THE PUBLIC SPEAKING PUBLIC: AN ANALYSIS OF A RHETORIC OF PUBLIC SPEAKING PEDAGOGY

Matt McGarrity

Submitted for the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Communication and Culture
Indiana University
June 2005
Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Patricia Hayes Andrews, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Rosa A. Eberly, Ph.D.

Jeffrey C. Isaac, Ph.D.

Robert L. Ivie, Ph.D.

Robert E. Terrill, Ph.D.

September 8, 2004
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe thanks to the members of my committee who helped me develop and complete this dissertation. In particular, I would like to thank Jeff Isaac who has long modeled for me the best traits of an engaged scholar. I am grateful to Rosa Eberly who encouraged me with her scholarship and her words. Finally, I would have never written nor completed this dissertation without the help of Pat Andrews. Her constant guidance and support were vital to my work. I consider it a distinct privilege to have been her final advisee at Indiana University.

I would also like to thank the other Communication and Culture faculty members at Indiana University, particularly Jim Andrews. Though Jim was not a member of my committee he has always proven to be a wonderful role model for good scholarship. Thanks are also due to my friends and colleagues in the Department of Communication and Culture. I would especially like to thank George LaMaster, who sat through many discussions about this dissertation at Kilroy’s. He helped me sort through a number of issue.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their support during this long process. My parents and my brother were always willing to listen to me talk about this project or simply vent my frustrations. I would especially like to thank my wife Laura. Were it not for her constant love and support I would never have been able to earn my degree. This work is dedicated to her.
THE PUBLIC SPEAKING PUBLIC: AN ANALYSIS OF A RHETORIC OF PUBLIC SPEAKING PEDAGOGY

This dissertation examines how the Communication discipline rhetorically constructs the public speaking course. Following the work of Stephen North, who studied the oral and textual means by which the field of Composition created a shared frame for teaching and discussing the composition class, this dissertation studies how teachers and scholars of Communication create a shared frame for teaching the public speaking course. North calls this shared frame a discipline’s “teaching lore.” In this dissertation, I examine how aspects of public speaking lore operate in textbooks and teaching materials, how lore is critiqued in journals, and how the field might best challenge this public speaking lore.

This dissertation examines those aspects of lore appearing in textbooks, teaching materials, syllabi, and interviews with public speaking teachers and textbook writers. This dissertation argues that the lore that appears in such materials minimizes the role that invention plays in a study of rhetoric.

This dissertation examines how teachers and scholars of Communication critique public speaking lore in academic journals. It argues that such critiques avoid close analysis of public speaking texts. Instead, these critiques attack lore with straw arguments.
Finally, this dissertation provides some strategies for challenging public speaking lore. It outlines a model for the public speaking class that challenges lore’s weak form of rhetorical invention. This dissertation also calls for changes to disciplinary discourse in order to improve the quality of public speaking lore criticism.

Patricia Hayes Andrews, Ph.D.
Chairperson
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Unlike other forms of disciplinary knowledge, the public speaking course receives little critical analysis. Common opinion seems to deny the public speaking course any theoretical or disciplinary validity. When the public speaking course is discussed in disciplinary spaces, it is framed as lacking theory (Leff, “Teaching Public Speaking;” Frobish; Pearson and Nelson), lacking ethics (Hess, “Rethinking Our Approach to the Basic Course;” Hess, “Teaching Ethics;” Schwartzman), and generally lacking quality. However, such criticism does not examine how the presumed model for teaching the public speaking course gained and maintains dominance. Although public speaking classes make up a significant portion of the Communication discipline’s course offerings, this aspect of the discipline receives virtually no significant critical attention.

Journals and fields of study that proclaim a dedication to communication education often avoid close analysis of public speaking texts and practices. While the sub-field of instructional communication has provided some insights into various aspects of student-teacher communication, instructional communication does not critique or develop pedagogical models for the public speaking course. Jo Sprague argues that instructional communication “has asked a narrow set of questions derived more from the demands of a preferred research methodology than from a mission to generate helpful findings for practitioners and policy makers” (“The Spiral Continues” 341). Public speaking receives some attention in Communication Education, but often the course simply serves as a site for studying communication apprehension or verbal aggressiveness. Apart from the 2002 Ronald Walter Greene article discussed later, over
fifteen years have passed since Quarterly Journal of Speech published an article relating to classroom teaching and that article dealt with the need to increase the study of media (Haynes, “Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Media”). The Basic Communication Course Annual (BCCA) addresses the basic course exclusively (though not necessarily the basic public speaking course) and includes an eclectic mix of teaching ideas, pedagogy, and instructional communication studies. Unfortunately, the BCCA exists more as a specialty publication that is read and cited infrequently by the majority of the discipline.

