ISERP

Working Paper 07-04

PowerPoint Demonstrations

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES OF PERSUASION

DAVID STARK

CENTER ON ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATION, ISERP
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

VERENA PARAVEL

CENTER ON ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATION, ISERP
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
FEBRUARY 2007

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH AND POLICY

PIONEERING SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AND SHAPING PUBLIC POLICY

POWERPOINT DEMONSTRATIONS

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES OF PERSUASION

David Stark
Center on Organizational Innovation, ISERP
Department of Sociology
Columbia University

Verena Paravel
Center on Organizational Innovation, ISERP
Columbia University

ISERP Working Paper 07-04

February 2007

Abstract

When policy issues involve complex technical questions, demonstrations are more likely to marshal charts, graphs, models, and simulations than to mobilize popular movements in the streets. In this paper we analyze PowerPoint demonstrations, the most ubiquitous form of digital demonstrations. Our first set of demonstrations is the PowerPoint presentations made in December 2002 by the seven finalist architectural teams in the Innovative Design competition for rebuilding the World Trade Center. Our second case occurred some blocks away, several months later: Colin Powell's PowerPoint demonstration at the United Nations. We argue that Edward Tufte's denunciation of PowerPoint does not capture the cognitive style made possible by the affordances of this pervasive new technology. On the basis of our case materials, we identify several features of the elementary grammar of a rhetoric that exploits the medium's potential to manipulate text, sound, and image. Our analysis further demonstrates the distinctive morphology of PowerPoint. Its digital character provides affordances 1) that allow heterogeneous materials to be seamlessly re-presented in a single format that 2) can morph easily from live demonstration to circulating digital documents that 3) can be utilized in counter-demonstrations. A careful examination of this widely used technology is critical for understanding public discourse in a democratic society.

| 1 | INTRODUCTION: MOTIVATIONS

How do actors conduct demonstrations before the public using digital tools? Our motivations to address this question can be stated as four related propositions which we develop with increasing elaboration. First, in our era, *political questions and technical questions are increasingly entangled.* As researchers in the field of science and technology studies have shown, technical questions almost always have a political component (Latour 1990, 2004; Callon 2004). Similarly, critical political issues are likely to involve technical questions. As soon as we think about matters like the environment, national security, abortion, urban housing, public health, or macroeconomic policy, we are immediately on the terrain of questions that are simultaneously political and technical (Barry 2001).

The second proposition follows logically from the first. The entanglement of technical problems and political issues reshapes modes of demonstration. In an era when policy decisions involve complex technical questions, *demonstrations are as likely to marshal charts, figures, models, and simulations as to mobilize popular movements in the street.* To be clear—as our readers, like the authors, have likely recently participated—people still "go to" demonstrations. But for every demonstration that we attend, there are many more demonstrations that we experience, see, or learn about—not because we are hearing about other mass rallies that we didn't attend, but because political demonstrations are not confined to the massing of bodies in public settings. Just as production has moved from mass production to flexible specialization, and mass media is giving way to the new social networking forms of collaborative media, so the public sphere is shifting from mass movements to new forms of political demonstration (Girard and Stark 2007).

What does it mean to demonstrate? Any good social activist, like any good political figure, knows that it is not enough to put people in the street. Precisely because political questions are also technical questions, there must also be ways to demonstrate, to persuade, about technical matters (Barry 2001). Take, for example, the group Asthma Moms, one of several grass roots civic associations that sprang up in Lower Manhattan after 9/11 to protest the fact that, far from simply being poorly informed, they had been knowingly and deliberately misinformed about hazardous environmental conditions in their neighborhoods adjacent to Ground Zero. Asthma Moms learned that banners saying "The Air is Unsafe," would not be sufficient to demonstrate their claims. If they mobilized in protest, they also needed to mobilize their own counter experts, to learn enough about complicated technical terminology, and to develop innovative means to demonstrate this knowledge to their communities, to health professionals, to policy makers, and to the broader public (Girard and Stark 2007). In short, they learned that to demonstrate is to attempt to persuade about matters political and technical.

Whereas our first two propositions were about politics and technology, the third is about technologies of politics, specifically about technologies of demonstration. And whereas our second proposition played with (we prefer "worked with") the multiples meanings of demonstration, here we explore the multiple meanings of representation. Political representation is, of course, about who speaks for whom. But representative politics is now, as it has always been, also about representational images. Effective demonstrations mobilize

1

forms of representation that speak to (perhaps by enunciating, perhaps by suppressing or disguising) the political interests and the technical questions at stake. The new politics of representation employs new technologies to represent the entangled political and technical matters of concern. But by employing new technologies of representation it also opens possibilities for new kinds of politics: Here allowing for the representation of new identities, actors, and agents; there suppressing other voices, actors, and interests. That is, new forms of representation can also pose new forms of misrepresentation.[1] In our era, the new technologies of representation are digital technologies. Thus, our third proposition: *Public demonstrations are increasingly digital demonstrations.* The question then is what happens when demonstrations take digital forms that can circulate through new network channels quite different from traditional broadcast media. When the tools of representation (as mediated images) become interactive, the task of representation (as who can speak for whom about what) can be re-imagined.

Our fourth motivating proposition: *PowerPoint is the most ubiquitous form of digitally assisted demonstration.* Together with the spreadsheet, the wordprocessor, the emailing program, the website, and the search engine, PowerPoint is one of the key products of the personal computing revolution to become a part of everyday life. Within a decade, PowerPoint software has become one of the most prevalent tools of communication, with an estimated 30 million Microsoft PowerPoint presentations everyday (Parker, 2001). Primarily conceived for business presentations, this "slideware" product has spread not only to architecture, academic settings, and public forums, but also to schools (Levasseur and Sawyer 2006), courtrooms (see www.powerpointforcourt.com), churches (see www.churchslides.com), and even funeral homes. As the most popular and powerful technical tool of demonstration, PowerPoint is an ideal candidate to examine reconfigurations in the "work of evidence" when it is operated by digital tools.

In addition to its infuriating ubiquity, PowerPoint is also an important object of study because of its curious morphology. In what form is a "PowerPoint presentation"? From the standpoint of the history of science it is an interesting form because it is a "live" demonstration that, despite the presence of eye-witnessess, is emphatically not an *experiment* performed in front of the audience. In one form it comforms to the "demo": in real time, an audience, a device, and a demonstrator providing a voice-over about the object.[2] But whereas in that form it requires the co-presence of author and audience, a PowerPoint presentation can also circulate independently as a text (Yates and Orlikowski forthcoming). Shorn of context, the question "Did you see her PowerPoint?" has an

---

[1] In an insightful history of the increasingly powerful technologies and institutions that shape the objects of attention for mass populations, Crary (2000) examines the intimate relationship between attentiveness and distraction.

[2] See especially Rosental (2002). Callon's definition of demonstration is particularly useful: "Demonstration, as the origin of the word indicates, makes visible for an audience, constructed contemporaneously with the demonstration, an object about which a discourse is articulated. It therefore simultaneously implies a putting-into-words, the construction of a referential chain (which enables the object to be articulated) and the organization of a public space in which the solidity, robustness, relevance and interest of the demonstration can be tested (possibly by other demonstrations)." Callon 2004:123. See also Ochs et al (1994) and Ochs et al (1996) on moving referentiality.

ambiguous referent. It could refer to the conference room meeting where the demonstrator presented, or it could refer to the PowerPoint "presentation" that you read as a handout ("the stack"), found on a website, or opened as an email attachment in .pdf or .ptt format. Whereas the first form supports an oral demonstration, the second form replaces the more conventional textual product as in "I haven't finished the paper, but I can send you the PowerPoint."[3]

The ability of a PowerPoint presentation to morph so easily from one form to another is directly related to its digital character. The bits and bytes are indifferent to whether they are projected onto a large screen, delivered by your printer, displayed on a website, or read by the Adobe or Microsoft programs on your laptop. PowerPoint is an interesting and complex sociological object because each form could involve different publics: the "live" show is not the same socio-technical assemblage (Girard and Stark 2007; Callon 2004; and see Marcus and Saka 2006) as that for the "derivatives products" that circulate as electronic documents. It thus becomes meaningful to ask "When and where is a PowerPoint presentation?" Because it can take different forms involving diverse publics in time and space, our study of PowerPoint addresses questions about the *geography of persuasion.*

As we shall explore in further detail, PowerPoint's digital character provides "affordances" (Gibson 1979) or constrained opportunities. Morphing is one of these. Another is the ability to easily import diverse digital materials into the demonstration. Whereas as the standard template urges "Click to add title," other affordances make it possible to click to add text, images, animations, databases, sound. In this way, a PowerPoint presentation "re-presents" materials gathered or produced elsewhere to achieve highly orchestrated effects. In a simple sense, PowerPoint images are projected onto a screen. More complexly, however, the demonstrator is re-presenting materials to "project" the audience backward or forward in time or to transport them from the meeting room into the "laboratory." Moreover, the digital character of PowerPoint presentations also provides another affordance: the more that demonstrations are presented in virtual form (posted, for example, on highly visible website), the more they are available as materials for counter-demonstrations.

To be clear, our four statements are not propositions to be tested but are the motivations for our study. To recall, our research question is how actors conduct demonstrations before the public using digital tools. We can now refine that question further: What is the morphology of a PowerPoint demonstration? To answer these questions we need to examine cases that follow from the propositions. The criteria guiding our case selection are, thus, the following: The cases must be ones in which PowerPoint presentations were the dominant mode of demonstration. These demonstrations must be performed in a public assemblage and must circulate in digital form after that performance. The demonstrations must represent technical issues entangled with political questions. And they should involve non-trivial matters of public concern.

