



W. Charles Redding (1914–1994): The teacher-scholar model of the Redding tradition

Patrice M. Buzzanell

To cite this article: Patrice M. Buzzanell (1999) W. Charles Redding (1914–1994): The teacher-scholar model of the Redding tradition, *Communication Studies*, 50:4, 310-323, DOI: [10.1080/10510979909388502](https://doi.org/10.1080/10510979909388502)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510979909388502>



Published online: 22 May 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 134



View related articles [↗](#)

W. CHARLES REDDING (1914–1994): THE TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL OF THE REDDING TRADITION

PATRICE M. BUZZANELL

There are six qualities that distinguish the teacher-scholar side of The Redding Tradition: eclectic approach; theoretical-pragmatic content; optimism that organizational communication could alter the fundamental problems of organizational life; challenges to our pedagogy; respect for quality; and promotion of our field at every opportunity. These six aspects of the teacher-scholar facet of The Redding Tradition guide our approach to our content, our attitude toward organizing processes, our careful assessment of our pedagogy, our work quality, and our belief that communication is the core of organizational life.

The years melt away as I open my notes from a COM 674 (Ph.D. level) seminar I took with W. Charles Redding many years ago. Out falls a “Speedletter” from Charles, a three-page memo form consisting of white, canary, and pink sheets with carbon paper between the canary and pink pages. The white page is missing—the form indicates that the white page is for the sender’s personal file. It’s dated as are all of Charles’s class handouts, letters, and memos. It’s signed “Peace & Joy! WCR.”

I read the Speedletter then glance at my notes from a COM 674 seminar on power and control in organizing processes that I took with Charles. I smile to myself. I now am teaching COM 674 at Purdue. It doesn’t seem possible that I, a mere mortal, would be teaching seminars with the same numerical designations as Charles. I recall the wonder that other students and I felt in the classroom of the “Father of Organizational Communication.” I would listen to him talk about current events, best-selling novels, the latest management or industrial/organizational psychology research, comics from the *Journal & Courier* or *The New Yorker* magazine, and Purdue dissertations. It often sounded as though he footnoted himself in his own lectures. These “asides” were just as compelling as the lecture-discussion portions of his classes. I would leave each session with dozens of new ideas for research projects and the typical grad student’s amazement that he could recall spontaneously the years and even page numbers of chapters and article tables. It wasn’t until years later that I found out from Ann Redding, Charles’ wife from 1943 until Charles’s death, that Charles was not quite as spontaneous all the time as I had believed.

I skim through my 674 binder. My top sheet for this set of class materials, as well as all my class notes from Charles’s seminars, is “Redding’s Ten Axioms for Graduate Students (Upwardly Mobile)” (see Table 1). This sheet, along with all the other handouts and individual student feedback he wrote, is typed. In the late 1980s or early 1990s, he finally bought a typewriter with memory but he never would use word processing on a computer. He had no need. He would sit either in the front bedroom of his house or in the enclosed patio area with his typewriter stand and eyeglasses and type.

I scan the list looking for the one axiom that I often have quoted for my own graduate students. There it is—number 10, “A happy graduate student is either a sloppy scholar or a psychopath.” I wonder if it also means that professors should not be happy. I think I should ask Charles about that. I know that he’ll need to differentiate between levels of professorial rank. And that our meeting to respond to my question will result in

Patrice M. Buzzanell (Ph.D., Purdue University) is an associate professor in the Department of Communication at Purdue University. She is the 1988 recipient of the International Communication Association’s W. Charles Redding Dissertation Award for her work on career uncertainty.

TABLE 1
REDDING'S AXIOMS

Purdue University
Department of Communication
(WCR-9/72)

REDDING'S TEN AXIOMS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS (Upward-mobile)

(Copyright will be applied for as soon as graduate students now in residence cough up the necessary cash to Professor Redding.)

- Note:* All axioms should be regarded as subsidiary to the most fundamental principle governing all academic research, *Murphy's Law*: "If anything *can* go wrong in a research project, it *will*."
1. It is written in the Scriptures: In the beginning was the *z*, and the *r* was with Pearson, and the *r* was Pearson.
 2. A graduate student is defined as one engaged in the feckless pursuit of the ever-receding goal of omniscience—a sublime state enjoyed only by the Major Professor (and, on occasion, the Deity).
 3. The graduate student who commits the crime of Disagreeing-with-the-Major Professor shall be condemned to everlasting confinement in the Chi Square.
 4. Once the graduate student has experienced that unforgettable moment of creating his/her first footnote, he/she loses all claim thereafter to either academic virginity or moral purity.
 5. *Ibid* is the most acclaimed offspring of academic fecundity. (too often confused with intellectual profundity).
 6. Length of bibliography is negatively correlated with intellectual creativity and positively correlated with academic achievement.
 7. He who writes clearly risks exposure.
 8. Obscurity is second in importance only to validity. *Corollary*: If you can't come up with a really good job of research, the next best thing is to make it unintelligible.
 9. Remember: it is possible to publish *and* perish.
 10. A happy graduate student is either a sloppy scholar or a psychopath.

Upon payment of an exorbitant fee, any graduate student aspiring to academic excellence and to a brilliant professional career will be issued one (1) copy of this sheet. (Social Security Number is required.)