This studied avoidance of the public speaking course was not always the norm. The public speaking course was a motivating factor for a group of public speaking teachers to break away from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) in 1914 and establish the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking (NAATPS). Andrew Weaver later named this founding group the “Seventeen Who Made History,” though perhaps the founding itself arrived with a bit less fanfare. In fact, the emerging discipline’s future was notably hazy. As the NAATPS sought to distinguish itself from the NCTE, members argued vigorously in the first editions of Quarterly Journal of Speech (then named The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking) about what it meant to study and teach public speaking. Pedagogical discussions during this early period enjoyed widespread participation from a variety of scholars. Public speaking was not simply a service course that had little impact on scholarship and research; the course was a key factor in the foundation of the discipline and not something to be ignored. The public willing to participate in discussions of public speaking pedagogy was thus quite active during this foundational period. Unfortunately,
the public that discusses and debates the public speaking course today is not nearly as robust.

This dissertation seeks to explore some of the strategies by which disciplinary discourse establishes certain social truths about the course, the implications of these truths, as well as some mechanisms for challenging these established social truths. In so doing, this dissertation hopes to understand some of the strategies and processes that rhetorically construct the public speaking course. While the remaining chapters provide a more detailed analysis and critique of how teachers and scholars of public speaking generate and circulate texts that create and sustain this rhetorical creation, this first chapter outlines the rhetorical nature of the public speaking course and the nature of this study. This chapter begins by exploring how the knowledge of the public speaking course can be understood in terms of Stephen North’s concept of “lore.” Drawing on the work of Michael Warner, this chapter examines how the public speaking teaching and reading community functions as a public. Next, this chapter combines North’s work on lore with Warner’s work on publics to chart out how this public circulates lore. This chapter then explains why lore often appears in the disciplinary spaces of textbooks, journals, and talk, and describes how the materials for this dissertation were collected and analyzed. After having developed some of the key theoretical terms for this study, this chapter concludes by explaining how this study functions in relationship to pedagogy.
Lore

In his analysis of how the field of Composition generates and circulates knowledge about teaching composition, Stephen North identifies a number of different modes of inquiry used by Compositionists. He draws on Paul Diesing’s investigation of the discourse of social sciences, which suggests that different modes of inquiry make up different “methodological communities.” Diesing writes:

A community is located by finding people who interact regularly with one another in their work. They read and use each other’s ideas, discuss each other’s work, and sometimes collaborate. They have common friends, acquaintances, intellectual ancestors, and opponents, and thus locate themselves at roughly the same point in sociometric space. Their interaction is facilitated by shared beliefs and values--goals, myths, terminology, self-concepts--which make their work mutually intelligible and valuable. (Diesing 17-18; quoted in North, 2)

North goes on to suggest that the field of Composition can be understood as encompassing three general methodological communities: Practitioners, Scholars, and Researchers. His work explores how these different communities interact and create a shared body of knowledge that affects how teachers and students experience the composition course. For North, Practitioners tend to be those teachers and course directors who are concerned primarily with the pragmatics of teaching the composition course to undergraduates; this community, he notes, is the largest in the field of Composition but rarely publishes academic work. North classifies as Scholars those Historians, Philosophers, and Critics who operate in a humanistic tradition and usually
profess a dedication to rhetoric as a professional label and an intellectual heritage.

Historians study either the history of composition or the history of rhetoric as it interfaces with composition. Philosophers of composition examine its “philosophical underpinnings.” Critics analyze either student or teacher discourse as texts. North classifies as Researchers those Experimentalists, Clinicians, Formalists, and Ethnographers who share a social scientific orientation to studying the act of composition. Experimentalists “seek to discover generalizable ‘laws’ which can account for—and, ideally predict—the ways in which people do, teach, and learn writing” (137). Clinicians examine individual cases in order to learn how individuals do, teach, and learn writing. Formalists “build models or simulations by means of which they attempt to examine the formal properties of the phenomena under study” (original emphasis 137). Ethnographers study teachers and/or writers as unique communities warranting detailed explanations.

