Please note: This is a rough transcription of this audio podcast. This transcript is not edited for spelling, grammar, or punctuation.

Participants:

Trevor Parry-Giles
Allison Kennon
Joshua Johnson
Whittney Darnell
Sarah Hock
Kimberly R. Moffitt
Dotty Burt-Markowitz
Rajani Gudlavalleti
J. David Cisneros
Janelle Wong
Mark C. Hobson
Lisa A. Flores
Star A. Muir

[Audio Length: 0:38:04] RECORDING BEGINS

Trevor Parry-Giles:

Welcome to *Communication Matters, The NCA Podcast.* I'm Trevor Parry-Giles, the Executive Director of the National Communication Association. The National Communication Association is the preeminent scholarly association devoted to the study and teaching of communication. Founded in 1914, NCA is a thriving group of thousands from across the nation and around the world who are committed to a collective mission to advance communication as an academic discipline. In keeping with NCA's mission to advance the discipline of communication, NCA has developed this podcast series to expand the reach of our member scholars' work and perspectives.

Introduction:

This is Communication Matters, The NCA Podcast.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

Thousands of scholars gather for the NCA Annual Convention each year to present and discuss new communication research and to reconnect with their colleagues and friends from across the discipline. The theme of the 2019 convention was Communication for Survival. In this episode of



Communication Matters, we'll hear highlights from the 2019 NCA annual convention in Baltimore. This episode features excerpts from the opening session, the Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture and the NCA presidential address. Now before we get to those highlights, we hear from some attendees about why they attend the NCA annual convention, their best memories about the convention, and their experiences with this year's annual convention in Baltimore.

Allison Kennon:

My name is Allison Kennon. I am from Hastings College in Hastings, Nebraska. I am a Communication Studies major and my focus is in rhetoric and specifically sexual violence, trauma rhetoric, and communication. Now I'm here this year as one of the three student national reps for Lambda Pi Eta as well as one of the two national representatives for students for the American Forensics Association and I am speaking on a panel as well as chairing a panel.

Joshua Johnson:

My name is Josh Johnson or Joshua Johnson and I'm from Purdue University in Indiana and it's just a great networking opportunity. Meet up with old colleagues and meet new ones and I feel like it's just a great socializing experience and a great way to meet new people.

Whittney Darnell:

My name is Whittney Darnell and I'm from Northern Kentucky University. My first NCA was probably over ten years ago as an undergraduate and then I went into the corporate world for a little bit, came back and got my Masters, then taught adjunct while I continued to work for a while. And then over the last four years went back to get my PhD and now I'm here more regularly. I have a varied NCA experience.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

Next, Alli tells us about the 2017 convention in Dallas which was themed 'Our Legacy, Our Relevance', Sarah shares how undergraduate students are celebrated for their leadership at the convention and Whitney discusses a panel on mental health.

Allison Kennon:

My first NCA was the Our Legacy theme and it was my most memorable one by far because I was a sophomore in college and had no idea what NCA was and I was just coming as an observer to go to panels, see what I might be interested in in my field. At that time, I wasn't exactly sure I wanted to do rhetoric or sexual violence communication and it really opened my eyes to see what was possible in the field of communication. As well as I am a large competitor on my forensics team at Hastings College and that year they did the lyrical justice panel with different slam poetry, national poets from across the country and it really showed me the possibilities of Communication Studies and how far we can go in academic fields as well as broadening that in performance.



Sarah Hock:

My name is Sarah Hock and I'm from Santa Barbara, California. Coming to NCA this year has been memorable because we, as I said, we're so thrilled to be receiving multiple awards for our chapter. Serving students and working with student clubs is one of the most exciting parts of my job and it's something that makes my job really rewarding. And so, to be able to be here and to be here with my students who are here for the first time and just to see them celebrated for their leadership is just a wonderful thing.

Whittney Darnell:

So, in the past I've always been here for different reasons. This is my first time on the other side of this as someone who has a job and is now here for intentional purposes of learning what I need to learn to continue my own research. In the past, it's been about networking for jobs. Last year I was here at the career fair doing the job hunt. Before that, I was doing the graduate school hunt and I did sit in on a panel yesterday which was a mental health panel. Gary Kreps and various others who were all talking about a book that they collaborated on, that was a very thoughtful and interesting panel that discussed IRB issues and everything from different methodology, some of the concerns we have as a discipline moving forward. It was a very well-coordinated, organized panel anybody sitting there would have taken a lot away from. So, that was probably my most useful and memorable moment so far.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

Finally, Alli explains how research on sexual violence trauma rhetoric relates to this year's theme, Communication for Survival. Josh addresses how constructive family communication can help children learn, grow, and socialize. Sarah shares how student groups can create spaces for students to survive and thrive on community college campuses. And Whitney tells us why understanding communication is crucial to survival.