---

[3] See Yates and Orlikowski (forthcoming) for an analysis of the consequences that consultants frequently offer their PowerPoint "stacks" as a contractual "deliverable."

| 2 | CASE SELECTION

We are deep at the bottom of Ground Zero. Everything is devastated. The camera pans slowly to the left, scanning across the ruins. We see dust, debris, and heavy equipment, but not a single human life. Without interruption, the camera reverses direction, panning slowly to the right. Immediately, we encounter people going for a walk with their kids under a sunny sky. We are in the exact same place, still at Ground Zero, but now restored to life. At the end of the 360 degree panoramic, the camera looks toward the sky, above the pregnant women, kids, and businessmen enjoying the lively green place, to let us see imposing edifices, the new World Trade Center (WTC). Everything is in order, and everything is as if it has always been here. We are in a middle of a PowerPoint presentation. Daniel Libeskind, one of seven architectural finalists in the Innovative Design Study for the WTC is presenting his design proposal to the public at the Winter Garden on the Hudson River. Two years later and some blocks across town on the East River, another man also used a PowerPoint presentation. Sitting around a horseshoe table, the audience faced the Iraqi desert, looking at trucks moving weapons of mass destruction while hearing intercepted conversations as Colin Powell presented the case to put his nation at war.

Both of these PowerPoint presentations were demonstrations, simultaneously political and technical. Architects, like high tech business strategists, borrow from the pages of the social movement organizer's handbook[4] by mobilizing support for their projects through demonstrations. And politicians bring technical materials into their representations (Latour, 2004). Like many of the important issues of our day, the political and the technical were intertwined both at the Winter Garden and at the United Nations. And like many of the new demonstrations that we encounter, they represented technical questions using digital technologies in efforts to persuade the public.

In this paper we examine the seven PowerPoint demonstrations at the Winter Garden and Colin Powell's PowerPoint demonstration in the Security Council. To do so, we draw on and develop analytic tools from Science and Technology Studies (STS). Although much of the research in STS examines the work of scientists and technologists, the field is giving increased attention to activities quite distant from traditional settings, for example, in finance (Knorr Cetina and Bruegger 2002; MacKenzie and Millo 2003; Callon 1998; Beunza and Stark 2004), in marketing (Clark and Pinch 1995; Cochoy 1998; Callon and Muniesa 2005: Grandclement 2007), as well as in the politics of representation (Latour and Weibel 2005). Because technical demonstrations are not confined to the restricted space of experts (on the debate, see Collins 1988), we need to study practices of proof "in

---

[4] Eric Schmidt, chief technologist at Sun Microsystem, was explicit about how the launching of Java involved processes similar to social movements: "I don't need a finished product. What I need is a social movement. I need to build a community of players who will help develop the offer, who will refine the language, who will join together to make this happen" (Schmidt quoted in Moore 1998:88). On architecture as a social movment in the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan, see Girard and Stark (2005).

the wild" (Hutchins 1995)—outside the laboratory, the scholarly journal, or the professional meeting.

Like much of the recent work in STS, we are studying a technology in its early moments of adoption during which there are important questions about when and, if so, how it becomes stabilized (Bijker 1995; Bijker, Hughes, and Pinch 1990). Because so many of us agonize through all-too-similarly boring PowerPoint presentations, it is tempting to think that the genre has been quickly standardized. There is an argument to be made along those lines (Tufte 2006), and we shall summarize and discuss it below. But if you are in the camp of "if I've seen one PowerPoint presentation, I've seen them all," then, in all likelihood, you have not seen the seven PowerPoint demonstrations by the architects we analyse here for they are certainly not standard. These and other innovative uses of the medium suggest two possibilities. The first possibility is that the PowerPoint genre form, like the format of the book following many decades after the initial technological revolution in printing, is still evolving. If so, it might take significantly new forms. The second possibility is that the genre has, indeed, already stabilized. In that case, the demonstrations we analyze here, might someday be looked back upon as actually viable options that became closed off by an overwhelming standardization. In either case, there is historical value in a detailed analysis of particular non-standard uses of a new communication technology in the relatively early phase of its adoption.

Our study thus examines how the digital character of PowerPoint affords distinctive cognitive styles not limited to the hierarchically-ordered bullet points of the standard template (Tufte 2006). To explore an alternative cognitive style afforded by PowerPoint, we deliberately chose two cases in which the demonstrators opened up the format. Like those who assisted Colin Powell, the seven finalist teams in the WTC architectural study certainly did not use Microsoft's AutoContent Wizard. In each case they devoted considerable resources to explore the potential of this mode of digital demonstration. But it does not follow that they were unconstrained. Our goal is to understand the elementary grammar of these digital demonstrations.

The final justification of our cases is that we expect that PowerPoint will be increasingly used in demonstrations to the public. While we were analyzing our set of cases, we speculated about various public situations in which the technology might be deployed, and we wondered about the limits to such deployment. We reasoned that there were some boundary conditions, concluding that it was highly unlikely that a candidate for president would ever make a PowerPoint demonstration…and then some weeks later we saw Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*. A careful examination of this widely used technology is critical for understanding public discourse in a democratic society.

What was being demonstrated in our two cases?   Stated most succinctly, each of the architects sought to demonstrate that his project would make a wounded city whole. Colin Powell sought to demonstrate that there were reasons for invading a country. What was common between those demonstrations?   Not just the fact that architects attempted to justify a future project and Powell attempted the justification of a future war. What was common was a *digital rhetoric of demonstration*. We examine these otherwise disparate cases to explore how digital technologies of representation equip the activity of demonstration.

| 3 | DATA AND METHODS

The analyses here are based on data collected for a project that examined new technologies of demonstration and public assembly in the rebuilding of the World Trade Center site. As part of that project, our research team inteviewed architects, public officials, and civic activists and gathered a broad array of materials (Girard, Polletta, and Stark 2003; Polletta and Wood 2005; Beunza and Stark 2005; Girard and Stark 2007) . For this paper, we focus on the presentations of the seven architectural finalists in the "Innovative Design" competition for the WTC site. The basic data are the PowerPoint presentations of the seven architectural teams. These presentations were available on the website of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, the official agency that sponsored the competition. (They were also posted on numerous other websites, including those of the architects.) To study the cognitive style of these demonstrations, we systematically examined the seven PowerPoint presentations as digital documents. To study the "live" component of these demonstrations, we examined the taped broadcast of the presentations at the Winter Garden of the World Financial Center in December 2002. In this way we could examine PowerPoint presentations as a combination of textual, visual, and oral argument in front of a live (and broadcast) audience. To study the circulation of digital documents, we also searched the web to explore the numerous and highly varied formats in which they were made available to the public. Similarly, we examined dozens of websites to study the reappropriation of the PowerPoint presentations and their incorporation in various counter-demonstrations.

The guiding framework of our data collection and analysis was to examine the seven architects' demonstrations and Colin Powell's demonstration in a symmetrical manner. As with the architects, the basic data was the PowerPoint document, in this case, made available on the website of the U.S. State Department within minutes of the conclusion of its presentation at the United Nations. As with the architects, we analyzed the content of the PowerPoint presentation as a digital document, exploring, for example, how Powell exploited visual references to the presentation by Adlai Stevenson (in the same room in the United Nations during the Cuban missile crisis). As with the architects, we coded the instances where diverse digital materials were imported into the document to "transport" the audience to a distant imaginary. Also, symmetrically, we studied a taped broadcast of the UN presentation, examined the circulation of the digital document, and searched the web to analyze numerous ways in which the PowerPoint presentation was subjected to counter-expertise and re-enscribed in digital counter-demonstrations.

Behind our methodology of examining our cases symmetrically there is, of course, another symmetry: in both cases, the demonstrations were about something that did not exist. The "buildings" that were presented so palpably in the seven architects' presentations, of course, did not exist. And, as it turns out, none of them, not even the winner's, will be constructed in materials other than the digital. The same, of course, holds for the non-existent "weapons of mass destruction" presented by Colin Powell. Our task in this paper is not,

however, to analyze the truth claims of these demonstrations.[5] In our cases, we know the demonstrations' outcomes—a war, an architectural winner. That is, our attention turns from whether there were weapons of mass destruction to how actors use weapons of communication. Our goal is to analyze the technical and rhetorical modalities of the production of digital demonstrations to understand how they redefine the social practices associated with the economy of conviction—the role of experts, the role of mediations, the staging/screening of "facts," their circulation and counter-demonstration. Rather than drawing a truth perimeter, our method tries to re-attach arguments to the media infrastructure in which all thought is objectified and transformed. By systematically making comparisons between two cases, we highlight the new figures of computer-assisted argumentation.