These various communities bear some type of relationship with the “lore” of composition, which North defines as “the accumulated body of traditions, practices, and beliefs in terms of which Practitioners understood how writing is done, learned, and taught” (22). This sense of lore, he argues, is developed through teachers reflecting on their positive and negative teaching experiences and then communally sharing these experiences. North suggests that lore adheres to a pragmatic and experiential logic. Lore “is concerned with what has worked, is working, and might work in teaching” (23). This logic enables three specific features of lore. First, North notes, “literally anything can become part of lore” (24). The only requirement for a teaching strategy to become part of lore is for someone to suggest that a particular strategy worked or might work.
Second, “While anything can become a part of lore, nothing can ever be dropped from it, either. There is simply no mechanism for it” (24). Members of the teaching community cannot simply remove an unsuccessful teaching strategy from lore. “Lore’s various elements are not pitted against one another within the framework of some lore-specific dialectic, or checked and re-checked by Practitioner experiments, so that the weakest and least useful are eliminated” (24). As such, lore is constantly accumulating new teaching strategies. While old strategies may suffer from lack of use, they remain, in North’s formulation, a part of lore. Third, “Because lore is fundamentally pragmatic, contributions to it have to be framed in practical terms, as knowledge about what to do; if they aren’t, they will be changed” (25). Any attempt to frame teaching knowledge or experiences as philosophical will become pragmatic as practitioners of lore transform these insights into teaching recommendations.

North notes that the Practitioner community emerges from “a shared institutional experience” (28). Consequently, lore also emerges in response to teachers’ shared institutional conditions. Such teaching recommendations gain currency when they offer solutions to commonly experienced teaching problems. This institutional aspect of lore provides grist for the informal discussions of Compositionists.\(^1\) North argues that lore is an oral body of knowledge, transmitted when individuals work out solutions to their shared institutionalized educational challenges by talking to other teachers. This holds particularly true for graduate training programs that officially induct the next generation of teachers into the most useful lore in order to help graduate students survive their first

\(^1\) I capitalize the field of Composition and its scholars Compositionists. I do not capitalize the act of composing or class of composition.
teaching assignment. This is only one example of the means by which institutions and programs circulate lore orally.

Lore is also written down and appears in teaching materials like textbooks. Since lore offers a series of solutions to common teaching challenges, textbook writers and publishers have an economic incentive to identify and highlight the most useful and popular aspects of public speaking lore. Lore also appears in the Instructor Resource Manuals (IRMs) that accompany public speaking textbooks. Lore in fact thrives more in IRMs than in textbooks since IRMs are aimed exclusively at the teaching community, who is the primary consumer and user of lore. While textbooks simultaneously address both teachers and students, IRMs plainly list and discuss the techniques for effectively managing the course that stand at the heart of lore.

Lore is critiqued in academic journals. Because lore is developed in response to shared material conditions and circulated widely among teachers, it also impacts the larger disciplinary community. Critiques of lore tend to reject this body of knowledge as sloppy and thus damaging to the discipline as a whole. Of course, criticism of lore cannot be separated from the overall production of lore; a critique of the pedagogical frame for public speaking also contributes to that frame. Since critiques of lore tend to identify problems with lore and then provide solutions, they are contributing more teaching recommendations to the shared body of teaching knowledge. Critiques of lore thus do not stand outside the production of this shared body of knowledge; they merely approach it from a different angle.

Finally, lore is privately applied. Despite the fact that a large and ongoing discourse community contributes to lore, each individual teacher decides which aspects
of lore to use. “The communal lore offers options, resources, and perhaps some
directional pressure; but the individual, finally, decides what to do and whether (or how)
it has worked” (North 28). This private application does not undercut the significant
framing capacities of lore. An individual could conceivably develop a relatively
complete composition (or public speaking) pedagogy in isolation, with no significant
contact with the existing lore or the existing teaching community, but this scenario is
unlikely. The shared conditions of the class, the common teaching materials, and the
similar institutional settings all predispose teachers towards interacting with lore’s
advice and teaching strategies. While one teacher’s exact form of lore will undoubtedly
differ from any other teacher’s, there are significant overlaps that can explain, in part,
the high degree of regularity between different public speaking programs at any given
period.

The Public Speaking Public

Much of the contemporary interest in public sphere theory in American
scholarship can be traced back to the 1989 English translation of Jürgen Habermas’s The
Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois
Society. That Habermas’s work has been richly suggestive is evidenced by the host of
critical commentators who have emerged to challenge and extend his work. While
Compositionists have applied Habermas’s work to the teaching of public writing (Wells,
“The Teaching of Technical Discourse”; Wells “Rogue Cops and Health Care”),
rhetorical scholars in Communication have shown less enthusiasm in using Habermas as
a means for thinking about the teaching of oral communication.² The public sphere
tory emanating from The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere and the
discussion surrounding this work provides a set of useful starting points for our
analysis.³ While sensitive to the work of Habermas and Habermas’s critics, I would like
to use the work of Michael Warner to explore how the circulation of public speaking
lore creates and reflects a loose public that I term “the public speaking public.”
Warner’s inquiry into publics and counterpublics is particularly rich for examining this
public since it calls attention to the importance of circulation and the role of institutions
in the development of a public (Warner, The Letters of the Republic; Publics and
Counterpublics; “Publics and Counterpublics (Abbreviated Version)”).

