



**Journal of
RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

VOLUME 13, NUMBER 1

1986

EDITORIAL BOARD

Derwood C. Smith, Cleveland State University, *Editor*

Herbert Neve, Wright State University
Roy Ward, Miami University
Willis Stoesz, Wright State University
Peter Williams, Miami University
Andrew Burgess, University of New Mexico
Harold Forshey, Miami University

Editorial Information

The Journal of Religious Studies welcomes articles for publication in upcoming issues. Manuscripts may be any length but should be typewritten, double-spaced and conform to any style suitable for publication in a refereed journal. Authors will receive complimentary copies of the issue in which his article appears. All material is subject to editorial revision.

Subscription Information

Cost: \$6.00 Annually (1 Volume consisting of 2 issues)

\$3.00 Single Issue

Checks payable to: *Journal of Religious Studies*

Back Issues: Available upon request

Cost: Same as above

Articles submitted for publication in JRS should be addressed to the Editor, *Journal of Religious Studies*, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

Requests for subscriptions, back issues, reprints of articles, etc., should be sent to the Secretary at the same address.

Published by the Department of Religious Studies,
Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Contents

- 1 **A Physician's Study of Human Suffering and God-Consciousness in the Sermons of Friedrich Schleiermacher**
By Thomas E. Elkins, University of Michigan and Douglas Brown, Harding Graduate School of Religion
- 15 **Biblical Literary Criticism: Logical Form and Poetic Function**
By Joseph Keller, Indiana University
- 25 **Unmasking the True Hegel: A Critique of Emil Fackenheim's Hegelianism**
By H.M. Ravven, Hamilton College
- 41 **Televangelism: A Look At Communicator Style**
By Kimberly Neuendorf and Robert Abelman, Cleveland State University
- 60 **The Transcendental Awareness: Husserl and Theology**
By Algis Mickunas, Ohio University
- 74 **Salvific Imagery in Skin Care Advertisements**
By Jorunn Jacobsen Buckley, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

material things and their common universal meaning within life.³⁷ Fackenheim misses the point of this Hegelian perspective. Yet he is correct in maintaining that it is through Hegel's concept of religion that his concept of the State and even of Philosophy itself, must be understood. Fackenheim misunderstands, however, the significance of Hegel's concept of religion.

According to Hegel, empirical reality cannot be negated by the self as the cow literally swallows and incorporates a thistle. That is precisely what happens on a *symbolic level*. As a result of the empirical, by means of human labor, coming to display its symbolic essence, knowledge can "swallow up" the explicit Reason manifested in the institutions of ethical life. Philosophy recognizes the social reconciliation of particular and universal as the finite embodiment of its own truth. The reconciliation of essential truth and empirical reality occurs — and can only occur — when the universal Truth of reality comes to be manifested in society and then known. Thus, the rational truth of empirical reality becomes actual through labor and meets the universal symbolic content of mind through the knowledge that reflects on rational society and all that has led up to it. *Therefore, knowledge — not history — is, in the end, the focus of the Hegelian reconciliation of empirical life and knowledge.* In keeping with the Western religious philosophical tradition, Hegel resolves eschatology ultimately and completely only in the unity possible to the human mind through Reason with its divine source and Truth. Fackenheim does not grasp fully the implications of this.

³⁷ Hegel clearly distinguishes between the conceptual universality of the mind — religion and philosophy — and their finite ethical embodiments. See, e.g.: Enc. #552:

The national spirit contains nature-necessity and stands in external existence (#483); the ethical substance, potentially infinite, is actually a particular and limited substance (#549, 550); on its subjective side it labours under contingency, in the shape of its unreflective natural usages, and its content is presented to it as something *existing* in time and tied to an external nature and external world. The spirit, however, (which *thinks* in this moral organism) overrides and absorbs within itself the finitude attaching to its national spirit in its state and the state's temporal-interests, in the system of laws and usages. It rises to apprehend itself in its essentiality. Such apprehension, however, still has the immanent limitedness of the national spirit. But the spirit which thinks in universal history, stripping off at the same time those limitations of the several national minds and its own temporal restrictions, lays hold of its concrete universality, and rises to apprehend the absolute mind, as the eternally actual truth in which the contemplative reason enjoys freedom, while the necessity of nature and the necessity of history are only ministrant to its revelation and the vessels of honour.

Televangelism: A Look at Communicator Style

Kimberly Neuendorf and Robert Abelman

Examining and understanding communicator style — "the way one verbally, nonverbally, and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood" (18, p. 48) — has a long and impressive history. In ancient Greece the Sophists discussed communicator style as an important part of practical speech-making and a major contribution to a persuasive argument. Style was also one of the "five canons of rhetoric" formulated during Roman times, a valued commodity among 18th Century European storytellers, and has occupied a prominent role in rhetorical theory ever since (16). Today, the success of the modern storyteller, television, is also evaluated in terms of communicator style. Measures of the mass appeal of Hollywood personalities, typically referred to as their television quotient or "TVQ," are often the basis by which multi-million dollar programming decisions are made.

