wrong and do things right. Think about this. What did the telescope represent? It represented the chance to see the old things in new ways. Folks had seen stars before; indeed, had studied them before, but never like they would once they looked through that telescope! And what did the microscope represent? It represented that which had never been seen before.

We also get to go back and relive our collegiate years. Go back to your images of the professors who most impacted you. What characteristics do you find? I cannot speak for you and your narrative, but only for my own, but what made those professors so special was that they most often either caused me to see an Old Thing in a New Way or caused me to see an Entirely New Thing!—and sometimes what was needing to be seen was not “out there,” but instead inside me and my own being. And what makes teaching students so special is a similar thing: sometimes, at least, I am able to help them either see the Old Thing in a New Way or to see a New Thing, and sometimes what they need to be made to look at and see isn't just in a Biblical text or Systematic Theology doctrine or a Spiritual Formation discipline: sometimes it is Inside Them!

Yet during my collegiate years, it wasn't just individual professors who impacted me, but indeed the faculty as a collective whole, who through the general education curriculum insisted that I be exposed to a wide range of ideas from a wide range of fields. Indeed, in 1975, *twenty-five years before the turn of the century* I took a course which every student on campus was required to take entitled “Decision-making in the 21st Century.” Twenty-five years before the turn of the century! I don't know if the course was the genius of a single professor, or a committee, or a task force; maybe it was even their QEP! But those faculty folk were wise enough to know that they were not preparing us simply for the world we would face at graduation but also for the world we would face two decades down the road.

Why am I here? I am here because we professors get to not just Inform our Students; we also get to Invite our Students to see the old thing in new ways and to see new things that they had never seen before. And we get to do so out of a profound conviction that these new things can lead not just to information which they can comprehend or utilize, but to a deepening sense of Awe and Wonder toward the God Who is still Creating them, still Sustaining them, still Redeeming them. What other profession gets to partner with God like that? We get to insist and model that All Truth is God's Truth, No Matter Where It Comes From and that it is often through our searching for Truth that God searches for us. We get to invite our students to look! And See! We get to invite them to WONDER! What an adventure!

The second reason I, and perhaps you, are here, is because I like asking Big Questions and I like pursuing Worthy Dreams. The period of life between eighteen and thirty years, that stage in which most of our students find themselves, is an epochal moment inside each of our individual students. In terms of both neurological development and spiritual development, there is perhaps no more significant a time, for it is during this time span that the values-making, decision-making portion of our students' brains and their inner spirits are being finalized.

I've been fairly familiar with the issue of spiritual formation within young adults for more than two decades now, given that I've been teaching Spiritual Growth and Development that long; but only recently have I become intrigued and have begun to read about neurological development in late teens/young adults. In terms of faith development, key theorists such as James Fowler, Sharon Parks, and Craig Dysktra provide valuable insights into learning what is going on inwardly during this key developmental stage. Parks has perhaps nailed it best by entitling her key works about faith development in young adults *The Critical Years* and *Big Questions, Worthy Dreams*. Essentially, this young adulthood stage of life is a key stage, indeed, perhaps THE KEY stage of the development of the life of faith and spirituality within each and every human.

The simple fact of the matter is that the one characteristic which most distinguishes *Homo sapiens* from all other species is that we are meaning makers, value deciders. We value things and seek to make meaning of things. And a pivotal, epochal time in life when we get those most meaningful things nailed down, those key values by which we will live the rest of our lives, is the young adult years. Bill Blevins' graduation speech last Spring commencement was right on target: values matter. So whether we talk about our young adult

students being in transition from a synthetic/conventional faith to an individuating/reflective one or whether we use the dyads of talking about the differences between a projected faith and an integrated faith, or an “embedded theology” versus an “owned” one, or a precritical “folk religion” versus a “reflective Christianity,” young adulthood is an epochal moment for shaping one’s values and spiritual orientation, a time when the interplay of faith and reason are foremost in our lives. The significance of this epochal stage within human development is recognized not merely among church-related institutions, but indeed across the educational spectrum, as evidenced by the fact that one of leading “hot off the presses in 2011” books in the field of student development is a work entitled *Cultivating the Life of the Spirit: How College Can Enhance Students’ Inner Lives*. This much anticipated work is authored by psychologists Alexander Astin, Helen Astin, and their colleague Jennifer Lindholm. Alexander Astin has been identified by a study in the *Journal of Higher Education* as the most frequently cited author in the higher education field and his work *Four Critical Years* as the most frequently cited work in the field. Both he and his spouse are Distinguished Professors of Higher Education at the same university, the one where Dr. Lindholm is director of the Spirituality in Higher Education Project. What university is that? One called UCLA—the University of California at Los Angeles! Ought it not be that we at this beloved place called Carson-Newman College realize just how significant a time and how significant an impact we can have on our students during the critical years of transition into and through young adulthood? For me, that is one very distinct reason Why I am Here.

In terms of the insights that neuroscience is providing us into the development of the human brain, there are a number of good works out there, but one I read recently and found fascinating is by Jonah Lehrer, a graduate of Columbia University and a Rhodes Scholar, entitled *How We Decide*. It was a required textbook for my son Will’s class in Leadership taken this past spring semester at Elon University. In it, Lehrer mines insights gained from numerous studies within neuroscience to demonstrate that when it comes to decision-making, all the old “left brain/right brain” or “cognitive domain/affective domain” or “thinking/feeling” or “rational/emotional” pairings are false bifurcations. That is, that we do not “decide” solely rationally or cognitively or on the basis of thought, but instead out of highly complex processes which take place within various parts of our brains, particularly the frontal cortex and its various subregions, and significant portions of those essential parts of the brain which come into play in our valuing, i.e., in *How We Decide*, are not fully formed until well past adolescence and into the young adult years.

Why are You Here? Why am I here? Maybe, just maybe, it is because we get to impact our students at a key developmental time in their lives, a time when they ask Big Questions and pursue Worthy Dreams, a time when we can help them acquire the values and convictions that help give meaning and purpose to their lives and to help them understand that there is no more significant place to center one's life than to ground it in a commitment to Christ and his Kingdom. We get to help them nail down that the values of Truth, Beauty, Goodness and corollary ones such as Justice and Courage hold fast regardless of what job they hold, culture they live in, or stage in life they may find themselves. What other profession is there that gets to do such a Grand Thing?

The third answer I arrived at in answering the question, "Why Am I Here?" is *It's the Economy, Stupid!* As a personal gift for my being named Distinguished Faculty member, Dr. Kina Mallard, our Provost, gave me Daniel Pink's *A Whole New Mind: Why Right Brainers Will Rule the Future*. It's a work which Thomas Friedman, Pulitzer Prize winning New York Times Foreign Affairs Correspondent, and author of the bestselling work *The World is Flat*, calls his "favorite business book." I could not put Daniel Pink's book down. It rocked my world and provided me such hope. Pink describes the thrust of his argument well in his Introduction when he states:

The last few decades have belonged to a certain kind of person with a certain kind of mind—computer programmers who could crank code, lawyers who could crank contracts, MBA who could crunch numbers. But the keys to the kingdom are changing hands. The future belongs to a very different kind of person with a very different kind of mind—creators and empathizers, pattern recognizers, and meaning makers. These people—artists, inventors, designers, storytellers, caregivers, consolers, big picture thinkers—will now reap society's richest rewards and share its greatest joys.

This book describes a seismic—though as yet undetected—shift now under way in much of the advanced world. We are moving from an economy and a society built on the logical, linear, computerlike capabilities of the Information Age to an economy and society built on the inventive, empathic, big-picture capabilities of what's in its place, the Conceptual Age.

He argues that due to a variety of forces, "we are moving from an age of the "knowledge worker," the well-educated manipulator of

information and deployer of expertise to an age animated by a different form of thinking and a new approach to life.”

There are six aptitudes Pink calls “high concept” and “high touch” which he believes that professional success and personal satisfaction will depend on in the future. These six aptitudes include Design, Story, Symphony, Empathy, Play, and Meaning. He states:

High concept involves the capacity to detect patterns and opportunities, to create artistic and emotional beauty, to craft a satisfying narrative, and to combine seemingly unrelated ideas into something new. High touch involves the ability to empathize with others, to understand the subtleties of human interaction, to find joy in one’s self and to elicit it in others, and to stretch beyond the quotidian in pursuit of purpose and meaning.

Does any of this sound faintly familiar, faintly hopeful? If, in our country and in our world, the adage of “It’s the Economy, Stupid” holds true, and if Pink is correct, then we have some great news!—the kind of person this new, future economy needs is EXACTLY the kind of student we at Carson-Newman College seek to produce in our liberal arts based curriculum. What other profession gets to say that?

The final conviction I wish to share as I wrestle within my personal narrative with the question of “Why Are You Here?” is born out of the conviction, shared by most folks in this room, that Carson-Newman College is at a critical point in her history. Why am I here? I am here because I believe, like you believe, in burning bushes and an Empty tomb. Why in the world would I leave a role I loved so much and now can claim to be “Distinguished” at—namely my role as Professor—in order to become Vice-President for Student Affairs? I’ll tell you why, as best I can, at a later date. Allow me to just briefly say that I took on the role because of a profound sense that it is what best serves Carson-Newman College at this point in time. But the reality is that VP or not, I’d still be here—Ross Brummett, Professor of Religion.

Why am I here today? In the song entitled “Burning Bushes” the artist coins the phrase, “We walk through a Garden of 1000 burning bushes, looking for a sign from God.” That phrase struck me hard, reminded me anew that the Holy can and does invade the Ordinary at any moment in time.

Why Am I Here? I am here because my Easter-grounded, Resurrection faith shouts to me that the Great, Grand Narrative of God moves on and you and I play key roles in it. WE

ARE Carson-Newman College—past, present, and future. Faculty—retired, mid-career, and young. Staff—retired, mid-career, and young. Students—alumni, returning, and new. WE ARE Carson-Newman College—not the policies, procedures, politics, or problems. WE ARE Carson-Newman College—not the titles, territories, turf battles, or terrible times of certain years now past.

I am here because Easter shouts that Despair is not the last word, Hope is; sorrow is not the final emotion, unspeakable Joy is. Why Am I Here? I am here and you are here because we serve Christ and His Kingdom, and as we meet, right here, right now, across campus there are 400 New Freshmen moving into the Residence Halls. God is not finished with us yet. It's time for us to hear again the voice of God calling us out of the burning bushes all around us. It's time for us to join the chorus of the angels singing, "Hear the bells ringing, they're singing that we can be born again!" It is time for us to BE WHO WE ARE and to never change that, no matter the changes which come upon us. It is time for us to do what God called us here to do. It is time for the work horses to get back to work.

From Purple to Dead Red: Tennessee Politics, 1966-2012

James L. Baumgardner

Like its sister former Confederate states, Tennessee in the 1870s turned toward the Democratic Party, which in the post-Civil War era served as the vehicle of white supremacy even as it had been the defender of slavery before the war. Yet, while the grip of that party on the state generally remained firm until the 1960s, there were mitigating factors that on a few occasions illustrated that the loyalty of Tennesseans could not be taken for granted, particularly on the gubernatorial and presidential levels.

This lack of political loyalty perhaps in part was due to the fact that the state's experience with Reconstruction was considerably milder than had been the case for the other states of the former Confederacy. A homegrown radicalism led by Whig Governor William G. ("Parson") Brownlow motivated the state legislature in 1866 to adopt the Radical Republican-proposed Fourteenth Amendment and allowed the state's readmission to the halls of Congress and thereby to the Union. Hence, the Volunteer State, unlike her ten sister states who initially refused to endorse the amendment, was spared the humiliating experience of being subjected to Federal military occupation until stringent political conditions imposed by a Radical-dominated Congress were met.

Another mitigating factor was the continuing presence in the state of what had been an old Whig coalition that at times could draw upon considerable numbers of voters in both East and West Tennessee to offset the general Democratic domination of the state, particularly when there were divisions within that party. Hence, Republican Ben Hooper, with the support of so-called "Independent Democrats," won the governorship in 1910 and repeated that success in 1912, despite a turbulent administration.¹ In 1920, another East Tennessean, Alfred Taylor, who was remembered for a famous earlier gubernatorial race against his Democratic brother, Robert Love Taylor, in a Tennessee version of the War of the Roses (which Alf lost), won handily with the

¹ Riley C. Darnell, *Tennessee Blue Book 1999-2000* (Millennium ed., 1999), p.480.

support of both Democrats and Republicans, including apparently a large number of newly enfranchised females who were casting their first ballots.² He would be Tennessee's last elected Republican governor for fifty years.

In the aftermath of the Great War, there was a general swing of the national electorate in the 1920s toward the Republican Party, and Tennessee twice displayed a purple hue by voting for Republican presidential candidates. In 1920 the state went for Warren G. Harding, thereby becoming the first southern state to break from the Democratic Solid South since the end of Reconstruction.³ While remaining firmly planted in Democratic ranks on the state level, Tennesseans once again bolted the national party in 1928 to vote for Republican Herbert Hoover, their last presidential GOP vote until the 1950s.⁴

In the 1950s, Tennessee voters began a new political tradition of casting their ballots for Republican presidential candidates by voting for Dwight "Ike" Eisenhower in both 1952 and 1956. Even the presence on the 1956 Democratic national ticket of a fellow Tennessean (Sen. Estes Kefauver) as the vice-presidential nominee was not enough to persuade the state's electorate to abandon "Ike".⁵ From that point forward, the Volunteer State has favored Democratic candidates only four times in the last thirteen presidential contests (1960-2008). In 2000, a Tennessean, Al Gore, Jr., was heading the Democratic ticket, but it was not sufficient to cause the state's voters to abandon their newly found devotion to the national Grand Old Party.

Meanwhile, after giving Republicans one last tour of the governor's office with Alf Taylor (1921-23), the majority of Tennessee's voters continued to allow the Democratic Party to dominate state politics on both the gubernatorial and legislative levels. This trend came to a grand climax in the 1950s and 1960s with the governorships of Frank G. Clement and Buford Ellington. The two

² *Ibid.*, p. 481; Robert F. Corlew, *Tennessee: A Short History* (Updated 2nd ed., 1990), p. 448.

³ *Ibid.*, p.448.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 464.

⁵ Paul H. Bergeron, Stephen V. Ash, Jeanette Keith, *Tennesseans and Their History* (1999), pp. 289-90.

men, close friends and political allies, controlled the state Democratic Party and shuffled the gubernatorial office between themselves for eighteen years (1953-1971). Clement, who became famous for his Biblical-based oratory, served the last two-year term (as a 1953 constitutional convention did away with the outmoded two-year term in favor of a four-year tenure⁶) and then was elected for the first four-year term allowing him to remain in the executive office from 1953 to 1959 and then, following Ellington's first term (1959-63), to reoccupy the seat (1963-67). Ellington then won a second four-year stint (1967-71).⁷ This spectacle encouraged another constitutional change in 1977 to provide simply for two consecutive four-year terms.⁸ As events would prove, the Clement-Ellington years represented the end of an era and the beginning of another in Tennessee politics, as the state began a shift from blue to purple.