—W. Charles Redding
Professor of Communication
Purdue University

Note. This list was updated in 1990 when Charles rephrased and added some axioms so that four axioms were for professors and a set of seven axioms were for graduate students.

a lively hours-long lunch in the Union beginning with current events (as always), teasing memory and language a little ("Who invented 'Student's *t*'?" "I am working on becoming a tenured emeritus professor."), swerving off into departmental and university matters (sometimes treading on issues that I deliberately put out of my mind as soon they are spoken), and interspersed with news about people one or the other of us knows. We'd promise to have lunch soon—probably at the Union again because the food wasn't spicy and he could order the kind of soup he needed to eat on his restricted diet—or maybe at Sorrento's for dinner. Then there would be martinis—splash Beefeaters gin in a martini glass, wave fumes from the bottle of Martini and Rossi vermouth (dry, of course) near the glass, and add an olive or onion. He and Ann would be at the restaurant early—waiting in the bar area. Ann would drive. Charles would direct Ann despite the fact that they'd lived in West Lafayette for decades and Ann certainly knew her way around town.

But the lunch isn't going to happen. I forget that Charles and Ann aren't reading and puttering around in their green house on Palmer Drive. I forget that I can't just call up and ask Charles to respond to a panel (which he would do as long as he could travel there without flying—he claimed that he developed earaches when flying). I forget that Ann is living in a condo near the university rather than the house. I forget that Charles's

books and handouts with handwritten notes along all sides of the documents are in files and boxes in storage areas of the Department of Communication at Purdue University.

But I can push the present aside for a moment as I relive what it was like to be a student in Charles's classes. Charles taught thousands of students in courses such as argumentation and debate, English composition, phonetics, interviewing, persuasion, history of rhetoric and oratory, and organizational communication (see Redding, 1984a). In addition to the students he influenced through the courses he taught, he served on over 200 advisory and examining committees at the University of Southern California and at Purdue University, according to his most recent vita on file in the Department of Communication at Purdue (Redding, 1984a). Because Charles was, above all other characteristics, a teacher-scholar, The Redding Tradition exists and lays the foundation for organizational and managerial communication. He taught us who we were and who we could be as a field; he continuously promoted our field in his classes, his consulting, and his research. He was delighted when the Organizational Communication Division of the International Communication Association offered the first W. Charles Redding Dissertation Award in 1979 on the occasion of Charles's first retirement celebration. I suspect that Charles is smiling—wherever he is—at the thought of the Redding Fellowship recently instituted at Purdue University. This Redding Fellowship is designed to provide assistance to a graduate student who plans to conduct research in areas of organizational communication, rhetoric, and/or ethics. Charles would be pleased.

TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL

Charles taught students inside and outside the classroom. He was available to sketch the history of our field on a moment's notice—making connections to socio-political changes and prominent researchers in other disciplines. He also had an inquisitive mind that was manifest in several distinguishing features of the teacher-scholar side of The Redding Tradition.

The most fundamental aspect of the Redding teacher-scholar model was an eclectic approach to materials, ways of knowing, and investigating organizational communication issues. In addition to an eclectic approach, a second aspect was theoretical-pragmatic content that incorporated organizational anecdotes and narratives from his consulting experiences. Third, he conveyed optimism in his lectures, speeches, and writings. He believed that organizational communication researchers, teachers, and practitioners could alter the fundamental problems of organizational life. In addition, Charles continuously challenged not only his students but also communication educators in general to develop critical awareness of what we teach and what we omit from our courses. Fifth, Charles respected quality work and did not shy away from providing less-than-positive critiques that preserved the self-image of the feedback recipient but made it clear that the work itself needed substantial revision. Finally, Charles promoted organizational communication, particularly the work of Redding candidates and other organizational communication students, at every opportunity. These six aspects still guide our disciplinary approach to our content, our attitude toward organizing processes, our careful assessment of our pedagogy, our work quality, and our belief in the centrality of communication in organizational life.

Eclectic Approach to Organizing Processes

A hallmark of The Redding Tradition that Charles modeled for students was the need to approach organizational issues broadly and eclectically. This primary charac-

teristic is connected not only to the historical roots of our field but also to the flexibility in approaches that we see today in organizational and managerial communication studies.

One day in class, Charles might be describing a novel he had just read and its application to certain constructs, such as power and control, that we were discussing. Another day, it might be a philosophical treatise or study on structural patterns in the physical sciences. Within any of these discussions (and soliloquies as when Charles would start on a “tangent”), he would capture the talk and experiences of everyday employees—he would quote *Newsweek*, popular and academic psychology or management sources, or a *Playboy* interview. The diverse nature of his readings and our discussions forced us to consider ranges of possibilities for human motivation and actions. These were possibilities—not definite predictions—that would change over time. We delved into the socio-historical conditions behind Hawthorne Studies or more contemporary findings about participation, ideology, and human resource development.