Over the years, rhetoricians, social scientists, and media professionals have recognized that the way a person communicates reflects, to a large extent, the individual's self-identity, affects other's perceptions of the individual, and contributes to that individual's success as a communicator. Style has been associated with the manner of communicating, not the matter; with how communication occurs, not with what communication occurs. Essentially, communicator style gives form to content and contributes to others' interpretation and impression of the message and impact of the messenger (19).

Recently, communicator style has also become a topic of concern for media critics and members of the clergy, many of whom have

included it among the most significant and controversial components of the "electronic church." Although the electronic church has often been criticized for its occasional ventures into the political arena (3), the primary focus of concern and commentary has revolved around the presentation of content rather than the content itself. The dynamic and charismatic performances of the electronic church's evangelistic personalities have often been cited as the reason for declining attendance in Sunday services (20) and decreasing financial contributions to the local church (11, 21). Although their ability to deliver the flock — an estimated 14 million American viewers (10) — has been much applauded by the clergy, televangelists' manner of presentation have inspired rigorous criticism. The basis of this criticism, according to Hadden and Swann (13, p. 19) is that televangelists offer a whole new way of experiencing religion:

The logic of television is simply that if you want people to watch a program, you must entertain them — visually, aurally, totally. Today the [TV] evangelists realize full well that they are in hot competition, not only with a lot of secular and a few main-line religious programs, but with each other as well. And they realize that the sophistication and slickness of their productions — in effect, their Hollywood quotient — can determine their success or failure. . . . Their style of preaching — and entertaining — include everything from the sotto voce reassurances of a funeral director to the soft rock of bewigged and bejeweled gospel-singing groups to the hellfire and brimstone of the save-yourself-or-be-damned tearful tirades.

A look at the most popular and prevalent religious programs in the United States confirms the fact that the primary component that separates one program from another is communicator style rather than a unique ideology or theology (15). The content in the top rated religious programs, for example, is highly consistent in its fundamentalists approach to Christianity (although most programs fail to identify any affiliation with a particular denomination (1)). While the formats of these programs differ — including talk shows, soap operas, magazines, musical/variety shows, and sermons — the majority of popular programs feature a single individual in an evangelistic role (with pentecostals and charismatics dominating the list), controlling and setting the tone for the program.

These portrayals are likely to have an impact on the viewers of religious fare. The same social learning theories (see 6) which have

yielded testable propositions about the learning of aggression (7, 5, 17), prosocial behavior (9, 2), and family role structures (12) from television would also be applicable to the learning of the roles of the "Men of God" and attitudes toward the church and the institution of religion. The communicator style of religious television's key personalities and leaders constitutes an abundant and potentially important class of environmental stimuli available for attitude formation and change and for behavioral modeling of viewers. As was noted earlier, communicator style gives form to content and contributes to others' interpretation and impression of the message and impact of the messenger (19). The observation of particular types of communicator style among the most popular televangelists may establish attitudes and interpretations of religion that is either compatible with or in opposition to the traditional church.

Preliminary to assessing possible effects is the systematic identification of the predominant communication styles of televangelists. Despite the widespread interest in the electronic church and the controversy brought on by its personalities, no prior content analysis has systematically and comprehensively described religious television or its personnel. The investigation reported herein focuses on the communicator style of the various televangelists featured in the country's most popular and prevalent programs. The list of personalities, in order of program popularity, include: (1) Jimmy Swaggart, (2) Jerry Falwell, (3) Robert Schuller, (4) Oral Roberts, (5) Herbert W. Armstrong, (6) Rex Humbard, (7) Kenneth Copeland, (8) Jack Van Impe, (9) Ernest Angley, (10) Dr. D. James Kennedy, (11) James Robison, (12) Richard DeHaan, (13) Fred Price, and (14) Dr. Richard Gottier. The "dynamics," "charisma," and "intensity" of these individuals, encompassing the verbal and nonverbal components of their presentations, will be quantitatively evaluated and compared.

A stratified random sample of 40 U.S. towns and cities were obtained, using U.S. Census information to constitute the sampling frame. The sample was stratified by size of the town or city; 10 towns with a population of 20,000-100,000 persons; 10 cities with a population of 100,000-1,000,000 persons; and the ten most populated cities in the U.S. During a two-week period in 1983 issues of *TV Guide* serving these locations were obtained. An exhaustive analysis of these 80 issues of the magazine produced the totality of religious programming in the sample cities. Additionally, *Broadcasting/Cable Yearbook* was consulted to obtain information in regard to what, if

any, religious cable channels were carried that were not listed in the magazine.