---

[5] This aspect of our methodology draws on Claude Rosental's (2003) exemplary book on fuzzy logic demos.

| 4 | CLICK TO ADD TITLE

Before, there were charts, posters, and blackboards. In the early 1980s Bob Gaskins, former head of computer-science research at Bell-Northern Research (BNR), invented *Presenter*, a graphics program to put together and edit a thread of "slides." Presenter became *PowerPoint*, the most pervasive communication tool in multiple spheres of activity. PowerPoint's origins thus reach back to engineers, and especially military contractors, who moved from flipcharts, to transparencies and slide projectors, to digital layout and LCD projectors. In some fields now it is basically obligatory. To appear at a meeting in corporate America today, writes Ian Parker (2001), would not only be "unwelcome and vaguely pretentious" but would be "like wearing no shoes." In academic fields, PowerPoint fits the requirements to publish (fast) or perish (soon). Shortcutting the traditional process of presenting and later certifying through publication, a PowerPoint presentation posted on the web acts as an almost-published paper. This basic instrument of communication has spread widely, not only to business, government, architecture, science and engineering, but also to university lectures, elementary education, church sermons,[6] courtrooms, weddings, and funerals. PowerPoint is *the* oral-demonstration support.

Not surprisingly for a technology that has risen so quickly to such prominence, the literature on PowerPoint is divided into two camps—backers and detractors. Whereas the first is dedicated to promoting the tool and explaining how to make a good case, the second could be sucinctly summarized as "don't use PowerPoint." This latter shows how a rich rhetoric could be flattened and oversimplified by presenting it in standard PowerPoint format (Norvig, 1999; Stewart, 2001; Schwartz, 2003; Tufte, 2006). In a short but forceful essay, "The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint: Pitching Out Corrupts Within," revised from a earlier essay in 2003, Edward Tufte (2006) argues that PowerPoint slideware weakens the analytical quality of presentations, deteriorates verbal and spatial reasoning, and corrupts statistical analysis.

Tufte's criticism concerns the format of enunciation that yields a constricted vision of thought, and the major culprit in his tale of woe is the AutoContent Wizard. As a set of normative guidelines, these ready-made templates are prescriptive. But because they format the very process of writing, we might also think of them as *pre-scriptive*. The AutoContent Wizard assists you to make a case, but it also makes it own case—about how much information to organize and how to organize it. It helps you to edit, but it also edits you. The simplest slide tenaciously pre-formats the point, be it with a heading followed by bullet points or with a certain number of frames that can be filled up. It guides you to make the point, but because it focuses only on the outcomes it makes it more difficult to convey the process of reasoning. In this way, the author is co-authored, shepherded toward a certain, quite minimalist, frame of mind.

Tufte does not employ the term, pre-scriptive, but the concept is implicit in his argument. By making the concept explicit, we see how the scripted format operates to *pre-form the performance*. As such, the analysis resonates with new work in STS on the performative

---

[6] See, for example, www.eBibleTeacher.com.

character of new technologies (see Callon 1998; and especially MacKenzie and Millo 2003 on performativity in the field of finance).

As the reader's own experience likely confirms, Tufte's critique of the typical PowerPoint presentation is on target. But Tufte's critique has some serious limitations, and it should not be taken as the final word on this new technology. Most significantly, Tufte ignores the fact that a PowerPoint demonstration is a performance. For Tufte, a PowerPoint presentation is a *report.* Throughout the essay, he denounces PowerPoint presentations because they fail by comparison with printed reports. His table on "Median Number of Entries in Data Matrices for Statistical Graphics in Various Publications," for example, finds a selection of PowerPoint presentations wanting when compared with entries in *Science, Nature, the New York Times, the New England Journal of Medicine*, and so on (Tufte, 2006: 159). A Harvard School of Public Health primer that advises users of PowerPoint to use simple tables is denounced by comparison to a public health publication in 1662 showing a Table of Casualties with 1,885 different data cells which Tufte claims allows 1,719,585 pairwise comparisons (p. 178). And his table, "Character Counts and Density per Page-Image" contrasts 250 characters per page in a selection of 189 PowerPoint presentations with 13,600 characters per page in the *Physicians' Desk Reference* (p. 180).

Tufte's criticisms are valid where the printed PowerPoint *document* is submitted as a report. Yet the thrust of his essay is not about this specific limitation (in any case, much more astutely analyzed by Orlikowski and Yates, forthcoming), but rather about PowerPoint presentations in general. As a *presentation*, PowerPoint is inferior to printed reports:

> [N]early all PowerPoint slides that accompany talks have much *lower* rates of information transmission than the talk itself… As shown in this table, *the PowerPoint slide typically shows 40 words, which is about 8 seconds of silent reading material.* The example slides in PP textbooks are particularly disturbing: in 29 books, which should use first-rate examples, the median number of words per slide is 15, worthy of billboards, about 3 or 4 seconds of silent reading material (Tufte 2006:169, emphasis in the original).

The problem, most concisely, is that Tufte uses criteria more appropriate for evaluating a train schedule than for examining PowerPoint as a tool for persuasion. Whereas we agree with Tufte in the need for a careful reading of PowerPoint, we disagree with his assumption that the attendee at a PowerPoint demonstration is literally a *reader*, disappointed with only several seconds of "silent reading material." Because we see PowerPoint not as a report (Wakeford 2006) but as a means of demonstration, we are less preoccupied with rates of "information transmission" than with the economy of persuasion.

Tufte's analysis thus seems to us a poor starting point for understanding our two cases. In the first and most simple place, neither Powell nor any of the architects used the conventional bullet point formatting. With an average of 20.4 words per slide for the

architects[7] and an average of 12.3 words per slide in the Powell PowerPoint, our cases would obviously fail Tufte's test of information transmission. More importantly, although one could certainly make a case about problems of logic and use of evidence in Powell's presentation, we would fail entirely to understand that important moment by denouncing it as an impoverished persuasive style.[8] What is striking to us about both Powell and the architects is how they discover rhetorical power in the digital format.

So, rather than Tufte, we begin with Gorgias, contemporary of Plato and one of the first students of rhetoric:

> To understand that persuasion, when added to speech, is wont also to impress the soul as it wishes, one must study … logically necessary debates *in which a single speech, written with art but not spoken with truth, bends a great crowd and persuades* (Gorgias 1972, emphasis added).

Gorgias was among the first to analyze the role of images in rhetoric. The observations in his famous "Encomium on Helen" (Gorgias 1972) are uncanily apt for Powell's presentation on "Weapons of Mass Destruction":

> Through sight the soul receives an impression even in its inner features. … It has happened that people, after having seen frightening sights, have also lost presence of mind for the present moment; in this way fear extinguishes and excludes thought.

And they bear as well on the presentations of the architects:

> Moreover, whenever pictures perfectly create a single figure and form from many colors and figures, they delight the sight, while the creation of statues and the production of works of art furnish a pleasant sight to the eyes. Thus it is natural for the sight to grieve for some things and to long for others, and much love and desire for many objects and figures is engraved in many men.

It is perhaps ironic that Tufte, who has written several eloquent books on the visual display of information, entirely ignores visual images in his analysis of PowerPoint. Although they

---

[7] In fact, four of the architectural teams averaged fewer than 6 words per slide. United Architects: 5.5 words per slide, Daniel Liebeskind: 5.4 words, Peter Eisenman and Richard Meier: 2.1 words, and Norman Foster: a mere 1.4 words per slide. Among the architects, the Peterson/Littenburg team was the outlier with 56.9 words per slide.

[8] Powell's demonstration was largely rejected by his colleagues at the Security Council and by world opinion. But it had an extraordinary effect at home. Liberal Democratic Senators, including Tom Daschle, Dianne Feinstein, Joseph Biden, and John Kerry, lined up to endorse it, a *Washington Post* editorial called the evidence "irrefutable," a *New York Times* editorial hailed it as "the most powerful case to date," and opinion polls in the week after the address registered a massive shift in favor of the view that the United States had proved its case against Iraq, especially marked among those who had watched, listened to, or heard about Powell's presentation (DeYoung 2006:470-1).

have not addressed the PowerPoint format, other scholars of digital technologies, especially those working in the new field of "visual literacy," are aware that the social practices of writing and reading are undergoing fundamental transformations in our era. In the search for new concepts, it is not surprising that many turn to the classical period (Welch 1999; LaGrandeur 2003; Baetens 2003). Whereas that earlier transformation involved the movement from oralism to literacy, ours involves a transformation from printed words to screened images. Or, more accurately, it involves the technologies of new media in which the reader is simultaneously presented with words and images (Baetens 2003; Wiley 2003).

At the risk of misunderstanding, instead of starting with Tufte, who regards PowerPoint as a counterpart to the memo or a report that presents statistical tables, we would do better to understand PowerPoint by reference to the analysis of comic books. We think especially, for example, of Chris Ware's experimentation to develop a visual grammar in the graphic novel in which the reader can take in an entire image on a single page and then, through combinations of words and images in the segmented panels, experience distinctive rhythms in the passage of time (see especially Raeborn 2004). The team that assisted Colin Powell as well as those that assisted the seven architects clearly understood that they were not simply presenting a report but were narrating a story. And, like good storytellers, their screened compositions used pacing and rhythm with systematic effect.

| 5 | THE COGNITIVE STYLE OF POWERPOINT REVISITED

PowerPoint has multiple technical capacities (or affordances). It allows arranging texts and graphics in a series of pages aiming to be "projected" in front of a public, slide-by-slide, from a laptop computer onto a screen, or printed as a booklet. The primary unit for storing objects is the slide. Each slide contains one or more objects, such as title text, a bulleted list, drawing, picture, or chart. Each object on a slide can have associated formatting, such as animation effects. A look at the PowerPoint manual of instructions will teach you how to give presentations "a consistent appearance." PowerPoint uses *masters* and *AutoLayouts* that automate the process of creating a presentation. Masters determine the graphics, layout, and formatting for all the slides in a given presentation. AutoLayouts insert specific content at predefined placeholders on a slide — for example, the title and subtitle on a title slide, or the title and bulleted list on a bulleted list slide. PowerPoint uses *templates*, which are predefined sets of masters and color schemes. All templates can contain text, clip art, charts, drawings, and other elements. As part of the PowerPoint user interface, AutoLayouts cannot be created or modified, but they can be turned off.

