

Does Gubernatorial Rhetoric Matter?

An Analysis of Gubernatorial Inaugural Rhetoric in Three Distinct States

J. Cherie Strachan
Associate Professor
Political Science Department
Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, MI 48858
Strac1jc@cmich.edu

Paper presented at the 2010 State Politics and Policy Conference, Springfield, IL, June 3-5, 2010

Does Gubernatorial Rhetoric Matter?

An Analysis of Gubernatorial Inaugural Rhetoric in Three Distinct States

Classic and contemporary scholars have identified participation in deliberative decision-making as the key to ideal citizenship. Yet has this concern for deliberation been embraced by elite political actors across the United States? To answer this question, this work tracks the embrace of deliberation in governors' inaugural rhetoric from the 1950s through 2009 in Minnesota, Ohio and Mississippi. Findings reveal differences in these governors' embrace of deliberation – which appear to reflect different core values regarding democracy.

Gubernatorial inaugural addresses provide a valuable source of both historical and comparative data about the American states. Unlike governors' campaign speeches or informal addresses, inaugurals are included in governors' official public papers – which means they are typically available from state archives and historical societies. Moreover, unlike presidential inaugurals, the number of concurrent gubernatorial inaugural addresses enables comparative research designs. Yet with notable exceptions (Ferguson & Barth 2002), inaugural addresses are not widely utilized as source of data in political science.

This oversight may result from our discipline's tendency to focus on national political actors. Or perhaps inaugurals are underutilized because many political scientists are primarily interested in identifying executive policy agendas – which can be more readily identified in presidents' State of the Union and gubernatorial State of the State addresses. Yet these approaches overlook the primary rhetorical function of inaugural addresses – which is to celebrate democracy in a rite of investiture that all elected officials are expected to undergo prior to wielding legitimate political authority (Campbell & Jamieson 1990). Hence this work relies on a historical data set of inaugural addresses in three distinct states to assess whether inaugural

addresses can be used to identify whether governors embrace different versions of American democracy.

More specifically, both classic and contemporary scholars have identified participation in deliberative decision-making as the key to a successful democracy. Yet has this concern for deliberation been embraced by elite political actors across the United States? Do they value deliberation with one another, and do they encourage citizens to participate in such activities along with them? These questions are answered by tracking embrace of deliberation in gubernatorial rhetoric in Minnesota, Ohio and Mississippi, which are three states at least once strongly identified with distinct cultural orientations (Elazar 1966; Sharkansky 1969). The speeches examined for this project include a complete set of all available inaugural addresses given by successful candidates from the 1950s through 2009.

Deliberation as a Model for Democracy

The notion that public decisions in a democracy ought to be based on discussion among free and equal citizens traces its roots to ancient Athens. In his eulogy of Athens, Pericles claimed that Athenians looked upon such discussions not as a stumbling block to action, but as “an indispensable preliminary to any wise action at all.” This favorable take on collective problem solving took root in America. Thomas Jefferson, for instance, justified his support of public education with the claim that: "In a republican nation whose citizens are to be led by reason and persuasion and not by force, the art of reasoning becomes of first importance."

Support for such sentiments, grounding a successful democracy in citizens' abilities to reason with one another, is readily found in contemporary political science (Ackerman & Fishkin, 2004; Bohman & Rehg, 1997; Burkhalter, Gastil & Kelshaw, 2002; Delli Carpini, Cook & Jacobs, 2004; Dryzek, 2000; Gastil 2000, 2008; Elster, 1998; Fishkin, 1995; Habermas 1984,

1991). Proponents of deliberative democracy disagree on a common definition of deliberation. Some, such as Guttman and Thompson (2004) provide explicit normative criteria, while others view deliberation as a dynamic process (Bohman, 1996). Yet the consensus of this work suggests that, at a minimum, deliberation refers to participants who offer justified opinions as they attempt to resolve disagreement surrounding a collective problem through group discussion. Problems are resolved when a shared understanding is reached and a solution is either implemented or recommended to policymakers. Note that shared understanding may not mean a synchronicity of beliefs, but rather that each individual can gain empathy for others positions and recognition of a common interest.