18,845 individual instances of religious TV programs were extracted, constituting 696 different programs. From this pool of programming, the most popular and prevalent programs featuring a key individual in an evangelistic role were elicited based on an index composed of (1) the frequency with which the show was aired in the 40 cities during the sample period, (2) the length of the average episode, (4) the number of different cable and broadcasting stations on which the show was available, and (5) the total number of households, both broadcast and cable, capable of receiving the show. All index components were calculated for the sample cities only and were standardized before inclusion in the index. Three episodes of the top 14 programs featuring a televangelist were collected using a random sampling of off-air programming.

The unit of analysis for this investigation was each verbal utterance targeted toward a typically undifferentiated, unresponsive and/or unseen audience. Monologues, as opposed to interactions between communicants, were employed in the analysis as a more accurate reflection of communicator style. Interaction analysis typically focuses on the context of the communication and the relationship between communicators, rather than on the communicators themselves (8). Each act/monologue ended with the introduction of a new audience, new speaker, or commercial interruption. Monologues were examined in terms of the targeted recipient, whether the messages consisted of religious or nonreligious content, communication type, the length (in seconds) of the monologue, the direction and mode of the message, and the intensity of the delivery of the message. Training three coders for these dimensions included 35 hours of discussion and practice coding. Reliability checks between each coder yielded 10 separate reliability estimates, all exceeding .85 in percentage of agreement within and between content categories.

Targeted Recipient

The recipient(s) is (are) identified through the initiator's verbal and/or nonverbal reference to him, her, or them. Possible recipients included *Live* (e.g., congregation, studio audience), *TV* (e.g., home viewing audience), *Live and TV*, *God*, *Devil*, *Jesus Christ* and *Other*

religious figures. It should be noted that these categories are mutually exclusive and a given monologue can be targeted to one or more of these recipients.

The fourteen televangelists differed significantly ($\chi^2 = 1694.37$, $df = 52$, $p < .0001$) in terms of the composition of their targeted audience (see table 1). Each of the televangelists were overtly aware of the television viewing audience and spent much of their time directing their messages at the TV camera. Among those whose monologues were primarily devoted to the home audience were DeHaan (100%), Gottier (99.2%), Van Impe (94.8%), and Robison (92.4%). Several televangelists also managed to target their messages to the home and live audiences simultaneously, including Price (63.6%) and Copeland (53.8%); Angley also divided his attention to these two audiences, but he tended to isolate his audience such that he directed 35.5% of his monologues specifically at the home audience and 32.2% were directed specifically toward the live audience.

Several televangelists were extensively devoted to their live audience or congregation. These included Kennedy (48.2%), Swaggart (32.9%), and Schuller (31.2%). Only Angley targeted a significant portion of his messages to the devil (12.4%), and only a handful of televangelists devoted a significant amount of their programs to directing messages specifically at God. Among them were Schuller (15.6%), Copeland (11.1%), Kennedy (10.6%), and Roberts (10.2%).

Communication Type

This refers to the method or vehicle by which the monologue was presented. There can be numerous communication types employed in a given monologue, which include: *Song*, *Sermon*, *Story*, *Conversation* (e.g., casual, informal, and spontaneous verbalizations which reflect present context and which has no specific direction), *Prayer*, *Reading*, *Disclaimer* (e.g., verbalizations which serve to establish the denial or relinquishment of responsibility for previous or forthcoming content in the program), *Testimony*, *Recitation*, *Narration*, *Introduction* (e.g., verbalizations which serve to direct attention to an individual, event, or upcoming program, and *Other*.

With the exception of Robison, Falwell, Van Impe, and Angley, each of the fourteen televangelists' primary form of communication

Table 1. Recipient of Communication By Televangelist

	Recipient*						
	Live	TV	Live & TV	God	Devil	Jesus	Other
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Swaggart	32.9%	60.0%	1.2%	4.7%	—	1.1%	—
Falwell	13.6	57.1	25.0	2.9	—	—	1.4
Schuller	31.2	22.1	31.1	15.6	—	—	—
Roberts	20.3	45.8	18.6	10.2	1.7	1.7	1.7
Armstrong	7.6	86.7	5.7	—	—	—	—
Humbard	21.8	26.9	46.1	2.6	—	1.3	1.3
Copeland	16.2	5.1	53.8	11.1	0.8	1.7	—
DeHaan	—	100.0	—	—	—	—	—
Van Impe	—	94.8	—	2.1	—	1.0	2.1
Angley	32.2	35.5	9.1	9.1	12.4	1.7	—
Kennedy	48.2	34.1	5.9	10.6	—	1.2	—
Robison	—	92.4	6.1	1.5	—	—	—
Price	27.2	8.6	63.6	—	—	0.6	—
Gottier	—	99.2	—	—	—	—	—

($\chi^2 = 1694.37$, $df = 52$, $p < .0001$)

*Percentages should be read across rows.

