



PROJECT MUSE®

Advances in Research Using the C-SPAN Archives

Browning, Robert

Published by Purdue University Press

Browning, Robert.

Advances in Research Using the C-SPAN Archives.

Purdue University Press, 2016.

Project MUSE.muse.jhu.edu/book/56713.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/56713>

Access provided at 25 Jan 2020 04:52 GMT with no institutional affiliation



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

CHAPTER 10

“WORKING THE CROWD”: HOW POLITICAL FIGURES USE INTRODUCTION STRUCTURES

Kurtis D. Miller

Politicians have always had a propensity for “working the crowd.” Shaking hands, kissing babies, posing for pictures, and greeting supporters are all common to politicians. With the growth of media coverage of campaigns by television, we see more of these events. Even with security concerns, it is commonplace for candidates to step from the stage and mingle along the rope line following speeches and rallies. C-SPAN has also followed candidates working the crowd at fairs and walking down Main Street. These candidates are equipped with wireless mikes that allow C-SPAN cameras to pick up their interactions with the voters they meet. It is these interactions that are the data and the focus of this chapter.

This chapter examines the way that presidential candidates introduce themselves in these appearances as they interact with crowds during the early primary season in the United States. In order to study how these

politicians use introduction sequences while working the crowd and how interactional dilemmas are navigated, data were drawn from the C-SPAN Video Library. Using a conversation analytic approach, this research extends current understandings of the structure and preferences for introduction behaviors and how these are adapted and sometimes co-opted by political candidates in the context of working the crowd. This activity is an example of a unique communicative situation that carries its own rules and norms of interaction, much as public speaking, interviewing, negotiating, and interrogating do. Nevertheless, there are no studies that examine this form of interaction, despite its prevalence in events of significant regional and national importance. These interactions are important to both focal and nonfocal persons, as crowd members are likely to share their experience of these rare and privileged encounters with focal persons, and are likely to share it far beyond the local context.

The communication dilemma for public figures, such as politicians, rock stars, or athletes, is that they are well known and recognized by members of a crowd, but generally speaking the individual members of the crowd are not known to them. Additionally, these public figures often have much to gain and lose by interacting with individual members of crowds. Working the crowd is an expected activity for many public figures, and the decision to avoid these crowd sessions are often seen negatively. Famous people are examples of what Sacks would call *storyable persons* (1984, p. 419). People who interact with storyable persons often recount these interactions, acting as opinion leaders with friends, family members, coworkers, and acquaintances. Effectively working the crowd directly influences both the number and quality of personal testimonies shared about the storyable person. Ineffectively working the crowd can result in serious public-relations gaffes. An Internet search for “refuses to sign autographs” reveals many examples of negative reactions that can occur.

This chapter grew from a pilot study, which used C-SPAN video of then-U.S. presidential candidate Joe Biden working the crowd at a campaign event in Iowa (C-SPAN, 2007). While watching Biden interact with the crowd, I noticed that he would often introduce himself to people at the event, even though it was an event organized for his campaign and attendees had come specifically to see him. Attendees were likely to know Biden by sight, or if not by sight, then through other cues such as his entourage and the behavior of

members of the press and other crowd members. It should be apparent at a campaign event for Joe Biden that the older male being followed by a group of aides and media who others go out of their way to speak to is probably Joe Biden. Nevertheless, Biden continued to engage in self-introduction, even when this was not necessary. My own observation showed that Biden often leveraged the introduction sequence tactically by introducing people he was interacting with to others in the crowd after a short time. As a result, Biden was able to disengage from these conversations and continue the activity of working the crowd. To advance the fields of language and social interaction, political communication, and interpersonal communication research, this chapter builds on the pilot case study, applying the introduction sequence preference organization structures detailed by Pillet-Shore (2011) to working-the-crowd interactions. It extends existing knowledge about the structure of introduction sequences into new contexts, and identifies ways that candidates' uses of introduction sequences in these informal political interactions adhere to, and depart from, established norms for introduction sequences in everyday interaction.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Communication as a field has a long tradition of research involving interactions of individuals with crowds. The field traces its foundations to the ancient Greek sophists who focused on exactly these sorts of interactions in rhetoric and oratory (Craig, 1999). To this day, the vast majority of research involving interactions between individuals and crowds has been grounded in the rhetorical and public address traditions—two research traditions that share a lot of common ground. However, in addition to public address, there are many situations in life where a large number of people want to hear from, meet, talk to, or interact with a single focal person on an individual basis. From red-carpet events to political campaigns to book signings to kids asking for autographs after a baseball game, the interactions of focal persons with members of crowds on an individual basis is an important and unique form of interaction with its own rules and norms of interaction. This sort of situation can be handled in several ways, though two ways tend to dominate: queuing and working the crowd.

The queuing approach, where people stand in a line and await their turns to interact, is typical of events like book signings, graduations, or kids telling Santa what they want for Christmas. The focal person (or people) interacts with each person or small group of people individually. There are two main variations of the queuing approach. In the first, the line of people slowly moves past the focal person as those in the line await their turn to approach, such as in receiving lines. In the second, the focal person moves down a line of people who are generally standing still. These approaches are formal—rigidly controlled by social conventions if not by external authorities. The use of a line ensures that each person will have the opportunity to interact with the focal person individually as long as there is sufficient time and motivation for all parties concerned to devote. An example of this approach in action can be found in Figure 10.1.



Figure 10.1 President Bill Clinton and other officials in a receiving line at an official dinner for British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

Working the crowd is seen quite frequently at political events where a candidate purposefully shakes hands with as many people as possible in an informal, possibly haphazard, fashion. Likewise, a sports figure who approaches

a section of fans to sign autographs also is working the crowd. Unlike cases where there is a line, interaction is not guaranteed for everyone attending the event, even if interaction with everyone is a goal of the focal person. An example of this approach can be seen in Figure 10.2.



Figure 10.2 A man works the crowd haphazardly, along a street at a Labor Day rally in Pittsburgh.

In interactions among ordinary persons, either way of resolving this situation, perhaps even the situation itself, would be an example of what would best be called an “accountable action” (Heritage, 1984). If an ordinary person were to engage in the activities that normally constitute working the crowd, observers of this activity would generally consider it a violation of expected norms and would work to provide an account for the activity witnessed, perhaps by assuming that they merely do not recognize the individual, or by assuming that individual has a particular mental handicap. This suggests that working the crowd is an *accountable action* for ordinary persons (Heritage, 1984).