While political conservatism (the great mentors of which proved to be George C. Wallace and Jesse Helms) and social and cultural movements of the late 1960s and the 1970s (particularly the emergence of the feminist and gay rights movements) would provide white southerners in general and Tennesseans in particular solid reasons for swinging from the Democratic to the Republican Party, the stark reality (no matter how much it may be denied) is that the shift was born in the turbulent civil rights era of the 1960s, the legal fruits of which were the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It was liberal leaders of the national Democratic Party, pushed by a president (Lyndon B. Johnson) who took pride in his southern roots, who championed these two key measures and, with the help of moderate Republicans (particularly in 1964), pushed them through Congress. Meanwhile, conservatives took control of the Republican Party in advance of its 1964 national convention and selected a strong opponent of the 1964 measure (Sen. Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona) as the party's presidential nominee. Southern whites were quick to grasp the message thereby being sent and began an exit of the Democratic

⁶ William Lyons, John M. Scheb II, Billy Stair, *Government and Politics in Tennessee* (2001), p. 35.

⁷ Darnell, *Blue Book*, p. 484.

⁸ Lyons, *Government*, p. 35.

Party even as newly enfranchised southern blacks began pouring into it. That “white flight” would continue until it came to a major crescendo in 1980 on the presidential level while beginning its spread to the congressional and state levels in the 1980s and 1990s.

Ironically, in meeting the demand of the 1965 Voting Rights Act to register southern black voters, Tennessee was the southern state that had to make the least adjustment, as the difference between African-American registration in 1960 and 1966 was only 21.6%. (For comparison, the state closest to Tennessee was North Carolina at 34.3%. At the top of the list was Mississippi with a whopping 695.4% increase!)⁹ Yet, the Volunteer State was among the southern states quickest to begin the shift on the congressional and state levels, “perhaps because the state always had had a Republican base in East Tennessee.”¹⁰

Although the results of the 1950s presidential elections portended a shift in the direction of Tennessee politics, the real turning point generally is considered to have been the election of Howard H. Baker, Jr. to the United States Senate in 1966, the first Tennessee Republican to be elected to that august body since Reconstruction.¹¹ His win was made possible by a repackaging of that old Whig coalition previously mentioned. In the process, Baker had increased his vote among African-Americans from virtually nothing in his initial failed bid for the Senate in 1964 to 15% - 20%.¹² In the campaign, however, the moderate Baker had felt behooved to charge that his Democratic opponent, Frank G. Clement, would have “an Administration [reference to LBJ] collar around his neck,” a charge designed to reassure “whites who weren’t comfortable with Baker’s appeal to blacks that he would resist the more extravagant programs of the Great Society.”¹³

⁹ Robert A. Divine, *et.al.*, *The American Story* (Combined Vol., 4th ed., 2011), p. 757.

¹⁰ Lyons, *Government*, p. 184.

¹¹ Bergeron, *Tennesseans*, p. 324.

¹² J. Lee Annis, Jr., *Howard Baker: Conciliator in an Age of Crisis* (2nd ed., 2007), pp. 29-30.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

Reinforcing this shift from blue to purple was the fact that the House of Representatives of the Tennessee Assembly in fall 1968 fell into Republican hands for the first time in modern history. That same year, Republican presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon carried the state with a margin (38%) that would have been much higher if George Wallace (34%) had not been in the race as a third party candidate.¹⁴

This combined vote (72%), coupled with the previous Baker victory and the temporary Republican success on the legislative level, was a sharp indicator of how rapidly the state's political climate was shifting to the right and thus toward the GOP. Further evidence came in 1970 when a Memphis dentist, Winfield Dunn, became the first Republican governor-elect since 1920. In that same election, Republican William E. Brock III defeated three-term incumbent Democratic Senator Albert Gore, Sr. in his bid for re-election to the United States Senate. One of the few southern members of Congress who refused to sign the famous (or infamous) 1956 Southern Manifesto protesting the Supreme Court's decision in the 1954 Brown case and to oppose the Vietnam War, Gore was considered by many of the state's voters to be "liberal, dovish, and out of touch with his constituents."¹⁵

With both of the state's Senate seats and the governorship in Republican possession, the GOP appeared to be making major strides toward converting Tennessee into a red state, a possibility reinforced by Baker's easy re-election in 1972. Yet, very quickly the state's hue reverted to purple. The Republican control of the Tennessee House lasted only two years before returning to Democratic hands. Aided by reaction to the Watergate scandal which brought down the Nixon presidency, Dunn in 1974 declined to seek a second term, opening the door for West Tennessean Democrat Ray Blanton to defeat his East Tennessee Republican challenger Lamar Alexander. Meanwhile, the state legislature remained under Democratic leadership, as it generally would into the 21st c., even as the governorship became a leapfrog affair.

Blanton, whose administration had become riddled with scandal, saw no purpose in attempting to seek a second term, thereby paving the way for his 1974 opponent, Maryville native Alexander, to achieve an easy victory over wealthy Knoxville Democrat Jake

¹⁴ Bergeron, *Tennesseans*, pp. 324-325.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 326.

Butcher. Alexander was followed by Democrat Ned Ray McWherter who was succeeded by Republican Don Sundquist, who in turn gave way to Democrat Phil Bredesen who in 2011 turned the reins to Republican Bill Haslam, who overwhelmed the politically inexperienced and underfunded son of former governor McWherter in another East vs. West Tennessee matchup.

All of these men shared in common the fact that they (not counting Haslam who took office in early 2011) served the constitutionally permitted two consecutive terms and also that they were likeable individuals who usually promoted non-controversial agendas. The exception proved to be Don Sundquist, who in his second term dared to touch the deadly “third rail” of Tennessee politics, a state income tax. (No one hoping to win an office in state government can even use the phrase “state income tax,” much less advocate. Indeed, entire campaigns can revolve around the issue of which of the two candidates is more anti-income tax!) Sundquist had opposed the income tax in his first term and made no mention of a change of mind in his re-election campaign. Thus, he became a political pariah and probably doomed the effort of Republican Van Hilleary to break the alternating governorship cycle, despite his taking a firm anti-state income tax stance (as did his Democratic opponent).¹⁶

By contrast, Sundquist’s successor, Democrat Phil Bredesen remained highly popular among Tennessee voters during his time in the governor’s chair. He did so by approaching state affairs in a businessman-like manner while managing to avoid becoming involved in controversy. In the budget arena, he carefully sidestepped any talk of a state income tax while finding ways both to cut the budget and to “enhance” revenue through means such as user fees. In the social and cultural realm, he stayed away from the Republican “killer issues” of abortion, gay rights, and gun control (the three G’s – God, gays, and guns) simply by never really discussing them. Hence, no one could achieve a clear grasp of where he stood on such matters, since he insisted on focusing instead on ways to attract businesses and thus jobs to the state. (The present governor, Bill Haslam, perhaps was preferred by the majority of the state’s voters because he reminded them of Bredesen, but it remains questionable as to how long he can remain above the fray in view of his party’s other leaders’ pushing of those

¹⁶ Michael Nelson, “Tennessee: Once a Bluish State, Now a Reddish One,” *The Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, Summer, 2006, p. 180.

same divisive social and cultural issues that his predecessor was able to avoid.)

While the state's top executive position swung back and forth between the two parties and the Democrats generally retained control of both houses of the Tennessee Assembly, the same was not true of the state's two United States Senate seats. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Republicans might have begun to question the strength of the inroads they had made into Democratic control. Sitting in the governor's mansion was the highly popular Democrat McWherter (who easily won his 1990 re-election bid with 61% of the vote)¹⁷ and in the Senate Democrats Al Gore, Jr. and Jim Sasser. When Gore came up for re-election in 1990, he carried all ninety-five state counties, the first candidate of either party in modern history to do so.¹⁸ (That feat would be duplicated by Bredesen in his 2006 gubernatorial re-election bid.)

As is often true in politics, situations can change quickly, and the year 1994 proved a landmark one for Tennessee Republicans, even as it was also true on the national level. When Al Gore resigned his seat in 1992 after winning the vice-presidency, he temporarily was replaced by McWherter's deputy governor, Harlan Mathews, who had no desire to seek election to the senate in his own right.¹⁹ This lack of interest opened the door for Tennessee's famed lawyer-lobbyist-actor Fred Thompson to seek the remaining two years of Gore's term, a feat he had no trouble achieving.²⁰ Meanwhile, Republican Bill Frist, a wealthy heart surgeon and political novice who previously had neglected voting (much less seeking office), easily destroyed Democratic incumbent Senator Jim Sasser, who made the mistake in what was essentially an anti-incumbent year for Democrats of boasting of his Washington connections. Whereas he had won his 1988 re-election by receiving 65% of the vote, he now lost his seat to an

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

¹⁸ "Biography of Vice President Al Gore",
http://clinton1.nara.gov/White_House/EOP/OVP/html/Bio.html.

¹⁹ "Harlan Mathews Biography,"
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harlan_Mathews.

²⁰ Nelson, "Tennessee," p. 177.

inexperienced opponent who received 75% of the ballots cast.²¹ As of 2010, no Democrat since the 1990 election has managed to win a Tennessee U.S. Senate seat.

1994 also proved a good Republican year in state elections, as was generally the case throughout the South. In addition to the Sundquist victory, Republicans took a temporary narrow control (17-16) of the Senate, and, despite a redistricting unfavorable to the party, still managed to win 40 of the 99 House seats. On the congressional level, the Democrats' 6-3 House margin was transformed into a 5-4 Republican advantage.²²

In 1996, Thompson easily was re-elected to a full six-year Senate term. In 1998, Sundquist was successful in his gubernatorial re-election bid, as was Frist in his 2000 quest for a second term. While the Tennessee Assembly still stood slightly beyond Republican grasp, the party could enter the 21st c. with considerable confidence, a feeling undoubtedly buoyed by the 2000 presidential defeat of Democrat Al Gore, Jr., whose loss of his home state cost him the election.

Through 2006, the state's purple trend continued. In 2002, Republican Lamar Alexander replaced Thompson, who did not seek a second full Senate term because of a desire to pursue other interests. The gubernatorial election that year was won by Democrat Phil Bredesen, who had lost his initial bid for the position in 1994, despite spending millions of his own money on the effort. In 2006, he coasted to a re-election victory, as had been true for all of his predecessors going back as far as Lamar Alexander.

In the 2006 Senate race, Frist kept the promise he had made in 1994 to serve only two terms and thus stepped aside in favor of Bob Corker, a wealthy Chattanooga businessman and former mayor who had lost the 1994 Republican primary to the man he was now seeking to replace. The Democrats responded with African-American Ninth Congressional District Congressman Harold Ford, Jr., who had high hopes (as did his supporters both inside and outside the state) of becoming the first popularly elected black southern senator. In the most expensive Senate race in Tennessee history, Ford largely had to depend on contributions (many from outside the state) in order to stand

²¹ Bergeron, *Tennesseans*, P. 329.

²² Nelson, "Tennessee," pp. 176-177.

a chance of winning, while Corker had the ultimate advantage of being able to supplement gifts given to his campaign with his personal fortune. In the end, the man who spent the most money prevailed, as Corker defeated Ford by an approximate 51%-48% margin. The overwhelming Bredesen victory and the narrow loss by Ford caused leaders of both parties to hail the independence of the state's voters and to contend that Tennessee still was a two-party (purple) state.²³

If Tennessee were still a two-party state in 2006, its coloration went from purple tingeing towards red to a deeper shade of red in 2008. Confronted this time by a Democratic African-American running not for the Senate but for the presidency, Tennessee responded by not only casting a decisive vote against Barack Obama but also by handing control of the Tennessee Assembly to the Republicans for the first time since the days of Reconstruction, although the victory was dampened somewhat by one of their number who weakened the narrow 50-49 control the party had of the House by soliciting the Democratic support for his bid to become speaker by promising a share of the power. (For this act of treachery, Kent Williams subsequently was effectively expelled from the party.) Since there was no gubernatorial or U.S. Senate race that year, further damage to Democratic political fortunes was confined to Alexander's expected Senate re-election victory and John McCain's win in the presidential election, since the Tennessee congressional delegation remained at the 5-4 Democratic edge that had been created in a previous election.²⁴

2010, then, became the year that the political roof totally collapsed on Tennessee Democrats. With Republicans already controlling both of the state's Senate seats, the magnitude of the GOP victories on the state and congressional levels was staggering. The Republican gubernatorial candidate, Knoxville mayor Bill Haslam, spent a record \$16+ million on the way to victory over hapless Mike McWherter, making him the first Knoxville resident to become governor since Parson Brownlow in the 1860s.²⁵ Two veteran

²³ Tom Humphrey, "Tennessee Voters Do it Their Way", *Knoxville News Sentinel*, Nov. 9, 2006.

²⁴ James L. Baumgardner, "A Deeper Shade of Red: Tennessee and the 2008 Elections," *Carson-Newman Studies* (Fall, 2010), pp. 47-59.

²⁵ Tom Humphrey, "Haslam Leads Historic Sweep", *Knoxville News Sentinel*, Nov. 3, 2010, p. A1.

Democratic members of the state's U.S. House delegation (Bart Gordon and John Tanner) had declined to seek re-election (perhaps because they sensed impending disaster), clearing the way for the Republicans to take the 6th and 8th Congressional District seats. In the 4th Congressional District, one of the bluest of the so-called Blue Dog Democrats, Lincoln Davis, was overwhelmed (57%-38%) by a physician seeking his first political office. With these victories, the GOP turned a 5-4 Democratic delegation into a 7-2 Republican one.²⁶

In relation to the Tennessee Assembly, the Republican sweep was equally stunning, as the Republicans pushed their Senate membership to 20-13 and their House total to 64-34, with one newly-minted Independent, Kent Williams. It was as if almost anyone with a (D) after his/her name was fair game. Republicans lost no seats to Democrats, while 14 Democrats lost to Republicans, making a total of 22 freshmen Republicans, including eight elected to previously held Republican seats. Of the 34 House Democrats, 15 were black and only six were from East Tennessee.²⁷ As Democratic Chairman Mike Turner ruefully noted with regard to Rep. Mark Maddox of Dresden, who had been slated to head the National Conference of State Legislators if he had been re-elected, "If Mahatma Gandhi has (sic) been a Democrat yesterday, he probably would have gotten killed if he was in the wrong district."²⁸

What factors possibly could have contributed to Tennessee assuming first a deeper shade of red in 2008 and then going dead red in 2012? The later perhaps is easier to answer than the former in that the 2010 results in Tennessee merely mirrored what happened elsewhere in the country during the midterm elections. President Obama left the impression in the 2008 presidential contest that he knew how to fix the nose-diving economy. Yet, by 2010, all he appeared to have accomplished was pushing through a Democratic-controlled Congress a highly controversial national health care plan. Meanwhile, despite

²⁶ Michael Collins, "DesJarlais Ousts Davis in 4th District", *Knoxville News Sentinel*, Nov. 3, 2012, p. A8.