Because of the infrequency of "Devil" and "Jesus" as recipient, these categories were collapsed into the "Other" category.

was the sermon. Angley's, Falwell's, and Robison's primary communication type was conversation with their audiences (52.1%, 39.2%, and 36.4% respectively). Van Impe was most often reciting to his audience (42.7%). In addition to sermonizing, each televangelist employed a significantly different variety of communication types in their presentations ($\chi^2 = 1541.99$, $df = 104$, $p < .0001$). Armstrong and DeHaan, for example, spent much of their programs (44.7% and 35.5%, respectively) narrating over some form of visual display (e.g., graphics, film footage). Price also spent time reading to his audience (34.0%), Falwell offered a significant amount of prayer (16.9%), and Humbard recited (19.2%) as well as sermonized.

Roberts, Kennedy, Robison, and Swaggart are the most diverse communicators in regards to employing the greatest variety of communication types. In contrast, DeHaan, Van Impe, and Armstrong were the least diverse, presenting a limited and inflexible repertoire of communication types (see Table 2).

Direction and Mode

A determination was made as to whether each monologue served to initiate, maintain, inhibit, or terminate communication with a targeted recipient. Direction (i.e., goes towards, goes against, goes away from) refers to the function of the communication and mode refers to the specific intent of the verbal utterances. The three most predominant modes were coded for each communication type occurring within a monologue. The definition for each type of direction and the modes relevant to each direction appears below and was adapted from Borke (8), Horney (14) and Greenberg, Hines, Buerkel-Rothfuss and Atkin (12).

Goes Toward: Positive verbal acts which initiate, maintain, and/or build a communicative relationship. These include *Offering information/data* (e.g., "The Bible says"); *Offering information/opinion* (e.g., "I believe"); *Offering information/products* (e.g., "These cassettes can be yours"); *Seeking support/behavior* (attempts to solicit or request (ask as a question) behavioral support, attention, help, gratification or favors); *Seeking support/non-behavior* (attempts to solicit or request (ask a question) non-behavioral (cognitive or affective/emotional) support); *Seeking information/data* (e.g., "What is the fifth commandment?"); *Seeking information/opinion* (e.g., "How do you feel when you get up in the morning?"); *Joking: Sup-*

Table 2. Communication Type By Televangelist

	Communication Type*									
	Song	Sermon	Story	Conversion	Prayer	Reading	Recitation	Narr.	Testimonial	Other
Swaggart	2.4%	32.9%	4.7%	18.9%	4.7%	9.4%	14.1%	13.0%	—	—
Falwell	—	15.7	1.4	39.3	4.3	4.3	2.1	22.1	—	10.8
Schuller	—	33.8	10.4	15.6	11.7	5.2	7.8	7.8	—	7.7
Roberts	1.7	23.7	1.7	11.9	16.9	6.8	5.1	18.7	11.9	1.4
Armstrong	—	38.1	2.9	10.5	—	—	1.9	44.7	—	1.9
Humbard	—	41.0	7.7	5.1	7.7	1.3	19.2	11.5	1.3	5.2
Copeland	—	47.0	7.7	13.7	8.5	19.7	0.9	—	—	2.5
DeHaan	—	51.6	3.2	—	—	—	9.7	35.5	—	—
Van Impe	—	39.6	—	7.3	6.3	—	42.7	—	—	4.1
Angley	—	19.0	2.5	52.1	6.6	2.5	6.6	8.3	1.7	0.7
Kennedy	—	29.4	7.1	14.1	10.6	4.7	11.8	12.9	2.4	6.0
Robison	—	15.2	1.5	36.4	1.5	6.1	15.2	18.3	4.5	1.3
Price	—	45.7	0.6	6.2	—	34.0	7.4	4.3	1.2	0.6
Gottier	—	45.8	9.2	4.2	—	—	15.0	23.4	—	2.4

($\chi^2 = 1541.99$, $df = 104$, $p < .0001$)

*Percentages should be read across rows.

Because of the infrequency of "Song" as a Communication Type, it was deleted from the chi-square analysis.

porting (e.g., "I'm behind you all the way, I support your efforts"); *Showing Concern*; *Directing/behavior* (attempts to manage or guide (telling/commanding) the behavior of another); *Directing/non-behavior*; *Accepting support* (e.g., "Thank you very much for your kind support over the years"); *Accepting direction*; *Greeting/introduction*; and *Other*.

Goes against: Conflict-producing and conflict-maintaining verbal behavior. These include *Opposing* (e.g., "I will not cooperate") and *Attacking* (e.g., "You are a fool").

Going away from: Verbal behaviors which psychologically distance one from another and/or behaviors by means of which one physically withdraws from another. These include *Evading* (to avoid dealing with another, to give evasive answers, to attempt to change topic or focus of communication in order to evade issues or questions raised) and *Farewell* (intended solely to terminate contact with another).