Political candidates who are working the crowd are engaging in a particular form of self-presentation. These candidates have multiple goals, which at times compete (O’Keefe, 1988; O’Keefe & Shepherd, 1989). Candidates often have the goal of appearing like an ordinary person, an activity Sacks (1984) called “doing ‘being ordinary.’” Although all people engage in the activity of being ordinary, it is notable that those who are “storyable people . . . [that] stand as something different from [the rest of] us” (Sacks, 1984, p. 419), are among

those working to do being ordinary. In addition to being ordinary, candidates have other goals, which may include managing an often-demanding schedule of campaign appearances, presenting themselves to both the audience in person and to additional audiences who will view the recorded interactions, persuading voters who may be on the fence, and motivating already committed voters to persuade others. This list is far from complete, as candidates may each be pursuing a number of additional, personal goals.

While working the crowd, it is possible, even likely, that all identifying information ordinarily conferred through personal introductions will be made available through other means. For example, in a political campaign environment, names may be locally available because the focal person is a candidate of whom other crowd members are already aware or have even come specifically to meet. Likewise, those who interact with the candidate sometimes wear name tags, making other identifying information explicit. Other introduction topics, such as personal connections, categorical relationships, and reasons for presence may also be inferable from context. Political candidates for national office generally campaign outside their home regions, and in most cases may assume that they share no personal connections with others in the crowd unless they are explicitly mentioned. Likewise, categorical relationships (potential supporter, protestor, candidate, volunteer, reporter, etc.) can often be inferred from local context, as can the reason for presence (to meet the candidate, to campaign for votes, to attend the fair, etc.).

INTRODUCTION SEQUENCES

People that we do not know are a cause of uncertainty, because they have not been defined (Goffman, 1966). Definition can be achieved, reducing this uncertainty, through introduction. People demonstrate a strong orientation toward nonintroduction when parties have been introduced before, and will perform interactional work to determine whether or not an introduction is necessary (Pillet-Shore, 2011). If the individuals have met previously, the introduction sequence will be skipped. Recent research suggests that humans on average can keep track of the social relationships within a group of approximately 150 people, and most can associate faces with names for around 2,000 people (Dunbar, 1993, 2003, 2004; Hill & Dunbar, 2003). Nevertheless,

Goffman (1966) theorized that once two individuals have become introduced to one another, they are each held responsible for remembering the other from that point forward (p. 120), and that failing to remember the other is *face-threatening* (that is, a source of embarrassment) for both the forgetter and the forgotten (Goffman, 2005), in spite of these cognitive limits.

In her 2011 monograph on introduction sequences, Pillet-Shore called for an extension of existing knowledge about the functions and processes of introduction beyond those that "occur in some private territory during occasions of sustained, focused interaction" (p. 90). This project fulfills that call by extending her work on introduction sequences into a very different context. Working the crowd is qualitatively different from private, sustained interaction; these interactions are necessarily public rather than private, and are characterized by transient rather than sustained interactions.

Introduction sequences may be described in terms of their composition, their *launch* (who initiates the introduction), and the directness of information seeking (Pillet-Shore, 2011). Everyday introduction sequences appear to consistently be composed of eight components:

1. gaze/body orientation-coordinating actions
2. person reference formulations
3. greetings
4. person reference formulation repeats
5. "howareyou"
6. claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons
7. introduction-specific assessments of "how it is to meet you"
8. touch/body contact (Pillet-Shore, 2011, pp. 77–78)

There are essentially two types of introduction launch in everyday introduction sequences: those where introduction is initiated by a mediating third party, and those where introduction is self-initiated by one of the two parties involved. According to Pillet-Shore, mediated introductions are preferred over self-introductions when a mutual acquaintance is present (2011).

Participants in everyday introduction sequences also generally prefer to offer implicit invitations for identifying information by offering self- or other-identifying information as opposed to requesting that others identify themselves (Pillet-Shore, 2011, p. 90). In addition to names, she also lists

three essential pieces of information necessary for interactants to determine, which are often provided through introduction: connection and ownership (“Who do you know that I know?”); social category, identity, or categorical relationship (“Who are you categorically to the known in common?”); and account for presence (“What are you doing here?”). Interactants typically state information from these identifying categories explicitly when they determine that it is not inferable solely from the local context (Pillet-Shore, 2011, p. 84). For example, at social ceremonial gatherings such as funerals, guests are often asked only about the second of these three pieces of information. People typically can assume that they knew the deceased in common and that engaging in the ceremony itself is their reason for attending, but they may not know what relationship each had to the deceased. Similarly, at weddings the third piece of information can typically be assumed. Guests may be asked which of the two participants they know and how they are connected with that person.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the pilot study and intuition, it seems clear that introductions are a key feature of working the crowd. However, considering that working the crowd has not been extensively studied in the communication field and that I will already be analyzing the relevant data, it is also important, as part of the key foundational research question (RQ) to determine what additional types of interactions are typical in this context :

RQ1: What types of interaction sequences are typical of working the crowd?

In addition, since there has been no prior research on working-the-crowd interactions, the first step is to establish whether introductions while working the crowd differ in meaningful ways from typical introductions in ordinary contexts. These descriptive features of introductions proposed by Pillet-Shore (2011, pp. 77–78; see list above in the section Introduction Sequences) suggest a series of three RQs based on comparing the preference structures for composition, launch, and information-seeking directness in ordinary interactions with the interactions observed with candidates working the crowd. (In this line of research, *composition* refers to the component building-blocks

of the introduction sequence, launch refers to the manner in which introduction sequences are initiated, and *information-seeking directness* refers to how implicitly or explicitly introduction relevant information is pursued within the introduction sequence.) The three questions are:

RQ2: Do introduction sequences while working the crowd differ in composition from introduction sequences in ordinary interactions?

RQ3: Do preference structures for introduction launch while working the crowd differ from those in ordinary interactions?

RQ4: Do preference structures for information-seeking directness while working the crowd differ from those in ordinary interactions?