²⁷ Tom Humphrey, "Legislature in New Hands", *Knoxville News Sentinel*, Nov. 4, 2010, p. A9.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

Democratic efforts to jump-start the economy, the job situation in the country appeared to many voters simply to be getting worse rather than better. The key issue for them was “Jobs! Jobs! Jobs!,” and, while the Republicans offered only their time-worn solution of maintaining tax cuts for the wealthy who in turn would (supposedly) invest in the economy and create more jobs (a stance that dated back to at least the 1920s), voters did the only thing most American voters seem able to do in such situations, i.e., vote the “ins” out and replace them with the previous “outs” who earlier had been the “ins”. Combined with agitation among many concerning “Obamacare” (which helped create the now oft-heard charge that the President is a Socialist), the predictable result occurred in Tennessee as well as elsewhere in the country.

What about 2008 and the basic replacement of Democratic control of the state legislature with that of the Republicans, which proved to be simply a harbinger of what would occur in 2010? It’s kind of “pay your money, take your choice” dilemma. Some would argue that it was a reflection of an increasingly conservative electorate becoming more so in terms of their view of economic policy and of social and cultural issues such as gun control, abortion, and gay rights (particularly as relating to marriage), all items which favor the GOP. Many conservatives also tend to identify with the so-called Christian Right (or Religious Right, or, more recently, the New Evangelicals) which ties them for second with Arkansas and narrowly behind leading Oklahoma, who cast their votes on the basis of so called “moral values” (or, to use an earlier phrase, “family values”). While the trouble with this explanation for voting Republican in Tennessee is that Democrats and Republicans in the state both tend to be economic and social conservatives, the problem may well be voters associating each party with its national counterpart, thus creating a decided Republican advantage.

What about the 800-lb. gorilla in the room that virtually no white southerners (including Tennesseans) wish to notice, much less to discuss, i.e., race? Even as African-American Harold Ford, Jr. was going down in his 2006 defeat by a wealthy white opponent in a bid for a vacant U.S. Senate seat, papers throughout the state talked about what a bright future awaited this young man in Tennessee politics, with attention focused upon a possible run for governor. Nonetheless, Ford must have sensed something otherwise because he left the state shortly thereafter in favor of what he may have viewed as the more inviting political climate of New York.

One of the problems with discussing race as a factor is that few people are willing to admit that it is. Brothers Earl and Merle Black, noted scholars on the subject of southern politics, declared in a 1987 work concerning the southern electorate, “Most voters in the mid-1980s are totally unaware, or retain only the dimmest memories, of the events, circumstances, and experiences that created and sustained Democratic hegemony.”²⁹ What was true in the mid-1980s would be much more true today. Does that reality, however, mean that race should be eliminated, discounted, and/or ignored in any study of southern voting today? There are those who emphatically would answer in the affirmative, and, if one should persist in discussing it as a potential factor in voter decisions, would become extremely agitated, reasoning that they are being accused of being racists.

Nonetheless, in an article that presented the findings of a study of voting prejudice in the 2008 presidential balloting, Benjamin Highton noted that Tennessee was eleventh among the 50 states in terms of non-black voters NOT voting for Obama, with approximately 35% of such voters voting for him. In estimated non-black prejudice, Tennessee was third behind only Mississippi and Louisiana. If the levels of prejudice had been reduced, simulated outcomes found that, instead of receiving 42.4% of the Tennessee vote, Obama would have gotten 53.3%. The verdict was that “the influence of racial attitudes on voting was on a par with the influence of partisanship and ideology.”³⁰ Such prejudice “does not ... appear to have a pervasive influence on opinion and behavior but instead seems to be invoked when the candidate being evaluated is African American.”³¹

Did the white Tennessee voters who constitute the great bulk of the state’s electorate become agitated when it became apparent that a black man would be elected president and consciously or unconsciously decide to vent that frustration by placing Republicans in control of the Tennessee Assembly? Did “Obamacare” and the still faltering

²⁹ Earl Black and Merle Black, *Politics and Society in the South* (1987), p. 176.

³⁰ Benjamin Highton, “Prejudice Rivals Partisanship and Ideology When Explaining the 2008 Presidential Vote Across the States”, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, July, 2011, pp. 530-43.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 530.

economy simply add fuel to the fire of prejudice in 2010 and help turn the Volunteer state dead red?

Tennessee moved from blue to purple and then to an increasingly deepening shade of red in the period 1966 to 2010. For what reasons? A growing economic and social conservatism? A decided commitment to “moral values” voting? Race? All of the above, some of the above, or none of the above. Something else? As stated earlier, “pay your money and take your choice.”

Regardless of the reason(s), Tennessee’s political hue as of 2010 was unmistakable: “dead red,” a color to which the state’s voters, whatever their political persuasion, should accustom themselves because they quite possibly will be seeing it for some years to come.

Tennessee Governors, 1970-Present

Winfield Dunn (R) – 1971-75

Ray Blanton (D) – 1975-79

Lamar Alexander (R) – 1979-87

Ned Ray McWherter (D) – 1987-95

Don Sundquist (R) – 1995-2003

Phil Bredesen (D) – 2003-11

Bill Haslam (R) - 2011-

Tennessee U.S. Senators, 1996-Present

Howard Baker, Jr. – 1966-84 (R)

William E. Brock III – 1970-76 (R)

James (Jim) Sasser – 1976-94 (D)

Albert Gore, Jr. – 1984-92 (D)

Harlan Mathews – 1/5/93 – 12/1/94 (D)

Fred Thompson – 1994-2002 (R)

Bill Frist – 1994 – 2006 (R)

Lamar Alexander – 2002 (R)

Bob Corker – 2006 (R)

YouTube as an Educational Tool: Marketing Education in the Classroom

Hester Daves Beecher

Abstract

Members of Generation Y are unique, as they were born into a world of technology. With today's college students consisting mostly of Generation Y, educators are challenged to maintain Generation Y's attention. Educators can incorporate technology by showing YouTube videos in the classroom to help demonstrate class concepts. This study was conducted in an undergraduate marketing class to help determine if videos within lectures serve as entertainment, a learning aid, or both. Results indicate that students who viewed videos within the lecture scored higher on quizzes than students who did not view videos, and the majority of students enjoyed the videos.

Introduction

With Generation Y being the second largest demographic cohort, and given that its members are today's college students, it is important for educators to determine the best methods to reach these students in the classroom. Technology is not a foreign concept to these students; it is a fundamental and essential part of their lives. Consequently, because of the student make-up in the classroom, and because they are deeply involved in technology, it naturally follows that successful teaching strategies incorporate technology into the classroom.

Conceptualization

Generation Y

The majority of today's college students fall into the Generation Y cohort, which was born into a world of technology. Today's college graduate has spent over 10,000 hours playing video games (Sabau 2008; Prensky 2001), spent 20,000 hours watching TV, spent 10,000 hours on their mobile phone (Ashraf 2009), and sent 250,000 email messages (Ashraf 2009). However, he or she has spent less than 5,000 hours reading (Sabau 2008; Prensky 2001; Ashraf 2009). Technology is vital to these members of Generation Y; they

have grown up with it as an integral part of their lives and they devote their free time to it.

"Web 2.0 is associated with web applications that facilitate participatory information sharing, interoperability, user-centered design, and collaboration on the World Wide Web" ("Web 2.0" 2011, para. 1). Web 2.0 is natural to this generation (McHaney 2011); they are tech savvy and visual learners, according to Shih and Allen (as cited in Bracy, Bevill, & Roach 2010, p. 21). This is important to educators, as learning styles influence the way classrooms are structured. With increased technology available, educators have the opportunity to use more visual aids. Today's students have changed due to digital technology; they "think and process information fundamentally differently from their predecessors" (Prensky 2001, p. 1). Generation Y thrives in a media-rich environment (Sabau 2008). One way educators have incorporated technology in the classroom is with YouTube.

YouTube

YouTube is a video-sharing website founded in 2005, and it has expanded to 32 countries ("YouTube" 2011). "YouTube is the dominant provider of online video in the United States, with a market share of around 43 percent" ("YouTube" 2011 Company History section, para. 5). Following Google and Facebook, YouTube is the third most visited website on the Internet ("YouTube" 2011), with over 90 million users per month in America ("The 100" 2011). The majority of YouTube viewers fall into the 18- to 34-year old age group ("Online Video" 2010). There is an abundance of material on YouTube to show in the classroom – figures show up to 120 hours of video uploaded every minute (Box Hill Institute 2011).

There are many short videos about various companies as well as TV commercials uploaded to YouTube. These can help demonstrate certain marketing concepts and real-world issues in business. For example, when discussing how people fear globalization and outsourcing, students can view a three-minute video about the accusation of human trafficking in production of Nike's products in Malaysia. Using a media with which the students are familiar and comfortable, the students gain a better understanding of the topic and can see how real-world companies are involved. When covering the topic of corporate social responsibility, students can view a one-minute commercial on how the Pepsi Refresh Project gives back to the community. Students' understanding of concepts is enhanced when they see videos about different companies, especially when the videos

are about the products that students purchase. YouTube is a powerful visual tool through which educators can reach their students.

In The Classroom

Limited research exists on YouTube as a learning aid in the classroom (Fralinger & Owens, 2009). Web portals, such as YouTube, provide educators with “a growing amount of visual information to share with a classroom full of young multimedia enthusiasts” (Dyck 2007, para. 4); therefore, there seems to be ample opportunity for research in this area.

Faculty members desire to connect with their students. Building such rapport can be challenging since the median age of college faculty is 50-53 years (Bracy, Bevill, & Roach 2010). One way educators try to build this connection is by incorporating Web 2.0 into the classroom, finding that their students will stay more engaged (McHaney 2011). Bringing technology into the classroom can make the atmosphere more relaxed, which helps Generation Y feel more comfortable as well as participate more in class discussions (Bracy, Bevill, & Roach 2010).

“YouTube is not necessary for good teaching, in the same way that wheeling a VCR into the classroom is not necessary, or bringing in PowerPoint slide shows with images, or audio recordings...it simply makes more resources available to teachers than ever before, and allows for better classroom management” (Conway 2006, para. 12). Therefore, because these resources are available, and because this generation connects with this type of technology in the classroom, educators should investigate this opportunity to determine if it will build rapport with students and serve as a learning aid.

Hypotheses

With educators continuously trying to find ways to entertain and connect with their students, and with the increased technology available in the classrooms, it is suspected that using YouTube videos (videos and/or commercials) as part of lectures can enhance student learning. It is also believed that when students view commercials throughout the PowerPoint presentation (lecture), they will enjoy the videos for entertainment purposes. Significant interest lies in the field of marketing, as TV commercials may help explain numerous concepts. Given the vast number of videos uploaded to YouTube, one can find almost any commercial desired. Viewing videos may not be as

effective or relevant in many fields, such as accounting, chemistry, or foreign languages. Subjects such as marketing, advertising, and/or retailing are likely more appropriate for this type of learning aid. Therefore, the following hypotheses are formed.

H1: Students exposed to YouTube videos within the marketing lecture will learn the material better than students who had the same lecture, only without any videos.

H2: Students enjoy having YouTube videos included in the marketing lectures for entertainment purposes.

Methodology

To test the hypotheses, a Principles of Marketing class with all Generation Y students was used. The 300-level class included mostly sophomores and juniors. With only one section of this class offered at the time of the study, the class was divided in half; each half attended class on different days for the two lectures of interest (Tuesday or Thursday). Over a two-week period, half "A" attended class on Tuesdays while half "B" attended class on Thursdays. For the chapter taught during the first week (chapter 3), half "A" received a lecture including YouTube videos. Half "B" read the same chapter, and heard the same lecture, but there were no videos shown. During week two, half "A" was exposed to another chapter lecture (chapter 5), this time with no videos shown, and half "B" had the same chapter lecture but with videos this time.

Each day, students took quizzes over the material. Each half took the same quiz on their respective days. Quiz questions contained general information about the class material from that day and were on topics that related to a particular video within the lecture. During the third week, all students attended the same class, as regularly scheduled, and completed a general survey on their preference for videos in the classroom - whether they felt that the videos aided in their learning and how much they enjoyed the videos for entertainment purposes.

The class instructor did not inform students about the details of this study or that the study even existed. The instructor asked students to attend class on different days of the week "for something that the professor was working on," and no students verbally questioned the motives. Students seemed excited to have two days off from attending class. The PowerPoint slides contained links to all videos. Ironically, there were technical failures on the two days designated with no videos. On the first day, the Internet was down campus-wide. On the second day, the projector in the classroom was

not working. Fortunately, students did not question the reason that they were not able to view the videos, as that is what they are accustomed to in the marketing class.

To prevent half "A" from telling half "B" there was a "quiz" so that half "B" prepared ahead of time, the instructor told the students that the quizzes were actually "surveys" to obtain general information about the lecture. There was no indication that half "A" forewarned half "B," as normally students would have asked ahead of time, "are we having a quiz on Thursday?"

Results

The instructor collected data in two ways. First, students completed their quizzes ("surveys") on the chapter material. Second, students completed a general survey with questions about how much they enjoy in-class videos and how much they find them entertaining. The instructor analyzed data with Microsoft Excel (see Table 1 for summary of results).

Table 1. Results Summary

| | Videos | No Videos | T-Test (p-value) |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Quiz 1 Average | 77.2% (half "A") | 63.8% (half "B") | .026 |
| Quiz 2 Average | 74.2% (half "B") | 72.9% (half "A") | .422 |
| Overall | 75.7% | 67.9% | .052 |

Quiz Results

Average Scores. The instructor compared average quiz scores for both halves for each week separately, as well as overall averages for the two-week period. Each week, the average quiz score from the half of the class who viewed videos was higher than the average quiz score from the half who did not view videos. This was the expected outcome. However, they were not as high as anticipated. The average quiz scores for the two chapters in which videos were included were 77.2% and 74.2% (combined average of 75.7%). The average quiz scores for the two chapters with no videos were 63.8% and 72.9% (combined average of 67.9%). Therefore, the video-viewing students outperformed the non-video-viewing students by 7.8%.