In oral demonstration mode, PowerPoint presentations are projected onto a screen. The social studies of science have recently given attention to the "staging of facts" (Latour 1990). PowerPoint brings a new element into the picture. Just as statecraft once involved aspects of stagecraft but now the "staging" of political events has given way to the "screening" of events before the public (Sheller 2004), so today technical demonstrations are less likely to be staged than to be screened. Screening involves three simultaneous processes: the screen reveals representations, the screen conceals, the screen filters.

The rhetorical style of PowerPoint is very much in its infancy, much like the years immediately following the invention of the printing press. Scholarship on that earlier invention has argued persuasively that reshaping the graphic landscape contributed to reorganize the landscape of readers' minds (Eisenstein, 1979). But the graphic landscape of print that we take for granted today took many decades to develop (Hesse 1996; Nunberg 1996; O'Donnell 1998). Fixity was not given by print itself but was something that was shaped and then again reshaped by many contingent actors (see especially Johns 1998; his debate with Eisenstein in Johns 2002; and a useful discussion of the debate by Boczkowski and Lievrouw, forthcoming). Following the dramatic invention of the printing press were many innovations, large and small, in pagination, typefaces, punctuation, footnoting, and so on. In the PowerPoint landscape, the heading and the bullet point are two quickly established conventions. But the genre styles of PowerPoint are likely to be still evolving. By coding elements the PowerPoint demonstrations in our cases and analyzing how they were being creatively recombined, we found small innovations in the economy of digital demonstration. Not as an exhaustive catalog, we briefly present several of these elementary forms which, no less than the bullet point, should be considered in a more comprehensive analysis of the cognitive style of PowerPoint.

Blinking Effect: The Frame and the Pace

All the architects' presentations were stories of remembrance, reconciliation, and renaissance; all were dedicated to make a resurrected global city. Their task of representing rebirth was facilitated by one of the most powerful affordances of PowerPoint technology. Thanks to the *exact over-impression* of slides and the skill with which they paced it, architects could produce the feeling that, from a monumentally tragic occurrence, a life-affirming opportunity could emerge. By "exact over impression" we refer to the fact that the dimensions of a PowerPoint slide remain fixed from one slide to the next. Parts of an image can be added, subtracted, or substituted. In a sense, each slide is like a single frame in a film. Through such "blinking," the medium provides (affords) a simple animation that can be used for specific effects.

Norman Foster, for example, used this simple animation function to produce the effect of "filling the void." Starting from an aerial view of Manhattan, the point of view comes closer and closer to let the void appear. In the next series of slides, we go from the messy disaster to a more and more "re-organized" representation of the site with the reappearance of the WTC footprints, which were buried under the dust, and then later with the site plan showing the placement of Foster's buildings. The "fill in" effect not only gives the impression of something rather than nothing, but it also gives the impression of order rather than Disorder-Disaster. The over-impression effect allows keeping track of the previous slides and gives the "impression" of adding order to the chaos. This narrative organization produces the desired experience of restoration.

The United Architects team as well as the team from Skidmore Owings & Merrill (SOM) used the same technical function for a different rhetorical purpose to give the sensation of a bustling, crowded place, adding new buildings from slide to slide while keeping point of view fixed. This narrative effect would be impossible with flip charts and would still be difficult with the 35mm slide projector (where the "blinking" is all-too-noticeable), but PowerPoint makes it technically straightforward, thanks to a unitary frame and a pace regulated by the narrator who controls the gaze of his/her eyewitnesses. Some studies have shown that cognitively, it was a revolution to go from a horizontal reading to a vertical reading (Chartier 1993; Goody 1979). Here, PowerPoint demonstrations bring us a new cognitive configuration where the information is "framed" in such a way that the eyes don't have to move while the narrative fills the space. Moreover, the narrator controls the pace of this filmic, we might say, musical composition. Technical function meets rhetorical purpose with persuasive effect. This simple but powerful visual tool combined with the demonstrations' varied rhythm was a shared graphic language among the architects.

Sequential Effect: Rupture and Continuity

It is one thing to show two different images, one of devastated ground zero, one of the final buildings. It is another to show the *process* of going from the dust to the astounding skyline where a new WTC is standing, right in the middle of an astonished public. PowerPoint doesn't simply show the re-generation, it is a "live" celebration of the renewal. Rather than going directly from the initial to the last stage, the power of a PowerPoint demonstration is situated in the possibility to present the various steps, that is, to install a rhetoric of *continuity*. As we shall see, an added value in this movement is that by

demonstrating the process by which the building comes to be (in some cases, by demonstrating engineering features of its construction), the architect conveys in terms accessible to the lay public a sense of how these large towers can stand up. Visual progression lets the various elements be integrated in a cognitive landscape as well as in a physical landscape.

This visual progression, it should be emphasized, is not produced through a simple rhetoric of continuity, but rather through an efficient and effective use of *rupture.* In coding the architects' demonstrations, we see them moving abruptly from one kind of image to another—from site plan, to digital rendering, to technical drawing—scaling up and down, here moving "forward" in time to present a glimpse of the "final product" and then moving "backward" in time, within an overall logic that tends toward completion. By doing so, the demonstrator allows the spectator both to understand the concrete detailed arrangements of the abstract future project and to give her a good sense of how it could stand up and fit in the landscape.

The rhetorical effect is that, while the demonstration is *composed*, the experience of the spectator is that it has not been *imposed*. The challenge facing the architects is difficult, easier to state than to carry out: Recall that their goal is to demonstrate that their designs can make a wounded city whole. The resulting buildings must appear impressive, but they cannot be experienced as imposing. And, thus, neither should the demonstration be experienced in an imposing way. To be successful, the architect must demonstrate that his building is impressive, indeed iconic; but at the same time, given the specific program (New York City after 9/11 in which the "client" is to some extent "the public") it must also be in some sense familiar, indeed, intimate. In short, how to achieve the grandiose *and* the intimate? How to achieve a sense of familiarity with a work that literally no one has ever seen before?   And how to do all that in a twenty minute demonstration?

There are, of course, cheap tricks to produce a sense of intimacy: all but one of the architectural teams showed at least one slide in which a child could be seen together with an image of their building (and some used such a device with considerable frequency). But this kind of cheap rhetoric was trivial in proportion to a much more profound rhetorical move: the spectator gains a deeper feeling of intimacy and familiarity when he/she understands the design. The emotional states of familiarity and intimacy *can be* produced directly; but they are experienced more fully if they are produced indirectly, that is, cognitively.

To achieve this effect—by which the spectator recognizes (we might say *re-cognizes*) their buildings—the architects show their design in varied states, drawing, with subtelty, connections between the precision of particular detail and the global sense of the project. An ongoing variation in the building's state of being (not literally through the stages of its construction but figuratively—here as technical drawing, there as digital rendering, photograph of scale model, animation of its engineering features, watercolor of its location, and finally, for each and every, its postcard representation on the Manhattan skyline) allows the audience to go down into details, refining its knowledge about the building, and then jump up to the iconic and striking final building. Steadily, we move cognitively towards a finalized version of the building in cumulating knowledge's effects thanks to a series of non-sequential presentational states of the building. As it goes through this

variation of states, of point of views, of material supports, of rhythms, the building emerges as something understandable, more real and "visible" in the cognitive and physical landscape.[9] The building is not shown in its construction; instead, the viewer is shown heterogenous images—the better for the viewer to construct it, to build it up cognitively.

The changing scale was a crucial element of the demonstration. The rhythmic feelings of going from one stage to another helped the spectator to make sense of the building process. The successive move, however, did not follow a linear process that went from a small model to a more and more informed and detailed model. The ruptured jumps from an overarching view to a ground floor and vice versa, from a tiny detailed model to a full scale representation helps the spectator to gradually absorb cognitively the idea of the building, going from a realistic vision to a rhetoric of feasibility. From a very human life scale, to a historical dimension, it was just a matter of one slide. Architects played with these two opposite registers at a low cost. They were scaling up and down, going from the ground floor where life has taken is rights back, to the monumental dimension of the event, where the iconic image of the new WTC fitted in the landscape, as if it had been always there. This was the climatic conclusion of each of the PowerPoint presentations: demonstrating that it fit into the skyline and that it was *already* an icon, a postcard.

**Image 1. THINK Team. Shigeru Bon, Frederic Schwartz,
Ken Smith, and Rafael Vinoly. Digital rendering. Credit: Rafael Vinoly Architects.**

---

[9] This demonstration process thus mirrors the broader process of experimentation in the design phase. See Yaneva (2005) on the notion of "practical cognitive power" whereby architects use models not simply or even primarily as demonstrations to the client but in the actual design process. Models are a form of knowledge—not only a means of representing what one knows but also a technology for learning and producing knowledge.

Image 2. Peter Eisenman, Charles Gwathmey, Steven Holl, and Richard Meier, Digital rendering.