DATA AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

In order to analyze candidate interactions with crowds, I used the C-SPAN Video Library to locate examples of candidates for similar positions working similar crowds during a narrow time frame. The C-SPAN Video Library is a fantastic resource for this type of research. In particular, it offers three key benefits: access, searchable and downloadable transcripts, and C-SPAN's neutral editing policy. C-SPAN has significant access to campaign events. Gathering these data independently involves both significant travel and challenges in obtaining consent from candidates and event attendees. Video files are watchable for free through the website, and are typically available as low-cost downloads in commonly used file formats. This last feature is particularly useful because the formats are compatible with all widely used transcription software that handles video. Additionally, the C-SPAN Video Library records and indexes transcripts of all C-SPAN video. For many of these videos, the transcripts are generated from uncorrected closed-captioning data. Because these transcripts are indexed and searchable, any researcher can identify phrases typical of highly scripted interaction sequences, such as introduction sequences, and search for program texts including these phrases. The closed-captioning data require only corrections and formatting/annotation additions to create a transcript that is in line with transcriptions typical of conversational analysis (CA) work, which records nonverbal aspects of speech that are not typically included in closed captioning (timing and rate of speech, locations of overlaps, pauses, etc.).

Finally, C-SPAN has demonstrated a long-standing commitment to presenting political events “without editing, commentary or analysis and with a balanced presentation of points of view” and to presenting political figures “without filtering or otherwise distorting their points of view.” These are the first two tenets of C-SPAN’s mission statement (Frantzich, 1996). Because C-SPAN engages in minimal editing (Taskiran & Delp, 2001), the records of these interactions between candidates and the public are typically presented without interruption, often within a single continuous shot. As a result, the records are defensible as records of entire, uninterrupted interactions with members of the public that have not been edited in a manner that could potentially bias the research. This benefit, in particular, is one that is not typically available through data obtained through any other broadcast outlet. C-SPAN also typically avoids the practice of reducing the volume of audio, or even eliminating audio, from unscripted interactions between political figures and the public in order to use these interactions as a visual backdrop for pundits, commentators, and network personalities engaging in analysis and commentary.

The C-SPAN Video Library contains many examples of political candidates working the crowd. A search of the C-SPAN Video Library for the phrase “with the crowd” revealed over 70 different interactions, 40 of which were in the *Road to the White House* series. The majority of these videos contained examples of candidates for office working the crowd before or after speeches at campaign events. A search of program text (uncorrected closed-captioning data) for the phrases “nice to meet you” and “how are you”—phrases typical of introduction sequences—combined with the key phrase “campaign event” resulted in nearly 100 programs, of which many included portions where the candidate works the crowd. I compiled a corpus of video recordings of 10 different candidates at events between July 18th and September 1st of 2015, identified using the earlier-described search criteria. Eight of the 10 candidates were recorded at the Iowa State Fair between August 13th and August 21st. The remaining two were recorded at a campaign event in Bedford, New Hampshire (John Kasich on September 1st) and at a town hall meeting in Carroll, Iowa (Scott Walker on July 18th). Recordings averaged just over 30 minutes (30:18.7), for a total duration of 5:03:07.0, or just over 300 minutes. This corpus contains over 700 unique spoken interactions involving candidates (an interaction is one or more turns

of spoken conversation involving both the candidate and another person), most of which are introduction sequences, transactions, and/or expressions of encouragement. Further details about each video are available as a table in the Appendix to this chapter.

The existing partial transcripts, generated primarily from uncorrected closed-captioning data, were corrected with reference to the primary source videos. Additional reference to the primary source videos was used to add further detail to relevant portions of the transcripts using traditional CA symbols (Psathas, 1995; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Sidnell, 2010). CA was codified as a methodology by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974). It uses highly detailed transcriptions of audio or video recordings of naturally occurring conversation to support data-driven analysis. This analysis is intended to identify patterns, systems, and components operating within interaction, with the intention of developing a model or set of rules that explain the patterns. In this chapter, I examine candidate interactions through existing understandings of introduction sequences in the CA tradition. Previously proposed rules and preference organizations (Pomerantz, 1984) for introduction sequences (Pillet-Shore, 2011) are compared with observed interactions in the context of the public, nonsustained interactions that characterize working the crowd.

FINDINGS

Typical Interaction Sequences When Working the Crowd (RQ1)

As one might expect, introductions occur frequently in the context of working the crowd. Working the crowd, or engaging in a connected series of public, nonsustained interactions, necessitates an atypically large number of introduction sequences compared to everyday interactions of ordinary persons. In fact, working the crowd seems to be characterized primarily by three broad types of interactions, which often overlap: introductions, transactions, and expressions of encouragement. Introductions typically occur when two parties meet one another for the first time. Transactions involve one or more parties obtaining a material object or service from or through the other. Expressions

of encouragement involve nonfocal interactants praising the actions of, or expressing positive orientations to the success of, the focal interactant. These broad types of interactions often overlap in the working-the-crowd context. Excerpt 1 includes a series of interactions which demonstrate all three broad types of interaction:

Excerpt 1: Senator Ted Cruz Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015i) (simplified)

0:19:21.0

- 1 PP: Oh. Ha ha. [Thank you.
 2 H3: [Alright, right here sir. (We
 3 got a) picture right here.
 4 BE: ↑Hi:↓:[:....
 5 TC: [How are you doin'.
 6 BE: Goo:d, I am Beverly.
 7 TC: ↑Hey Beverly. ((gaze directed at camera))
 8 (2.4)
 9 H3: There ya go. ((hands phone back to BE))
 10 BE: Thank ↓you.
 11 TC: Thank you for being here, (glad to meet
 12 ya)
 13 BE: () ((hands an object to TC))
 14 TC: °Sure.°
 15 H3: Here. ((hands TC a pen))
 16 BE: Thank you for you bein' here and all you
 17 do.
 18 TC: Well, than--thank you very much.
 19 (2.2)
 20 82: You're a Godsend. Thank you.
 21 TC: Thank you, sir. God bless you.
 22 82: Thank you for (everything)
 23 TC: Hey! What's your name.
 24 83: Carter.
 25 TC: Carter? How old are you?
 26 83: (Uh, I'm six)
 27 TC: Six! Good d--alright, fist bump.