Many of the initial advocates of deliberative democracy grounded their arguments in political theory. Yet their ideas eventually led to the development of civic education endeavors – such as Study Circles, the National Issue Forum, and Deliberative Polling – all of which are intended to improve the quality of American democracy by enhancing citizens' deliberative skills (For a full array of deliberative civic education efforts, see Gastil and Levine 2005). Yet successfully implementing such programs may be more difficult than well-established theoretical arguments suggest. Deliberative civics programs have had mixed results, and meta-analysis of research in this vein concludes that such efforts may do little to enhance the quality or quantity of political participation (Ryfe 2005, 50). Mutz' (2006) empirical assessment of disagreement, for example, leads her to conclude that high levels of deliberation and political participation are incompatible.

These mixed results and recommendations lead to the question -- has deliberation been as widely embraced by elected officials and citizens as it has been by academics? Do Americans hold deliberation through disagreement with the same regard as theorists and academics? Given

the role of elite political actors in mobilizing citizen participation (Rosenstone & Hansen 2003), structuring institutional rules and developing folkways within these institutions, (Dye & Ziegler 1996), has this concern for deliberation been embraced by elite political actors across the United States? As the most prominent political actor at the state level and the most visible symbol of state government, governors' rhetorical choices provide insight into these questions.

Gubernatorial Inaugurals as Cultural Artifacts

Further, inaugural addresses are an ideal source of such insight into elite politicians' cultural norms. Cultural norms reflect shared assumptions about appropriate behavior and, for members of a shared community, provide a common framework for understanding the world. Precisely because they are shared and assumed, they do not need to be explained -- and they typically remain unspoken. This silence is broken in ceremonial speeches accompanying sacred rituals that function to reify shared norms. Inaugural addresses are a classic example of this celebratory or epideictic rhetoric.

Inaugural addresses are a genre of speeches unique to democracy. They serve as a public ritual, where the newly elected typically celebrate the democratic processes that empower them. Rhetorical analyses of presidential inaugurals, for example, indicate that this particular genre of political speeches functions to celebrate Americans' shared values in a process that explicitly describe the relationship between the executive and the people – upholding the shared values of democracy – as well as the relationship between the executive and the legislature – upholding the values of limited government (Beasley 2004; Campbell & Jamieson 1990). As Joslyn (1986) notes, American executives' willingness to participate in a rite of investiture that recognizes the role of the public in authorizing their administrations and the role of Congress in enacting policy “reveals much about the legitimacy of political power and the world view of Presidents” (315).

Presidential inaugurals that fail to make such rhetorical moves – most notably Richard Nixon’s – leave attentive audiences distinctly unsatisfied (Campbell & Jamieson 1990).

Understanding of these types of norms can be gained through in-depth longitudinal and comparative study of cultural artifacts. Indeed, Elazar (1982, p. 231), argued that rhetorical analysis of political speeches should be used for precisely this purpose. Hence inaugural addresses were chosen for this analysis because they represent an important ceremonial ritual not only in national politics, but in state politics as well.

Why Would Governors Invoke Deliberation?

This analysis not only attempts to determine if American governors invoke deliberation in their inaugural addresses. It also attempts to discern their motivation for doing so. If governors conform to the expectations of the genre, inaugural addresses should provide insight into each governor’s underpinning political values and world view. When these world views are different, one might reasonably expect these variations to emerge in the speeches they give. It seems likely that governors with a shared partisan and ideological identity, for example, would be more likely invoke similar definitions of democracy – simply because they truly share the same worldview and political value systems.

The culture of the Democratic Party has been described as less hierarchical, with power flowing upward from organized groups of supporters rather than down from party and elected officials. Democrats also tend to define themselves as outsiders who need to build coalitions to oppose the status quo -- even when they control government. (Freeman 1986). Since at least the 1960s, minority and marginalized groups – who must rely on the power of persuasion to gain access to power because they will never win a majority vote based solely on the size of the

population – have also been important Democratic constituents. Without being invited to deliberate, their point of view might be overlooked. Hence Democratic governors might be more inclined to embrace deliberative democracy than their Republican counterparts.