By seeing the building from different aspects (not, of course, simply from different angles or perspectives) the spectator builds up a set of different (kinds of) images. Paradoxical only on first inspection, rupture—movement from one type of representation to another— produces the sense of familiarity. We are guided to recognize various features across different modalities. Together with the architect, the spectator composes a building out of heterogeneous representation, and with each moment of recognition the building becomes more familiar.

Some of the architects mixed such rupture with another means to create familiarity and intimacy by using 3-dimensional animation to penetrate the displayed artifact. The "place of refuge," the sanctuary for private remembrance and reflection they wanted to build, could be experienced from within. The 3-dimensional tool allowed the spectator to infiltrate the building at a pace controlled by the demonstrator, go through doors, transport his body into the building, "climb" the stairs up to the last floor, look around to see how the view from the top of the building. In the case of the Rafael Vinoly's Think team, this possibility of experiencing the space from inside, took the form of a seamless three-minute animation (as if one "camera shot" sustained without rupture). As opposed to a textual argumentation in which the reader can skip over some parts, a PowerPoint demonstration compels spectators to follow the demonstrator. In the 3D animations in particular, as with the fixed-order character of the PowerPoint slides in general, step by step we follow the commentator up to the top floor as step by step we follow the argumentation.

Composition: Multi-media in One Medium

These effects work in relation to each other as the new technology makes it possible to bring remote facts with different textures together in front of the eye-witnesses. Whereas the demonstrations of the architects transported the spectator to some future state of the world, the demonstration of Colin Powell employed technical means to achieve the rhetorical effect of transporting the spectator to a distant place back in time. Like the

architects, Powell exploited the compositional capacity of PowerPoint by integrating video, satellite imagery, and even audio conversations in his demonstration. The facility of combining in the same text images, streaming videos and audio to *compose* a case may be the most powerful aspect of the PowerPoint rhetoric. This investigation leads us to consider an important dimension of the virtual economy of persuasion, that of the location of facts and the place of witnesses as well as the site of demonstration.

Colin Powell's presentation of evidence of Iraqi deception to the United Nations bring us back to the time when Adlei Stevenson, presented evidence to the UN Security Council during the Cuban missile crisis. The setting and the situation are similar. On October 25, 1962 after sparring with his Soviet counterpart, Adlai Stevenson turned to his demonstration:

> I doubt if anyone in this room, except possibly the representative of the Soviet Union, has any doubt *about the facts*. But in view of his statements and the statements of the Soviet Government up until last Thursday, when Mr. Gromyko denied the existence or any intention of installing such weapons in Cuba, I am going to make a portion of the evidence available right now. *If you will indulge me for a moment, we will set up an easel here in the back of the room where I hope it will be visible to everyone* (Stevenson, 1962, emphasis added).

With the assistance of an aide who turned the flip charts, Stevenson then presented a series of photographs taken from a U2 spy plane as well as a set of maps which he interpreted as demonstrating the existence of Soviet missiles on Cuban territory.

On February 5, 2003, after some opening remarks, Colin Powell introduced his demonstration in terms similar to Stevenson: "*What you will see is an accumulation of facts…*" Powell then presented, among other materials discussed below, a series of photographs and maps each of which has striking similarity to those presented by Stevenson. This deliberate parallel to Stevenson's address is one of the key underlying rhetorical strategies of Powell's demonstration.[10]

---

[10] In her biography of Colin Powell, DeYoung (2006) devotes considerable attention to the conflicts between the White House (and the office of Vice President Cheney in particular) and Powell's staff in the State Department regarding the form and content of Powell's Security Council address. On January 28, only a week before the UN address, Powell was given a forty-eight page, single-spaced, ready-to-deliver speech drafted by the vice-president's office. After attempting to work with that document, CIA director George Tenet and Powell's chief advisor, Lawrence Wilkerson decided on the afternoon of January 29th to scrap the White House document and start from scratch. "Late that night, after the senior CIA and White House officials had left for the day, Wilkerson and his colleagues watched a film he had borrowed from the State Department archives of Adlai Stevenon's historic speech to the Security Council at the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962… Stevenson had responded with irrefutable proof in the form of twenty-six grainy, poster-sized black-and-white photographs… *That 'Stevenson moment,' Wilkerson told them, was the effect they were after*" (DeYoung 2006: 462, emphasis added).

ADLAI STEVENSON, OCTOBER 25, 1962   COLIN POWELL, FEBRUARY 5, 2003

Images 3-8. Similar aerial photographs and maps from Security Council demonstrations.
(See accompanying PowerPoint document for further examples.)

But the parallels should not be overdrawn: Although the situation and the setting are similar, the technological setup has changed in the intervening forty one years. From the point of view of our media savvy era, Stevenson's remarks, asking the indulgence of his audience as they set up the easels which he hopes will be visible to everyone, seem almost charming. Powell, by contrast, makes no meta-references to the technology he is employing for it is already commonplace.

Image 9. UN Security Council, October 25, 1962.

Image 10. UN Security Council, February 5, 2003.

What Powell does do is to demonstrate, without mentioning it explicitly, is that *his* government has even more powerful surveillance technologies than those available to Stevenson. "*Let me begin by playing a tape for you. What you're about to hear is a conversation that my government monitored.*" (Powell voiceover, slide 3). With these words, Powell introduces his first piece of evidence, an audio recording of an intercepted conversation between two officers in the Iraqi Republican Guard. Then followed an avalanche of "facts,"[11] videos, satellite imagery, other photographs, drawings, maps, and another intercepted conversation, this one between a Iraqi fighter pilot and his commander.

---

[11] Powell uses the word, "facts," nine times in his seventy-five minute address.

Here we see cargo vehicles are again at this transshipment point, and we can see that they are accompanied by a decontamination vehicle associated with biological or chemical weapons activity. (Powell, voiceover PowerPoint presentation, emphasis added)

When they searched the homes of an Iraqi nuclear scientist, they uncovered roughly 2,000 pages of documents. *You see them here* being brought out of the home and placed in UN hands" (Powell, voiceover slide 11). [They were there, and the voice of Powell, over the images, was here to remind us that] "Iraq's goal was to give us in this room, to give those of us on this Council, the false impression that the inspection process was working" (Powell, voiceover, slide 10).

With this visual and audio "evidence" Powell's rhetoric suggested that, whereas Adlai Stevenson's government had spy planes, his government had even more powerful tools that could not only surveille from the skies but could reach into homes and even into the Iraqi command structure. Just as Stevenson could counter the "deception" of his Soviet counterparts, so Powell would unmask the "denial and deception" of his Iraqi counterparts. Stevenson's spy planes had revealed the existence of weapons of mass destruction. With even more powerful tools, Powell's spoke from the facts. If the world believed Stevenson, it should believe Powell.

The difference for the purposes of this study is not, of course, that Powell spoke falsely. Nor is it that Powell used "media" whereas Stevenson only used photographs. All demonstrations are mediated. The difference is that Powell could compose from multimedia *in a single medium*. With the PowerPoint"import" function, audio and video files could be loaded into the slides, flowing, seemingly effortlessly at the click of a key, into the composition. Representational materials encoded in diverse types of files could be re-presented in a single medium. The audience was in Security Council or in their homes watching the televised address, but on the screens they could be transported to the Iraqi desert. Import to transport.

Circulation and Counter-Demonstration

The heterogeneous materials with which Powell and the architects composed their demonstrations had one thing in common: they had to take the digital form. The digital morphology of the resulting PowerPoint documents then allowed for another aspect of the new geography of persuasion. Where were the PowerPoint demonstrations? As live performances they were undoubtedly in rooms—the Winter Garden and the Security Council. But as we have seen, PowerPoint is a kind of transportation system that could "bring" the home of an Iraqi official into the Security Council or "take" the audience around and inside Rafael Vinoly's World Cultural Center. Where were the PowerPoint demonstrations? On a screen, in a room, yes. But also on many screens, first on the television screens where the demonstrations were broadcast live, and then, moments later, on the computer screens where users could view the downloaded PowerPoint documents.

Within minutes after Powell's Security Council address, his PowerPoint demonstration was available on the State Department's website. By the afternoon of the Winter Garden presentations, users could find the architects' PowerPoint slides on the website of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. And if they would not think to go there, they could find them on the websites of New York Times Digital, WNYC, CNN, BBC, and dozens of other media outlets. The PowerPoint demonstrations were everywhere.

To examine this final aspect of the morphology of PowerPoint we make a brief excursus to the work of Harry Collins, a leading figure in Science and Technology Studies.[12] In an important essay, "Public Experiments and Displays of Virtuosity : the Core-Set Revisited," Collins (1988) made a critical distinction between "experiments, demonstrations, and displays of virtuosity." Experiments, Collins argued, are about *testing*; demonstrations are about *showing*. The third part of the typology is not immediately transparent from the terminology. By "display of virtuosity" Collins referred to media depictions of demonstrations. The triad moves with ever increasing degrees of staging, and ever increasing degrees of control, from uncertainty to certainty. An experiment must be controlled—in order to isolate the component of uncertainty, for to be an experiment the outcome cannot be known in advance. In a live demonstration, outcomes are known, as for example, when an actor conducts a procedure for which the experimental results are already known. These are staged; but there could still be an element of uncertainty because things can go wrong. In a display of virtuosity, this last aspect of uncertainty is eliminated. The projector might malfunction, but the presenter controls every other aspect of the presentation. Displays of virtuosity are about *lock in.* The fix is in, outcomes are locked up, contending interpretations are locked out.