The most fundamental “truth” that emerged from Charles’s different ways of knowing and approaching organizational concerns was that the source of most human error and unethical behavior in organizational contexts was an inadequate understanding of communication. He remained curious until the end about why we do the things we do, what motivates us to behave in seemingly inconsistent and contradictory ways, and how we can expose (and help rectify) those human frailties that prevent individuals and organizational systems from being effective (with numerous definitions of effectiveness). The eclectic nature of his reading meant that numerous explanations needed to be considered and that simple variable relationships were suspect. Broad reading formed preliminary thinking about topics before these considerations were narrowed into topics for more in-depth examinations.

Over time, his interests evolved as his materials became increasingly diversified. His earliest files offer advice on giving feedback and orders, making presentations, using (and not using) fear appeals, designing more open communication climates, and uncovering values (e.g., Steele & Redding, 1962). He saved copies of debate magazines and notes from the 1940s and 1950s. His later files include materials and commentary on new media, networks, technological innovation, electronic surveillance, and unobtrusive control. One file from the 1970s even contains an intact issue of *Psychology Today* that had a number of articles that Charles would have found interesting enough to include in classes and sessions. One described David McClelland’s need for achievement and how research on high achievers’ doodles translated into findings about designs on pottery shards from different phases of the ancient Minoan civilization (Davies, 1969).

This first characteristic was a quality that made The Redding Tradition so noticeable in our field. Redding modeled a way of thinking about research that exploded contemporary disciplinary connections. He demanded that students explore what humans say and do across time and space. He connected the new sciences, social sciences, and humanistic studies. He could anticipate trends because of the way he linked diverse materials to organizational communication.

Theoretical-Pragmatic Content

Although Charles was highly theoretical in his lecture-discussions, he also layered in pragmatic concerns. Whenever possible, Charles incorporated his consulting experi-

ences so that students could envision how communication principles and research findings could be built in training sessions and organizational development.

In his videotaped address for the Foundations of Communication series, "What It Means to Study Organizational Communication," Charles (Redding, 1991) laid out the groundwork for thinking about the different organizations in which students play roles. He developed two primary arguments, "Communication either sustains an organization or destroys an organization" and "Organizations *are* communication entities," then moved into one of his favorite ways of teaching—anecdote and stories. He recounted an example "from personal observation and personal experience" that is familiar to the many students who studied with Charles over the years. Charles began with his typical opening, "A few years ago, I was working in an organization that I shall call Company B. . . ." He said that he was conducting in-depth interviews and went into a spacious office to interview an executive. After a short while, Manager X whispered in Redding's ear. The manager pulled his JIC (Just in Case) file with letters, including memos to and from himself, and told Charles that he was sure his office was bugged. The JIC file saved his neck on a number of occasions as did other executives' files in the same company. Charles noted that this is not an unusual example but it is not the sort of issue that we typically consider when describing organizational communication. In this case, the story is intended to bring a real world perspective on what we investigate and teach, especially what we often omit from our discussions.

Although Charles viewed consulting as a way of supplementing his teaching repertoire (and bank account), he did not consider consulting a lesser job than that of the university professor. Instead, he noted that the consulting career must be approached with the same degree of preparation, theoretical understanding, and methodological expertise as professorships.

In a *Communication Education* article based on a conference address about consulting, Charles (Redding, 1979a) discussed communication consulting as a viable career option for those with advanced communication degrees. He presented a rudimentary typology of consulting approaches based on the consultant's level of involvement in change processes and on the kinds of preparation necessary (i.e., a well-rounded program of rhetorical, managerial, and interpersonal communication processes) (see also Redding, 1994). He used himself as an example to display the range of communication consulting—and noted that he consulted for over a quarter century span of time. He asserted that consulting requires rigorous preparation and continuous education over the course of a lifetime. He concluded with criteria for competent communication consulting (i.e., liberal arts foundation, advanced degree coursework, decision about type of consulting for which one is most qualified, internship experiences, and continuous education). He maintained that these criteria combined with systems-oriented thinking and reflection on one's philosophical premises, are essential for communication consulting.

In Charles's meticulously labeled, dated, and chronologically ordered manila folders, readers can find some sense of how he conducted consulting sessions. His correspondence with company executives was crisp and business-like with explanations for what he did or planned to do in data gathering through debriefing portions. He had documents—pamphlets, newsletters, company memos, biographical sketches of top officers, survey reports, and location (including itinerary) details—with (his own) underlined phrases and side notes. He made copies of his consulting session handouts, executive summaries, exercises, adapted Likert-type scales and cases, and scripts for running particular training sessions. These copies wait in files for his next consulting

sessions. He saved notes of appreciation that indicate how interesting participants thought his sessions were. Many thank you notes commented on the level of advance preparation and giving of himself that made the sessions truly memorable for participants.

Each file offered a fairly complete set of comments and annotated readings for individual consulting jobs. He included materials such as the following: "Communication Commandments" (e.g., "2. Build a total *atmosphere* or cordiality, reasonableness, and (especially) integrity. (events and actions communicate meanings, too!)" and "15. Provide *safety valves* for releasing gripes and complaints.") (Redding, 1957, emphases in original); giving and getting information in interviewing; belief and value inventories; communication climate assessments; myths of communication; internal employee poll results; and ways of handling complaints. He consulted for Fortune 100 companies, secondary schools, and churches. He presented communication workshops for Purdue staff and for Florida phone companies. The same degree of preparation and obvious enjoyment in bringing the latest thinking on organizational communication into the workplace is evident for large and small organizations. His combination of theoretical and pragmatic issues evident in consulting and teaching files led to the diversity we now see in organizational and managerial communication research, including applied work in varied organizational contexts.