T-Tests. The instructor conducted a one-tailed, type 2, T-Test on the data to compare the two groups (video viewers versus non-video viewers). It was predicted that the non-video viewers' quiz scores would be lower than those who viewed videos within the lectures. When analyzing the first week's quizzes, comparing video viewers to non-video viewers, the p-value was .026. The p-value for week two's quizzes was .422. When examining the overall quiz scores (combining all quizzes for video viewers and for non-video viewers), the p-value was .052. Therefore, difference in quiz 1 scores was statistically significant, while there was not a significant difference in the groups for quiz 2 scores. The overall p-value for the two groups was statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level ($p = .052$). Therefore, H1 is supported, indicating that students who were exposed to YouTube videos within the marketing lecture did learn the material better than the students who had the same lecture, but viewed no videos.

Survey Results

Once the class returned as a full group, the students completed a general survey that included questions about how much the students enjoyed the videos for entertainment purposes and how much the students felt that the videos helped them in their learning the material. There were eight questions on the survey, with a 5-point likert scale, anchored with disagree and agree. Although it was expected that students would indicate that they do "enjoy" videos, responses to these questions were higher than anticipated. The averages of all eight questions were answered in favor of having videos in the lectures. Seven out of the eight questions were worded in a positive manner, meaning that a 5 would have been the best possible answer. The one negatively-worded question was reverse coded to be consistent with the other seven questions. This question stated, "I find them boring." For this question, a 1 would have been the best answer, meaning that they disagreed with this statement. The average was above a 4.0 for seven out of the eight questions, with the one other average being a 3.88. The overall average for all questions was a 4.3. Therefore, H2 was supported. See Table 2 for specific questions and averages from the survey.

Table 2. Survey Questions and Averages

| When I see videos and/or commercials in MKT 300: | Average Response (1 = disagree; 5 = agree) |
|--|---|
| 1 I enjoy them. | 4.55 |
| 2 I find them boring. | 1.48* |
| 3 I find them entertaining. | 4.33 |
| 4 They help me learn the material or concept. | 4.45 |
| 5 They help me learn about companies in the real world. | 4.42 |
| 6 If there is a celebrity (with whom I'm familiar) in the video and/or commercial, I remember the material better. | 3.88 |
| 7 I enjoy the number of videos and/or commercials we are shown in class. | 4.30 |
| 8 I enjoy the length of most of the videos and/or commercials we are shown in class. | 4.18 |

*Reverse-coded, equivalent to 4.52 on 5-point scale

Implications

The results of this study indicate that showing YouTube videos in the marketing classroom can be beneficial for both entertainment and learning purposes. Students not only enjoy watching the videos, but they also scored higher on the quizzes when videos were included in the lecture. This study adds to the body of knowledge regarding YouTube videos in the classroom. Educators can use this information as they plan their classroom lectures with the goal of building rapport with Generation Y as well as helping their students learn the material.

Limitations

Given that this study was conducted at a small, private college (Carson-Newman College), classroom sizes were rather small (36

students in this particular class; 17 in half “A” and 19 in half “B”). Ideally, more students involved in the study would have produced more reliable results. Additionally, the semester in which this study took place offered only one section of the Principles of Marketing class. On the opposing semester, there are two sections offered. Had two sections been offered at this time, it would have been easier to test each section separately – one with videos and one without videos. This would have also provided almost twice the number of students involved.

Although there was only one section of this class studied, and the sample size was rather small, it was still helpful to gain an understanding of whether the videos are actually helpful in the students’ learning and how much the students enjoy the videos. The results indicated enough of a positive relationship to warrant future research.

Conclusion

The hypotheses in this study were supported, indicating that college students gain a better understanding of the class material when lectures include YouTube videos. Further, these students also enjoy the videos for entertainment purposes. For educators to try to connect with Generation Y, especially with their knowledge and demands of technology, educators should strongly consider incorporating videos and commercials relevant to the course material into the lectures. Because so many commercials, which demonstrate marketing concepts, have been uploaded to YouTube, this can be a good tool for marketing and advertising classes. Results reveal that these videos aid in the students’ learning as well as serve as entertainment in the classroom, making it easier for a faculty member to connect with a Generation Y student.

References

Ashraf, Bill (2009). “Teaching the Google-Eyed YouTube Generation,” *Education + Training*, 51 (5/6), 343-352.

Box Hill Institute (2011, April 13). “Social Media Statistics & Facts 2011,” (accessed August 23, 2011), [available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r7Oh9TIpzhY>].

Bracy, Courtney, Sandra Beville, and Terry D. Roach (2010). “The Millennial Generation: Recommendations for Overcoming Teaching

Challenges,” *Allied Academics International Conference, Proceedings of the Academy of Educational Leadership*, 15 (2), 21-25.

Conway, Christopher (2006, November 13). “YouTube and the Cultural Studies Classroom,” *Inside Higher Ed*, (accessed August 23, 2011), [available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/views/2006/11/13/conway>].

Dyck, Brenda (2007, May 1). “Have You Tried YouTube?” *Education World: Brenda’s Blog*, (accessed August 31, 2011), [available at http://www.educationworld.com/a_tech/columnists/dyck/dyck015.shtml].

Fralinger, Barbara, and Russell Owens (2009, December). “You Tube As A Learning Tool,” *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 6 (8), 15-28.

McHaney, Roger (2011, September-October). “Forward-Thinking Classrooms. (The New Digital Shoreline: How Web 2.0 and Millennials Are Revolutionizing Higher Education) (Book Review),” *The Futurist*, (accessed September 29, 2011), [available at <http://www.wfs.org/content/futurist/september-october-2011-vol-45-no-5/books-brief>].

“Online Video Goes Mainstream: 18- to 34-Year Olds at the Forefront” (2010, April 28). (accessed September 21, 2011), [available at <http://www.emarketer.tv/Article.aspx?R=1007664>].

Prensky, Marc (2001, October). “Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants,” *On the Horizon*, 9 (5), 1-6.

Sabau, Isabelle (2008). “The Visual Component of E-Learning,” *Bulletin of the Transylvania University of Brasov*, 1 (50), 110-118.

“The 100 Most-Visited Sites: United States,” (2011, January). (accessed August 31, 2011), [available at <http://www.google.com/adplanner/static/top100countries/us.html>].

“Web 2.0” (2011, October 7). In *Wikipedia*. (accessed October 8, 2011), [available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_2.0].

“YouTube” (2011, October 2). In *Wikipedia*. (accessed October 2, 2011), [available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/YouTube>].

A Miktam for the Road

Mark Brown

[Baccalaureate Sermon, May 2012]

Context matters. Right? I feel sure you've heard that in the last few years, and if you've had Dr. Don Garner, I know you have. Without context, I might as well stand up here and burn 15 minutes telling Chuck Norris jokes. But, I'd rather tell Chuck Norris jokes for the sake of context!

If you'd like, you can help.

Chuck Norris doesn't do pushups... He pushes the world down.

Superman wears Chuck Norris underwear.

And, maybe my favorite...

Before the boogeyman goes to sleep at night, he checks his closet for Chuck Norris.

Ever wonder what would happen if Chuck Norris got into it with The Most Interesting Man in the World? Because, Sharks have a week for him.

Clearly, I have too much time, or maybe too much cable...

Three thousand years ago, Chuck Norris was David. In his teens he used a sling to kill a lion and a bear, and it's not like a lion and a bear get all "slothy" and wait on you to make the first move. One day he took a care package to his brothers at the war front, and he was embarrassed by what amounted to national fear... That day Goliath the Philistine mocked an entire race... David showed no hint of worry, no fret ...He was as cool as Thomas Milligan.

It's not long after killing the giant that he becomes a national hero. In I Samuel 18:7, shortly after David is hand-picked by God (though King Saul doesn't know he will be deposed), Saul hears women signing something he likes: "Saul has killed his thousands..." Now that was cool, because it was about him, the king.

But cool died with the rest of the line. For, immediately after that, comes "But David has killed his ten thousands." Well Chuck Norris has got nuthin' on David, this shepherd-harpist-warrior who, as one of my favorite people on the planet says "is all Beast-Mode!"

David is the hero and Saul becomes the joke! But, it gets worse, because David's best friend is Saul's son Jonathan, and then Saul has David marry his daughters, yes two of them.

And, as noted in Chapter 18:28-9, "When Saul saw and knew that the LORD was with David, and that Michal, Saul's daughter, loved

him, then Saul was even more afraid of David. Thus, Saul was David's enemy continually."

It gets worse. The king hates his son-in-law for all he's done and the son-in-law keeps killing Philistines, and doing more, and getting larger. It's so bad that Saul's adult children are lying to him to spare David's life. And God's spirit has long left the hateful old man. And he's gonna kill him, *he's gonna kill 'im*, if only his children and God will cooperate. And, now think of music, like some heavy, powerful Wagner meets Bohemian Rhapsody ... and Chuck Norris, I mean David, GETS SCARED.

Beast-Mode freaks out. The most interesting man in the Old Testament world has a conniption. Just how scared can a giant killer get when a mad king wants him gone? How scared indeed? It can get this bad. Where does David go for refuge?

Out far enough that he's captured by Goliath's people and taken to Gath, which, for those who aren't Drs. Jones, Ballard, Garner or O'Brien, is Philistine-ville. How bad can it get?

Bad enough that David, "the guy after God's own heart," is caught in the place that hates him most and has really, really, really good reason to. And the Philistine king's hired help aggravates him with that song about all those he killed.

(Mockingly) "Saul has killed his thousands... But David has killed his ten thousands." Oh my goodness!

Dr. Christine Jones said the other day that's it's never lost on her how cunning David could be. Always a strategy, always a plan, which sometimes don't work, but David is a thinker and it may be that he was laying groundwork for future alliances. Like "Survivor: Palestine."

But that's down the road. Right now, David needs a Plan B – So he fakes crazy. He scratches on the walls and doors and foams at the mouth. It apparently affords him enough, just enough, to escape to a cave.

And somewhere in between getting captured and Gath, and being able to mouth-foam at will, and tearing-out for a cave, he writes a *miktam*. The 56th of 150 Psalms we have recorded.

In what amounts to instructions before the Psalm, he notes that it should be sung to the tune of "A Dove in Distant Oaks." Of David. A *miktam*.

In the spirit of full disclosure, I need to tell you that no one really knows what *miktam* means. It's used only six times, all in Psalms, all laments and all connected to David. Four are about conflict with adversaries.

Born out of worry, like mud boiling from deep within his soul, this poem rises out of him. He may be running from the Philistines but he's scared of Saul.

That's the context, that's what pushes David to write this psalm, this miktam, if you will. And here's the answer to your question if your question is "HEY -- We're ten days from GRAD-U-A-TION... Why is this dude bringing us down? Why spend today on a fear psalm???"

I know you'll get wonderful inspiration in ten days. Dr. Belle Wheelan will do a fine job, and Dr. O'Brien will give you a charge that could light up KnoxVegas, but here's my logic. This is not about today. My hope is to put something in the pocket of your hearts for some time later.

It's about a day or a night, or a string of nights when life is kicking your fanny. When times get hard: if a job plays out, if a spouse isn't the person you have believed him or her to be, or maybe you're not who you intended to be. And here's another thing, it might not happen to everyone here.

But, if the days turn gray, or the dark night of the soul settles hard on your life, I want you to know that others before you have issued a miktam. Not just David (now, maybe there's never been one as good as his), but plenty have cried out.

I can't say for certain, but I am pretty sure that I knew Psalm 56:3 in the King James, "What time I am afraid, I will trust in thee," BEFORE I knew John 3:16. If I didn't know it before, I did know it better. In the Alabama countryside, we did not have the boogeyman. We had the Boogerman – lovely image, huh? And he wasn't in closets, he was under the bed.

And I must have invoked Psalm 56:3 something like 1.7 million times before I was ten.

I rely on it still. Not too long ago I lay on a bed in my mother's house 250 miles away from here, not long after my dad died. I was still working to get my head around the fact that the phone call that informed me he was sick, and the one that told me he was dead, were less than 90 minutes apart.

I lay *on* the bed—because *in* the bed means asleep or close to it—*on* the bed means the hope of sleep is from here to Katmandu. I had questions that needed answers—the sorts of questions my dad answered.

I was afraid and the next day was to be filled with appointments, and I was supposed to have answers to questions I had never considered. I had become my mother's go-to person for bills,

wills, accounts and annuities. And, at 51 years old, I had just learned my dad could die. I knew 83 year-olds die; I just didn't think he could be one of them.

It's not Philistines on one side and Saul on the other, but it hurt. Still does...

In a phone call between 11:30 pm and midnight, I told my wife Cathy that I was invoking Psalm 56:3. We hung up, and at some point I stumbled into an anguished nap. I awoke about 1:20 am; checked for a text from the woman who said "for better or worse..." There was a text indeed. In verse eight of Psalm 56, David says to the Lord, "Record my misery; list my tears on your scroll — are they not in your record?"

Better for what I needed was Cathy's use of Eugene Petersen's "The Message," which says, "You've kept track of my every toss and turn through the sleepless nights, each tear entered in your ledger, each ache written in your book."

Some of you at 20, 21 and 22 have already known pain deeper and greater than I have. Parents have disappointed you; you may have lost the person who was going to be the one. You may have hurts and scars that you need to do something with. Because, if we can't get on top of pain, it gets on top of us. It weighs us down, like it's trying to pull us to the bottom of life's ocean.

I hope, I pray, that you will invest your hurts. Take your grief and equip yourself to help those who will climb Himalayan Mountains they do not yet know. Be a Sherpa! Seek those travelers who need a guide. Use the light of your education, the buoyancy of your faith in Jesus, and even your pain to help. Maybe even teach them about *miktams*.

==

Last Wednesday, I was watching WBIR's morning news to see a buddy of mine, Carson-Newman alum Nathan Manning, plug Newport's Cruise against Cancer. Nathan established an event where hot rod aficionados use old cars to raise money for cancer patients -- Almost \$40 grand in four years. It's not for research and it's not for clinics. It's for daily survival.

I watched to let my friend know I saw him and, all of a sudden, I heard a miktam.

With Nathan was a cancer survivor, Freddie Campbell, who they call "Chicken."

Chicken knows firsthand that the power bills keep coming and you still need groceries when you're too sick to work, from cancer, chemo, or radiation. So he helps raise money. And then he said this, "Sometimes it's hard to understand what all's fixin' to happen..."

Turns out, there's a man in Newport they call Chicken, and he's a Sherpa! He uses what he's learned and an old Monte Carlo to help provide a light on a dark path.

If ancient texts, old cars and a man named Chicken can provide comfort, and light, then as sure as any of that, the time you spent here on the banks of Mossy Creek, with this amazing collection of scholar-teachers, dedicated staffers and administrators—oh, and the lifelong friends you made here—all of those things combined, they are all are all part of the light you carry. Lift that light high; go forth and matter.