Within Collins' schema, the PowerPoint performances of Powell and the architects would correspond to *demonstrations*. Something could go wrong; the demonstrator could make a terrible gaffe or otherwise mis-speak. In demonstrations other than in the Security Council—for example, as you make a PowerPoint presentation in an academic department—the demonstrator might have to deal with persistent interruptions from the audience. Within Collins' schema, the PowerPoint *document*, however, is a display of virtuosity. It seems to circulate outside the live performance in a fixed form.

Collins's essay was written before the advent of new media technology. Film and television broadcast were the forms of virtuosity he had in mind. The question we ask of Collins' schema is what happens when the display of virtuosity takes its most virtual form, posted on websites available to many users. Using Colllins' framework, could we say: the more the virtuality, the more the virtuosity?   Our cases show something different.

As we mentioned, the PowerPoint demonstrations of the architects of war and the architects of public buildings were posted almost immediately on the websites of various official agencies as well as those of numerous media outlets. Citizens could then examine these demonstrations at times convenient to them. More importantly, because the documents were digital, citizens could also download the PowerPoint documents, cut and paste materials from them, and then post them, alongside their comments, on other

---

[12] See Paravel and Stark, forthcoming, for a more elaborated discussion that situates PowerPoint in historical context of the changing topography of experiment, demonstration, and virtuosity.

websites. The materials from the Winter Garden thus began to circulate in altered form outside the control of the architects, as some citizens, for example, juxtaposed images from several of the architects or highlighted some features for praise or criticism.

Within days after Mr. Powell made the case for the invasion of Iraq, a citizen who typed "Colin Powell United Nations" or similar phrases into the Google search engine would find among the ten sites ranked most highest by the Google algorithm not only the official State Department website from which Powell's PowerPoint could be downloaded but also sites in which the images from the demonstration had been entirely reframed (see accompanying PowerPoint demonstration). Some of these counter-experts questioned whether the resolution of satellite imagery warranted the conclusions that trucks were transporting weapons of mass destruction, others noted that none of the intercepted conversations were played in their entirety, and others countered the CIA's estimates with contrary interpretations from French and British Intelligence.[13]

Broadcast over television, the demonstrations might have conformed to Collins' "displays of vituosity." But as they now re-circulated in *counter-demonstrations* on the web, they had slipped out of the control of the initial demonstrator. At the hands of "citizen-participants" (Barry 2001), from displays of virtuosity, they had become displays of volatility, with new elements of uncertainty and scepticism where the facts had once been blackboxed.

---

[13] A citizen on yet another website cut and pasted the aerial photographs alongside critical comments expressing puzzlement that the images in Powell's PowerPoint demonstrations were in black and white, noting that satellite cameras transmit images in color. Our analysis suggests an explanation: as opposed to color, black and white images would be more likely to evoke the deliberate (but unstated) analogy to the Stevenson demonstration.

| 6 | CONCLUSION: THE DISTINCTIVE MORPHOLOGY OF POWERPOINT

In the DVD that accompanies this article (and on the website where this same material is available), we provide a PowerPoint demonstration to augment the argumentation in this paper. In it we exploit frame, pace, rupture, rhythm, voiceover, and composition in a kind of demo about demonstrations. The current text is, of course, another kind of demonstration in a different medium.

Here we have argued that the auto-formatting features of PowerPoint technology are, in fact, pre-scriptive in the sense that they preform the performance. But the same technology also allows these features to be turned off, providing the discovery of new affordances different from the AutoContent Wizard and the hierarchically-ordered bullet points of the standard format. In analyzing two symetrical cases involving eight (seven plus one) PowerPoint presentations before the public, we demonstrated that the new technology could be a persuasive medium when it more fully exploited the given potential to manipulate text, sound, and image. To begin the process of studying the elementary grammar of a cognitive style of PowerPoint that departs from the text centered bullet points, we identified several basic elements of a visual rhetoric—used well, though not always for good, in the demonstrations we analyzed. Far from an exhaustive catalog of that grammar, our analysis is meant to be suggestive, in hopes of stimulating further research on the potential of this new medium for persuasion, representation, and mis-representation.

Our analysis further demonstrates the distinctive morphology of PowerPoint. Its digital character provides affordances 1) that allow heterogeneous materials to be seamlessly re-presented in a single format that 2) can morph easily from live demonstration to circulating digital documents that 3) can be utilized in counter-demonstrations. The persuasive power of digital demonstrations suggests that they are likely to become a pervasive feature of public life. Will these new forms of demonstration be corrosive of democracy? Or will they provide new tools for citizen-participants to redefine expertise in new forms of distributed intelligence? This is the generalized experiment that is one of the challenges of democracy in the age of digital demonstration.

REFERENCES

Allen, Steve. 2000. *Practice: Architecture, Technique and Representation*: N.Y.: Overseas Publishers Association.

Barry, Andrew. 2001. *Political Machines: Governing a Technological Society.* London: The Atholone Press.

Basalla, George. 1988). *The Evolution of Technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baetens, Jan. 2003. "Illustrations, Images, and Anti-Illustrations." Pp. 179-199 in Mary E. Hocks and Michelle R. Kendrick, eds., *Eloquent Images: Word and Image in the Age of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Beunza, Daniel and David Stark. 2004. "Tools of the Trade: The Socio-Technology of Arbitrage in a Wall Street Trading Room." *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 13(1):369-401.

—. 2005. "Resolving Identities: Successive Crises in a Trading Room after 9/11." Pp. 293-320 in Nancy Foner, *Wounded City: The Social Impact of 9/11*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation Press.

Bijker, Wiebe E. 1995. *Of Bicycles, Bakelites, and Bulbs. Toward a Theory of Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The MIT Press.

Bijker, Wiebe E., Thomas P. Hughes, and Trevor J. Pinch. 1990. *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo and Leah A. Lievrouw. Forthcoming. "Bridging STS and Communication Studies: Scholarship on Media and Information Technologies." In *New Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, edited by E.J. Hackett, O. Amsterdamska, M. Lynch, and J. Wajcman. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brian, E. 1995. "Le livre des sciences est-il ecrit dans la langue des historiens?" Pp. 85-98 in *Les formes de l'experience –une autre histoire sociale*, edited by B. Lepetit. Paris: Albin Michel.

Brooks, Jo Ann M. 2004. "Presentations as rites : Co-presence and visible images for organizing memory collectively." PhD dissertation, *Department of Philosophy (Public Policy)*: University of Michigan.

Callon, Michel. 1996. "Le travail de la conception en architecture." *Situations, Les cahiers de la recherche architecturale* 1-er trimètre:25-35.

—. 1998. "The Embeddedness of economic markets in economics." Pp. 1-57 *The Laws of*

the Markets edited by Michel Callon. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

—. 2004. "Europe wrestling with technology." *Economy & Society* 33:121-134.

Callon, Michel and Fabian Muniesa. 2005. "Economic markets as calculative collective devices." *Organization Studies* 26(8): 1229-1250.

Callon, Michel, Pierre Lascoumes, and Yannick Barthes. 2001. *Agir dans un monde incertain. Essai sur la democratie technique*. paris: Edition du Seuil.

Campbell, Nancy. D. 2004. "Credible performances: the performativity of science studies." *Social Studies of Science* 34:433-442.

Chartier, Roger, 1993. "Le message écrit et ses réceptions. Du codex à l'écran." *Revue des Sciences morales et politiques*, 1993, n° 2, pp. 295-313.

Clark, Colin, and Trevor Pinch. 1995. *The Hard Sell: The Language and Lessons of Street-Wise Marketing*. London: HarperCollins.

Cochoy, Frank. 1998. "Another discipline for the market economy: marketing as a performative knowledge and know-how for capitalism." Pp. 222-243 in *The Laws of the Markets* edited by Michel Callon. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Collins, Harry.M. 1988. "Public Experiments and displays of virtuosity : the core-set revisited." *Social Studies of Science* 18:725-748.

Crary, Jonathan. 2000. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Daston, L. 1991. "Marvelous facts and miraculous evidence in early modern Europe." *Critical Inquiry* 18:93-124.

DeYoung, Karen. 2006. *Soldier: The Life of Colin Powell*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Doumont, J-L. 2005. "The cognitive style of PowerPoint: Slides are not evil." *Technical communication* 52:64-70.

Eisenstein Elizabeth, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Evans, Robin. 1997. *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays*. London: Architectural Association.

Fidel, Marcus. 27 Feb 2005. "Papyrus to PowerPoint: Poppycock!" in *bmj.com*.

Johns, Adrian. 1998. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

—. 2002. "How to Acknowledge a Revolution." *American Historical Review* 107(1):106-125.

Galison, Peter. 1987. *How Experiments End*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Gibson, J.J. 1979. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Eribaum.

Girard, Monique and David Stark. 2003. "Heterarchies of Worth in Manhattan-based New Media Firms." *Theory, Culture and Society* 20(3): 77-105.

—. "Architecture Goes Public." 2005. *Volume #3* (architecture journal produced by the Office of Metropolitan Archictecture, Rem Koolhaas's studio). September.

—. 2007. "Socio-technologies of Assembly: Sense-making and Demonstration in Rebuilding Lower Manhattan." In David Lazer and Viktor Mayer-Schoenberger, eds., *Governance and Information: The Rewiring of Governing and Deliberation in the 21st Century.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press (in press).