With the exception of Oral Roberts and Jimmy Swaggart, each of the fourteen televangelists' primary mode of communication was offering information/data to their audience (see Table 3). Oral Roberts' primary mode of communication was the offering of information/opinion (18.5%). Jimmy Swaggart also spent a large portion of the time offering his opinion on various issues (31.2%).

With several exceptions, most televangelists' secondary mode of communication was the offering of information/opinion. A significant portion of the messages presented by several televangelists, however, entailed the directing of others' behavior — Copeland (24.6%), Price (18.7%), Schuller (15.2%), and Angley (15.1%). Several televangelists employed rather deviant modes of communication in comparison to the others. Price, for example, spent a good portion of his monologues (21.4%) offering non-behavioral direction (i.e., directing one's faith, hope, dreams) to his audience. In addition, approximately 10% of Falwell's communication entailed the offering of information about products for purchase or distribution. Over 10% of Gottier's and Copeland's monologues were spent soliciting the opinions of others.

Roberts, Angley, and Kennedy were the most diverse communicators in regard to modes of communication, employing the greatest variety of appeals within their messages. In contrast, DeHaan and Armstrong were the least diverse, maintaining a rigid style of

Table 3. Selected Communication Modes By Televangelist

	Communication Mode*									
	Offer Data	Offer Opinion	Offer Product	Direct Behav.	Direct Nonbeh.	Joking	Supporting	"Going Against"	"Going Away From"	
Swaggart	25.5%	31.2%	0.6%	11.5%	2.5%	—%	5.7%	2.5%	0.6%	
Falwell	27.2	22.1	10.0	16.3	2.1	—	1.4	—	0.3	
Schuller	19.1	17.9	5.8	15.6	7.5	3.5	5.9	0.5	—	
Roberts	17.7	18.5	4.0	16.9	4.8	0.5	4.8	2.4	2.4	
Armstrong	37.6	25.7	8.8	11.4	4.3	—	—	—	1.9	
Humbard	27.2	19.4	3.9	21.7	0.5	—	2.2	0.5	1.1	
Copeland	29.2	21.8	—	24.7	3.3	—	—	—	0.8	
DeHaan	49.1	35.8	—	11.3	—	—	—	—	—	
Van Impe	40.5	15.5	1.8	12.5	8.3	—	2.4	5.3	0.5	
Angley	20.6	18.1	4.2	15.1	8.4	0.4	1.3	7.6	0.4	
Kennedy	21.1	17.9	3.7	8.9	7.4	0.5	7.9	2.0	2.1	
Robison	27.3	19.6	0.7	6.9	13.3	1.4	2.8	8.2	—	
Price	25.7	13.8	—	18.7	21.4	4.6	1.5	2.1	0.6	
Gottier	37.9	26.2	—	15.2	0.8	—	0.4	—	5.1	

($\chi^2 = 545.33$, $df = 91$, $p > .0001$)

*Percentages should be read across rows and do not add up to 100% due to rounding error. It should also be noted that some mode categories did not occur or occurred less than .1% in the programs. These categories do not appear in this table. Because of the infrequency of "joking" as a Communication mode, this category was deleted from the chi-square analysis.

communication. All in all, there was a significant difference in the communication modes employed by the various televangelists ($\chi^2 = 545.33$, $df = 91$, $p < .0001$).

Intensity

A description of the nonverbal presentation of each mode was also measured (see Table 4). An index of intensity constitutes the summation of seven estimates, each of which is measured on a five-point scale (1 = very low intensity, 5 = very high intensity). Estimates examining visual presentation are only used when initiator is visually present, and include:

Vocal Intensity (measurement of volume of the initiator, ranging from soft to loud). Robison demonstrated the greatest amount of vocal intensity, followed by Copeland and Humbard. Kennedy had the least intense vocal display of all the televangelists.

Nonverbal Intensity/face (the degree of animation/movement shown on initiator's face, ranging from still to animated). Robison also demonstrated the greatest amount of facial intensity, followed by Angley and Schuller. DeHaan and Armstrong had the most rigid and expressionless facial displays.

Nonverbal Intensity/body (the degree of animation/movement demonstrated by initiator's body, ranging from still to animated). Swaggart was the most intense televangelist in regards to body movement and physical display. Robison was also rated high on physical intensity, as was Copeland. Armstrong demonstrated the least intense body movement, followed by DeHaan.

Duration (the approximate length of each mode, in accordance to each particular communication type. Duration ranges from short to long). Price was rated highest in this dimension of intensity, with Robison and Swaggart following the lead. Armstrong and Gottier engaged in the shortest application of modes.

Pace (the rate of speech of the initiator, ranging from extra slow to extra fast). Robison was among the fastest and most intense speakers, followed by Price and Copeland. Kennedy was among the least intense speakers in terms of pace.