- 28 Excellent. This is your brother?
29 83: Umm hmm.
30 TC: What's your name.
31 84: Weston [(Pruitt)
32 TC: [Weston. Well, it's good to see ya
33 and this is dad I'm guessin'.
34 85: Ryan, nice to meet you. Thank you very
35 much.
36 TC: Great--Great to see you. You guys havin'
37 fun at the state fair?
38 84: Umm hmm.
39 TC: Excellent. (.) Well thank you...
40 85: Say good luck.
41 84: (Good luck)
42 85: Thank you.
43 TC: Thank you very much.
 0:20:08.4

Excerpt 1 picks up with one of Senator Ted Cruz's aides (H3) directing the senator (TC) into a transactional encounter. The speech from PP on line 1 is overlapping speech from the closing of a prior interaction. TC greets the woman involved, Beverly (BE), who self-initiates an introduction sequence by voluntarily disclosing a person reference formulation on line 6. TC responds with a person reference formulation repeat, then directs his gaze to the camera. BE follows and they pose for a picture. H3 takes a photo, then hands a phone to BE. We do not see her give him the phone initially, but participants act as if he has used her phone to take the photo, then returned the phone to her. As H3 hands the phone back, both TC and BE thank one another at lines 10 and 11. Immediately afterward, BE hands TC an object, saying something which is inaudible, which TC treats as a request. H3 hands TC a pen, which he uses to autograph the object. As TC autographs the object, at lines 16–17 BE expresses thanks to TC again for both his presence and his actions generally. TC replies by thanking BE a second time, which all interactants treat as an interactional closing. In this single portion of the interaction, there have been two transactions, an expression of encouragement from BE ("thank you for...all you do"), and an extremely abbreviated

introduction sequence. The next two interactions in Excerpt 1 are purer examples of expressions of encouragement and introduction sequences. TC walks a short distance in the crowd and bends over as if to greet a young boy (83). Before TC speaks, another man (82) greets him with an additional expression of encouragement at line 20, calling TC a “Godsend.” TC expresses his appreciation, then turns back to 83. The senator then interacts with 83 and his family (84 and 85) by going through a relatively standard introduction sequence in lines 23–40.

Providing detailed analysis of preference organizations surrounding expressions of encouragement and transactions while working the crowd (as Pillet-Shore has done for introductions in ordinary interaction) is beyond the scope of this chapter, but this excerpt is an example of one of many ways that the three broad types of interaction observed in the context of working the crowd differ and yet often overlap.

Introduction/Greeting Sequence Structure (RQ2)

Introductions while working the crowd largely follow previously proposed rules and preference organizations proposed for private, sustained interactions, but there are also a number of interesting differences between these two interactions. Of the eight constitutive components listed by Pillet-Shore (2011, pp. 77–78; see list above in the section Introduction Sequences), many continue to occur while working the crowd. Gaze/body orientation-coordinating actions, greetings, introduction-specific assessments of “how it is to meet you,” and touch/body contact (usually in the form of a handshake) are near-universally present. Candidates vary in their use of person reference formulation repeats and “howareyous.” Person reference formulation repeats tended to be made only by the focal person and not by nonfocal interactants. Claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons occurred rarely, and were likewise nearly always made by nonfocal interactants in reference to the focal person. Expressions of gratitude are a unique feature of introduction sequences in this context and typically occurred at the end of introduction sequences, often being treated as closings (for example, see lines 15–16 in Excerpt 1). Examples of these tendencies are found in Excerpts 2 and 3.

Excerpt 2: Governor Scott Walker (R-WI) Meet and Greet (C-SPAN, 2015a) (simplified)

- 0:04:27.2
- 1 Man1: This is Senator Kettering, he is a (former whip).
2 SW: Good to see ya.=
3 SK: =Nice to meet [you.
4 Man1: [Now, Governor Walker.
5 SW: [Yeah, thank you so much.
6 Man1: He just retired from [politics.
7 SK: [Yeah.
8 SW: What do you do?
9 SK: Yeah, (Brad) called, got me breakf[ast and
10 SW: [It's hard
11 SK: [said show up,] yeah.
12 SW: [to turn down, right?]
13 SW: () Thanks for coming.
14 SK: Yeah.=
15 SW: =We're gonna keep coming back.=
16 SK: =Yeah.=
17 SW: =We're doing the full grassroots,=
18 Man1: =Yeah.=
19 SW: =We're doing all 99 counties.
20 SK: Ah perfect.
21 SW: Yeah, we're going to have some fun.
22 SK: Well, welcome to western Iowa anyway.
23 SW: It's good to be back.
24 SK: I'd love to have you.
25 SW: Thank you.
- 0:04:52.4

In Excerpt 2, an unidentified man (Man1, interaction at line 9 suggests his name may be Brad) calls across the room to introduce Governor Scott Walker (SW) to former Senator Kettering (SK). During this stage, the parties establish mutual gaze and bodily coordination, and SW moves across the

room to approach the introducible party. Man1 distributes person reference formulations at lines 1 and 4. The parties initially address each other by providing introduction-specific assessments of “how it is to meet you” at lines 2–3. During this time the parties engage in touch/body contact by shaking hands. Finally, SW expresses gratitude to SK at line 5, which all parties treat as a closing of the introduction sequence, but not the interaction. SK further initiates touch during the interaction by placing his hand on Man1’s shoulder at line 9, and by placing his hand on SW’s shoulder during the closing at lines 22–24. Missing from this interaction are greetings, person reference formulation repeats, “howareyous,” and claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons.

Excerpt 3: Presidential Candidate Hillary Clinton Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair, Part 2 (C-SPAN, 2015f) (simplified)

0:00:43.5

- 1 Woman5: Secretary Clinton!
 2 HC: How are ↑yo::u. ((Shakes hand))
 3 Woman5: I’m ↑goo::d! ↑How [are ↑yo:::u.=
 4 HC: [It’s good to see you-
 5 ((Still shaking hand, Hillary tries to continue walking))
 6 Woman6: (To this side,) Lisa, turn! Turn! Lisa, turn!
 7 ((Man in hat taps Woman5 on the shoulder, then on the
 8 hand until she ends handshake, then HC and Woman5
 9 turn to pose for a photograph))
 10 Woman5: ((Points to man in hat)) I used to work for this
 11 guy.
 12 HC: Well, that’s a good recomend↑a::tion!
 13 Woman6: Yaa::aa::y!
 14 ((photograph taken))
 15 Woman5: [↑Thank you so much! Nice to mee:t ↑you:!
 16 Woman7: [() ((shaking HC’s hand))
 17 HC: °Thank you, thank you.°
 18 Woman8: Thanks for coming out ((shaking hand))
 19 HC: Hey, glad to be here. ((shaking hands))
 20 HC: ↑Tha::nk Yo:::u!
 21 Fan: (Would you like my fan?) ((shaking hands))