Regional political culture may also influence the messages that governors construct in their inaugural addresses. The tenets of deliberative democracy are most compatible with the political norms of moralistic cultures – where citizens were judged harshly for failing to participate fully. It is least compatible with those of traditionalistic cultures – where political norms restricted political power to an elite circle (Elazar 1966). Hence governors from moralistic states might be the most inclined to embrace deliberative democracy, with governors from individualistic cultures falling in the middle, and those representing traditionalistic cultures the least likely to uphold deliberation as an essential democratic tradition.

On the other hand, Americans hold an array of shared – and sometimes contradictory -- norms regarding our political system (McClosky & Zaller 1984). Strategic governors can meet the requirements of the inaugural genre, while also choosing to emphasize the democratic traditions and values that are most likely to help them advance a political agenda. Even governors who are particularly predisposed to embrace deliberation may choose not to under certain circumstances. One particularly important circumstance is the governor's relationship with the legislature. Upholding deliberation makes far more sense when one party controls both the executive and legislative branches. Even those who share a party identification and agenda will need to resolve lesser conflicts and skirmishes that inevitably occur throughout the legislative process. Inviting those who oppose the administration's agenda altogether into this process is a much riskier proposition. It seems that governors who begin their terms facing a divided government would be less apt to embrace disagreement and deliberation as a cornerstone

of American democracy than those facing a unified or split legislature.

Incumbency status may also affect a governor's strategic decisions. First term governors may, for example, underestimate the role that legislative deliberations will have over their policy agendas. Fresh from the campaign trail, they may highlight their own influence over their administration's agenda and downplay the role others will play in enacting that legislation. Incumbents with more realistic expectations of executive-legislative relationships might be more inclined to embrace the tradition of deliberation in American political culture.

These four influences are by no means exhaustive. Other ideological, environmental and institutional factors may also influence the rhetorical choices that governors make in their inaugural addresses. Yet these four independent variables can provide preliminary insight into the type of variables that wield the most influences over the version of democracy governors choose to celebrate in their inaugural addresses.

Methods

To determine whether governors invite others extol the virtues of deliberation in their inaugural rhetoric, a content analysis was conducted on inaugural addresses given since the 1950s in Minnesota, Ohio and Mississippi. While some speeches were missing from historical archives, almost all of the speeches given in each state were included in the analysis. Moreover, given varying terms of office in each state, a comparable number of speeches were obtained from each state despite the problem of missing speeches. For a complete listing of the governors, as well as the years of their inaugural addresses, see Table 1.

The first dependent variable, support for deliberation was measured by simply identifying the number of comments celebrating deliberation, disagreement and dissent in each speech. Of

the 46 inaugural addresses included in this analysis, 13 included such comments. The number of comments within each speech ranged from 0 to 4. Meanwhile, the number of words dedicated to explaining the value of deliberation in each of these speeches ranged from 0 to 125. These comments ranged from Harold Levander's (R-MN) 1967 succinct claim that, "In deliberation is wisdom," to John Gilligan's (D-OH) far more elaborate defense of the deliberative process, quoted below:

And so it is on the basis of this mutually shared confidence in the collective wisdom of our people that we begin today the never-ending process of the public consideration of the problems that confront us as a people; the open and free discussions of alternative courses; and the ultimate decision, by the expressed will of the majority, as to the path we shall take. And no sooner is one decision made than the process begins again, because that is the very nature of human existence. Therefore we will begin again, here in Ohio, today, the processes of deliberation and debate; and we will decide, as free men, what kind of life we shall lead, and what kind of society we will shape and share.

Yet openly celebrating deliberation is not the only rhetorical device that signals gubernatorial willingness to include others in an open-ended policy-making process. People are more apt to engage in deliberation when they are invited into the process, and the rhetorical device that most clearly invites others to participate is posing a question. Hence governors' reliance on questions was also measured – initially by identifying the number of questions posed in each speech. An initial assessment revealed that governors from these 3 states included 136 questions in their inaugural addresses. Yet a closer review revealed that not all of these questions were intended to address the audience. Some were included in the process of relating a story or vignette, while others addressed discrete individuals rather than a governor's full audience.