Effective Practicing

Ryan Fogg

[Reprinted by permission of *Piano Pedagogy Forum*
<http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF>]

Synopsis

One of the faulty assumptions I used to make regarding my students is that they knew how to practice. Students came to lessons unprepared, and I gave the familiar diagnosis, “You need to practice more next week.” However, the students may have indeed spent the required amount of time at the piano during the week, but the end result was far from satisfactory because there was no clear understanding of *how* to practice. One of the most valuable lessons teachers can impart to their students is an understanding of effective practicing. Within this article, I offer ten guidelines for students to follow that will result in more efficient and effective practice sessions, and ultimately, a more satisfying musical performance.

Article

All of us have heard the old adage, “Practice makes perfect.” I shudder to think how many poor souls have bought into that piece of fiction. Years ago I had a basketball coach who slightly altered that statement but significantly changed its meaning: “Practice makes permanent.” The new slogan may appear less catchy, but it is much more representative of the truth. A student can practice a particular musical passage incorrectly for weeks, and the end result is certainly not perfection. Consequently, the student will have a very hard time undoing the bad habits that have settled. Why? Because the lack of tonal variety, the incorrect fingerings, or the unsteady tempos have become permanent through consistent, but incorrect, practice. The solution to such dilemmas is to know how to practice effectively in the first place so that the *good habits* become permanent and subsequently contribute to a secure musical performance.

I studied the piano for years before I learned how to practice. In my mind, practice was equivalent to mere repetition. I would practice the length of time for the week required by my teacher, then she would “fix” any mistakes or incorrect habits that had developed. The vicious cycle continued until I finally realized that I could get

much more accomplished if my practice time consisted of not only repetition, but evaluation as well. As I learned how to correct my own mistakes before they became habits, I began to enjoy my practicing more and more. Practicing was no longer a chore to me; it was now a tool that enabled me to extend the limits of my playing to a level far beyond what I had ever imagined.

As I have been teaching over the past few years, I have learned that some deficiencies students may have in their playing are due in large part not to a lack of understanding of the concepts or even a lack of technical facility, but to a fundamental problem of not knowing how to practice. In these cases, I spend the majority of the lesson time showing the student exactly how to practice a particular passage; not surprisingly, these lessons turn out to be very productive. After practicing *correctly* for the week, the student returns with marked improvement and with the encouragement that his or her hard work has reaped substantial benefits.

Many teachers advocate practicing a specified number of hours per day. For intermediate and advanced students, this number is usually anywhere from one to four hours. While such structure is often helpful to establish a practice regimen for students, quality must be emphasized more than quantity. One student may accomplish in an hour of efficient (but thorough) practice what another may do in two hours at minimum. The time must be spent wisely so that any potential problems are isolated, corrected, and no longer repeated. The key to such efficient practicing is to have a plan in advance. Before students sit down on the bench, they should know exactly what their goals are for that practice session. Without a plan, students will likely play through all of their pieces repeatedly without truly “practicing.”

The following ten guidelines are useful in developing a practice plan. They are general, non-specific reminders that can be applied to a variety of repertoire. Some of these guidelines are supported by quotations of various pianists and composers cited in Reginald Gerig’s *Famous Pianists & Their Technique*. This is not an exhaustive list by any means; rather, it is my intent that these guidelines may be adapted as a starting point for those looking to increase the effectiveness of their practicing.

Guidelines for Effective Practicing

1. Set a specific goal to achieve in each practice session. For example, rather than, “I will practice Beethoven today,” consider, “I will memorize the first theme of the exposition of my Beethoven today,” or “I will work on making all trills in the Beethoven light and continuous.”
2. Listen to recordings of your piece, not to imitate, but to become more aware of interpretive possibilities.
3. Analyze the overall structure and significant chord progressions. A clear understanding of the form and harmony will not only help in the memorization process (see #8 below), but it will also influence your interpretive decisions.
4. Consider the following three questions regarding sound quality:
What should my piece *sound* like?
How does my playing differ from the desired sound?
What can I change so that my playing matches the desired sound?(When students become more aware of their own sound, a more musical result is inevitable.)
5. When deciding on fingering, be sure to test it at a faster tempo – it may not work!
“Awkward fingering interferes with gracefulness in the hand, without which beauty of tone and phrasing are impossible.” – Marguerite Long¹
6. Be disciplined with regard to rhythm and tempo – these elements are foundational.
“When you think you are practicing very slowly...slow down some more. You spoil everything if you want to cut corners. Nature itself works quietly. Do likewise. Take it easy. If conducted wisely, your efforts will be crowned with success. If you hurry, they will be wasted and you will fail.” – Franz Liszt²
7. Avoid doing too many run-throughs; focus on smaller sections. For example, if you have a 10-minute piece but have

only 30 minutes to practice, practice efficiently by emphasizing one particular section in detail or by working only the “trouble spots,” rather than by playing through the entire piece 3 times.

8. Memorize as you go – it is a part of the learning process, not something that happens later. Once a piece is memorized, use the music – you may find something you missed the first time around!
9. Avoid mindless repetition – your practice should consist of focused listening and adjustment. (The student must learn to listen more carefully while he plays because in the practice room, he becomes his own teacher.)

"Always play as though a master were present." – Robert Schumann³

10. Know your limits. While it is important that you practice regularly and thoroughly each day, be sure that you're never practicing with excessive tension and that you take multiple breaks. If you cannot concentrate anymore, stop practicing. If you're hurting physically, stop practicing.

"Through intelligent practice it is easy to achieve that which can never be attained by excessive straining of the muscles." – C. P. E. Bach⁴

Conclusion

So how can one know whether he or she has practiced sufficiently? When is it enough? Well, as many musicians would say, you can never practice enough, and you can always find more ways to improve. But I believe one of the surest ways to tell if your students are ready to move from the practice room to the recital hall is the level of mental and physical relaxation at which they execute their playing. Although concentration must always be present, there must also be a point of release in which the performer becomes part of the audience and is able to enjoy the music effortlessly. Of course, a performance such as this is ideal but at the same time very rare. I have found that some of my better performances have occurred when I stopped trying to make everything work and was able to let go and enjoy the music again. Performing in front of a live audience can be one of the most grueling experiences in life, but it does not have to be. The goal of one's performance should match one's original impetus and inspiration

for playing: musical enjoyment rather than note-perfect accuracy, personal expression rather than a pedantic adherence to the score, and pursuing artistic endeavors rather than seeking to win the approval of others. Practicing more effectively will ensure that such an inspired performance is within the student's reach.

Notes

1. Reginald Gerig, *Famous Pianists & Their Technique* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 321.
2. Gerig, 184.
3. Gerig, 206.
4. Gerig, 29.

“And There Is a Great Chasm Fixed Between the Two”:
Biblical Scholarship, the Church, and the
Great Divide between Them

Chad Hartsock
[Russell Bradley Jones Lecture, March 2012]

In the course of this lecture, I hope to highlight a problem. I do not know if I have time or capacity to *solve* the problem, but if nothing else, I would like to call our attention to a problem. The problem, as the title of the lecture indicates, is a great chasm that seems to separate what we do here in the academy—whether on Henderson Hill or elsewhere on the banks of Mossy Creek—and what we do on Sundays in our churches. That is, there seems to be a very apparent divide between the academic pursuits of things like biblical scholarship, scientific inquiry (especially biology, geology, and astronomy), and even history on the one hand, and the devotional, spiritual, and missional work of the church on the other hand. It is a divide that many of us perceive, a divide that seems like a gigantic, uncrossable chasm that leaves the church and the academy in conflict and often in stark opposition to one another. I want to suggest in this lecture that these things simply should not be so—that the academy and the church need not be enemies, but that each has valuable contributions to make to the other. It is time that the chasm is crossed.

First, a word about what this lecture is *not*. This is *not* a lecture about the integration of faith and learning; this is a lecture about the integration of learning and faith. What I mean is this: “the integration of faith and learning” has become something of a technical term, and a trendy and fashionable one at that, and libraries have been filled with many great works on the subject. When most of us use the phrase “integration of faith and learning,” we specifically have in mind some sort of notion of how faith impacts the academy or ought to impact the academy. That is, we are talking about how our Christian perspectives affect the way we think about science, history, business, and all of our other various disciplines. I once heard our very own president, Dr. Randall O’Brien, on a radio interview when we were both at Baylor, I as a student and he as a provost. The questioner asked him about the role of religion in the academy, things like scientific inquiry and the like, and how as a leader at a faith-based institution he could say religion has any place there at all. In a moment of brilliance,

he responded by telling the questioner that the secular academy has every conceivable line of inquiry welcomed and available to it except one: religion. The Christian scholar, however, has every conceivable line of inquiry available and welcomed, *including* religion, and that this actually places the faith-based institution and faith-based scholar in a position of great advantage. I think he is right about that. And that is what we mean when we speak of “the integration of faith and learning.”

Yet this is not a lecture about the integration of faith and learning, that is, how we bring our faith to bear in appropriate and helpful ways in the academic setting. To be sure, many on this very campus have far better things to say than I do when it comes to that question, and I would happily defer to them. Suffice it to say that when it comes to integrating faith into the academy, I think we have that one figured out here at Carson-Newman. We might do it better than anyone. So this is no lecture on the integration of faith and learning.

No, this is a lecture on the integration of *learning and faith*. What’s the difference? Direction. The phrase “integration of faith and learning” usually has to do with how our faith—something we have outside of the academy, whether as faculty or students—gets *brought to* the academic situation. I want to talk about things going in the other direction. That is, we have to take what happens in the academic world—all these great concepts we learn in history, art, social sciences, and yes, even in religion and biology—and bring that learning to bear on the church. Frankly, it seems to me that on the whole we Christians have done a very poor job of that, especially those of us in the conservative or evangelical traditions from which most of our campus community comes. So this lecture has as its primary aim to point out that problem and to call for a better course of action. *Our learning must inevitably impact the church.*

The Russell Bradley Jones Lecture is also a very appropriate venue for such a conversation. Jones, born in Kentucky in 1894, lived through times of much cultural upheaval, whether globally (he saw both World War I and World War II unfold in his lifetime), or intellectually (he lived through some of those religion-vs-academics battles like the Scopes Monkey Trial or the rise of fundamentalism and anti-intellectualism in our own denominational tradition). Further, Jones was an educated minister, having attended both Georgetown College and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and his life demonstrated that he had a foot firmly planted in each of the two realms—the church and the academy. He was a pastor and a missionary, but was also later the head of what was at that time the Religion Department at Carson Newman for a decade. The lectureship that bears his name has also lived with that tension between church and

academy, as it is an academic lecture but one which was founded and governed by the Ministerial Association. Speakers have included everyone from biblical scholars to pastors to most religion faculty over the years and even the occasional administrator, and it even included a biology professor in 1971 who delivered a lecture on questions of science and faith. Incidentally, the specific scientific items addressed in that lecture were cutting edge in 1971, and no doubt were disturbing and controversial to many in the churches, but most of those items are largely taken for granted now, even in the church, and I think this says something powerful and instructive about how science, learning, and academics will inevitably make their way into the church, even if slowly. Topics for this lecture series have also ranged from traditional sermons to high level academic lectures, and they have frequently included lectures directly targeting ministers specifically, with topics covering things like how to preach, how to minister, how to lead the church, and the sort. As a fun side note, one lecture title from the 1980s reminded me of the dangers of context—the title was “Hacking in Jefferson County on a Sunday Afternoon.” My first thought was “I didn’t realize computers had reached Jefferson County in the 80s.” Then I saw the subtitle in parentheses that explained that the lecture was about the style and content of radio preachers. Yes, context in fact matters.

While the lectureship has largely been given by ministers of one sort or another and targeted at ministers of one sort or another, I have a different audience in mind. I would like to aim my comments today not at professional ministers specifically, but more broadly at the many of us in this room who care deeply about the church and about the Kingdom of God. It is high time that we as a group take what we do here in the academy and deliver it to the churches, and it is time that we all as church people demand that our congregations and communities stop hiding from information and learning and start asking difficult questions about our faith, our God, our Holy Book, and our world. So this lecture is aimed at most of us in this room, not just the would-be professional ministers. And so we need to have a very serious talk about the integration of *learning* and *faith*.

A colleague of mine used to say that on consecutive weeks in November, we C-N Religion folks attend two different meetings. At the first, the Tennessee Baptist Convention, Carson-Newman Religion faculty are frequently labeled “liberals,” not because people necessarily know us in order to make such an assessment, but simply because we teach religion at Carson-Newman. The very next week, we go to the Society of Biblical Literature (the primary gathering of biblical scholars nationwide), and we are often dismissed as “unthinking conservatives”

or “closet fundamentalists,” and again not because anyone necessarily knows us but simply because we teach Religion at a faith-based Baptist college in the south. In both cases, of course, the labels say more about the giver of the label than about the one being labeled. But in both cases, I would suggest the underlying issue is still the same: the perceiving divide between serious academic scholarship on the one hand and a meaningful faith experience on the other. Too often for our Baptist constituency, C-N Religion faculty (and often our students and graduates) have been perceived variously as “out to destroy the Bible,” “non-believers,” or “cherry-pickers” who decide what parts of the Bible to believe or not believe. In fact, one of our Religion majors recently told a few of us that his church and family now label him a “liberal,” and when he asked them what that even means, he was told that “a liberal is somebody who knows the truth but runs from it.” We get those pejorative labels because we seek to do serious academic work and because we use critical methodology to read the Bible, while those offering those labels are often well-meaning churchmen who operate from a place of faith-over-reason in which literalism is often the only interpretive principle at work, and in my experience were all too often typified with bumper sticker slogans like “God said it, I believe, and that’s good enough for me.” And I used to be one of those very people I just described.

Yet inside the professional guilds of academia, C-N religion folks are often seen as “closet fundamentalists” or “preachers masquerading in academic regalia,” and we are given these labels because we do still place faith in the book we study and we do affirm it as the truth revealed by God for the faith and practice of the believing community. The problem: on the grand spectrum between pure academics and pure religion, people like so many of us at a place like Carson-Newman stand somewhere in the middle, and I am not sure we have done the best job of articulating why we are here or what deeply valuable function we serve by being here where we are.

We religion folks are often torn about which world we most want to live in, the academy or the church. Pastors and professors swap seats every academic year as pastors leave for the classroom and professors leave for the pulpit. It is not always because we are miserable in the one job and prefer the other; it is often because of our deep love and commitment for both. And listen to us lecture. Students, how many of you have rolled your eyes at your Old or New Testament professor or put your pen down and stopped taking notes because it is obvious that yet again we have stopped lecturing and have started preaching? Whether it is Don Garner’s lecture on Matthew 5 “The Hermeneutic of Jesus,” or Hartsock’s rant about Jesus’s economic

worldview in Luke, sometimes you guys just are not sure where the lecture stopped and the preaching started. As it turns out, sometimes we are not sure either. And, might I add, may it always be so.