Camera shots (the predominant angle/distance of each mode, ranging from extra long to extra close) and **Camera Movement** (the

Table 4. Intensity by Televangelist Religious Television by Marital Status

	Intensity*							
	Vocal	Face	Body	Duration	Pace	Shots	Camera Move.	Average Intensity
Swaggart	2.71	2.80	2.86	2.19	2.93	2.85	1.62	2.57
Falwell	3.26	2.23	1.79	1.66	3.24	2.90	1.41	2.36
Schuller	3.14	3.61	2.42	2.03	2.72	2.94	1.92	2.68
Roberts	3.25	2.34	2.39	1.77	2.93	2.83	1.34	2.41
Armstrong	3.00	1.16	1.10	1.14	2.99	3.00	1.11	1.93
Humbard	3.36	1.59	2.36	1.51	2.92	2.81	1.54	2.29
Copeland	3.53	2.13	2.68	1.51	3.24	2.99	1.76	2.55
DeHaan	3.00	1.00	1.16	1.25	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.92
Van Impe	2.72	2.65	1.72	1.26	3.13	2.98	1.07	2.22
Angley	3.33	3.67	2.50	1.95	3.13	2.73	1.34	2.66
Kennedy	2.54	2.56	1.83	2.04	2.58	2.85	1.55	2.28
Robison	3.60	3.92	2.82	2.22	3.51	2.98	1.42	2.92
Price	3.29	2.27	2.53	2.24	3.44	2.25	1.87	2.57
Gottier	3.00	1.27	1.70	1.22	3.04	3.00	1.09	2.04

*Each level of intensity is measured on a five-point scale (1.00 = low; 5.00 = high).

amount of activity, based on camera positioning, employed in presenting the initiator. Movement ranges from no movement to extensive movement). Although Armstrong's, DeHaan's, and Gottier's physical displays and verbal performance lacked intensity, the implementation of many close-up shots by the camera created the most intense visual displays of all the televangelists. The distance of the speaker based on camera techniques also worked to enhance the intensity of Van Impe and Copeland. Price, among the most intense communicators in regard to physical and verbal performance, made little use of the camera (i.e., close-ups) to present a sense of intensity. Camera movement can also create a certain intensity in a program. Among the most intense performances, based on the amount of camera movement, were Schuller, Price, and Copeland. The least intense were Van Impe and Gottier.

In terms of overall intensity, taking each of the individual measures of intensity into account, the fourteen televangelists were rated as follows (ranked from most intense to least intense): Robison, Schuller, Angley, Swaggart, Price, Copeland, Roberts, Falwell, Humbard, Kennedy, Van Impe, Gottier, Armstrong, and DeHaan.

Based on this descriptive analysis of communicator style, it appears that the evangelists found in the traditional preaching/revival programs are highly divergent; employing a wide range of communication types and television techniques to relay their messages. Some are creatures of the medium in which they appear, complete with dynamic personality, telegenic good looks, and an educated eye for the TV camera. Others are as they were when their programs originally aired on radio, full of poignant verbal content and void of visual display. Still others lack presence in front of the camera but have the presence of mind to manipulate the camera to amplify the visual effect. The one thing all these individuals have in common, it seems, is that they are each seen in hundreds of thousands of households and have a following that spans the world. A closer examination of each televangelist will serve to highlight their diversity and unique appeals.

Jimmy Swaggart. Cousin of rock musician Jerry Lee Lewis and country western star Mickey Gilley, Jimmy Swaggart is one of the most stylized and charismatic televangelists on national television. Swaggart is a performer, feeding off and devoting much of his message to the live audience. Combining sermon with informal

conversation, and song with prayer, Swaggart offers a highly entertaining program to the viewing audience. Balancing opinion with the gospel, intensity (Swaggart is the fourth most intense televangelist in the sample) with comforting support for this congregation, Swaggart offers a program of high appeal to a wide audience.

Jerry Falwell. In reviewing Jerry Falwell's "The Old Time Gospel Hour," Hadden and Swann (13, p. 28) made the following observation: "For all the inflamed rhetoric surrounding Falwell's latter-day political activities as leader of the Moral Majority, one might tune into his program expecting to see a fire-eating preacher." Although Falwell does stray from the topic of religion upon occasion, and more often than most televangelists, his manner is certainly reserved and primarily conservative. Falwell has a greater tendency to address his home viewing audience than his immediate congregation, and is more conversational than preaching. Still, as a self-proclaimed fundamentalist, his message is a call to return to an America that once was and his approach is to offer opinion-laced data, literature for consideration, and behavioral guidance. All of this is presented as a "soft sell," however, for Falwell is rated eighth among the fourteen televangelists in terms of intensity. Although he is a fast speaker, his complementary movement and the movement of the TV camera present a low-to-moderately intense individual.