The coding was refined to produce two more precise dependent variables. The first included all real questions addressed to the audience -- even when a governor provided an

answer to his own question. Of the 46 inaugural addresses included in this analysis, 25 included real questions. The number of questions posed in each address varied from 0 to 15. The number of words dedicated to asking questions in these speeches varied from 0 to 468.

Examples of such questions include the following queries and curt answer by Richard Celeste (D-OH):

Is it possible, that in 1983, some Ohio families are forced to live in their automobiles because they have lost their homes and all they once had? Is it possible, that in 1983, decades after the eradication of many crippling diseases, children go hungry in our state? Is it possible, that in 1983, communities throughout our state, once productive and thriving, are now boarded-up, resembling frontier ghost towns? Is it possible? We know full well it is.

In a similar vein, Paul Burney Johnson (D-MS) asks the series of questions below in his 1964 address so that he can provide an even more detailed answer.

How great or how limited will be the opportunities open to your children? How adequate will be the services properly provided the people by their local and state governments? How much greater will be the contribution Mississippi will make to the productivity and strength of our nation and the free world? All of these things, and many more, are determined by the degree of Mississippi's success or failure in the broad field of activity referred to as "economic development."

Yet some governors used questions not only as a rhetorical advice to highlight their own policy preferences, but to encourage their audience to think about issues and to develop their own answers. A second measure of questions was developed, which included only questions clearly encouraging an audience response. Only 12 inaugurals included these types of encouraging questions, with the number in each speech ranging from 1 to 3. Meanwhile, the number of words dedicated to asking such questions once again varied from 0 to 468.

In 1959, for example, Orville Freeman (DFL-MN) asked those listening to consider the future of Minnesota with this request:

To what old visions of Minnesotans, now half fulfilled, ought we to lend our strength? To what new challenges created by the onrush of history ought we to dedicate our effort? What sort of Minnesota do we envision today, for 1968, just ten short years ahead, and for the years that stretch beyond?

An even more demanding Rudolph Perpich (DFL-MN) instructed his 1983 audience that, “You and I together must ask the hard question: Does it make any sense?”

All of these dependent variables were operationalized with word counts. The number of words in a speech represents the amount of emphasis dedicated to a particular idea or concept. Hence word counts provide a more precise measure of the importance each governor placed on celebrating deliberation and on encouraging the audience to begin the process of deliberation by engaging in contemplation and thoughtful reactions. In content analysis, word counts are often transformed into percentages in order to equalize the length of the units of analysis. Yet the total word counts in each of these dependent variables are very low in comparison to the entire length of these speeches. This discrepancy occurs because governors often pay their respects to democracy, the electorate and the legislature fairly quickly before moving on to spend the bulk of their addresses articulating priorities for the upcoming administration. Governors who spend more time explaining their democratic values and preferences are making a conscious choice to do so. Hence the decision was made to rely on total word counts to measure each variable. (Further, while the dependent variables are manifest, they are also being coded by a trained undergraduate Honor’s student in order to calculate inter-coder reliability scores.)

The dependent variables included two ordinal variables and two dummy variables. At one time, the three states included in this analysis were identified as the strongest representatives of Elazar’s traditionalistic, individualistic, and moralistic cultures (Sharkansky 1969). Since Elazar’s (1966) culture typology predicts increasing levels of support in each of three cultures,

state culture was coded as an ordinal variable, with Mississippi coded as 0, Ohio coded as 1, and Minnesota coded as 2. Thirty five percent of the inaugurals were given in Minnesota, with about 33% in Ohio and another 33% in Mississippi.

Similarly, the relationship with the legislature was measured at the ordinal level. Divided government, with both houses of the state legislature controlled by the opposite party of the governor, was coded as a 0, while a split legislature was coded as a 1. Meanwhile, a unified legislature, with both houses controlled by governor's party, was coded as a 2. Approximately 50% of the inaugurals were given when the governor enjoyed the benefit of a unified government. Yet 20% were given when the legislature was split, and another 30% when then governor faced a divided government.