Religion students feel the same tension. When we teach our students to write academic papers, students inevitably feel the pressure to answer the “so what?” questions and begin interpreting a text for its usefulness to the believer or the church. Yet as part of the academic exercise, we are often trying to teach those students to withhold that sort of practical analysis until the end of the paper (or sometimes not at all, depending on the assignment or the institution), instead giving attention to the academic issues at hand. Perhaps it is because we have tried to artificially divide two realms that simply cannot and should not be divided?

And, lest you think this is just a problem unique to those of us who teach or study Religion, it is not. This tension between academy and church, between learning and belief, is a very real tension that all of us face on some level or another. Often, this conflict surfaces in predictable places, like the conflict between science and religion. May I read you a paragraph from an email I received from my good friend Don Garner? This comes from an email in which I was soliciting some conversation and input for this lecture, and perhaps some of you have heard Dr. Garner say something similar in the classroom. He wrote, “consider how foolish we Christians must appear to the world each week as we wake up on Sunday morning to a pre-set electric-with-battery-back-up clock radio, listen carefully to a meteorologist help us know just how to dress, shower with purified hot water, anoint our bodies with various chemical solutions, ingest our personalized medications, digest our diet of nutritious and healthy food, dress in colorfully attractive and comfortable fabrics, drive to church on durably paved roadways in a vehicle with more computer technology than the first spacecraft that was sent into earth’s orbit, enter a thermostatically controlled and artificially but energy-efficiently lighted church building environment, sit on synthetic fabric-covered foam seats, sing songs and view video clips prompted by digitized computerized equipment, read the Bible text on a Smart phone, and then listen to a sermon that tells us that science does not know what it is talking about and we should reject it.”

That example seems comical to me, but we could enumerate so many historical examples that are not. Let us then stick to the obvious: Galileo. All of Galileo’s scientific observations of the heavenly bodies led him to one conclusion: that the Earth was not the center of the universe but that the Earth actually revolved around the sun. The church responded emphatically—the Bible says the Earth is

at the center, and if the Bible says so, no amount of scientific observation and evidence will ever matter to the contrary. *Faith* became an entrenched position that forced opposition to serious academic work, and scientific work that in this case proved to be true.

The chasm between church and academy is still just as sharp for the sciences today as it has ever been. Heard any good conversations lately about evolution? Global warming or climate change? Human cloning? And that does not even get to the intricacies of chaos theory, quantum mechanics, or all the wild stuff that none of us regular people understand! Have you tried to talk about evolution at your church though? We have an entire political party whose candidates go out of their way to upstage one another about who is *more* opposed to Darwinism, and many of the churches that so many of us call home are more extreme than the politicians. Why? Because we simply have never been very good at figuring out how to bring the academic world into the realm of faith in a way that respects both and without forcing one to devour the other. Yet these things can and should be done. We can and should be able to take the best of what our scientists are producing and integrate that with our church life.

It is not just the scientists and the Bible scholars though. When I was in Texas, I knew of a church that so desperately hated psychology and counseling that they believed that any and all problems could be solved by simply praying for someone. At first glance, that sounds like a holy and faithful thing to say. But should we really treat bipolar disorder with a heavy dose of prayer rather than medication that might also help? This same church also encountered a member who had been raped and was suffering from severe mental distress and bouts of depression as a result, and their solution was to perform an exorcism because, as they justified it, that is what Jesus would have done in the Gospels. That church needed a heavy dose of the integration of learning and faith.

Or what about all the great work that our literary critics in the English department do? When they teach us all how to approach various genres of literature and to read those texts with an eye toward things like characterization, symbolism, metaphor, or the role of the narrator, should we not also apply such skills to reading the Bible? It is not an unholy act to acknowledge that the Bible is in fact literature that was crafted in some way by both God and humans for the purpose of communicating the deepest of truth to us, and it was done so in the form of literature for a reason. We would do well to apply that same academic skill set to our reading of sacred scripture.

So, then, I think it is very much the case that we not only can and should bring the best of the academic world back into the church,

but that we *must* do so, regardless of our particular discipline. I would argue that we Religion folks on the 2nd floor of Henderson try to do this every day; we are as “liberal arts” as anybody because we genuinely think that all of your academic disciplines have something valuable to contribute to a full reading of the Bible. I think that “liberal arts” means the integration of all learning, that everything has to do with everything else. I believe that we cannot read the Bible well on Henderson Hill without the help of our friends in science, social sciences, history, business, art, or whoever else: that all of those things have a valuable contribution to make to our understanding of the Bible, and that the Bible is not in any way threatened by those conversations, but our understanding of it is only enhanced. If we can do that on the 2nd floor of Henderson, why can we not do that in First Baptist Anytown USA? I think we can. And we must.

Recently in an upper-level Religion class, sitting in a room with just a handful of students, a student asked me, “Chad, do you ever preach this stuff? And do you preach what you are telling us right now? Or do you have to cross your fingers and pretend this isn’t part of the text?” It was a fantastic question. The question asked quite sharply about the almost universally-felt divide between the academic study of text and the practical proclamation of it. My answer was honest and simple: yes, I absolutely preach this stuff. And why wouldn’t I, if I am genuinely convinced that this is what the text means? Her follow-up question was the real point of concern, because what she was really wanting to know is how I would get away with it, without facing some sort of sanction or booing or backlash from the congregation. This, I think, highlights an important truth: we owe it to the Bible to preach it for what it really is, not for what popular Christian culture of this or any other era says it means, and not what we think might be popular to the ears of our audience, and not in some way that neatly hammers into our three-point outlines. No, we preach the text as it is, for what it is, and when we do that, a strange thing happens: the text connects with the souls of our people. That connect occurs precisely because that is what the text was always meant to do, if we will simply illuminate the text sufficiently that it can jump across the centuries to encounter a new audience in a new situation without caving in to the temptation to bend and break the text until it fits our own culture and our own needs. The book is a book of faith, a book of the encounters of the people of God with the God who loves them desperately. If we use whatever historical, social, or literary tools we have at our disposal to unearth that experience, it will speak to our souls and our experience just as deeply. And what of those who are not proclaiming the text but who are listening to it being proclaimed? We

must demand that our ministers do the hard work of interpretation that I just described, because we as congregants so desperately need that word.

Scholars and the academy must stop running into the shadows and hiding from the church; it makes us look suspicious, and it does nothing to help the church, either. And as a church, we must stop holding scholars at arm's length as if they are going to break something. When I am sick, I want a professionally trained medical doctor, not a witch doctor or an alchemist, because I believe that knowledge is fundamental to healing. When my car is broken, I take it to the best mechanic I can find, and not to my next door neighbor who always thinks "it sounds like the alternator," and preferably not to someone's uncle who operates a shop out of his basement even though a friend tells me "trust me, he's the best." No thank you, I want a professional. Yet when it comes to religion, not only is everyone apparently an expert—we do, after all champion the priesthood of the believer—but we also seem to privilege those who are often the least qualified and justify it as "being filled with the Spirit." We need to elevate the role of a good, professionally trained pastor-theologian and seek the counsel of such a person, in the same way that we go to trained doctors and mechanics.

So what do we do from here? I said at the outset of the lecture that I wanted to at least highlight and call attention to a problem, but I might not have the time or capacity to solve the problem. To that end, let me at least offer some suggestions, a primer list of sorts.

1) We who aspire to be ministers have to tell the truth, and the *whole* truth. I am forever in debt to my colleague and friend Ross Brummett for this key theological question: "Is it true? Is it the whole truth?" We must do that as ministers and as churchmen.

2) Moreover, we as church members must demand that of our leaders. We must hold our leaders accountable for dodging hard questions and issues, and we must demand that our leaders help us to love Jesus not only with our hearts but with our minds also.

3) We have to ask tough questions and wrestle with tough topics, and we cannot hide from these things in favor of some sort of lowest-common-denominator approach to church. That is, we have to stop giving shallow, pat answers that are dismissive to genuine crises of faith, because every time we do it, we see another chunk of our generation walk away. God is not scared of our questions; we should not be either. Too often our churches have been content with proclaiming a gospel that sounds more like self-help than the Gospel Jesus proclaims, and we are far too quick to run away from any difficult question that might cause us to think hard, far too often

excusing ourselves from expending any serious mental energy with pious platitudes like “God’s thoughts are higher than our thoughts” or “I guess we’ll have to wait and ask when we get to heaven.” Every time I hear one of these clichés, I get ill; they are little more than escape hatches to help us avoid the hard work of thinking critically. Critical thinking should not be a skill uniquely taught at the university level; it should pervade our churches as well. God is a God who intends to be known by the creation God loves so much. Using our minds, even when it is challenging or frustrating, is one of the many tools God has placed at our disposal for coming to know that God.

As part of that process, we have to allow experts to be experts; we have to stop yielding the floor to armchair theologians like TV preachers, radio DJs, and politicians. Students should, for example, grow up knowing that there are two creation stories in Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 (and a dozen others outside of Genesis!) and that the duplication is no accident and no problem but is instead beautiful. More than that, students need to know that before their freshman year in college when some mean professor has to break the news to them. How many of us in the room can tell that story? At first, we are mad at the professor, because we conclude that the professor is trying to ruin our faith. Later, we get mad at our churches wondering why no one ever told us this before now. Neither is a necessary response, if we would ever figure out how to integrate our learning with our faith. And yes, I absolutely have preached Genesis in church, and it was received warmly and openly by a congregation that was not afraid that I would break their faith, but one that knew that all truth is God’s truth.

If this sort of thing destroys a student’s faith or a church member’s faith, it is only because that faith was built on the shifting sands of a faith-only shore instead of the sturdy bedrock of a faith that is both seriously *faith* and *experience* while also being seriously academic and thoughtful. We can do both. We should do both. We *must* do both. And not just here in the confines of our academic institutions, but also out there where the questions really matter. We owe that much to the Gospel, and we owe it to the world we claim to be reaching.

Thank you for your time. Thanks for being here. And may you go from this place as ones who do not exile your learning to the ghetto of this sacred space we call a college, but instead take what happens here as a gift that is very much worth sharing with your church and your world.

Primary Motivational Factors Regarding School Leadership Candidates' Licensure Aspirations

Earnest Walker
Julia Price

Review of the Literature

The school leader's role in the school environment is one of vital importance. The school leader is expected to lead the organization in an effective manner, manage and evaluate personnel, make responsible fiscal decisions, be the link for community and parental involvement, set the benchmarks for the school climate and culture including disciplinary factors, and become the curriculum and instruction leader of the school. Epstein, Galindo, and Sheldon have found that the principal's efforts to involve family and community directly contribute to school quality (2011). The supportive role of the principal is vital. According to Hupial, Devos, and Van Keer, the quality of support given teachers by the school leadership affects the organizational commitment of the teachers (2011). Ethical leadership has become another important issue for school leaders. The import of ethical decision making and the dynamics involved has been analyzed by Ehrich and Kimber, and emphasizes the many dilemmas faced by school leaders in today's society (2008). Often exacerbated by social media and other societal issues, the school leader must effectively manage concerns such as e-ethics, which have become important in the school environment. The current school leadership expectations also include leading the effort for school success as measured by proficiency and growth based on high stakes testing. Such measures, if not successful, may lead to sanctions affecting the school and the administrator. In spite of discussions regarding shared leadership, servant leadership, and disseminated leadership roles, the fact remains that the community, school staff, and parents continue to view the principal as the leader of the school (Cranston, 2005).

In addition to defining and recognizing the multiple roles which school leaders must master, candidates for school leadership positions must choose an appropriately rigorous school leadership preparation program in order to be prepared to fulfill the various and difficult tasks which will be required of them as they assume positions of leadership. Research has shown that leadership preparation programs that are exemplary produce leaders who understand and use effective leadership practices. The school improvement process and school

climate are also positively influenced (Orr and Orphanos, 2010). Teachers who seek the role of school principalship must conceptualize their roles via thorough preparation (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003). The manner in which school leaders are prepared influences their knowledge and career intentions (Orr, 2012). Principal leadership preparation programs affect the team building capacity of school leaders (Fuller, Young, and Baker, 2011).

Cranston's study regarding the next generation of global school leaders points to disengagement from principal aspirations, leaving fewer candidates than anticipated. Research continues internationally regarding the reasons potential candidates are choosing not to pursue leadership roles (2005). Supportive and arduous leadership preparation programs may alleviate the candidates' concerns regarding their confidence to fulfill school leadership roles.

Statement of the Problem and Research Question

The advent of more difficult administrative roles, in addition to the already demanding tasks of school leaders, makes the choice to aspire to school leadership more problematic for candidates. What are the primary motivational factors expressed by school leadership candidates that explain why they have chosen to pursue school leadership roles in the future?

Methodology

In order to gather data regarding the primary motivational factors of school leadership candidates, the Statement of the Purpose sections of candidate application forms for the Carson-Newman Educational Leadership program were examined and analyzed. Forty-two applications, representing a five year span, were investigated. The researchers disaggregated the data into the six most often mentioned areas. The areas of emphasis were: Professional and Personal Goals, Certification and Career Advancement, Service, Family, Professional Growth and Continual Learning, and Spiritual Fulfillment. Frequencies of comments from the 42 respondents in the six areas posited were tallied and means were determined based on the 95 comments gathered. By viewing the percentage of instances that comments were made in each area, a hierarchy of motivational factors was determined.

Vocabulary Terms

An explanation of the six areas of emphasis follows:

Professional and Personal Goals - comments related to pursuing the personal goal of becoming a school leader or attaining personal goals within the educational profession

Certification and Career Advancement - comments related to attaining the necessary credentials for school leadership

Service - comments related to using the leadership role to serve students, colleagues, coworkers, the school organization, and others

Family - comments related to pride and role modeling for family members by aspiring to the school leadership role

Professional Growth and Continual Learning - comments regarding knowledge to be gained in preparation for a school leadership role and for future leadership tasks

Spiritual Fulfillment - comments concerning faith-based beliefs leading to attaining a school leadership role

Findings

Ranking of Primary Motivational Factors for Attainment of an Educational Leadership Role

| <u>Motivational Factor</u> | <u>Frequency/Percent</u> |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Professional Growth and Continual Learning | 31 (32.63) |
| 2. Service | 19 (20.00) |
| 3. Certification and Career Advancement | 18 (18.94) |
| 4. Professional and Personal Goals | 11 (11.57) |
| 5. Family | 10 (10.52) |
| 6. <u>Spiritual Fulfillment</u> | 6 (6.3) |
| Total | 95 (99.97) |

Conclusions

The Professional Growth and Continual Learning motivational factor was the most significant area noted. Examples of candidate comments in this area include: “expanding my career, continuing to learn, being more educated in my field, become more knowledgeable of current educational trends, broaden my understanding of the field, develop better leadership skills, grow as an educator, and be a life-long learner.” These comments indicate that candidates wished to grow and continue to learn throughout their leadership program and beyond.