- 22 ((Woman begins to fan Hillary))
23 HC: I love it! I love it!
24 HC: How are ya, sir? ((shakes hand)) Good ta see ya
25 Man2: ↓Thank you
26 Woman9: We are glad to have [you here! ((Shakes hand))
27 HC: [Oh! I love [your
28 Woman10: [°Yes, we
29 HC: ["Keep Iowa Beautiful"
30 Woman10: [are delighted to see: you!°
31 HC: Great to see yo:↓u:
32 (2.2)
33 HC: Thank you guys! ((walking away))
34 (6.9)
35 ((Turns back to Woman8 & Woman9))
36 HC: ↑That is ↑so:: (good!)
37 Woman9: We've got a whole (slew/crew) of (advisors) that
38 have em
39 Woman10: ((Indiscernible))
40 HC: That's even ↓better!
41 Woman10: ↑Yeah?
42 HC: That's even ↓better.
43 ((Turns away))
0:01:28.6

In Excerpt 3, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton (HC) is walking down a pathway tightly lined with supporters while she greets a selection of people along the route. Those she greets seem primarily to be people who are in the front row and people who are not holding cameras. The excerpt starts with a woman (Woman5) who calls out to HC as HC approaches. HC orients to Woman5 and continues down the route, approaching Woman5. Both engage in touch/body contact with the handshake at line 2. HC and Woman5 exchange “howareyou” in lines 2–3, and HC provides an introduction specific assessment of “how it is to meet you” in line 4, which Woman5 does not yet return. Woman5 holds on to HC while continuing in conversation. At the same time Woman6 calls out the name “Lisa” at line 6, presumably addressing Woman5. With encouragement from an HC aide, Woman5 stops

the handshake as both HC and Woman5 turn and pose for a photograph together. Conversation continues (lines 10–12), with Woman5 asserting a known-in-common individual while they hold the pose for the picture. After the picture, Woman5 expresses gratitude and returns her own introduction-specific assessment of “how it is to meet you,” which both parties treat as a closing. Absent from this interaction are person reference formulations for the nonfocal interactant, person reference formulation repeats, and claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons. The thank-you delivered in line 15 does not appear to be an expression of encouragement.

As HC continues down the packed route, she engages in touch/body contact with a series of additional supporters. While shaking hands, HC consistently directs gaze/body orientation away from those she is speaking to, and toward those she is about to speak to. Woman8 thanks HC for her presence, and HC responds at line 19, offering a greeting and saying that she is “glad to be here”—a variant of the assessment “how it is to meet you,” which is often used by the candidates. HC continues to offer expressions of gratitude. A woman in the crowd offers HC her hand-operated fan at line 21, and starts waving it intensely to cast a breeze on HC, who responds with an additional expression of gratitude at line 23, but does not take the fan. In these interactions, person reference formulations and person reference formulation repeats are both absent, as are “howareyou,” and claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons.

HC continues by turning back slightly to shake the hand of Man2 at line 24, who reaches over those standing in the front row. This touch/body contact is accompanied by a “howareyou” and an assessment of “how it is to meet you.” Instead of reciprocating, Man2 merely says “thank you.” Turning back, HC is addressed by Woman9, who launches at line 26 with the same variant assessment of “how it is to meet you” used at line 19. HC engages in touch/body contact by shaking hands with Woman9 and Woman10, and expresses positive sentiment toward the brightly colored tee shirt that Woman9 and Woman10 are wearing, which displays the slogan “Keep Iowa Beautiful” (an antilitter campaign). There is a pause without conversation for 2.2 seconds, during which HC, Woman9, and Woman10 remain oriented toward each other. At this point HC volunteers an expression of gratitude at line 33, which all parties treat as an appropriate closing, and HC turns and walks away. HC turns back 6.9 seconds later to restate her appreciation of the shirts

worn by Woman9 and Woman10 in lines 35 through 42 before continuing on her way. In these interactions, person reference formulations and person reference formulation repeats remain absent. Greetings also do not appear in these interactions.

Introduction Launches While Working the Crowd (RQ3)

As detailed earlier, two different types of introduction launch are typically observed in everyday introduction sequences: mediated and self-initiated. As in private, sustained interaction, mediated introductions seem to be preferred over self-initiated introductions, but only in certain contexts. Mediated introductions appear not to be preferred for ordinary nonfocal interactants when the potential mediator is affiliated with the campaign, as in Excerpt 3, line 10. However, regarding selected members of the crowd, the preference for mediated introduction remains. In some cases, as with the interaction starting at line 2 in Excerpt 1, candidates used an aide to mediate introductions or arrange for interactions between candidates and selected members of the crowd. An excellent example of aide-mediated introductions can be found in a recording of George Pataki at the Iowa State Fair, where Kevin McLaughlin (phonetic), an aide to Pataki, performs a number of these mediated introductions between Pataki and several VIPs (C-SPAN, 2015g). From 0:20:45.0 to 0:25:50 McLaughlin engages with a series of 12 interactants (primarily as individuals, though there are two couples and one group of four), including many who hold state or national office, prior to introducing them to Governor Pataki. A similar arrangement can be seen between Governor John Kasich and the host of a campaign event in New Hampshire in Excerpt 4:

Excerpt 4: Governor John Kasich Meet-and-Greet in Bedford, New Hampshire (C-SPAN, 2015j) (simplified)

0:02:31.5

- 1 Man2: Paul ()
- 2 Paul: Hey Governor. Nice [to meet you. Welcome
- 3 to
- 4 JK: [Paul, nice to see
- 5 you.

- 6 Paul: New Hampshire. My [wife, Cathy.=
 7 Cathy: [Cathy
 8 Man2: =And his wife, Cathy
 9 JK: How are you?
 10 Man2: Great Americans, you look well
 11 JK: Good, [look at this.
 12 Man2: [A lot of people here.
 13 JK: Yeah.
 14 Man2: Uh, Rich will, uh, will introduce you
 15 [(means) he's the host with the most.
 16 RA: [Yeah, thanks for sneaking by!
 17 Man2: I said hello to your (.) better half.
 18 JK: So let me grab you for two seconds
 19 Man2: Oh
 20 RA: You're gonna have a meeting before the
 21 meeting
 0:02:53.0

In Excerpt 4, John Kasich (JK) is introduced to Paul and Cathy, by Man2, who then goes on to discuss how Rich (RA) will be responsible for introducing JK to everyone at the party (which RA proceeds to do throughout the rest of the event). In other cases, as with the interaction in Excerpt 2, another member of the crowd engages in mediated introduction. Members of the crowd typically do not engage in mediated introduction unless they have met the focal interactant before, though the timing of this previous meeting appears irrelevant. Nonfocal interactants typically mediate introduction after having a previous separate interaction with the candidate, even if that previous interaction was only moments ago, as illustrated in Excerpt 5:

Excerpt 5: Senator Ted Cruz Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015i) (simplified)

- 0:23:52.8
 1 97: Senator (Cruz). ()
 2 TC: How you doin' (bud). ((no mutual gaze with
 3 97))
 4 TC: Good to see ya. ((to 97))

- 5 ((shake hands))
6 97: Alright, could she get a picture with you,
7 sir?
8 TC: Yeah, sure. What is your name.
9 CA: Caitlin
10 TC: Hey Caitlin, good to see you.
11 97: ()
12 (2.6) ((97 takes picture))
13 97: That's ama::zing. Thanks very much.
14 TC: Yeah, sure. How you doin' sir.
15 98: ((in Spanish))
16 TC: (Ecuamente)
17 H3: Is that for me?
18 97: My, uh:, my roommate.

Interactions from 0:24:10.2 to 0:25:07.0
omitted.

- 19 98: Mi mama
20 ((Indiscernible conversation))
21 TC: (Quienes una foto)
22 101: Si, [si, si.
23 98: [Si, si. (La familia.)
24 102: She got the donut. That is (0.6) skill.
25 Teach me how to eat a donut ()
26 TC: Hey, you want to hop in too?=We'll do all
27 of us.
28 102: I can do the whole fam--just give me one
29 camera for the family
30 101: Ah ha ha [ha.
31 102: [Go ahead, hop in there. Get your
32 donut.
33 98: ((In Spanish))
34 TC: Ah, qué bueno
35 102: Alright, look at this camera then right
36 here, guys. A::[nd ()

- 37 103: [She's like, how do I get out.
 38 102: (Looks like something did). That was a
 39 great shot. There you go.
 40 98: Gracias [()]
 41 101: [Gracias (0.4) () día.
 42 TC: Y usted también.
 0:25:42.6

In Excerpt 5, Ted Cruz (TC) is interacting with the crowd when a young man (97) approaches to speak with him. TC does not initially respond to 97's attempt to gain attention and establish coordinating actions with TC at line 1, but does direct shift gaze to 97 at line 4. TC approaches 97, who has not interacted with TC prior to this interaction, and they shake hands. At line 6, 97 asks for a photograph on behalf of Caitlin (CA). TC agrees, but has to directly request a personal reference formulation in line 8. CA responds with her name only, and TC issues a greeting, a person reference formulation repeat, and an assessment of "how it is to meet you." TC and CA pose for a picture. They both orient toward the camera. TC places his arm around CA's shoulders and CA places her hand on TC's back. At line 12, 97 takes the picture then assesses the quality of the picture and expresses gratitude to TC for the photo. At line 14, TC acknowledges gratitude and addresses a different man (98), who walks up just as the interaction with 97 and CA ends and leans over and shakes hands with TC, speaking in Spanish. TC responds in Spanish, then 98 points at TC and nods in an affirming gesture. As TC continues to work the crowd, interacting with other groups of people over the course of a minute, 98 then walks away.

As TC is about to leave the area, he passes 98 again, who gains his attention. TC changes course to walk up to him, and 98 provides a person reference formulation for the woman standing next to him (101). TC asks if they want a photo at line 21, and both agree at lines 22–23. One of the cameramen traveling with TC (102) comments on how a female member of the family (who does not appear in the transcript since she doesn't speak) is operating a camera while holding a donut. TC invites the entire family into the photograph, and offers to take a photo for the family so everyone can be in it. After 102 asks for and receives a camera from the family to take the picture, 101 starts to laugh, and 102 reassures the original photo taker that she can keep her donut with

her while they take the picture. TC and 98 engage in conversation until 102 indicates he is ready to take the picture. Then a different member of the family (103) speaks, 102 takes the picture with one hand while holding his own camera in the other hand, assesses that the picture is of good quality, and returns the camera to the family. Both 98 and 101 express their gratitude to TC.

Requests for Identifying Information (RQ4)

In the context of working the crowd, preferences for introduction sequences are different compared to ordinary everyday interactions. Introduction does not seem to be expected for the focal person in most cases. When the focal person is introduced, they are typically introduced to someone because that person is something more than an ordinary nonfocal interactant. In ordinary everyday interaction, there is a preference for introduction when meeting, whether that introduction is mediated or self-initiated. When interactants are not introduced and do not introduce themselves, others typically directly request person reference formulations. When candidates self-initiate introduction sequences with ordinary nonfocal interactants, it is often treated as an implicit request for identifying information. Candidates had different responses when the nonfocal person was not introduced. Some candidates directly requested identifying information, as TC does in lines 4 through 13 in Excerpt 5, and with 83 and each member of his family in lines 23 through 33 of Excerpt 1. Other candidates chose not to request identifying information, as HC did with Woman5, Woman7, Woman8, Fan, Woman9, Woman10, and Man2 throughout Excerpt 3.

Unlike in everyday introduction sequences, candidates almost never provided person reference formulations in interactions, and nonfocal interactants almost never disclosed person reference formulations unless directly asked. George Pataki and Martin O'Malley self-initiated disclosures of person reference formulations more frequently than other candidates. In the rare cases where nonfocal persons did provide person reference formulations, focal persons did not treat them as implicit requests for identifying information, in contrast to everyday introduction sequences. For example, at line 6 in Excerpt 1, BE provides TC with her name. TC clearly hears the name and replies with a person reference formulation repeat, but does not reciprocate by providing his own name.

DISCUSSION

In answering RQ1, working-the-crowd interactions were characterized by a number three primary types of interactions. These types of interactions were introductions, transactions, and expressions of encouragement. It is common for these types of interactions to overlap. For example, interactants may engage in an expression of encouragement during an introduction sequence, or an introduction may occur during a request for an autograph. Preference organizations surrounding both expressions of encouragement and transactions present an interesting opportunity for future research.

In answering RQ2, introductions seem to have many of the same component features in working-the-crowd situations as have been reported in private, sustained contexts. Many features left out of introductions while working the crowd can be inferred from the local situation. This is identical to the omission rule, which has been observed in private, sustained interactions. Component features of introductions are displayed both by nonfocal interactants and by focal persons. Introduction sequences while working the crowd differ from everyday introduction sequences regarding claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons, person reference formulation repeats, a lack of preference for implicit requests for identifying information, and the inclusion of expressions of gratitude. Additionally, working the crowd is characterized by asymmetry between interactants that manifests itself in how preferences for mediated introduction are resolved, and the likelihood of person reference formulation repeats.

Claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons are not displayed equally, being much more likely to be made by nonfocal interactants than by focal persons. This difference is to be expected given the specific nature of working-the-crowd interactions. Focal persons are more likely to be known to potential interactants; and a group of nonfocal interactants, who generally are less famous, are less likely to be known by the focal person. Focal persons are, therefore, less likely to have preexisting knowledge of the nonfocal interactants, so the lower incidence of these claims is unsurprising.

Person reference formulation repeats are also not displayed equally. Person reference formulations for the focal person were much less likely to be repeated than reference formulations for nonfocal persons. Since focal persons are generally already known to nonfocal interactants, it is not necessary

for nonfocal interactants to display that they are "doing 'working to commit that name to memory'" (Pillet-Shore, 2011, p. 78). However, since focal persons are not expected to have prior familiarity with nonfocal interactants, demonstrating a commitment to remembering a name remains relevant (though considering the earlier-mentioned cognitive limits, the focal person is unlikely to remember many of these names).

In answering RQ3, mediated introductions do seem to be preferred generally, but the strength of the preference seems to be different for focal and nonfocal interactants. The preference for mediated introductions seems to be based on whether or not the introducible party is the candidate (focal person). When the introducible party is a nonfocal interactant, other nonfocal interactants have been observed to make an effort to introduce the introducible party. However, if the introducible party is a focal person, nonfocal interactants do not generally make an effort to introduce the introducible party. Focal interactants will go through work to avoid self-initiated introductions. Nonfocal interactants will avoid providing identifying information altogether rather than self-initiate. Examples of tactics used by focal persons to ease the burden of self-initiated introductions on nonfocal persons include soliciting this information early ("Hey, what's your name?"), and engaging aides to premeet and then introduce nonfocal interactants. Many candidates used aides who met nonfocal persons and then introduced the candidate to them.

Finally, in addressing RQ4, unlike in everyday interaction, there is no preference for making implicit requests for identifying information in the working-the-crowd context. Implicit requests for identifying information do not seem to be preferred over explicit requests. Focal persons may provide identifying information at times as an implicit request for information, but are more likely to make a direct request for identifying information from nonfocal interactants. In addition, when nonfocal interactants provide identifying information, this information is not likely to be interpreted by the focal person as an implicit request for identifying information. The fundamentally asymmetric nature of the context is a likely cause of this difference.

Overall, focal persons appear to have no obligation to provide person reference formulations. Nevertheless, the interactants display a preference for working through the introduction sequence, even when the exchange of person reference formulations is omitted. Both focal and nonfocal interactants frequently display the remaining components of the introduction

sequence, such as exchanging “howareyou,” providing introduction-specific assessments of “how it is to meet you,” and touch/body contact. Interactants display unique modifications to the existing norms of everyday introduction sequences that are specific to the working-the-crowd context. Introduction sequences in the context of working the crowd differ from everyday examples of introduction sequences in their near-universal inclusion of expressions of gratitude as a component of the introduction sequence. Interactants also appear to apply different sets of norm expectations for introductions of focal persons than nonfocal persons. The consistent functioning of these preference organizations in different types of interaction, especially when no identifying information is conveyed, implies that there are deeper functions to the ritual of introduction than merely obtaining identifying information.

Limitations

It is probable that there are differing expectations and behaviors associated with the gender of candidates for any office. It is well established in communication and language literature that there are styles of speech and interaction that are perceived as typically feminine. An analysis based on gender is beyond the scope of this chapter, but Hillary Clinton did use a qualitatively different interaction style than her male colleagues. It is difficult to make extrapolations based on gender from the sample of presidential nomination candidates used in this study, as Secretary Clinton is the only female candidate currently included. Video is available in the C-SPAN Video Library for a second female presidential candidate, Carly Fiorina, who was a Republican candidate. A further analysis of speech patterns in candidates’ interpersonal interactions may prove fruitful, and an initial impression based on these limited data suggest that gendered language expectations may come into play.

Comparisons across focal persons are complicated by differing levels of support from their bases, and in some cases by the inclusion of stricter security protocols. While some candidates consistently encountered large crowds of enthusiastic supporters (e.g., Sanders, Clinton), other candidates had fewer supporters (e.g., O’Malley, Webb). Secretary Clinton’s interactions were uniquely characterized by an element of crowd control and by the presence of individuals in plain clothes who appeared to be security personnel. As with an analysis of gender, an analysis of the effects of security on interpersonal

interactions with crowd members could prove fruitful. The tactics that candidates and crowd members use to try to bridge the larger social gulf that can be a consequence of added security could prove interesting, and would be of particular interest to participants in these encounters.

This chapter focuses on analysis during a brief period of only a few weeks in one campaign cycle. In order to increase similarity across cases, the majority of campaign events happened in the span of a few days at the same location (the Iowa State Fair). Although Iowa is critically important to presidential campaigns for a number of reasons, the United States is a large and diverse country, and Iowa is not representative of that diversity. Initial impressions of this corpus suggest that the interpersonal interactions of political candidates while working the crowd are areas of interest for scholars interested in social justice generally. A further analysis by scholars whose work takes a critical or social justice perspective are likely to find these interactions to be fertile ground for a variety of issues, not the least is the issue of tokenism.

Finally, the Iowa State Fair is but one example drawn from a wide variety of situations in which political candidates work the crowd. In addition, working the crowd is an important mode of interaction for people from many different walks of life. Future research will need to extend this line of research beyond the political context into other contexts of working the crowd.

CONCLUSION

The appearance of introduction sequences in the working-the-crowd context provides additional confirmation of their importance as a feature of conversation that appears in a wide variety of contexts. Likewise, the appearance of previously observed components of introduction sequences in the working-the-crowd context adds to existing evidence that implies that these components apply universally to the construction of introduction sequences across all types of human interaction, though gaze/body orientation-coordinating actions, greetings, introduction-specific assessments of "how it is to meet you," and touch/body contact appear to be more consistently present than others.