Incumbency status was coded as a dummy variable, with a 0 assigned to inaugurals given by first-term governors and a 1 assigned to governors who had just won re-election. Given term-limit restrictions, most of the inaugurals included in the sample (70%) were given by first-term governors.

Party status was also coded as a dummy variable, with a 0 assigned to Republicans and a 1 assigned to Democrats. Minnesota governors representing the Democratic-Farm-Labor party were counted as Democrats, just as the state's Independent-Republicans were counted as Republicans. The sample was close to evenly split, with 52% of the speeches given by Democrats, 46% given by Republicans, and one governor – Jesse Ventura of Minnesota – representing the Reform Party. For a full list of the dependent and independent variables, see Table 1.

Findings

A standard multiple regression analysis was performed on each of the three dependent variables. The regression analysis on the first dependent variable indicates that the model significantly predicted governors' likelihood of celebrating deliberation, $F(4, 41) = 3.63, p < .05$. R^2 for the model was .512, and adjusted R^2 was .262. Table 2 displays the full results for each variable in the model. Neither measure reflecting these governors' strategic relationships with the legislature contributed to an explanation of variance in the dependent variable.

Governors were no more likely to celebrate deliberation when they were incumbents with more experience, nor when they faced a legislature entirely controlled by members of their own party. This pattern for incumbents might be more prevalent in Mississippi, as the state restricted governors to one term until 1988. Yet one incumbent and one first term governor both embrace deliberation in Ohio, while in Minnesota only two of the 10 inaugurals celebrating deliberation were made by an incumbent. Moreover, despite a consistently unified government in the state of Mississippi, only one governor in the past 60 years embraced deliberation in his inaugural. Ohio doubles this number to two, yet both of these governors faced a divided government. The number of deliberative inaugurals is more evenly distributed in Minnesota, but 6 of the 10 were given by governors facing a split legislature, with another two facing divided government. Overall, only 23% of deliberative speeches were given by governors facing a unified legislature.

Meanwhile, both variables reflecting differences in orientations toward democracy were significant and helped to explain a governor's willingness to embrace deliberation. For each shift in state culture from a less supportive to a more supportive culture, the average number of words dedicated to increased by 18 words. Similarly, being a Democrat is responsible for, on average, an increase in 18 words dedicated to celebrating deliberation.

All three of the governors embracing deliberation from Mississippi and Ohio were Democrats, while partisanship was equally split in Minnesota with 5 deliberative speeches given by Democrats and another 5 by Republicans. Hence Democrats were responsible for about 62% of these speeches. Moreover, with Ohio and Mississippi contributing only 3 deliberation speeches, the 10 speeches by Minnesotans accounted for nearly 77% of all those highlighting the importance of deliberation.

The regression analysis on the second dependent variable indicates that the model significantly predicted governors' likelihood of posing real questions in their inaugurals, $F(4, 41) = 3.17, p < .05$. R^2 for the model was .236, and adjusted R^2 was .162. Table 2 displays the full results for each variable in the model. Once again, neither incumbency nor the level of government unification achieved significance or helps to explain variance in governors' rhetorical strategies

Again, both state culture and Democratic status help to explain gubernatorial preferences. For each shift in state culture from a less supportive to a more supportive culture, the average number of words dedicated to asking questions increased by nearly 40. Meanwhile, being a Democrat is responsible for, on average, an increase in 68 words dedicated to asking questions.

The regression analysis on the third dependent variable provides similar result, as it significantly predicts governors' likelihood of posing questions that encourage audience members to construct their own answers, $F(4, 41) = 3.51, p < .05$. R^2 for the model was .255, and adjusted R^2 was .183. Table 2 displays the full results for each variable in this model. Again, neither incumbency nor the level of government unification helps to explain variance in these governors' use of open-ended questions.

Meanwhile both state culture and Democratic status contribute to the explanation. For each shift in state culture from a less supportive to a more supportive culture, the average number of words dedicated to posing open-ended questions increases by about 38 words. Being a Democrat is responsible for, on average, an increase in 67 words dedicated to asking open-ended questions.