Service was the second in rank of motivational factors. Comments in this area included: “serve my students in a leadership capacity, positively affect more students, share my passion for educating and motivating young people, change lives, bring a wholesome and productive environment to the school, make sure all

children have a fair chance, encourage and support teachers, and being a positive influence on the lives of those around me.” Inferences in this area may be made regarding the wish of the candidates to become servant leaders, impacting those with whom they work through empowerment and shared leadership.

Certification and Career Advancement was a veritable tie with Service. Candidate comments in this area included: “meeting the academic needs to fulfill my career needs, valuable preparation for any additional levels of education, prepare me for a long and distinguished career as a secondary school administrator, and provide me with the training and tools I need to succeed.” These comments imply that the candidates realize the importance of formal licensure in order to advance in this field.

Professional and Personal Goals and Family were areas closely ranked. The goals area included comments such as: “reach many of my personal goals; my pursuit of an overarching life goal; meet my overall goals; realize several of my short and long term goals.” The inference is that pursuit of a leadership degree would allow the attainment of many goals, both professionally and personally.

Family was an area in which comments were often personalized. Examples include: “give my daughter the hope that one day she can obtain a higher education degree, be an inspiration for my own children, be the first person in my family to obtain a graduate degree, justify the support and enthusiasm of my family members.” It is evident that being a role model and having pride in accomplishments, which would be valued by the family, are important areas for these candidates.

Spiritual Fulfillment was the final area noted. Candidate comments included: “the school is my mission field, be a leader with Christian principals, following long conversations with God to pursue this program, and continue to pursue the program to attain my goals professionally and spiritually.” These comments are relevant to a program which is decidedly faith-based.

It is interesting to observe that growing as a professional while continuing as life-long learners and serving others are ranked above leadership certification and career advancement. Educators are frequently described as being “called” to serve. Perhaps the emphasis on serving others and growing in knowledge throughout a lifetime reflects this thought.

In general, the implications of this study attest that candidates for school leadership attainment understand the challenges involved in that pursuit. They are cognizant that they must fully prepare for the role ahead, set appropriate goals, and must attain proper certification in

order to become school leaders. They are willing to serve those whom they will lead, and many welcome both family and spiritual support as they move forward. These attributes are positive signs that school leaders of the future will meet the challenges necessary to attain their vision of exemplary leadership.

References

- Aieman, A. O., Mamdouh, Sharaah. (2012). Leadership Readiness among Prospective School Leaders in Jordan. Paper presented at Hashemite University Faculty of educational sciences, Jordan. Retrieved from *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1), 50-61
- Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003, October). Becoming a principal: role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement. Paper presented at University of Kentucky. Retrieved from *Education Administration Quarterly*, 39(4) 468-503. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03255561
- Cranston, N. (2005, December). *Principal disengagement: an exploratory investigation into next generation school leaders*. In Tin, Van. Place, Eddy. (Eds.), *Building new knowledge about teaching and learning: New Zealand Association for Research in Education National Conference 2005* (pp. 1-10). Wellington: Teaching & Learning Initiative Publication.
- Cranston, N. C., Ehrich, L., Kimber, M. (2008, September). Understanding ethical dilemmas faced by school leaders: Examining the issues and the dynamics. Paper presented at University of Gothenburg From teaching to learning, University of Gothenburg
- Cranston, N., Wright, E., Davies, M., & Shilton, W. (2006). *Doom and gloom or a time for optimism: Potential aspirants' views about school leadership - now and for the future*. In Jeffrey, R. Wright, E. Davies, M. Shilton, W. (Eds.), *Engaging Pedagogies* (pp. 26-30). Adelaide, SA, Australia: AARE Inc

- Epstein, J. L., Galindo, G.L., Sheldon, S.B. (2011). Levels of leadership: Effects of district and school leaders on the quality of school programs of family and community involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3). doi: 10.1177/0013161X10396929
- Fuller, E., Young, M., & Baker, B. (2010, December). *Do principal preparation programs influence student achievement through the building of teacher-team qualifications by the principal? an exploratory analysis* . doi: 10.1177/0011000010378613
- Hulpia,, H., Devos,, G., & Van Keer,, H. (2011, March). The relation between school leadership from a distributed perspective and teachers' organizational commitment. Paper presented at Ghent University Examining the source of the leadership function, Belgium
- Orr, M. T., Stelios, O. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 47(1), 18-70. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378610
- Orr, M. T. (2010, September). *Pipeline to preparation to advancement: graduates' experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation*. Bank Street College, New York. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378612

Shakespeare's Treatment of *Amour Courtois* in *Antony and Cleopatra*

Mary A. Ratchford

Literature has power. Packaged between the covers of books are entire societies that authors have skillfully laid out for their readers. In contrast to static history books constrained to dates and precision, works of literature portray the dynamic lives of characters to tell the story of their time. Great literature has the ability to shape and to mold as well as to reflect the values, beliefs, and aspirations of its time, all the while leaving indelible marks on its readers' hearts. One such piece of literature is Shakespeare's rendition of the classic story of Antony and Cleopatra. In his play *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare artfully takes the characters out of history and applies his own concept of courtly love to the couple to create a fictional and a critical portrayal of their love for each other that ultimately leads to their destructions.

The term "courtly love" (*Amour Courtois*) made its first appearance in an 1883 article by Gaston Paris called "Lancelot du Lac: Le Conte de la Charrette" (Boase 1). But the idea behind the term had been around for centuries, perhaps most famously described by Andreas Capellanus in his late 12th century work, *The Art of Courtly Love*. In this book, Capellanus codifies the rules into two lists that total thirty-nine rules for a lover to practice in order for his love to be considered *fin amour*. His book suggests that this form of love inspires a

Morally ennobling emotion; the lady as moral suzerain; the knight as servant inspired by love to perform deeds benefiting others and improving him; the lady's granting of love in return for proof of the knight's worthiness; the manners, means, and modalities of adulterous love; the need for secrecy; the use of confidants and intermediaries; the rules and courts of love. (Hays 79)

Throughout the years, Andreas Capellanus's manuscript has been greatly revered as well as greatly criticized. Scholars have asked questions such as: exactly when did he write? For what purpose did he write? For whom did he write? While different dates have been given for the exact publication of *The Art of Courtly Love*, it is clear that it was sometime around 1190. Some claim that Capellanus writes as a teacher who is desperately trying to get his young, female students to

do their Latin studies. Capellanus could have merely been spinning a fanciful tale to entice the young girls to read their Latin book. In contrast, others put Capellanus on a pedestal by claiming he is an important revolutionary who, through his work, *The Art of Courtly Love*, helped to develop and define the new idea of courtly love.

Regardless of what critics say about Capellanus' intentions, motivations, and objectives for writing, *The Art of Courtly Love* impacted society. It was "a code, an art of love, which every courtly lover must learn and practice" (Mott 5). The basic components of "the worship of woman, the doctrinaire free love, and sublimation through chivalric activity" come together to form the foundation of the code (Boase 34). All of the ideas and rules of courtly love sprang up so suddenly and were so sweeping that they seemed to become popular instantaneously. Playwrights, authors, and laity alike began to exercise courtly love's themes of love at first sight, forbidden love, and being sick from love until it became so common that modern readers are tempted to find it cliché and juvenile. One must remember that at this time these ideas were revolutionary—unlike anything that had ever been practiced before the ground-breaking work of Andreas Capellanus.

Because the historical figures Antony and Cleopatra lived a thousand years before courtly love began, any courtly love either of them exhibits is a fictional addition made by Shakespeare in his rendition of their lives for his play. There are parts of Antony and Cleopatra's courtly love Shakespeare seems to reject all together. Even though there are no records of Shakespeare stating his exact views on *amour courtois*, one can perceive how he regards this form of love by looking at the way he incorporates and treats it in his play *Antony and Cleopatra*. Furthermore, by analyzing the characters' actions and emotions during different scenes throughout the play, one can also discover Shakespeare's unique view on the varying levels and intensities in which courtly love can be experienced.

In order to understand the radical nature of the rules of courtly love, one must understand the time in which it evolved. Elevation of men and subservience of women was considered a truth and adhered to by all. Katherine M. Rogers sheds light on the medieval era in a publication in the University of Washington Press. In her article, she states that the time before courtly love was "virulently misogynistic—sex even within marriage was regarded as a sin; because of Eve, women were regarded as the source of sin and mortality, and, consequently, all woman should be punished throughout their lives" (Rogers). These were hardly ideal conditions for females. The elevation

of women is just one of the many reasons for the popularity of courtly love.

Courtly love in one of its highest degrees can be seen in Antony's elevation of Cleopatra in Shakespeare's text. Some view Cleopatra as "a sexual glutton" and a "selfish tyrant" while others go as far as to say that she is "the wickedest woman in history" (Hughes-Hallett 1). But to Antony, she is the object of his affection. While Cleopatra's true feelings towards Antony will always remain slightly veiled, one thing can be known for certain: Antony and Cleopatra engaged in the art of courtly love. Antony pours himself out and elevates Cleopatra above his morality, his military duties, his masculinity, and even above his own life.

The elevation of women is one of the components of courtly love that made it so revolutionary. Before Andreas Capellanus's work was written, men viewed women more as objects and possessions than as people who were worthy of praise and devotion. In the play, Enobarbus represents the previous view of women in his statement to Antony that women are robes, and "when old robes are worn out, there are members to make new" (1.2.163-164).¹ In this statement, Enobarbus tries to get Antony to become thankful for his wife Fulvia's death. Yet throughout the play, Antony, in stark contrast to Enobarbus, practices the post-12th century form of courtly love with Cleopatra. Cleopatra thrives off of Antony's emotions, and encourages his courtly love because she recognizes in this new love the potential for power.

In the play, Cleopatra finds courtly love to be empowering, but there are scholars who would disagree with her on this point. Out of the feminist movement has come the concept that women do not need men to feel empowered, but rather have power built into their very being. To some who read back on the text and apply modern concepts of feminism, Cleopatra is actually compromising her own strength by stooping to put herself into a position where she thinks she needs Antony and his courtly love for power. The amount to which courtly love gives or takes away power and dignity to women is highly debated, but what remains constant is that Cleopatra thought that Antony's courtly love was something to be desired.

¹ References to Shakespeare's play *Antony and Cleopatra* will be cited in the text using this format throughout the paper (Act, Scene, line number).

The very first rule of Capellanus's rules states that "marriage is no excuse for not loving" (second list).² This calls into question the institution and the very sanctity of marriage. Adulterous in nature, this rule implies that no matter what one's relational status, a true courtly lover should always be looking for someone to love. While courtly love does not condone adultery, its practice of admiration from afar frequently leads to physical adultery. To embrace courtly love requires embracing questionable morality, and such was the case for Antony. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare makes the point that the practice of courtly love undermines the purity of marriage.

Shakespeare is not alone in having a problem with this aspect of courtly love. After Andreas Capellanus wrote down his *Rules of Courtly Love*, the church responded with strong opinions against the work. The church recognized that marriage was not only a crucial part of society, it was an institution God created. Soon after creation, God created Eve for Adam because God knew that he needed a helper. The church opposed courtly love because they could not condone adultery nor did they, at this time in history, support the elevation of women. They used straightforward verses like Exodus 20:14 that left no room for arguing by using diction such as "You shall not commit adultery." The Bible is also filled with verses warning against the negative effects of adultery, such as, "But a man who commits adultery lacks judgement; whoever does so destroys himself" (Proverbs 6:32). Adultery is even equated with murder, immorality, theft, lies, and slander in Matthew 15:19.

Although the church did not condone such behavior, Antony's marriages to Fulvia and then Octavia do not stop him from loving Cleopatra. Even when Antony hears the news of Fulvia's death, he responds with an oddly unemotional question: "Where died she?" (1.2.119). This is hardly the cry of a heartbroken husband. While Antony later does express some sense of loss, even he recognizes the fact that he only desires Fulvia because he knows he cannot have her back.³ The fact that Antony does not follow the rule of courtly love that "when one lover dies, a widowhood of two years is required of the survivor," but rather moves on very quickly is evidence that he did not love Fulvia (rule 7 of the second list).

² References throughout the paper to Andres Capellanus' *The Art of Courtly Love* will specify the list and the rule number for clarity.

³ His full response to Fulvia's death appears in 1.2.119-30.

After Fulvia dies, he marries Octavia.⁴ Agrippa describes Octavia as a woman “whose beauty claims no worse a husband than the best of men, whose virtue and whose general graces speak that which none else could utter” (2.2.136-39). Antony’s marriage to Octavia seems like the perfect solution. Through this marriage Antony and Caesar will be bound to peace. Antony will not only receive military security, but also a beautiful woman of strong virtue for a wife; however, hidden along with all the potential for success in this marriage is the potential for failure. If Antony does not follow through with his promise to be a faithful husband to Octavia, he will gain an ever stronger enemy in her incensed brother, Caesar. Shakespeare’s audience does not feel a sense of “doom—for the play is not brooding or gloomy—but inevitability” because they know the strength of Antony’s courtly love for Cleopatra, and that it will devour any chance of his marriage to Octavia being a success (Rose 6).

Shakespeare uses Octavia as a direct foil to Cleopatra. While Octavia has all the beauty of Cleopatra, she goes beyond looks to provide a helpful military peace treaty while Cleopatra is militarily destructive. Octavia is innocent, virtuous, pious, and meek while Cleopatra is cunning. Not only are Octavia and Cleopatra foils of each other, but Antony’s different forms of love for them are in direct opposition. Virtuous, pure Octavia undoubtedly is a devoted and true wife, but the love that develops out of duty is not strong enough to compete with the carnal courtly love that Antony has for Cleopatra. Because the audience knew the basic story going into the play, they could see from the very beginning all signs warning of the danger that surrounds the sly Cleopatra, but Antony is so entranced by her that his courtly love does not allow him to preserve himself or his kingdom as he willingly walks into her embrace.