Optimism in the Power of Communication

A third characteristic of Charles' teaching is optimism. This optimism coexisted with a sense that communication is the core of human life in general and of organizing processes in particular. Charles believed that organizational systems could change—and would change—through an empirical study of communication and a rigorous critique of assumptions. He dissected narratives from his own consulting experiences, from research findings, and from historical examples to ferret out what happened, why it happened, and what the consequences were. He typically sought to uncover where our human errors lay (e.g., myths about communication, inappropriate feedback or appraisal systems). He engaged his students and a broader audience in developing mechanisms to alter our communication practices for a better workplace.

He encouraged his students and communication researchers to question everything and to prompt social change. In the numerous files and boxes housed in the Department of Communication, readers can find articles on any number of topics—service stations that refused to provide gas for automobiles bearing peace sign stickers, teachers suspended for bringing in prostitutes to address classes on contemporary social issues, social scientific terminology (e.g., Woodman, 1979), free speech activists during the Vietnam war protest era, "true" meanings behind numerical and categorical designations in performance evaluation ratings, and male-female relationships from the Sunday comic section of the *Journal & Courier* as well as other sources. Many of these materials centered on a society in transition, a questioning of sacred methods and assumptions, and the telling symbols of social unrest and tensions. Whereas others might become cynical observing superficial alterations, Charles maintained his belief that communication scholars held the key to social, particularly organizational, transformation.

For instance, Charles maintained that ethical communication could change the human condition. In the Foundations of Communication series, Charles participated in a discussion called "Foundations for Future Development: A Discussion" (1991). For this discussion on August 3, 1991, six scholars gathered to reflect on the past and future

of our field. He commented on empowerment issues. He said that questions concerning the empowerment of “so-called subordinates” would engage our discipline and become critical issues for future development. He asked, “How can we empower workers, teachers, and so on so that they have an impact on organizations rather than organizations having only an impact on them?” Moreover, in his posthumously published chapter on ethics, he calls the question, “When Will We Wake Up?” (Redding, 1996). Readers can feel the passion, urgency, and exasperation flowing between sentences that fill page after page of condemnation of our field (and of himself, as well) for not infusing our work with investigations and applications of organizational communication ethics. Yet, he does not give up. He offers a “proto-typology”—not a typology, for nothing is ever set in stone in Charles’s work—of unethical messages. He suggests that this proto-typology is flawed but might serve as a starting point for empirical research, particularly content analysis, on ethical and unethical organizational communication. He concludes on an optimistic note:

In conclusion: Is the list of proposed categories exhaustive? I’m sure it is not. Are the categories mutually exclusive? Obviously, they are not. But they are a beginning. After all, we must remember that if we expect to advance from anecdotal to the theoretical level of inquiry, we need to develop some sort of category system. When will those of us who study organizational communication wake up and get moving? There is work to do—important work, exciting work. (p. 36)

Challenges to Our Pedagogy

In his classes, speeches, and writing, Charles continued his practice of questioning what we take for granted. Some might have considered him to be a thorn in the side of communication educators. He critiqued our teaching—his own included—and found it lacking. He expected instructors to constantly assess popular and academic writings, critically analyze the credibility of data and findings, and guard the integrity of what we teach. He abhorred complacency.

In the mid-1980s, Redding (1985a) published his 1982 keynote address, “Rocking Boats, Blowing Whistles, and Teaching Speech Communication,” that was delivered to the Indiana Speech Association conference, held in Indianapolis. In this address, he surveyed recent academic and popular writings to derive a singular cultural premise for contemporary organizational life, that is, fit in and do not rock the boat. Once he established this norm in business discourse and practices, he then described evidence of this trend in communication education. He systematically traced the basis of fit-in-and-do-not-rock-the-boat to the changing nature of education as vocational training and career education, particularly the ways in which communication educators equip students for success in organizations. He displayed how communication instruction reinforces organizational premises by what is taught and what is omitted. But he also provided means of addressing his concerns, as any good persuasive speaker would do. For example, in proposition #7 “*Assumptions like ‘Please the boss,’ ‘To get along, go along,’ and ‘Don’t rock the boat’ are best understood, hence combated, when we examine them in their context: the dominant organizational ideology*” (p. 249, italics in original). He noted that cultural premises are extremely powerful—they often are unstated, but they socially construct realities. Because communication researchers deal with the way people create reality through symbols, Redding described our discipline as uniquely qualified to address issues of ethics.

On the surface, Redding’s commentary about cultural premises underlying corporate success within hierarchical, organizational bureaucracies might seem outdated given contemporary emphasis on teamwork and continuous improvement (see Barker,

1999; Zorn, Page, & Cheney, 2000), yet the acceptance of norms and decision premises found in interpretive work on self-organizing teams and quality initiatives (e.g., best customer's order is filled first, or necessity to fit into the team, in Barker, 1999; accept management's definition of the situation, in Zorn et al., 2000) attest to the contemporary nature of Charles's points. Charles urged communication educators to strike a "happy medium" (p. 254) between dissent and loyalty/commitment; he stated explicitly that he certainly did not advocate disloyalty.