Girard, Monique, Francesca Polletta, and David Stark. 2003. "Policy Made Public: Technologies of Deliberation and Representation in Rebuilding Lower Manhattan." Columbia University. Center on Organizational Innovation, Working Papers, May.

Gooding, D. 1985. "In nature's school: Faraday as an experimentalist." Pp. 105-35 in *Faraday rediscovered: Essay on the life and work of Michael Faraday, 1791-1876*, edited by Gooding and F.A. James. London Macmillan.

Gooding, David, Simon Schaffer, and Trevor Pinch. 1989. *The Uses of Experiment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goody, Jack. 1979. *La raison graphique*. Paris, Minuit.

Gorgias. 1972. "Encomium on Helen," trans George A. Kennedy. Pp. 50-54 In *The Older Sophists*, ed. Rosamond Kent Sprague. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Grandclement, Catherine. 2007. "Wheeling food products around the store… and away: The invention of the shopping cart, 1936-1953." Columbia University, Center on Organizational Innovation Working Papers.

Heintz, Michael. 2004. "The Digital Divide and Courtroom Technology:Can David Keep Up With Goliath?" *Federal communications law journal* 54.

Henderson, Kathryn. 1999. *On Line and On Paper: Visual Representations, Visual Culture, and Computer Graphics in Design Engineering*. Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.

Hesse, Carla. 1996. "Books in Time." Pp. 21-36 in *The Future of the Book* edited by Geoffrey Nunberg. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hocks, Mary E., and Michelle R. Kendrick (Eds.). 2003. *Eloquent Images. Word and Image in the Age of New Media.*: MIT Press.

Hutchins, Edwin. 1995. *Cognition in the Wild.* Cambridge, MA*:* MIT Press.

Knorr Cetina, Karin and Urs Bruegger. 2002. "Global Microstructures: The Virtual Societies of Financial Markets." *American Journal of Sociology* 107(4)(January):905-50.

LaGrandeur, Kevin. 2003. "Digital Images and Classical Persuasion." Pp. 117-136 in Mary E. Hocks and Michelle R. Kendrick, eds., *Eloquent Images: Word and Image in the Age of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Lanham, Richard A. 1993. *The Electronic Word: Democracy, Technology, and the Arts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1990. "Drawing Things Together." Pp. 19-68 in *Representation in Scientific Practice*, edited by M. Lynch & S. Woolgar. Cambridge: Mass/ MIT Press.

—. 1996. "Sur la pratique des theoriciens." Pp. 131-146 in *Savoirs theoriques et Savoirs d'action*, edited by J-M Barbier. Paris: PUF.

—. 2003. "The Promises of Constructivism'." in *Chasing Technoscience. Matrix for Materiality*, edited by D. Ihde & E. Selinger. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

—. 2004. *Politics of Nature. How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*: Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Latour, Bruno and Peter Weibel. eds. 2005. *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Law, John, and RJ Williams. 1982. "Putting facts together. A study of scientific persuasion." *Social Studies of Science* 12:535-558.

Lepetit, B. *Les formes de l'experience –une autre histoire sociale*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Levasseur, David G. and J. Kanan Sawyer. 2006. "Pedagogy Meets PowerPoint: A Research Review of the Effects of Computer-Generated Slides in the Classroom." *The Review of Communication*, 6(1- 2) (January-April):101- 123.

Licoppe, C. 1996. *La formation de la pratique scientifique, le discours de l'experience en France et en Angleterre (1630-1820)*. Paris: La decouverte.

Livingston, Eric. 1999. "Cultures of proving." *Social Studies of Science* 29:867-888.

Lynch, Michael. 1985. *Art and Artifact in Laboratory Science: A study of Shop Work and Shop Talk in a Research Laboratory. (Studies in Ethnomethodology).* London/Boston/Melbourne: Routledge & Kegan paul.

—. 1985. "Discipline and The Material Form of Image: An Analysis of Scientific Visibility'." *Social Studies of Science* 15:37-66.

MacKenzie, Donald and Yuval Millo. 2003. "Constructing a Market, Performing Theory: The Historical Sociology of a Financial Derivatives Exchange." *American Journal of Sociology* July 2003 109(1):107-145.

Marcus, George E. and Erkan Saka. 2006. "Assemblage." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(2-3):101-106.

Moore, James F. 1998. "The New Corporate Form." Pp. 77-95 in Don Tapscott, Alex Lowy, and David Ticoll, eds., *Blueprint to the Digital Economy: Creating Wealth in the Era of E-Business.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Morgan, Mary S. 2003. "Experiments without Material Intervention: Model Experiments, Virtual Experiments, Virtually Experiments." Pp. 216-235 in *The Philosophy of Scientific Experimentation*, edited by Hans Radder. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh press.

Norvig, P. 1999. "The Gettysburg Powerpoint Presentation." www.norvig.com/Gettysburg/index.htm

Nunberg, Geoffrey. ed. 1996. *The Future of the Book*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ochs, Elinor, Sally Jacoby, and Patrick Gonzales. 1994. "Interpretive journeys: How physicists talk and travel through graphic space." *Configurations* 2:151-171.

Ochs, Elinor, Emmanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson eds. 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Donnell, James J. 1998. *Avatars of the Word: From Papyrus to Cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paravel, Verena and David Stark. forthcoming. "The Landscape of Digital Persuasion: Experiment and Demonstration in Historical Perspective." Columbia University, Center on Organizational Innovation.

Parker, Ian. 2001. "Absolute Powerpoint. Can a software package edit our thoughts?" *The New Yorker* May 28:76.

Perelman, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1969. *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Pinch, Trevor. 1993. "Testing—one, two, three,... testing!": Towards a sociology of testing." *Science, Technology & Human Values* 18:25-41.

Porter, Tom. 1979. *How Architects Visualize*. London: Studio Vista.

Povinelli, Elisabeth. 2003a. "Technologies of Public Form: Circulation, Transfiguration, Recognition." *Technologies of Public Persuasion* 15:385-397.

___. 2003b. "Transfiguration, Recognition." *Public culture* 15:385-397.

Polletta, Francesca and Leslie Wood. 2005. "Public Deliberation after 9/11." Pp. in Nancy Foner, *Wounded City: The Social Impact of 9/11*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation Press.

Powell, Colin. 2003. "Iraq: Denial and Deception." Speech at the United Nations Security Council, February 5, 2003.transcript and PowerPoint document available at http://www.state.gov/p/nea/disarm/

Raeburn, Daniel. 2004. *Chris Ware*, "Building a Language," pp. 6-27. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Raynaud, Dominique. 2001. "Compétences et expertise professionnelle de l'architecte dans le travail de conception." *Sociologie du travail* 43:451-469.

Rosental, Claude. 2003. *La trame de l'evidence. Sociologie de la demonstration en logique.* Paris: PUF. coll. « Sciences, modernités, philosophies ».

—. 2002. "De la Demo-cratie en Amerique. Formes actuelles de la demonstration en intelligence artificielle." *Actes de la recherche en science sociales* 141-142:110-120.

Schaffer, Simon. 1983. "Natural Philosophy and Public spectacle in the eighteenth century',." *History of science* 21:1-43.

—. 1994. "Universities, instrument shops and demonstration devices in 1776." Paris: Seminaire CRHST "Spaces of experiment", nunemo 2, 10 mai.

—. 1994. "Machine Philosophy : Demonstration Devices in Georgian Mechanics." *OSIRIS* 9:157-182.

—. 2005. "Public experiments." Pp. 298-307 in *Making Things Public. Atmosphere of democracy*, edited by Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel. The MIT Press / Cambridge, Massachussets/ London, England.

Schoeneborn, Dennis B. "Consistency Encounters Contingency. The Application of

PowerPoint for Knowledge Management Purposes and Its Differentiation as a Genre of Organizational Communication."

Schwartz, John. 2003. "The Level of Discourse Continues to Slide." *New York Times* (September 28).

Shapin, Steven. 1988. "The house of experiment in seventeenth century England." *Isis* 79.

Shapin, Steven, and Simon Schaffer. 1985. *Leviathan and the air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and The Experimental Life.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sheller, Mimi. 2004. "Mobile publics: beyond the network perspective." *Environment and Planning D* 2004 22:39-52.

Stevenson, Adlai. 1962. "Cuban Missile Crisis Speech at the United Nations Security Council." October 25, 1962. Transcript available at http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Adlai_Stevenson's_Cuban_Missile_Crisis_speech_to_the_United_Nations_Security_Council

Stewart, T. 2001. "Ban It Now! Friends Don't Let Friends Use PowerPoint." *Fortune* (February).

Tufte, Edward R. 2006. "The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint: Pitching Out Corrupts Within." Pp. 156-185 in Tufte, *Beautiful Evidence.* Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press LLC.

Wakeford, Nina. 2006. "Power Point and the Crafting of Social Data." *Proceeding of the 2006 EPIC conference*, pp. 94-108.

Welch, Kathleen E. 1999. *Electric Rhetoric: Classical Rhetoric, Oralism, and the New Literacy.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wiley, Jennifer. 2003. "Cognitive and Educational Implications of Visually Rich Media: Images and Imagination." Pp. 201-215 in Mary E. Hocks and Michelle R. Kendrick, eds., *Eloquent Images: Word and Image in the Age of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Yaneva, Albena. 2005. "Scaling Up and Down: Extraction Trials in Architectural Design." *Social Studies of Science* 35.