Courtly love promises its adherents the chance to obtain a higher sense of purpose and honor if they follow its rules. Courtly love, as a practice, refers less to “the satisfaction of emotional desires” but rather emphasizes the promise of “inspiration to good behavior in society and the performances of worthy acts” (Hays 79). In Octavia, Antony had a chance to attain his goals of military success, honor, respect, as well as to gain a higher sense of purpose. Shakespeare could easily have exercised poetic license with the historical facts to create two people who are tragically in love but cannot be together because of their political responsibilities. But instead of making politics the

⁴ Octavia is the sister of Antony’s military enemy, Caesar. The marriage was made to try to keep peace between the two men.

enemy, Shakespeare casts Antony's choice of courtly love in a negative and destructive light.

These negative effects are many in number, but the most notable effect is on Antony's military endeavors. True to rule 24 on the second list, Antony's thoughts, and even his entire mind, are back in Egypt with the one he loves.⁵ Philo notes Antony's misplaced loyalties in the very first line of the play by saying,

Those his goodly eyes,
That o'er the files and musters of war
Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
The office and devotion of their view
Upon a tawny front. His captain's heart,
Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper
And is become the bellows and the fan
To cool a gypsy's lust. (1.1.2-10)

According to his men, Antony's love for Cleopatra has reduced his status and causes him to go from a great warrior to "a strumpet's fool" (1.1.13). In relation to political responsibilities, courtly love is pictured as hindrance.

Because Rome is more military-minded than Egypt, Antony wrestles between the Roman soldier side of him and the newfound Egyptian lover side of himself. When it came to Antony's marriage to Octavia, Menas thinks it is "the policy of that purpose made more in the marriage than the love of the parties" (2.6.117-18). In contrast to that marriage, Cleopatra and courtly love must have been a fresh and welcome change to the structure and responsibilities he left at home in Rome. According to Meader, courtly love sets "its focus upon seduction" while romantic love sets "its focus upon marriage" (87). Unfortunately for Antony, throughout the play it becomes clear that both sides of himself simply could not coexist. In the end, Antony chooses Cleopatra and seduction above marriage, and ultimately brings about his untimely demise.

Shakespeare continues to build this contrast between courtly love and sense of duty. While Antony wants to be with Cleopatra in Egypt, his domestic responsibilities at home in Rome cause him to have a divided head and heart. Enobarbus describes the situation insightfully

⁵ Rule 24 of the second list states "Every act of a lover ends in the thought of his beloved."

by saying “Antony will use his affection where it is. / He married but his occasion here” (2.6.128-29). Through Enobarbus, Shakespeare implies that a person’s courtly love is a stronger force than even an entire kingdom of responsibility. Shakespeare does not underestimate the power of *fin amour*, but rather sees it as a strong competitor for the mind’s attention.

Instead of the emphasis being on Antony and Cleopatra’s love with Antony’s duties being the hindrance, it is rather Antony’s responsibilities that are key and the obstacle is *amour courtois*. Antony constantly has to choose between his love for Cleopatra and his love for Rome. For Antony, this choice eats within him and he “himself lives the conflict; in him it is internal. He begins by sharing the general opinion that he must choose between Rome and Egypt by rejecting one for the other” (Markels 18). Whenever he chooses Cleopatra and rejects Rome, it is treated in the play as an irresponsible decision that results in destruction and hardship not only for Cleopatra and Antony, but also for their countries; but, in contrast, whenever he chooses Rome and rejects courtly love, Shakespeare treats it as the correct, responsible decision.

When Antony makes statements like “Let Rome in Tiber melt and the wide arch / Of the ranged empire fall” the audience saw it as treason to his state (1.1.35-36). He even goes as far as to say “Here⁶ is my space. Kingdoms are clay” (1.1.36). How could someone, especially a military leader, be so flippant about his responsibilities and loyalty to his homeland? Shakespeare seems to answer this question resoundingly with “courtly love.” Antony’s loyalty to his troops and kingdom is fogged again and again by his courtly love for Cleopatra. Even when Antony makes a wise decision and recognizes “the strong necessity of time commands [his] services awhile” he unfortunately communicates the truth that his “full heart remains in use to [Cleopatra]” (1.3.43-44). Through Shakespeare’s reactions to Antony’s military decisions, Shakespeare clearly viewed Antony’s courtly love not as a chivalric endeavor but rather as ignoble behavior.

Sadly, his behavior went beyond ignoble to become entirely emasculating. Antony suffers this fate as he follows the rules that “a lover must be the vassal of love, must follow his advice and obey his commands, must find his penalties sweeter than other rewards, must suffer pain and sickness almost to death, must be plunged in contradictions, lose his reason, tremble and pale in his lady’s presence,

⁶ Antony is referring to Egypt and his place by Cleopatra’s side as his new home.

[and] dwell in thoughts of her” (Mott 46). The viewers of Shakespeare’s play watch as Antony, a young man with a bright political future, allows himself to be weakened little by little at the hands of *fin amour*. Shakespeare uses this draining of Antony’s power to portray the irony of courtly love because, while it promises to make men more manly and noble, in the case of Antony and Cleopatra, it actually destroys not only a man but also an entire kingdom. Courtly love weakens Antony until he “becomes a prisoner in the hands of his lady or of love himself” (Fowler 25).

Cleopatra knows that from the first moment they met, “she pursed up his heart upon the river of Cydnus,” and she has been pulling on Antony’s strings ever since (2.2.196-97). Cleopatra herself recognizes the power she has over Antony in her fishing analogy when she says,

My bended hook shall pierce
Their slimy jaws, and as I draw them up
I’ll think them every one an Antony
And say, “Aha! You’re caught.” (2.5.12-15)

This control with which courtly love empowered her is never more evident than in her manipulation of Antony in battle. Against the advice of Enobarbus, Cleopatra decides that “as the prudent of [her] kingdom . . . [she] will not stay behind” (3.7.19-20). Furthermore, through Cleopatra’s influence, Antony decides, going against all other advisement that he will fight by sea. Antony’s response to Caesar’s dare shows how anxious Antony is to elevate himself. Instead of making himself look noble, fighting by sea makes him look like a child responding to taunting without any regard to the ramifications of his decision. Canidius recognizes that Antony’s decisions and “his whole action grows / Not in the power on ‘t; So our leader’s led, / And we are women’s men” (3.7.68-70). Shakespeare portrays an army, once led by a strong man, now, through the effects of courtly love, being led by a woman.

While some critics desire to claim that Antony is the victim of the cunning Cleopatra, Shakespeare leaves no room for this conclusion in his play. Shakespeare makes it evident that Antony does have moments of clarity where he sees the downfalls of courtly love and the destruction that it was causing yet chooses it nonetheless. Caesar recognizes this as an unwise choice. In frustration, Caesar states that what Antony wants to do in his personal time is his own business:

But to confound such time

That drums him from his sport and speaks as loud
As his own state and ours, 'tis to be child
As we rate boys who, being mature in knowledge,
Pawn their experience to their present pleasure
And so rebel to judgment. (1.4.28-33)

As a direct result of his courtly love, instead of being viewed as a man, Antony is reduced to a child that needs to be punished. Antony, like a child, allowed his emotions to overcome the moments of clarity he experienced. He chooses Cleopatra over his reason, kingdom, and better judgment.

Shakespeare's portrayal of Antony is far from static. Shakespeare masterfully creates depth in Antony's character and shows the development of Antony's courtly love for Cleopatra in all its varying intensities. At times Antony and Cleopatra exhibit the rules of courtly love at a high intensity, and at other times Antony and Cleopatra completely disregard some of the crucial rules. Taking all these moments into consideration, the general trend is that Shakespeare portrays negative results when Antony and Cleopatra follow the rules of courtly love, but when they break the rules of courtly love, Shakespeare portrays it positively.

The exception to this inverse relationship is when Antony and Cleopatra break the rule that a courtly love should remain unconsummated. While Antony and Cleopatra break this rule, and thus exhibit a low moment of courtly love, Shakespeare still treats their consummation negatively. The fact that he agrees with courtly love on the point of chastity being key is understandable because it was still the general consensus of society that adultery was wrong. However, the culture was beginning to accept the idea that emotional adultery was acceptable, and that is where Shakespeare disagreed. Through his play, Shakespeare shows that emotional adultery is wrong because, using the lives of Antony and Cleopatra as an example, it readily leads to physical adultery. *Amour courtois* tried to claim that a person can be engaged in emotional love with someone while married to someone else, but Shakespeare rejected that idea entirely.

Shakespeare portrays Antony as a courtly lover using Andreas Capellanus's rules of courtly love. Antony adheres to rules of courtly love, such as rule four on the first list, which states: "thou shalt not choose for they love anyone whom a natural sense of shame forbids thee to marry." Cleopatra is a queen. Who could possibly be more honorable to marry? He also is "obedient in all things to the commands of ladies" (list 1 rule 7). All of Antony's acts "ends in the thought of his beloved" (list 2 rule 24). In both his marriages he observes rule one on

the second list that “marriage is no real excuse for not loving.” When it comes to Cleopatra, Antony is certainly “impelled by the persuasion of love” (list 2 rule 9). Out of all these rules that they follow, the most detrimental one was rule 26 on the second list: “love can deny nothing to love” because out of it came a subservience that resulted in Antony giving up everything—even his life.

Between Antony and Cleopatra, there certainly is “real jealousy [that] always increases the feelings of love” (second list rule 21). While Cleopatra is a strong individual, courtly love’s power is so potent that even she cannot escape its effects. Cleopatra has the messenger who brings her the news of Antony’s marriage to Octavia beaten as a direct result of her jealousy. It is not until she is assured that she is more beautiful than Antony’s new wife that her jealousy subsides. Act 1, Scene 3 opens with Cleopatra pacing around wondering where Antony could be. She sends Alexas to “see where he is, who’s with him, [and] what he does” (1.3.3). Courtly love contends that expressions of jealousy are high moments of love, but Shakespeare shows her *fin amour* to be petty by making her very next line “I did not send you. If you find him sad, / Say I am dancing. If in mirth, report / That I am sudden sick. Quick, and return” (1.3.3-5). In this scene, courtly love is merely a game for the rich and bored that leaves lovers emotionally wrecked.

This new form of courtly love does not only have emotional effects, but has physical ramifications as well. These effects go beyond rule 15 that says “every lover regularly turns pale in the presence of his beloved,” rule 16 that says “when a lover suddenly catches sight of his beloved his heart palpitates,” and even rule 28 that says “he whom the thought of love vexes eats and sleeps very little” (all on the second list). Hidden below the surface of all the rules lies a deep desire for the unattainable. Rule 24 portrays one dimension of the unattainable to be “the easy attainment of love makes it of little value; difficulty of attainment makes it prized” (list 2), but for Antony and Cleopatra, this concept of the unattainable goes far beyond this rule. They embrace the ultimate unattainable: death.

While Antony and Cleopatra do not follow all the rules of courtly love perfectly, their love most assuredly fits under the title of courtly love. Even though Antony was not a perfect courtly lover, he did everything he could for Cleopatra and he did it all in the name of *amour courtois*. As a direct result of this form of love, Antony changes from a man of power to whom his troops could look up to and becomes a man of questionable judgment and morality. The courtly love in his heart leads him to embrace Cleopatra and let go of everything for which he had once stood. In light of all the evidence, Shakespeare

seems to be emphasizing that Antony made a mistake in trading his kingdom for courtly love.

Everyone has biases. There has never been an author who has successfully removed himself/herself from a work of literature and produced something entirely devoid of themselves. Mary Campbell quoted English novelist Henry Fielding when he communicated much the same point by saying, "The writer's genetic inheritance and her or his experiences shape the writer into a unique individual, and it is this uniqueness that is the writer's only stuff for sale." A close reading of Shakespeare's play *Antony and Cleopatra* opens the reader's eyes to Shakespeare's "own stuff" that he is selling; namely, his view of Andreas Capellanus's *The Art of Courtly Love*.

Shakespeare's intention in this play is not to give a historical account of the lives of Antony and Cleopatra and the decisions that led to the fall of an empire. Rather, Shakespeare absorbed the historical facts, combined them with his own unique point of view on courtly love, and interpreted history to create an intriguing and unique portrayal of the lives of Antony and Cleopatra. Shakespeare does not appear to condone this new form of love, because it embraces detrimental physical effects, lasting emotional consequences, and encouragement of irresponsibility.

Works Cited

- Andreas Capellanus, *The Art of Courtly Love* Trans. John Jay Parr. New York: Columbia UP, 1960. 28-36, 81-82.
- Boase, Roger. *The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love: A Critical Study of European Scholarship*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977. Print.
- Campbell, Mary J. "Gaining Inspiration from the Greats – The Art of Writing." *Writers Inspired*. 9 Aug. 2010. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.
- Fowler, Earle B. *Spencer and the System of Courtly Love*. New York: Phaeton, 1968. Print.
- Hays, Michael Louis. *Shakespearean Tragedy as Chivalric Romance: Rethinking Macbeth, Hamlet, Othello and King Lear*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003. Print.
- Hughes-Hallett, Lucy. *Cleopatra: Histories, Dreams and Distortions*. New York, NY: HarperPerennial, 1991. Print.
- Markels, Julian. *The Pillar of the World; Antony and Cleopatra in Shakespeare's Development*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1968. Print.

- Meader, William Granville. *Courtship in Shakespeare; Its Relation to the Tradition of Courtly Love*. New York: King's Crown, Columbia University, 1954. Print.
- Mott, Lewis Freeman. *The System of Courtly Love*. New York: Haskell House, 1965. Print.
- Rose, Mark, ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Antony and Cleopatra*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977. Print.
- Rose, Mark. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Antony and Cleopatra: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977. Print.

Contributors

- James Lewis Baumgardner**, *James F. Ellis Professor of History, 1964*; B.A., Carson-Newman College; M.A., Ph.D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville
- Hester D. Beecher**, *Assistant Professor of Marketing, 2004*; B.S., M.S., Ph.D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville
- J. Mark Brown**, BA, MA, MTS Director of News and Media Relations
- Ross Brummett**, *Professor of Religion, Vice President for Student Affairs, 1987*; B.A., Ouachita Baptist University; M.Div., Ph.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Further study: University of Louisville, Baylor University
- J. L. Ryan Fogg**, *Associate Professor of Music, 2006*; B.M., East Texas Baptist University; M.M., University of Houston; D.M.A., University of Texas at Austin
- J. Chad Hartsock**, *Assistant Professor of Religion, 2008*; B.A. Carson-Newman College; M.Div. George W. Truett Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Baylor University
- Julia Jones Price**, *Assistant Professor of Education, 2011*; B. S., Carson-Newman College; M.A., Ed.D., East Tennessee State University.
- Mary A. Ratchford**, Sophomore Interior Design Major, Honors Program, Honors Program Student Worker, Carson-Newman College
- Earnest Walker**, *Assistant Professor of Education, Director of Graduate Studies in Educational Leadership, 2007*, B.S., Carson-Newman College; M.A., Ed.D., East Tennessee State University