Besides the recommendation to assess ideology and current practices, he also instructed communication educators: to raise consciousness—"focus here is upon encouraging students to think seriously about the organizational cultures in which they will spend the rest of their lives" (Redding, 1985a, p. 255); and to consider a range of dissent behaviors with whistle blowing used only as a last resort:

Let me propose that students be invited to construct an imaginary continuum of conditions that they predict would be triggers, or precipitators, of dissent (given certain circumstances). Among these would be "bad decisions." Thus, the student would confront the question: How bad does a decision have to be before it passes my tolerance level—before I should consider rocking the boat? No sane person would consider the decision to remove water coolers as equitable with the decision to close the plant.

We could visualize a continuum . . . At the top would be those [decisions] involving intolerable violations of legal or moral standards. These would be the potential precipitators of whistle blowing. At the bottom would be such decisions as choosing an unaesthetic color scheme for the office furniture. (p. 256)

Charles recommended that students examine decision making using case studies and their own reactions. Redding (1985a) argued that communication educators should create a learning environment in which dissent and freedom of speech are prominent.

The same theme of challenging educators and researchers to think about and change what we teach and do not teach, is echoed in a 1985 address, reprinted in *Vital Speeches*, "The Enemies of Responsible Communication" (Redding, 1988). Charles's purpose is "to suggest a point of view toward the problem of irresponsible communication, a point of view that may even modify, in some small measure, how we conceptualize 'responsible communication' in both our teaching and our research" (p. 702). He establishes conceptual and operational definitions of irresponsible communication then asks readers:

. . . visualize a simple two-part typology for categorizing the occasions in which "enemies of responsible communication" most often appear:

Type A—There is Voice where there ought to be Silence. (The silence could be either empathic listening or prudential restraint.)

Type B—There is Silence where there ought to be Voice. These abstractions will, of course, be more meaningful as they are demonstrated in real-life episodes. (p. 703)

Through this speech, Charles used vivid, current, specific, and verifiable examples of historical and contemporary events, persons, and ideas. Toward the end of this speech, he called his audience to action: "My overriding desire is that we leave this conference 'fired up' with a burning determination to make the concept of responsible communication a vivid part of our teaching . . ." (p. 704). He provided specific remedies for communication instructors: raise questions about responsibility as well as effectiveness, build responsibility into our evaluation systems, and focus public discourse on this topic.

Charles continuously challenged our research and pedagogy. These challenges delved into fallacies of human communication, ideological derivations of our theories,

and components of communication effectiveness (e.g., Redding, 1968, 1979b, 1984b). Later, with some urgency as he neared the end of his life, he attacked complacency in our field by directing us to teach and research ethical issues in organizations.

Quality of Work

Charles expected quality work of himself and of his students. His many addresses and publications have more than one typed (and often hand edited) draft. His landmark publication, *Communication Within the Organization* (Redding, 1972) is affectionately referred to as “the telephone book” because of its size and shape (and consideration of anything anyone would have wanted to know about organizational communication up through about 1970). The telephone book has 138 pages of text, excluding the preface, plus an additional 360-page “Special Supplement. The Ideal Managerial Climate: Main Components” and references. I have yet to see another book that has an extended “footnote” longer than the main text portion. But that kind of consideration wouldn’t have stopped Charles from making sure that he covered his subject matter in as thorough a fashion as possible.

He also expected thoroughness from his students. Charles was straightforward about his expectations for students’ performance. He expected excellence, but he was flexible in his grading systems. In fact, he went to great lengths to offer varied forms of assessment from which students could elect a combination of grading options (see Table 2). He sometimes referred to other handouts on his handouts (e.g., Table 2, see the “note,” “notes,” and “PS.” sections, particularly the reference to another sheet, “A Pragmatic Classification of Seminar Term Papers/Projects”). On the first page of this “A Pragmatic Classification . . .” is a lengthy note, “Note Regarding ‘Magnitude’ of Term Papers,” that is followed by a detailed exposition of each classification and subclassification (seven-page, single-spaced total). There is a sheet of guidelines for task group presentations for “600” level seminars and a seven-point (interval level) system of seminar presentation evaluations with six criteria for effective performance (scope, expository-communication skills, understanding, coverage of essentials, involvement of learners [class members], and ability to suggest implications of theory/research for real-life setting). Criteria are defined through use of adjectives on the grading sheet; a conceptual definition of each point on his seven-point numerical evaluation scale is provided.

Readers of this article may think that Charles’s fastidiousness was a bit excessive. But I can assure readers that students in Charles’s classes knew how they were being evaluated at every step. In addition to grading options, descriptions of options, and so on, students also may recall Charles’s tests. Sometimes these tests had word limits for each question (e.g., no more than 100 words, no more than 200 words). I recall (although I cannot locate the document in my own files) folding lined paper to produce four columns so that I could calculate my essay length more quickly during exams. Even though the limit might have been 100 words, Charles expected that the response would be thoughtful and thought provoking. A student could not simply summarize a line of research, the 100 words also had to embody some sort of critique.