Yates, Joanne, and Wanda Orlikowski. Forthcoming. "The PowerPoint Presentation and Its Corollaries : How Genres Shape Communicative Action in Organizations." in *The Cultural Turn: Communicatives Practices in Workplaces and the Professions*, edited by Mark Zachry and Charlotte Thralls. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing.

ISERP Working Papers

<u>2007</u>

07-03: "No Entiendo: The Effects of Bilingualism on Hispanic Earnings," Jeronimo Cortina, Political Science, Columbia University, Rodolfo de la Garza, Political Science and International Affairs and Public Affairs, Columbia University, Pablo Pinto, Political Science, Columbia University

07-02: "The Assessment of Poverty and Inequality through Parametric Estimation of Lorenz Curves," Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University, Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics

07-01: "Implementing Second-Best Environmental Policy under Adverse Selection," Glenn Sheriff, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University

<u>2006</u>

06-01: "The Impact of Parental Marital Disruption on Children's Performance in School," Christopher Weiss, ISERP, Columbia University, Kathleen Foley, University of Pennsylvania

06-02: "The Choice of Index Number: Part I, Valuation and Evaluation," Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics, Benjamin Plener, Yale University

06-03: "Real Income Stagnation of Countries, 1960-2001," Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics, Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University

06-04: "Chinese Poverty: Assessing the Impact of Alternative Assumptions," Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics, Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University

06-05: "Spaghetti Politics," Paolo Parigi, Sociology, Columbia University, Peter Bearman, Sociology, Columbia University

06-06: "Attention Felons: Evaluating Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago," Andrew Papachristos, University of Chicago, Tracey Meares, University of Chicago, Jeffrey Fagan, Law, Columbia University

06-07: "Dynamics of Political Polarization," Delia Baladassarri, Columbia University, Peter Bearman, Columbia University

06-08: "Why do Some Countries Produce So Much More Output per Worker than Others?" Emmanuel Pikoulakis, University of Hull Business School, Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University

06-09: "Trivers-Willard at Birth and One Year: Evidence from U.S. Natality Data 1983-2001," Douglas Almond, Economics, Columbia University, Lena Edlund, Economics, Columbia University

06-10: "Forecasting House Seats from General Congressional Polls," Robert Erikson, Political Science, Columbia University

06-11: "From Drafts to Checks: The Evolution of Correspondent Banking Networks and the Formation of the Modern U.S. Payments System, 1850-1914," John James, Economics, University of Virginia, David Weiman, Economics, Barnard College, and History, Columbia University

2005

05-01: "Social Construction of Flows: Price Profiles Across Producers Gear to Market Context Upstream, Downstream and Cross-Stream," Harrison White, Sociology, Columbia University

05-02: "Temporality and Intervention Effects: Trajectory Analysis of a Homeless Mental Health Program," Mary Clare Lennon, Public Health, Columbia University, William McAllister, ISERP, Li Kuang, Public Health, Columbia University, Daniel Herman, Public Health, Columbia University

05-03: "Do Parents Help More Their Less Well-off Children?: Evidence from a Sample of Migrants to France," François-Charles Wolff, Université de Nantés, Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Columbia University, and Claudine Attias-Donfut, Caisse Nationale d'Assurance Vieillesse

05-04: "Politics, Public Bads, and Private Information," Glenn Sheriff, International and Public Affairs, Columbia University

05-05: "Determinants of Justification and Indulgence," Ran Kivetz, School of Business, Columbia University, Yuhuang Zheng, School of Business, Columbia University

05-06: "Political Competition and Policy Adoption: Market Reforms in Latin American Public Utilities," Victoria Murillo, International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, Cecilia Martinez-Gallardo, Centro de Investigación y Docéncia Económica

05-07: "In Search of Lost Memories: Domestic Spheres and Identities in Roman Amheida, Egypt," Anna Lucille Boozer, Anthropology, ISERP Graduate Fellow, Columbia University

05-08: "Global Links, Local Roots: Varieties of Transnationalization and Forms of Civic Integration," David Stark, Sociology, Columbia University, Balazs Vedres, Central European University, Laszlo Bruszt, European University Institute

05-09: "Socio-Technologies of Assembly: Sense-Making and Demonstration in Rebuilding Lower Manhattan," Monique Girard, ISERP, Columbia University, David Stark, Sociology, Columbia University

2004

04-01: "Reducing Bias in Treatment Effect Estimation in Observational Studies Suffering from Missing Data," Jennifer Hill, International and Public Affairs, Columbia University

04-02: "Production Markets Broker Upstream to Downstream, balancing their volume and quality sensitivities to firms through an oriented market profile of signals," Harrison C. White, Sociology, Columbia University

04-03: "Measuring Economic Disadvantage During Childhood: A Group-Based Modeling Approach," Robert L. Wagmiller, Jr., SUNY Buffalo, Mary Clare Lennon, Public Health, Columbia University, Philip M. Alberti, Public Health, Columbia University, and J. Lawrence Aber, New York University

04-04: "Policymaking and Caseload Dynamics: Homeless Shelters," William McAllister, ISERP, and Gordon Berlin, Columbia University

04-05: "Fresh Starts: School Form and Student Outcomes," Christopher Weiss, ISERP, Columbia University and Peter S. Bearman, Sociology, ISERP, Columbia University

04-06: "Parental Wealth Effects On Living Standards and Asset Holdings: Results From Chile," Florencia Torche, Sociology, Queens College, Center for the Study of Wealth and Inequality, Columbia University and Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Center for the Study of Wealth and Inequality, Columbia University

04-07: "Routes into Networks: The Structure of English Trade in the East Indies, 1601-1833," Emily Erikson, Sociology, ISERP, Columbia University and Peter Bearman, Sociology, ISERP, Columbia University

2003

03-01: "The Plasticity of Participation: Evidence From a Participatory Governance Experiment," Shubham Chaudhuri, Economics, Columbia University, and Patrick Heller, Sociology, Brown University

03-02: "Factional Politics and Credit Networks in Revolutionary Vermont," Henning Hillmann, Sociology, Columbia University

03-03: " 'Active Patients' in Rural African Health Care: Implications for Welfare, Policy and Privatization," Kenneth L. Leonard, Economics, Columbia University

03-04: "Living at the Edge: America's Low-Income Children and Families," Hsien-Hen Lu, Public Health, Columbia University, Julian Palmer, Younghwan Song, Economics, Union College, Mary Clare Lennon, Public Health, Columbia University, Lawrence Aber, Public Health, Columbia University

2002

02-01: "Alternative Models of Dynamics in Binary Time-Series-Cross-Section Models: The Example of State Failure," Nathaniel Beck, Political Science, UC San Diego, David Epstein, Political Science, Columbia, Simon Jackman, Political Science, Stanford and Sharyn O'Halloran, Political Science, Columbia

02-03: "Link, Search, Interact: The Co-Evolution of NGOs and Interactive Technology," Jonathan Bach, Center on Organizational Innovation, Columbia University and David Stark, Center on Organizational Innovation, Columbia University

02-04: "Chains of Affection: The Structure of Adolescent Romantic and Sexual Networks," Peter Bearman, Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy, Columbia University, James Moody, Sociology, Ohio State, Katherine Stovel, Sociology, University of Washington

02-05: "Permanently Beta: Responsive Organization in the Internet Era," Gina Neff, Center on Organizational Innovation (COI), Columbia University, and David Stark, Center on Organizational Innovation (COI), Columbia University

02-06: "Negotiating the End of Transition: A Network Approach to Political Discourse Dynamics, Hungary 1997," Balázs Vedres, Columbia University, Péter Csigó, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales

02-07: "The Influence of Women and Racial Minorities Under Panel Decision-Making in the U.S. Court of Appeals," Sean Farhang, Political Science, Columbia University, Gregory Wawro, Political Science, Columbia University

02-08: "The Role of Effort Advantage in Consumer Response to Loyalty Programs: The Idiosyncratic Fit Heuristic" Ran Kivetz, Business, Columbia University, Itamar Simonson, Business, Stanford University

2001

01-01: "Pathways of Property Transformation: Enterprise Network Careers in Hungary, 1988-2000 Outline of an Analytic Strategy," David Stark, Sociology, Columbia and Balázs Vedres, Sociology, Columbia

01-02: "Policy Space and Voting Coalitions in Congress: the Bearing of Policy on Politics, 1930-1954," Ira Katznelson, John Lapinski, and Rose Razaghian, Political Science, Columbia

01-03: "Doing Fractions: An Analysis of Partisan ship in Post-Socialist Russia," Andrew D. Buck, Sociology, Columbia

01-04: "Opposite-Sex Twins and Adolescent Same-Sex Attraction," Peter Bearman, Sociology/ISERP and Hannah Brückner, Sociology, Yale

01-05: "On the Uneven Evolution of Human Know-How," Richard R. Nelson, Business/SIPA, Columbia

01-06: "Self-Control for the Righteous: Toward a Theory of Luxury Pre-Commitment," Ran Kivetz, Business, Columbia and Itamar Simonson, Business, Stanford

01-07: "Distributing Intelligence and Organizing Diversity in New Media Projects," Monique Girard, ISERP, Columbia and David Stark, Sociology, Columbia

01-08: "Agricultural Biotechnology's Complementary Intellectual Assets," Gregory D. Graff, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Berkeley, Gordon C. Rausser, Agricultural Economics, Berkeley and Arthur A. Small, SIPA/Earth Institute, Columbia

FEBRUARY 2007