Of particular interest, no governor in Mississippi asked questions that encouraged audience members to construct their own answers. Such questions were posed by four Ohioans and eight Minnesotans – with Minnesotans contributing about 67% of the speeches including encouraging questions. All of the Ohioans who posed such questions were Democrats, as were seven of the eight governors posing such questions in Minnesota. Hence 92% of these speeches were given by Democrats.

Discussion

The most important finding of this project may be that deliberation through disagreement -- for better or for worse -- does not appear to be at the core of many elite politicians' definitions of successful democracy on the same level as procedural criteria such as one-person-one-vote and majority rule. Rather, this preliminary analysis suggests that an emphasis on deliberation may be a far more important tradition within unique political cultures – such as academia, the state of Minnesota, and among some Democrats -- than it is for the rest of the country. This finding may shed some insight into the difficulties of promoting deliberation as a civic engagement solution among members of the broader electorate, who simply may not recognize this activity as fundamentally important to their political participation. In short, efforts to promote deliberation may not resonate with most Americans' core political values.

These analyses also suggest, however, that the rhetorical moves made by governors in Minnesota appear to be unique, at least in comparison to those of Ohio and Mississippi. Minnesotans were not only more likely to celebrate deliberation as an essential component of a successful democracy, they were also more likely than their counterparts to encourage listeners to actively construct answers to the questions posed in their addresses. This pattern may be occurring because Minnesota truly has a unique political culture that embraces a higher and more engaged level of participation from all Minnesotans. Yet given the small number of variables included in the model, these differences might also be attributable to other state-level differences. For example, a preference for deliberation might reflect political ideology – with liberal Democrats and Republicans in Minnesota joined by liberal Ohio Democrats in emphasizing values that are foreign to conservative Mississippians of both parties.

The state level findings might be largely a reflection of different levels of racial and ethnic diversity across Minnesota, Ohio and Mississippi. This pattern would parallel recent findings on youth political socialization, which indicate that a safe environment for controversial political discussion in the classroom cultivates long-term civic identity and predicts adult political participation. Yet the higher the level of racial and ethnic diversity, the more likely schools are to promote tolerance at the expense of a deliberative environment (Campbell 2008).

Clearly, further efforts to refine the regression models presented here will help to clarify the source of the patterns uncovered. Yet this preliminary analysis does reveal the limited impact of factors that should drive governors to make more strategic decisions references to deliberation and ask open-ended questions. The limited impact of both legislative composition and gubernatorial experience in these models supports the claim that inaugural rhetoric does

indeed reflect governors' preferred definitions of democracy – regardless of the underlying source of these varying definitions.

Conclusion

These findings suggest a more prominent role for inaugural addresses in future research. A comparative analysis of inaugural addresses, for example, may reveal further variation in the cultural norms embraced by governors across the 50 states. Combining content analysis with qualitative rhetorical analysis could provide in-depth understanding of the underpinning world views embraced by elite politicians in the United States. Familiarity with these rhetorical patterns could be used to develop experiments designed to assess whether different patterns in gubernatorial rhetoric have an effect on listeners' attitudes toward their own political participation. Finally, further longitudinal analyses may also reveal whether the definitions of democracy emphasized in particular states and regions shift over time in response to changes in the political environment. Do the versions of democracy celebrated in inaugural addresses, for example, shift in response to long-term economic distress such as that suffered in the Midwestern Rustbelt, large waves of immigration such as those experienced in the Southwest, or even terrorist attacks such as that suffered by New York on 9/11?

In short, while preliminary, these findings suggest that gubernatorial inaugural addresses provide a valuable yet under-mined source of both historical and comparative data about cultural norms underpinning democracy in the American states.