Allison Kennon:

And especially for the field that I study which is a very marginalized group, their communication is everything to them and uplifting their communication is really the biggest part. So, I am very proud to be presenting these words that I've been able to uplift from the narratives that I've gotten in my research and I think this theme unites the various academic specialties by acknowledging the fact that survival is an important component in whatever department you're in in Communication Studies.

Joshua Johnson:

When I think about survival for communication, I think back to my own interest as a family comm scholar. I think of parents who interact with their kids and is their communication constructive, is it building them up in a way that helps them grow and socialize and learn who they are. And in



many ways, kids today are learning, are fighting for survival in their own homes and their families and parents are having to adjust their own communication to learn how to adapt to their kids.

Sarah Hock:

The experience of belonging as a student is an important part of surviving the college experience and particularly for my students who are community college students. What we're able to offer them through Sigma Chi Eta is a way to belong in our college and on our campus community. And so, for me when I think about communication for survival, I think about how as a field we want to empower our student leaders not only to survive but to thrive and by having spaces like student clubs where they can belong and get connected and exercise leadership and service, we create a way for them not only to survive but also to thrive. And I think for those of us that are teachers who love teaching and who love engaging with students and being a part of their lives, I think that we can be united across our different areas of specialty if we really do care for students and we really want to see them not only survive but thrive. And so, I think that's something that unites us.

Whittney Darnell:

I would say and we like to pride ourselves as a discipline as and just about anything that you do in life, communication is essential to that process. And so, to me that kind of captures that communication for survival. Without it, without studying it, without a disciplined approach to understanding it, it impacts our ability to survive and our learning and our health communication and our rhetoric and our organizational lives. And so, that's what I think they were trying to capture there is that essential quality of communication and the significance of it to not just our discipline but in life is what that meant to me.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

We conclude this section with a final thought from Josh about the importance of the NCA Annual Convention.

Josh Johnson:

I love the National Communication Association. It's so great. I would never have dreamed growing up in my home that I would be at a conference like this. So, a lot of the things I ask myself is well, how can I then give back in the future? It's something I think a lot about because there's just so much opportunity at these places. And so, for any of you who are thinking about this or anyone who'd be listening to this, take advantage of it, enjoy it, be professional but find and enjoy the people around you because it's a connecting point. I think we're all looking for people who shared the same things that we're interested in.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

Now we turn to clips from the opening session sponsored by the Waterhouse Family Institute for the Study of Communication and Society. The opening session focused on issues of race and



social justice as they played out in Baltimore. Panelists included Dotty Burt-Markowitz, co-founder of the Baltimore Racial Justice Action; J. David Cisneros, associate professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Rajani Gudlavalleti, community organizing manager for the Baltimore Harm Reduction Coalition; Mark C Hobson, director of African and African-American Studies and associate professor in the Department of Communication at George Mason University; and Janelle Wong, professor of American Studies and a core faculty member in the Asian-American Studies program at the University of Maryland. Kimberly R. Moffitt, director and associate professor in the Language, Literacy and Culture PhD program, an affiliate associate professor in the Department of Africana Studies at the University of Maryland Baltimore County-UMBC served as chair and moderator of the session. The panelists discussed race relations in Baltimore and throughout the nation and examined ways in which social justice work seeks to improve issues associated with race including poverty, violence, wealth attainment, and food access.

Kimberly R. Moffitt:

Welcome to Baltimore. I know it's a little cold but we're so glad to have you here and hope that you will enjoy the conversation today. So, I have the pleasure of serving this role to start the conversation with these five colleagues of ours on race relations and what better place to have such a conversation in a city that has such a complex history and even a complex contemporary history of what we're dealing with.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

That was Kimberly R. Moffitt and now we will hear from all five panelists on the question of how communication scholars can have an impact on communicating the role of race in all issues of social justice in the United States.