If a student did not produce documents to Charles’s expectations of that particular individual’s capabilities (given the student’s graduate level), Charles did not flinch from giving “C” and “D” grades, all documented with extensive typed feedback and justifications as well as positive aspects of the student’s presentations, article critiques, or papers. He spent time crafting his feedback so that the self-image of the feedback recipient would be preserved.

TABLE 2
GRADING OPTIONS

Purdue University (date of form)
 Department of Communication
 "600" level seminars
 Prof. W. C. Redding

Name: _____ Term Grade: _____

_____ M.A. or M.S. _____ Taking course 1st time _____ Outside Com. Dept.
 _____ Ph.D. _____ Taking course 2nd time _____ Inside Com. Dept.

Grading options:

	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	Ad Hoc
Major term project (paper)	_____ (20%)	_____ (30%)	_____ (40%)	_____ (60%)	_____ ()
In-class task group	_____ (30%)	_____ (30%)	_____ (30%)	_____ (30%)	_____ ()
Critical review(s) No. 1	_____ (10%)	_____ (10%)	_____ (10%)	_____ (10%)	_____ ()
No. 2	_____ (30%)	_____ (20%)	_____ (10%)	xxxxxxxxxxxx	_____ ()
Examination	_____ (30%)	_____ (20%)	_____ (10%)	xxxxxxxxxxxx	_____ ()
Totals (for computation)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Bibliographical survey	_____ (o.k.)	_____ (o.k.)	_____ (o.k.)	_____ (o.k.)	_____ (o.k.)

Note: The bibliog. survey *may* or *may not* be applicable in any given course, in any given year.

(storage/retrieval project; everyone assists; no grade)

Notes:

- Restrictions on selecting grade options.*
 Option No. 1—not open to anyone taking course *second* time
 Option No. 4—not open to anyone taking course *first* time
- Options should almost always be selected no later than the fourth or fifth week of the term (NEVER later than "mid-term")*
 Selection of options should always be made in consultation with the instructor.
- Kinds of projects available for term papers* (see separate document, "A Pragmatic Classification of Seminar Term Paper/Projects," 5th ed., 1977)
- Length or scope of term papers*
 It is impossible to give meaningful estimates of page lengths or of "size" of term papers in most instances, since such matters will obviously vary according to grading option and type of project. However, taking the familiar case of the "*position paper*" (library paper, based primarily upon secondary sources) as a convenient example, the following figures will serve as rough guidelines and will illustrate the important variations related to grading option selected by the student:
 Option No. 1—10 pages Option No. 3—20 pages (*Typed, double-spaced*)
 Option No. 2—15 pages Option No. 4—30 pages
 (These figures *exclude* such materials as: bibliographies, footnotes, endnotes, charts, tables, pictures, appendices, etc.)

P.S. It will be greatly appreciated if ordinary typing paper (rather than "corrasable") be used for all written work; and if generous margins are provided: at top, bottom, and both sides of each page!

I had forgotten this aspect until I was reading through Charles's numerous course files while preparing to write this article. In one of his files was feedback I had received on a paper that did not measure up to Charles's expectations. I had received a C on a paper—the only low grade of my graduate career—and had deserved the grade. He began by explaining why he delayed in providing my grade (winter holidays, birth of my child, and re-readings of the paper "to make sure that my reactions were not completely wrong-headed or quixotic"), then wrote a very specific and lengthy commentary on what he identified as the "pervasive problem":

tossing abstract and sometimes "wrong" terms around with abandon, neglecting to consider either (a) the most precise and clear wording that is justified by the "state of the art," or (b) the poor reader (even when he's a professor!). . . . [insertion of data as evidence]. Perhaps closely allied to this unfortunate tendency is another problem: not laying out your lines of thought (inference, logic, etc.) in a fairly simple, clear-cut, straightforward, clearly *organized* fashion. . . . [more evidence].

His concluding paragraph recapitulated the positive aspects of the paper, provided a

TABLE 3
 REDDING CANDIDATES WHO COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS

Name	Year Ph.D. Was Awarded	Title of Dissertation
William K. Clark	1960	An Analysis of Contemporary Speech Education in American Protestant Seminaries
R. Wayne Pace	1960	An Analysis of Selected Oral Communication Attributes of Direct-Selling Representatives as Related to Their Sales Effectiveness
George A. Sanborn	1961	An Analytical Study of Oral Communication Practices in a Nationwide Retail Sales Organization
Herbert W. Simons	1961	A Comparison of Communication Attributes and Rated Job Performances of Supervisors in a Large Commercial Enterprise
Charles M. Kelly	1962	"Actual Listening Behavior" of Industrial Supervisors, as Related to "Listening Ability," General Mental Ability, Selected Personality Factors and Supervisory Effectiveness
Phillip K. Tompkins	1962	An Analysis of Communication Between Headquarters and Selected Units of a National Labor Union
Joseph F. Miraglia	1963	An Experimental Study of the Effects of Communication Training Upon Perceived Job Performance of Nursing Supervisors in Two Urban Hospitals
Dean S. Ellis	1965	An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Various Types and Degrees of Communication Opportunity on Conflict Between Groups
Ronald L. Smith	1967	Communication Correlates of Interpersonal Sensitivity Among Industrial Supervisors
Joseph P. Zima	1968	The Counseling-Communication of Supervisors in a Large Manufacturing Company
Robert L. Minter	1969	A Comparative Analysis of Managerial Communication in Two Divisions of a Large Manufacturing Company
Gary M. Richetto	1969	Source Credibility and Personal Influence in Three Contexts: A Study of Dyadic Communication in a Complex Aerospace Organization
Michael Z. Sincoff	1969	An Experimental Study of the Effects of Three "Interviewing Styles" Upon Judgments of Interviewees and Observer-Judges
Gerald M. Goldhaber	1970	An Experimental Study of the Effect of "Ego-Involvement" on Selected Dimensions of Speech Production
Thomas McPhail	1971	A Study of Interpersonal and Mass Communication Influence
William E. Spaulding, Jr.	1971	An Exploratory Study of Communication Concerning Data Processing in Twenty-One Midwestern Banks
William B. Cash, Jr.	1972	An Experimental Study of the Effects of Five Styles of Appraisal Interviewing Upon Anxiety, Defensiveness, and Interviewee Style Preference
James O. Derry	1972	A Correlational and Factor-Analytic Study of Attitudes and Communication Networks in Industry
Gary T. Hunt	1972	Communication, Institutional Satisfaction, and Participative Decision-Making at Three American Colleges
John Pacilio, Jr.	1972	A Quasi-Experimental Study of Communication Outcomes of Three Management Instruction Programs
John W. Baird	1973	An Analytical Field Study of "Open Communication" as Perceived by Supervisors, Subordinates, and Peers
Stephen D. Clement	1973	An Analytical Field Study of Selected Message and Feedback Variables in the Officer Hierarchy of the United States Army
Lyle Sussman	1973	Upward Communication in the Organizational Hierarchy: An Experimental Field Study of Perceived Message Distortion
Harry Dennis, III	1974	A Theoretical and Empirical Study of Managerial Communication Climate in Complex Organizations
William F. Eadie, II	1974	Dimensions of Supportive and Defensive Communication
James B. Stull	1974	"Openness" in Superior-Subordinate Communication: A Quasi-Experimental Field Study
Brian L. Hawkins	1975	Superior-Subordinate Communication as Related to Interpersonal Need Confirmation

TABLE 3 (continued)

Name	Year Ph.D. Was Awarded	Title of Dissertation
Paul K. Krivonos	1975	Subordinate-Superior Communication as Related to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: An Experimental Study
James L. Smith	1975	Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Decision Quality in Problem-Solving Tetrads
John D. Hatfield	1976	The Development of a Category System for Analyzing Superior-Subordinate Communication Behavior
Val Ray Smith	1976	"Function-Identity" in Message Evaluation: Experimental Tests of a Proposed Theory
Frederic M. Jablin	1977	An Experimental Study of Message-Response in Superior-Subordinate Communication
Robert E. Carlson	1978	Rhetorical Sensitivity: Theoretical Perspective, Measurement, and Implications in an Interpersonal and Organizational Context
Louis P. Cusella	1978	Variations in Verbal Feedback Messages Following Task Performance as Related to Intrinsic Motivation
Rich L. Sorenson	1979	Communication Behavior of Supervisors: Participativeness, Uncertainty, and Environmental Complexity
David A. Bednar	1980	Relationships Between Communicator Style and Supervisory Performance in Complex Organizations: A Field Study
Stephen R. Axley	1981	Communication, "Root-Metaphor" Orientation, and Decision Making: A Laboratory Study
Linda McCallister	1981	"Rhetorical Sensitivity," Sex of Interactants, and Superior-Subordinate Communication
Mary Ruth Snyder	1982	Message Preference, World-View Orientations and Alumni Interests

step-by-step method of handling the paper's flaws, and reaffirmed his opinion that I was a good student.

The feedback I received is typical of the feedback provided to others in seminars. Whether the student earned a high or low grade on an assignment, Charles always provided comments. He also gave feedback to the students and professors who wrote and asked Charles's opinions about research projects, survey designs, references, and so on. Whether Charles knew the writer personally or not, his letters—all stored in his files and some yellowed with age—were constructive but specific about problematic aspects. His expectations of himself, his students, and others soliciting his advice was that they produce good quality work that was thorough, well designed, critical of writings that did not measure up to rigorous standards, and written (or spoken) precisely and interestingly.

Organizational Communication Field Promotion: The Redding Candidates and Others

Finally, The Redding Tradition is alive because Charles valued teaching and making academic and non-academic connections for his students. The Redding Tradition is not about a huge corpus of academic writings that Charles left for posterity. Rather, The Redding Tradition resides in flesh and blood. Charles's immediate legacy is a generation of people who can be listed as teacher-scholars, administrators, consultants, and managers, among other titles. This legacy now carries on into its third and fourth generations.