Robert Schuller. Robert Schuller is good television. He is a forceful, intense (rated second) orator with a flair for the dramatic. His voice is typically low and theatrically paced, counterbalanced by a face filled with intent and energy. His movements are limited as a result of his regal garb and floral-filled pulpit, but the camera work is well timed and extremely active. Schuller's sermons are usually filled with stories and various mnemonic devices to accentuate his ideas, as well as prayer to put his ideas into perspective and religious context. Schuller comes across as a sincere individual, spending as much time with the people at home as he does with his live congregation at the \$15 million glass sanctuary of the Crystal Cathedral (15), presenting messages that offer moral and religious support in a fashion that serves to bring him closer to his audience.

Oral Roberts. Although Roberts' program is produced at his multimillion dollar television studio on the campus of Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, there are still traces of the style and technique he developed while serving as a tent preacher and faith healer for twenty years. Roberts combines sermon with prayer, narration, and testimo-

nial. He appeals to his audience on various levels, employing the greatest variety of modes of all the televangelists. Though no doubt less flamboyant than during his roadshow days (rating seventh out of fourteen televangelists on the intensity scale), Roberts is more likely to offer opinion than fact, is more likely to engage in "going away from" modes than any other televangelist, and frequently addresses the devil during his sermons.

Herbert W. Armstrong. Armstrong is among the least intense (thirteenth of fourteen) televangelists on television, rating consistently low in regard to verbal, facial and physical display and employing an excessively limited range of communication modes within his messages. Armstrong spends a great deal of his program sermonizing; a substantial amount of time is also devoted to his narrating over a chart or superimposed phrase. This technique and a constant close-up of Armstrong add vitality to the program, but not much.

Rex Humbard. Humbard's program offers its viewers much to see and hear, including fully orchestrated musical numbers, interviews with guests, and religious sermons. The sermons, however, present a rather low intensity (rated ninth) Humbard. Although his volume is high, his subdued behavior is lost on television and little is done to visually enhance his performance. He does make good eye contact with his home and live audiences however, contributing to the personal touch associated with his brief sermons. His message, too, is rather personal, with Humbard frequently reciting scripture and expounding on its application to the audience and how it should direct their behavior.

Kenneth Copeland. Kenneth Copeland is among the new breed of televangelists, making his television ministry debut in 1979. He is a high energy performer and spirited orator. When not reading from the Bible during his sermons, Copeland is seen pacing among his live congregation while giving the TV audience equal time. He is more inclined to direct the behavior of his congregation than offer information, and address God while preaching rather than while praying. Consequently, he is more assertive than persuasive in his approach to the Bible.

Richard DeHaan. DeHaan's "Day of Discovery" is a direct descendant of one of radio's longest running religious programs, "The Radio Bible Class," in which DeHaan co-taught with Paul Van Gorder. As with the radio program, DeHaan's main activity in "Day of

Discovery" is to teach the Bible to the home audience. The show features extensive information about the Bible and is offered by the least intense and least diverse communicator of the fourteen televangelists in this analysis. DeHaan's adoption of various communication types and television techniques is excessively limited.

Jack-Van Impe. As a self-proclaimed "walking Bible," Van Impe is either engaged in discussing the Bible with his wife, quoting from the Bible for his own edification, or sermonizing about the "good book" to the viewing audience. Consequently, Van Impe produces the greatest amount of monologues, but with limited variety in terms of presentation. He is among the least intense televangelists in regards to visual and aural display. It is Van Impe's words that bring life to his program for he is among the few televangelists who are likely to offer information that is conflict-producing or conflict-maintaining.

Ernest Angley. During his sermon, Angley is more likely to assume a conversational tone than preach, is more likely to offer data than opinion, and balances his "going towards" messages among the live and home audiences. During the videotaped healings from a "Miracle and Salvation Crusade," however (which are an integral part of his program), Angley is more likely to address the devil than God, and is among the televangelists most likely to engage in "going against" messages. Consequently, Angley is also rated high (third) on the intensity scale.

James Kennedy. Kennedy is among the most diverse communicators in our sample of televangelists, though not among the most intense (rated tenth) or dynamic. Kennedy plays primarily to his live audience and to the heavens, without much regard for the television camera and its placement. He offers his congregation a wide variety of contexts for his highly supportive, highly inspirational messages, including sermon, conversation, prayer, recitation, and narration.

James Robinson. According to Hadden and Swann (13, p. 42), Robison is "one of God's angry men. He thunders from the pulpit against all manner of immorality, sinfulness, vice, un-Americanism, and secular humanism. He is a truly dynamic preacher of seemingly inexhaustible energy." The analysis reported here confirms this description. He is the highest rated televangelist on the intensity scale and the most frequent employer of conflict-producing and conflict-maintaining behavior. Though highly conversational, Robinson

manages to attack or oppose a variety of issues with elaborate flair.