Political candidates and their campaigns can also draw a number of conclusions from this study. Interactions with individual members of crowds are a unique form of interaction that is characterized by introductions, transactions,

and expressions of encouragement. Introductions while working the crowd are not the same as introductions in other contexts. They are less likely to include the exchange and repetition of person reference formulations such as names and titles, questions about how people are (“howareyou”), and claims of preexisting knowledge about introducible persons. Successful candidates often use a “nice to see you” rather than “nice to meet you” construction, which saves face in the circumstance that they have met the other at some other event in the past but do not remember them.

Candidates engaging in working the crowd will often have to shift between interactions with general crowd members and interactions with key persons and donors. An understanding of how working-the-crowd introductions differ from ordinary interactions will serve the candidate well in choosing the right mode of interaction for each audience. Initial impressions from this research suggest that effectively working the crowd as a political candidate is a team effort. The ways that campaign staff and other figures effectively support working the crowd is an important area for future research.

Likewise, political candidates often have unique security considerations that can complicate interactions with crowds of people. The ways that candidates can effectively work the crowd while taking these security concerns into account may be useful both within campaigns and within the larger security community. Security professionals can be served by understanding what typical introduction sequences look like while working the crowd, in order to help them identify potential security threats.

This study of candidate interactions advances the larger field of communication research by examining a modality of face-to-face communication that has largely been overlooked in communication literature. Despite the importance and frequency of working the crowd, especially surrounding regionally and nationally important events, very little is known about working the crowd and how the rules and norms for this form of interaction vary from well-studied modes of communication. The present chapter has contributed to an improved understanding of the use of introduction sequences while working the crowd, but there is still much to learn. Other forms of public, nonsustained interaction are prime areas for further research in this area. Future research on working the crowd should examine the organization and structure of the expressions of encouragement and transactional elements associated with working the crowd.

REFERENCES

- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119–161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2007, June 3). *Iowa Democratic Party event* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-spanvideo.org/program/IowaDemocraticPartyE>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015a, July 18). *Governor Scott Walker (R-WI) meet and greet* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327189-1/governor-scott-walker-rwi-meet-greet>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015b, August 13). *Former Governor Martin O'Malley meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327523-8/former-governor-martin-omalley-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015c, August 13). *Former Governor Mike Huckabee meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327523-6/former-governor-mike-huckabee-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015d, August 13). *Former Senator Jim Webb (D-VA) meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327523-7/former-senator-jim-webb-dva-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015e, August 15). *Presidential candidate Bernie Sanders meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327525-10/presidential-candidate-bernie-sanders-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015f, August 15) *Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair, Part 2* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327525-9/presidential-candidate-hillary-clinton-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair-part-2>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015g, August 16). *Former Governor George Pataki news conference at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327573-5/former-governor-george-pataki-news-conference-iowa-state-fair>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015h, August 18). *Senator Marco Rubio meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327575-4/senator-marco-rubio-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair>
- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015i, August 21). *Senator Ted Cruz meet-and-greet at the Iowa State Fair* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327577-3/senator-ted-cruz-meetandgreet-iowa-state-fair>

- C-SPAN (Producer). (2015j, September 1). *Governor John Kasich meet-and-greet in Bedford, New Hampshire* [online video]. Retrieved from <http://www.c-span.org/video/?327900-2/governor-john-kasich-meetand-greet-bedford-new-hampshire>
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (1993). Coevolution of neocortical size, group size and language in humans. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 16(4), 681–694. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00032325>
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (2003). The social brain: Mind, language, and society in evolutionary perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 32(1), 163–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.32.061002.093158>
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (2004). Social cognition as a constraint on social interaction. *Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology*, 2(3–4), 181–194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/JCEP.2.2004.3-4.1>
- Frantzich, S. E. (1996). *The C-SPAN revolution*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Goffman, E. (1966). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (2005). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345).
- Hill, R. A., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (2003). Social network size in humans. *Human Nature*, 14(1), 53–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12110-003-1016-y>
- O’Keefe, B. J. (1988). The logic of message design: Individual differences in reasoning about communication. *Communication Monographs*, 55(1), 80.
- O’Keefe, B. J., & Shepherd, G. J. (1989). The communication of identity during face-to-face persuasive interactions: Effects of perceiver’s construct differentiation and target’s message strategies. *Communication Research*, 16(3), 375–404. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009365089016003004>
- Pillet-Shore, D. (2011). Doing introductions: The work involved in meeting someone new. *Communication Monographs*, 78(1), 73–95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2010.542767>
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1984). On doing "being ordinary." In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413–429). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Taskiran, C. M., & Delp, E. J., III. (2001). Distribution of shot lengths for video analysis. In M. M. Yeung, C. Li, & R. W. Lienhart (Eds.), *Proceedings of SPIE: Vol. 4676, Storage and Retrieval for Media Databases 2002* (pp. 276–284). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1117/12.451098>

APPENDIX

Party and Title	Candidate	Date	Length	Location	Video Title and Citation
R, Governor (WI)	Scott Walker	2015-07-18	59:18.0	Town Hall Carroll, IA	Governor Scott Walker (R-WI) Meet and Greet (C-SPAN, 2015a)
R, Former Governor (AR)	Mike Huckabee	2015-08-13	31:30.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Former Governor Mike Huckabee Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015c)
D, Former Governor (MD)	Martin O'Malley	2015-08-14	26:54.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Former Governor Martin O'Malley Meet-and-Greet (C-SPAN, 2015b)
D, Former U.S. Senator (VA)	Jim Webb	2015-08-14	11:36.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Former Senator Jim Webb (D-VA) Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015d)
D, Former U.S. Secretary of State	Hillary Clinton	2015-08-15	17:18.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Presidential Candidate Hillary Clinton Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair, Part 2 (C-SPAN, 2015f)
D, U.S. Senator (VT)	Bernie Sanders	2015-08-15	28:11.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Presidential Candidate Bernie Sanders Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015e)
R, Former Governor (NY)	George Pataki	2015-08-16	28:53.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Former Governor George Pataki News Conference at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015g)
R, U.S. Senator (FL)	Marco Rubio	2015-08-18	33:16.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Senator Marco Rubio Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015h)
R, U.S. Senator (TX)	Ted Cruz	2015-08-21	42:11.0	Iowa State Fair Des Moines, IA	Senator Ted Cruz Meet-and-Greet at the Iowa State Fair (C-SPAN, 2015i)
R, Governor (OH)	John Kasich	2015-09-01	24:00.0	Campaign Event Bedford, NH	Governor John Kasich Meet-and-Greet in Bedford, New Hampshire (C-SPAN, 2015j)