Dotty Burt-Markowitz:

Communication and whether that's in a large institution where there's a whole department of communication, whether it's in teaching communication or in being an administrative role, whether it's just a small nonprofit where the executive director is the primary communicator, whoever it is that is responsible for shaping the message and mission of that organization, it is so essential to be able to do two things and to have two things as a foundation. One is to learn the history. If you care about racial justice within the context of the larger social justice, you have to keep learning history especially around race. It's the foundation of informing the way you talk about and think about these issues and for those of us who are white, that's really a life, lifelong component. You can't ever get to a place where you have enough understanding of the history. And the other thing is developing the skill of directly naming race and talking about it in clear terms, not using euphemisms, not trying to soften it, not using jargon.

Rajani Gudlavalleti:



Nothing is outside of history absolutely and no one is outside of social justice as well. Right? Because the more we think of social justice, the implicit bias is that it is a black issue, it is a poor people issue, it is a women's issue. Not exactly. And the way I sort of translated that into the work I do now around drug user health and ending the overdose crisis. But now that we see that the systems that exist now are also sweeping everybody in. Right? Incarceration and addiction and all the ways we're taught. Now it's becoming, now we're able to see it where oh, no, we need treatment services, we need this. We've always needed that. We've always needed that. And so, I bring that as an example to say if we continue to separate and say this is an issue over here in this community, soon enough that issue actually will directly affect you in your house. Right? And then where are you going to be? And so, I think recognizing, right, that we are impacted by social justice issues and until we have this honesty with ourselves and interrogate that and have honest conversations with our peers, then we really won't get anywhere.

Janelle Wong:

I'll just say that when I look as an outsider to this organization, to NCA, I think about what your field really does is and can do when it comes to thinking about social justice and race and communications is to show us and illustrate for all of us how words matter but really how words shape institutions and are shaped by those institutions that continue to perpetuate racism.

J. David Cisneros:

First, you know, we have to acknowledge I think the central role of race within our own discipline and obviously this has been, you know, disciplinarily speaking, at least a conversation that we've been having even more publicly I guess recently, recognizing, you know, racialization, institutional racism, structures in our professional organization, structures in our departments, our journals, our notions of merit, good scholarship, all of that stuff. And then we have to actively work to disinvest from those things where we take corrective steps to change those structures. I think as the second thing is realizing that kind of a lot of times it's easy to feel comfortable in a presumably insular academic world but kind of realizing that world is tied to it as part of this broader world where these, you know, and so the struggles in this community and in this world are tied to the struggles outside of it.

Mark C. Hobson:

I would challenge my peers to move beyond these feel-good stories about diversity and move beyond the extreme issues that we see every day in the news and we begin to look at the subtle ways in which white supremacy i.e. racism kills the soul of individuals and groups. It happens in the classroom, it happens in the meeting room, it happens out in the streets, I mean it even happens here at our annual meeting. And so, I would say we need to move beyond the privilege of being comfortable with coming into a room like this and having this discussion and then going out into the world and not really acting on what it is we know because you all know what you're hearing here and if you don't know it, well, you've heard it. But how does it matter? How do you



enact it on a daily basis? And so, at this point, it's time to stop being sensitive, it's time to stop being aware, and it's time to start acting on the knowledge that you have.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

In the clips you just heard, the panelists spoke on the importance of addressing institutional racism and using our expertise as communication scholars to speak on issues of social justice. In this next set of clips, Janelle, Mark, and Dotty speak on the importance of taking action even if it makes us uncomfortable.

Janelle Wong:

If we are not radical, are we complicit? And so, one of the greatest impediments I think to working on racism is that it's always evolving, the sources are evolving and changing even though a lot of the script is the same. And so, how we can move beyond that, I've noticed definitely in my students, is you have to tell your students to look to their own communities to identify anti-blackness for what it is, to identify anti-immigrant sentiment for what it is, to identify Islamophobia because they think it's in the past or they think it rests with one group. It does not and when the students recognize that, you can see their attitudes change.

Mark C. Hobson:

I say the personal is political. So, you put your money, you put your actions where your mouth is. It's about that time of year. We'll see our families, we'll see our friends, and we'll have an opportunity to raise issues or to avoid issues. You'll have an opportunity soon there enough to put your vote where it counts. So, again, the personal is political. You act on what you believe. You walk the walk. I would also add to this idea of liberation and language and being proactive, that is so important. Asante calls it liberation language but it's about being proactive rather than reactive. So, looking at ways of thinking and acting different and understanding that what we've done so far is not necessarily working. For me, it involves working with young men of color, you know, talking to them, for example, about violence prevention. I use communication strategies to do that. I use definitions. I use all kinds of activities. But talking to them about things that they may not understand when confronted with it. So, doing it at an early age. We oftentimes hear talk about putting public speaking in either elementary schools and middle schools but I'd like to see African-American studies, critical intercultural communication studies in schools so that when we begin to have these really charged dialogues, people understand the difference between prejudice and discrimination and racism and privilege and all these terms don't become conflated to the point that we walk away with little to no understanding.