In his "Biographical Summary (selective)," as Charles labeled this document, Charles described his involvement with the Purdue graduate program (Redding, 1984a). He noted that he served as chair or co-chair of 41 Ph.D. dissertations, including 39 in organizational communication, and listed some of the organizations for which he

consulted, instructed, trained, or conducted organizational development interventions. In the files on these organizations, readers can find paragraphs about unnamed students whom Charles was trying to place in organizations for dissertation research or jobs. He also directed the Communication Research Center (CRC) at Purdue University for a number of years (1956–1979), with Bob Goyer as his Associate Director for part of that time. The CRC assisted students in obtaining financial support for research projects (see CRC Bulletin #3, 1962). In a recent visit to his alma mater, Chuck Pyron (Ph.D., Purdue University, 1962) talked about Charles's connections and support. He recalled that he found his first academic jobs through Charles's network before becoming a consultant and partner in Gossard Pyron Associates, Incorporated. These connections often were phone calls beginning with "Charles Redding said that you might be interested in . . ." I remember receiving one of those phone calls myself.

The love of teaching in different contexts and of making connections for students helped promote our field within and outside academe. But Charles also wanted to leave a historical record of our roots and of others' accomplishments. He did this through chapters on the chronological and thematic development of our field. He argued that Estes actually was the founder of organizational communication (Redding, 1985b) and mentions others' expertise whenever possible (e.g., Sue DeWine's extensive experience as a consultant; Redding, 1994, pp. xxv & xxvii). Likewise, he thanked others publicly for sharing papers and articles so that future readers would know connections among scholars and ideas (e.g., R. Wayne Pace in Redding, 1985b). He had files with abstracts of dissertation research—previously housed at the Purdue CRC—and he promoted these dissertation findings whenever possible.

Even in his videotaped address for the Foundations of Communication series, "What It Means to Study Organizational Communication," Charles (Redding, 1991) read off a few of the titles of dissertations done at Purdue University from 1954 to 1990. Some of these dissertations were completed by the Redding Candidates (see Table 3). This list of dissertations directed by Charles tells the history of our field—the history associated with the "Father of Organizational Communication." Most of these names are set in metal on a wooden plaque in the Department of Communication's conference room. For Charles, the history of our field and the culmination of his life's work, was never just about him (although he certainly was pleased about his role in this history). The history resided in all who worked and continue to work at promoting communication as the core of organizing processes and ethical human conduct.

SEMPER FIDELIS

The six defining characteristics of the teacher-scholar aspect of The Redding Tradition are not exhaustive. They provide some insight into the man who championed our field, but they do not tell the whole story. Charles was not perfect. His humor could become risqué; his real or fabricated exploits were rumored; his stubbornness was legendary. He was determined to travel to Austin, Texas, in November 1993 and receive the Wayne Danielson Award for his "outstanding contribution to the field of communication." Against doctor's orders, he somehow did manage to go and receive that final award at the end of a career punctuated with numerous accomplishments and honors. When he died on a summer day in 1994, he left the beginnings of a long legacy . . .
Peace & Joy!

REFERENCES

- Barker, J. (1999). *The discipline of teamwork: Participation and concertive control*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Communication Research Center (CRC). (1962). *Purpose and scope*. Bulletin #3. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.
- Davies, E. (1969). This is the way Crete went—not with a bang but a simper. *Psychology Today*, 3(6), 42–47.
- Foundations for future development: A discussion*. (1991). Foundations of Communication Videotape series. Greenwood, IN: An Alliance Video Production, for The Educational Video Group.
- Redding, W. C. (1957). *Communication commandments*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.
- Redding, W. C. (1968, January 8). *Human communication behavior in complex organizations: Some fallacies revisited*. Paper presented to the students and faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Redding, W. C. (1972). *Communication in the organization: An interpretive review of theory and research*. New York: Industrial Communication Council, Inc.
- Redding, W. C. (1979a). Graduate education and the communication consultant: Playing God for a fee. *Communication Education*, 28, 346–352.
- Redding, W. C. (1979b). Organizational communication theory and ideology: An overview. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 3* (pp. 309–341). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Redding, W. C. (1984a). *Biographical summary (selective)*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.
- Redding, W. C. (1984b). *The corporate manager's guide to better communication*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Redding, W. C. (1985a). Rocking boats, blowing whistles, and teaching speech communication. *Communication Education*, 34, 245–258.
- Redding, W. C. (1985b). Stumbling toward identity: The emergence of organizational communication as a field of study. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 15–54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Redding, W. C. (1988, September 1). The enemies of responsible communication. *Vital Speeches*, 54(22), 702–704.
- Redding, W. C. (1991). *What it means to study organizational communication*. Foundations of Communication Videotape series. Greenwood, IN: An Alliance Video Production, for The Educational Video Group.
- Redding, W. C. (1994). Forward. In S. DeWine, *The Consultant's Craft: Improving organizational communication* (pp. xxiii–xxvii). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Redding, W. C. (1996). Ethics and the study of organizational communication: When will we wake up? In J. A. Jaksa & M. S. Pritchard (Eds.), *Responsible communication: Ethical issues in business, industry, and the professions* (pp. 17–40). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Steele, E. D., & Redding, W. C. (1962). The American value system: Premises for persuasion. *Western Speech*, 26(2), 83–91.
- Woodman, R. W. (1979). A devil's dictionary of behavioral science research terms (with apologies to Ambrose Bierce). *Academy of Management Review*, 4, 93–94.
- Zorn, T. E., Page, D., & Cheney, G. (2000). Nuts about change: Multiple perspectives on change-oriented communication in a public-sector organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 515–566.