References

Ackerman, B., & Fishkin, J. (2004). *Deliberation day*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Bohman, J. (2003). Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity and democracy. *Political Theory* , 31 (6), 757-779.
- Bohman, J., & Rehg, W. (1997). *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J., & Kelshaw, T. (2002). The self-reinforcing model of public deliberation. *Communication Theory* , 398-422.
- Campbell, D. E. (2007). Sticking together: Classroom diversity and civic education. *American Politics Research* , 35, 57-79.
- Campbell, D. E. (2008). *Why we vote: How schools and communities shape our civic life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dye, T., & Ziegler, H. (2009). *The irony of democracy* (14th Edition ed.). Boston: Wadsworth/Cengage.
- Elazar, D. J. (1966). *American federalism: A view from the states*. New York: Thomas Y Crowell Co.
- Elazar, D. J. (1980). Steps in the study of political culture. *Publius* , 10 (2).
- Elster, J. (1998). *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, M. R., & Barth, J. (2002). Governors in the legislative arena: The importance of personality in shaping success. *Political Psychology* , 23 (4), 787-808.

- Fishkin, J. S. (1991). *Democracy and deliberation: New directions for democratic reform*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Freeman, J. (1986). The political culture of the Democratic and Republican parties. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101 (3), 327-356.
- Gastil, J. (2008). *Political communication and deliberation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gastil, J., & Levine, P. (2005). *The deliberative democracy handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guttman, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. (T. Burger, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Vol I.: Reason and the rationalization of society*. (T. M. Trans., Trans.) Boston: Beacon Press.
- Joslyn, R. A. (1986). Keeping politics in the study of political discourse. In H. W. Simon, & A. A. Agahazarian, *Form, genre and the study of political discourse*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- McCloskey, H., & Zaller, J. (1984). *The American ethos*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mutz, D. C. (2006). *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenstone, S., & Hansen, J. M. (2003). *Mobilization, participation and democracy in America*. New York: Longman/Prentice Hall.
- Ryfe, D. M. (2005). Does deliberative democracy work? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 49-71.

Sharkansky, I. (1969). The utility of Elazar's political culture: A research note. *Polity*, 2 (1), 66-83.

Table 1: The Governors of Minnesota, Ohio and Mississippi from 1950-2010

<u>Governor</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Legislature</u>	<u>D/R/E</u> <u>Word#</u>
<i>Minnesota</i>				
Luther Youngdahl	Republican	1947-1949	Unified	63/0/0
C. Elmer Anderson*	Republican	1951-1952	Unified	-----
C. Elmer Anderson	Republican	1953-1954	Unified	0/0/0
Orville L. Freeman	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1955-1956	Split	102/70/42
Orville L. Freeman	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1957-1958	Split	93/23/23
Orville L. Freeman	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1959-1960	Split	24/478/478
Elmer L. Andersen	Republican	1961-1962	Split	72/48/0
Karl F. Rolvaag	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1963-1966	Divided	43/25/25
Harold Levander	Republican	1967-1970	United	76/192/192
Wendell Anderson	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1971-1972	Divided	33/25/25
Wendell Anderson	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1973-1974	Unified	0/162/142
Rudolph G. Perpich*	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1975-1978	Unified	-----
Albert H. Quie	Independent-Republican	1979-1982	Split	53/18/0
Rudolph G. Perpich	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1983-1986	Unified	0/116/99
Rudolph G. Perpich*	Democratic-Farm-Labor	1987-1990	Unified	-----
Arne H. Carlson	Independent-Republican	1991-1994	Divided	0/0/0
Arne H. Carlson*	Independent-Republican	1995-1998	Divided	-----
Jesse Ventura	Reform	1999-2002	Divided	-----
Tim Pawlenty	Republican	2003-2006	Split	11/0/0
Tim Pawlenty	Republican	2007-2009	Divided	0/29/0
<i>Ohio</i>				
Frank J. Lausche*	Democrat	1949-1950	Unified	-----
Frank J. Lausche*	Democrat	1951-1952	Divided	-----
Frank J. Lausche*	Democrat	1953-1954	Divided	-----
Frank J. Lausche	Democrat	1955-1956	Divided	39/0/0
C. William O'Neill,	Republican	1957-1958	Unified	0/0/0