Dotty Burt-Markowitz:

Weighing risk is something that's important for any of us to do in the work of social justice. For those of us that are white, we need to challenge ourselves about what is really the risk I'm taking.



Trevor Parry-Giles:

Finally, we end this section with comment from Mark about the violence of racism and the nature of systemic racism in America today.

Mark C. Hobson:

I think about racism in the same way as I think about violence because racism is indeed violent. But one of the things that I work with young people on is recognizing it when they see it. A lot of times students and even adults don't know it because they don't have the language, they don't have naming for the issues and so it goes completely unrecognized. Racism is much the same way. We sometimes confuse prejudice for racism. Personal prejudice is not systemic racism. I may not like your black sweater. That does not make me racist. That is my personal preference. But if I tell you that those of you who are wearing black sweaters must sit in the back, that becomes discriminatory and if it happens without me saying so, now it's systemic, it's structural society. So, knowing it when you see it is really, really important and I think that's where most of us miss the mark.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

In addition to the opening session, there were numerous other panels that addressed race, social justice, and survival. Lisa A. Flores, associate professor of communication at the University of Colorado at Boulder served as this year's Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecturer. Flores addressed the topic of mobility containment and the racialized spatio-temporalities of survival which made connections between communications for survival and national discourses about race. We begin with Lisa discussing the use of a slur and its relevance to work on racial rhetorical criticism. Be advised that listeners should note the slur is used in the following clip.

Lisa A. Flores:

Despite these occasional references, the term did not widely circulate until the late 1940s and early 1950s, when the nation rather suddenly paid heightened attention to the so-named "wetback problem." It was at that time, according to Juan Garcia, that "seemingly overnight, the public was flooded with a mass of articles and feature stories concerning undocumented workers." The definition, like several other circulating, elides the literal original significance of the term, the reference to entering the U.S. along the Texas/Mexico border and by crossing the Rio Grande. I pause on this term tonight, I pause on the "wetback, what it tells us about the intersections of rhetoric and race. My investment lies largely in the project that I have named as racial rhetorical criticism. A central task of racial rhetorical criticism, at least for me, is the development of theories that account for the rhetoricity of race. That is, if we argue, as many of us tend to, both in communication and across other disciplines, that race is a social construct or a discursive materialization, then we in communication should lead the theoretical conversations around race.



Trevor Parry-Giles:

Lisa's address examined the use of that slur in the era in which it became part of the national conversations around race, 1944 to 1954. And in the following clips, Lisa defines racial recognition and explains the implications of the social construction of race.

Lisa A. Flores:

Racial recognition is a discursive mode of rhetorical racialization. I'll argue that we—everyday citizens—are asked, even expected, to know race when we see it, and in that knowing, to contain its ever-frightful excessive mobility. The recognition is the rhetorical means through which race itself survives. Now we are at least decades, if not a century, deep into conversations, both popular and scholarly, that name race as a cultural, social, or discursive construct. We might trace these arguments to 1897 and W. E. B. DuBois' essay, "The Conservation of Races." There, he wrote: "What, then, is a race? It is a vast family of human beings, generally of common blood and language, always of common history, traditions, and impulses, who are both voluntarily and involuntarily striving together for the accomplishment of certain more or less vividly conceived ideals of life." I'm puzzled by social, political, public, and scholarly fixation with race. If we all agree that race is socially constructed, then why do we remain so intent on seeing it, knowing it, naming it? Is it the persistent slipperiness, yet oddly rigid nature of race that compels so much investment in this task? Because for all that social construction theories have mostly displaced biological and scientific ones, we—everyday citizens—remain attached to some concept of race as "real." It is, at least in part, the alleged "realness" of race that prompts such often benevolent questions as, "Where are you from?" or "What are you?" It is the "realness" of race that fosters suspicion and antagonism toward so-called scholarship kids or diversity hires. That same "realness" motivates and perpetuates police brutality against blacks and stand your ground laws as well as restrictive immigration laws. Or, as Nadine Ehlers argues, there is a language of "crisis" prevalent in the varied, yet consistent, narratives of race. And crisis, she reminds us, is figured through jeopardy, risk, even loss. The crisis of race, Ehlers explains, is one of racial truth—or the absence of racial truth. It is a crisis of ontology. For despite widely proclaimed theories of race as cultural, social, constructed, or discursive, the truth of whiteness remains premised upon the truth, or the realness, of blackness. The superiority of whiteness—the superiority that says "they must be here on scholarship," or "she must be a diversity hire"—is guaranteed only if it is set against the assumed inferiority of blackness. It is the need for ontological security, Ehlers writes, that installed one-drop and anti-miscegenation laws. If blackness could not cross in to whiteness, then whiteness remained intact, pure. But, of course, such laws could not and did not contain the slipperiness, the evasiveness of race. Its movement into whiteness, much like migrant movement into the nation, permeates, even pollutes. In doing so, it threatens the ontological security of whiteness, thus prompting even greater crisis. It is in this argument of racial ontological crisis that I think about racial recognition. I'm motivated here by Nadine Ehlers, who continues her argument by invoking Judith Butler, performativity, and the persistent reiteration of race: "Race is a practice—an ongoing discursive practice of racing individuals that must be maintained in order to