Fred Price. The only black televangelist in the sample, Price rated fifth in intensity as a result of his great stage presence. Although the program features little else but Price sermonizing and reading from the Bible, he is capable of light-hearted and humorous interludes, and pays a great deal of attention to his TV and live audiences. In addition, Price expresses a genuine concern for the religious well-being of his audience by offering frequent direction of their behavior, thoughts and feelings toward God.

Dr. Richard Gottier. As with DeHaan's "Day of Discovery," "The Lesson" features a televangelist discussing the Bible with the TV audience. Interestingly, Gottier presents much of his information in response to questions he asks of his audience. Despite this facade of interaction, however, Gottier's manner is hardly conversational. He is a very undynamic speaker, offering little variety in terms of modes or communication types. Also, within the confines of his studio set, Gottier makes little use of his cameras except for a perpetual closeup.

An assessment of the impact of these highly visible and successful individuals on their viewers' faith or participation in religious activities is not within the scope of this investigation. Nor is it capable of determining which communicator style is more effective than another. One thing is clear from the availability, variety, and style of the various evangelists on television, however: They are destined to play a critical role in the shaping of American society. As a result of their having more undisputed access to the airwaves than any other contemporary social movement in this country, these individuals hold the potential to redefine the role of religion for millions of individuals.

Furthermore, as is the nature of the medium, this year's successes are likely to breed a three-fold supply of "spin-offs" next year. Consequently, the perspective assumed by the most visible televangelists (e.g., fundamentalist, mainline, extremist), not to mention their demographic composition (e.g., male, white) is likely to have an impact on the nature of religious television and, in turn, on its viewing audience. An awareness of the similarities and differences in communicator styles of today's leading televangelists is the first step in gaining foresight into the shape of the "electronic church" in years to come.

Bibliography

1. Abelman, Robert. "Ten Commandments of the Electronic Church." *Channels*, 4(5), 1985, pp. 64-67.
2. Abelman, Robert and John Courtright. "Television Literacy: Amplifying the Cognitive Level Effects of Television's Prosocial Fare Through Curriculum Intervention." *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 17(1), 1983, pp. 46-57.
3. Abelman, Robert and Kimberly Neuendorf. "How Religious is Religious Television Programming?" *Journal of Communication*, 35(1), 1985.
4. Abelman, Robert and Kimberly Neuendorf. "The Demography of Religious Television Programming." Report submitted to Unda-USA, Washington, D.C., 1983.
5. Charles Atkin, John P. Murray, and Oguz B. Nayman. "The Surgeon General's Research Program on Television and Social Behavior: A Review of Empirical Findings." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 1971, 16, 21-39.
6. Albert Bandura. Social-Learning Theory of Identificatory Processes. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1969.
7. Berkowitz, L. *Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
8. Borke, H. The Communication of Intent: A Systematic Approach to the Observation of Family Interaction. *Human Relations*, 20, 1967, 13-28.
9. Friedrich, L.K. and A.H. Stein. Aggressive and Pro-Social Television Programs and the Natural Behavior of Pre-School Children. *Society for Research in Child Development*, 41, 1973, 1133-1142.
10. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Stewart Hoover, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli. "Religion and Television." Unpublished Report by the Annenberg School of Communications, 1984.
11. Graham, Billy. The Future of TV Evangelism. *TV Guide*, 31(10), 1983, 4-11.
12. Greenberg, Bradley S., Mary Hines, Nancy Buerkel-Rothfuss and Charles K. Atkin. Family Role Structures and Interactions on Commercial Television. In B.S. Greenberg (ed.), *Life on Television: Content Analysis of U.S. TV Drama*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1980, pp. 149-160.
13. Hadden, Jeffrey K. and Charles E. Swann. *Primetime Preachers*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1981.
14. Horney, K. *Our Inner Conflicts*. New York: Norton, 1945.
15. Horsfield, Peter G. *Religious Television: The American Experience*. New York, NY: Longman Publishing, 1984.
16. Mark L. Knapp. "Series Editor's Foreword." In Robert Norton, *Communicator Style: Theory, Applications, and Measures*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983, pp. 7-8.
17. Liebert, Robert M., Joyce N. Sprafkin and Emily S. Davidson. *The Early Widow: Effects of Television on Children and Youth*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.
18. Norton, Robert. "Foundations of a Communicator Style Construct." *Human Communication Research*, 4, 1978, 99-112.
19. Norton, Robert. *Communicator Style: Theory, Applications, and Measures*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.
20. Margaret O'Brien-Steinfelds and Peter Steinfelds. "The New Awakening: Getting Religion in the Video Age." *Channels*, 2(5), 1933, pp. 24-62.
21. Oaks, J.L. "The Electronic Church Verses Traditional Preaching." Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association Conference, Washington, D.C., 1983.