Michael V. DiSalle	Democrat	1959-1962	Unified	0/0/0
James A. Rhodes	Republican	1963-1966	Unified	0/0/0
James A. Rhodes	Republican	1967-1970	Unified	0/0/0
John J. Gilligan	Democrat	1971-1974	Divided	125/317/263
James A. Rhodes	Republican	1975-1978	Divided	0/0/0
James A. Rhodes	Republican	1979-1982	Divided	0/0/0
Richard F. Celeste	Democrat	1983-1986	Split	0/163/130
Richard F. Celeste	Democrat	1987-1990	Split	0/152/136
George Voinovich	Republican	1991-1994	Split	0/30/0
George Voinovich	Republican	1995-1998	Unified	0/27/0
Bob Taft	Republican	1999-2002	Unified	0/20/0
Bob Taft	Republican	2003-2006	Unified	0/23/0
Ted Strickland	Democrat	2007-2009	Divided	0/23/14

Mississippi

Hugh Lawson White	Democrat	1952-1955	Unified	0/0/0
James P. Coleman	Democrat	1956-1959	Unified	0/55/0
Ross Robert Barnett	Democrat	1960-1963	Unified	90/0/0
Paul Burney Johnson	Democrat	1964-1967	Unified	0/0/0
John Bell Williams	Democrat	1968-1971	Unified	0/0/0
William L. Waller	Democrat	1972-1975	Unified	0/6/0
Charles C. Finch	Democrat	1976-1979	Unified	0/32/0
William F. Winter	Democrat	1980-1983	Unified	0/0/0
William A. Allain	Democrat	1984-1987	Unified	0/0/0
Raymond E. Mabus	Democrat	1988-1991	Unified	0/0/0
Kirk Fordice	Republican	1992-1995	Divided	0/7/0
Kirk Fordice	Republican	1996-1999	Divided	0/32/0
Ronald Musgrove	Democrat	2000-2003	Unified	0/0/0
Haley Barbour	Republican	2004-2007	Divided	0/0/0
Haley Barbour	Republican	2008-2011	Divided	0/11/0

*These speeches were not included in the analysis either because no inaugural address was given, or a copy of the speech was not available.

Notes: Of the 19 Minnesota inaugural addresses given over the past five decades, three were unavailable. Minnesota had two year terms of office up through 1975 and experienced considerable partisan competition with governors from the Republican, Independent Republican, Democratic-Farm-Labor, and Reform parties. Meanwhile, Ohio inaugural addresses of this time period were given by only nine different Ohio governors, as the state had no similar restrictions on gubernatorial terms of office. Two year, rather than four year, terms through 1963 also increased the number of terms served by Ohio incumbents. This fact does not significantly affect the number of addresses analyzed because Frank J. Lausche only gave an address at the first of his four successive inaugurations. In addition, Ohio experienced narrower bipartisan politics across the past five decades, with four governors from each of the two major parties. Finally, 15 addresses were given by 13 different Mississippi governors since the 1950s, as state law prevented governors from serving successive terms in office until 1988. Given the single-party politics dominating Southern politics for much of this era, the Mississippi governors who took

office from 1950 through 1988 not only campaigned for an open seat, they were also Democrats.

Minnesota legislative elections were nonpartisan from 1914 until 1972, so party designations were based on participation in liberal and conservative caucuses that unofficially represented party identification.

Source of party in government: Durbin, M. J. (2007). Party affiliations in the state legislature, A year by year summary, 1796-2006. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., Inc.

Table 2
Regression Analyses of Variables Predicting Governors' Rhetorical Choices

	Celebrate Deliberation	Pose Real Questions	Pose Encouraging Questions
Party Status	18.49* (2.00)	67.69** (2.58)	67.40** (2.70)
Unified	-6.26 (1.14)	.004 (.000)	.375 (.026)
Incumbency	-17.21 (1.69)	35.33 (1.25)	36.04 (1.34)
State Culture	18.21** (3.16)	35.33* (2.37)	37.64* (2.48)
R-squared	.26	.23	.26
F	3.16	3.17	3.51
N	46	46	46

t-scores in parentheses

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$