survive." The implication of this for me is this: If race, even as social construction or discursive materialization, is in persistent ontological crisis—if "we" need to know that it exists and yet we are confronted with endless instances that call such existence into question—then we need a resolution to that crisis. We need ontological security. The retelling of race in language produces the seeing of race as real.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

So, Dr. Flores' focus in this lecture is on race as a rhetorical construct, how we as a society construct racial difference. Scholars have also suggested that recognition can come in other forms such as recognizing similarities in others.

Lisa A. Flores:

In brief, this work suggests that we recognize each other when we see aspects of ourselves reflected in the other. In that reflection, we feel a sense of connection—a mutuality, a sense that we have the same shared experiences, feelings, ways of being. Mutuality, then, is a way of thinking likeness. If we believe that we have shared histories or shared experiences, shared beliefs or cultural practices, then we are like each other. We recognize each other in and through that likeness. It's that feeling of instant connection with individuals we do not know. And while recognition certainly happens interpersonally, it also happens rhetorically, among publics, in and through our discourse. My theory of racial recognition suggests that shared vocabularies, common languages, retold stories also prompt recognition. The constant circulation of the term "wetback" produces the seeing and knowing of wetbacks. Here is where we need race scholars to help us think with theories of recognition. Racial recognition thinks of likeness as likeness to a circulating discourse, such as a racial category. The likeness is not likeness in terms of mutuality or sameness between individuals in an interaction, but sameness between individuals presumed to share certain characteristics, what Jacobson might name as the collapse between the perceptual and conceptual. A theory of recognizing race in and on individuals as well as of seeing individuals as instantiations of presumed racial essences, racial recognition accounts for the two key modes through which race has historically been understood—phenotype and character, color and blood. It turns on the collapse between the seeing and knowing. It is in the collapse between the perceptual and conceptual, between skin and blood, that we see race. Racial recognition thus suggests that the very premise that one can "see" race grounds the argument that race "exists" to be seen. It is a move that fixes and locates bodies on a racial scale—this one is Mexican, that one is White.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

With this knowledge of racial recognition, we return to a discussion of the slur used earlier in this section and how racial recognition and metaphors rhetorically make race.



Lisa A. Flores:

The term itself, wetback, condenses body and movement, the body that crosses illegally. In the literal equation of entry and criminality, color and blood, skin and heritage, collapse. The term is not just a label or a slur or an epithet. It produces a category of being. One becomes a criminal wetback threat. The collapse is a mode of containment, a mode of fixing race. In part it does so because the term simply references the body. One is a wetback. It also signals criminal/illegal movement to the U.S.; one is also a wetback. And every single reference to the term, then or now, names wetbacks as part of a national problem. This careful accounting of Mexican bodies both reinforced the immensity and magnitude of wetback movement as it also refused the force of nature that constituted the discourse. Thus, readers were assured that even floods and swarms could be controlled, made inferior, contained. Again, it is racial recognition that makes this containment possible. The tension between the spatio-temporalities of movement and containment secured the moral order of superiority that is fundamental to the rhetorical making of race. Animal metaphors and nature metaphors juxtaposed against the hierarchical superiority of humanity, of civilization make possible the awesome fear of the uncontrollable and the triumph of whiteness against that seeming impossibility. It is here, finally, in the intersections of "wetback" as a term of the body, with wetback as a body that moves animalistically, that the discourse of the wetback problem produced race as real. Epithets, such as wetback, make race in the ways they direct our perceptual and conceptual attention. The move to invoke the slur, whatever the slur, is a rhetorical move to fix and locate. It is a move of recognition. Each invocation is an act of race making—whoever invokes does whiteness, remakes whiteness, whoever is invoked is remade, all at once, and all too quickly and easily. Survival is the ultimate resistance. In racial recognition, race survives, often in its most caricaturish and violent ways. But racial recognition is a rhetorical theory of race; as such, it is premised in the second possibility for survival and that is resistance. For as much as all of us, but really many of you, will continue to participate in discourses of racial recognition, some of us will refuse to be contained.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

This powerful address was one of many sessions at the annual convention and you can find a video of the full Arnold Lecture on NCA's YouTube page. While we can only share a portion of the address here, we hope that it was enlightening. The last highlight we would like to share is an excerpt from the NCA presidential address. NCA President Star A. Muir who is an associate professor of communication at George Mason University offered these thoughts on the importance of education and the role of scholarly associations like NCA.

Star A. Muir:

Most members of our association, I believe, share an underlying value, that education is truly the foundation for people growing and actualizing their lives. For me, whether through research or teaching, learning is a joyful part of what we do. Not all students might agree but this is the light



of our culture, the transmission of knowledge and experience, memories of our lessons enriching the discussions of following generations, cultivation of thoughtful and open discussion on difficult issues, resistance to simplistic characterizations and chaotic distractions. This is how we prepare people to think critically, communicate well, work with others, and address the local and global problems that we all face. For the learned societies to stay relevant to new generations of scholars and to retain a strong value proposition for membership, we must support, we must first focus on member community experiences; second, support resources for interaction and collaboration; and third, begin to integrate structural and perceptional concerns into organizational planning and actions in support of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Membership and the value proposition will be called into question, and rich community experiences, helpful resources to connect and engage with distributed scholarly groups and an association committed to recognition, leadership roles and fair access to scholars of color and other important groups will be critical for association survival.

Trevor Parry-Giles:

We hope you enjoyed that selection from Star's speech and a special thanks to all of the NCA annual convention attendees who joined us on the podcast. We hope that our listeners enjoyed hearing from all of them. In some NCA news, in a special November issue of Spectra magazine, we focus on the state of the communication discipline, presenting data on five aspects of the communication discipline: departments and programs, faculty in communication, undergraduate students in comm, graduate students in communication and communication scholarship. Among other data, the report notes that the number of communication undergraduate and Master's degrees conferred continues to increase. In 2017 alone, there were more than 93,000 undergraduate degrees and over 10,000 Master's degrees conferred in the United States in the discipline of communication. So, be sure to check out this latest issue of Spectra. It's available to everyone publicly at Natcom.org. And listeners, we hope you tune in for the upcoming episodes of Communication Matters, one of which will feature a conversation with Mary Beth Tinker, a petitioner in Tinker against Des Moines, the landmark case from 1969 that affirmed the free speech rights of children in schools. Steve Smith, a freedom of expression scholar and professor emeritus of communication at the University of Arkansas, also joins us for this exciting podcast. In addition, we'll have conversations with the incoming president of NCA, the University of Utah's Kent Ono and a conversation with the inaugural recipient of the Orlando Taylor Award, Joel M Cruz from the University of Colorado. So, be sure to tune in for upcoming episodes of Communication Matters, the NCA podcast.

Be sure to engage with us on social media by liking us on Facebook, following NCA on Twitter and Instagram and watching us on YouTube. And before you go, hit subscribe wherever you get your podcasts to listen in as we discuss emerging scholarship, establish theory and new applications, all exploring just how much communication matters in our classrooms and our communities and in our world. See you next time.



Conclusion:

Communication Matters is hosted by NCA executive director Trevor Parry-Giles and is recorded in our national office in downtown Washington DC. The podcast is recorded and produced by Assistant Director for Digital Strategies Chelsea Bowes with writing support from Director of External Affairs and Publications Wendy Fernando and Content Development Specialist Grace Hébert. Thank you for listening.

RECORDING ENDS