Warner’s work on publics and counterpublics begins with the assumption that
publics are wholly discursive entities. He writes, “A public is a space of discourse
organized by nothing other than discourse itself. It is autotelic; it exists only as the end
for which books are published, shows broadcast, Web sites posted, speeches delivered,
opinions produced. It exists by virtue of being addressed” (Publics and Counterpublics
67). Given this discursive nature, a public, unlike a group or an audience, does not
require physical co-presence in order to exist; members do not need to see or to know
one another in order to be counted as participating members of the same public. Warner
writes, “Belonging to a public seems to require at least minimal participation, even if it
is patient or notional, rather than a permanent state of being” (Publics and

² The obvious exception to this is Farrell’s use of Habermas in The Norms of Rhetorical Culture. Though
Farrell’s theory of rhetoric is normative, it would be a stretch to suggest that this work is pedagogical in
spirit. Also, Gerard Hauser’s use of Habermas’s approach to publics is discussed below.
³ Unfortunately, the Habermas of Communicative Action, with his resistance to rhetoric and instrumental
discourse has perhaps prevented rhetoricians from exploring his earlier work on public spheres. Thomas
McCarthy, in the translator’s introduction to Communication and the Evolution of Society, sees a division
in Habermas’s thought emerging when he began working in universal pragmatics.
Counterpublics 71). Attention to the texts of a public thus constitutes the thinnest form of public participation. Similarly, Hauser asserts, “Since communication is the means by which public issues acquire publicity, there is every reason to suspect that publics exist only as they manifest their publicness” (64). In other words, a public is what a public does--it exists in discursive exchanges and it thus ceases to exist when interest in the discourse of the public fades.

Since physical co-presence is unnecessary, members of a public are often strangers, “A public sets its boundaries and its organization by its own discourse rather than by external frameworks only if it openly addresses people who are identified primarily through their participation in the discourse and who therefore cannot be known in advance” (Publics and Counterpublics 74). Members of a public are drawn together by the discourse primarily instead of by some other positive identity component (race, religion, etc.). Thus, a writer sitting down to address a public addresses a group of strangers in the sense that the writer cannot know definitely ahead of time who will read the text and who will circulate the text; all the writer knows is that the readers of the text will be members of the public because they consume and potentially circulate the text. Scholars writing for academic publics may simulate this strangeness (i.e., writing for a general audience instead of a tightly conceived audience of one’s peers), but there are institutional limitations that enable a writer to make some educated guesses about the nature of the reading public. Scholars addressing the public speaking public experience these institutional boundaries even more tangibly since the public is organized, in part, by the material experience of the public speaking class.
There are two related questions that test the limits of membership in such a public. First, does the writer know her audience in advance? Second, do some individuals qualify as members of the public regardless of being aware of their participation? If the answer to both of these questions is yes, then the public is not primarily discursive, but is a group based on some positive identity content. For example, nations and groups count as members those who do not think of themselves as members (they can be awake, asleep, insane, etc.); the primary criterion for membership in these groups is some positive identity content (in this case, the holder of citizenship). Participation in the public speaking public is not based primarily on the positive identity content, but upon discourse, albeit discourse that exists in relation to positive identity content. We might say that the public speaking public, at its core, is defined by discourse, though positive identity content plays an important role in the development of this discourse.

At the core of the public speaking public, we find a discussion of the methods, goals, and related issues concerning the teaching of public speaking (in other words, an active discussion of lore). The authors and researchers producing this scholarship could be said to be the most active participants of this public because they produce texts for the public and circulate others texts through reference and citation. Further out we find those members of the public who grant their notional attention to the discourse of the public through contact with teaching training programs, contact with scholarly articles, informal conversations with colleagues, or even reading a public speaking textbook used to teach a public speaking class. Still further, we find those members who do not exist in daily conversation with other teachers of public speaking, or perhaps no longer use a
textbook to teach the course, but at academic conventions still circulate among those members who do participate more fully in the public. This concentric understanding of membership in a public moves from primarily discursive participation (most active) at the center of the public to primarily identity-based membership (least active) at the periphery. Since inactive members participate in the discourse, no member can know the addressee ahead of time; but the smaller the public, the greater the chances of the addressee making an educated guess about the possible circumstances of the addressee.

I thus side with Hauser’s criterion of participation: “We belong to a community insofar as we are able to participate in its conversations. We must acquire its vernacular language in order to share rhetorically salient meanings” (original emphasis 67). Those who lack the language unique to the public speaking public cannot really be said to be members. The circulation of public speaking lore thus requires a basic awareness of its tenets. While the most active members of this public are involved in contributing to and critiquing lore, less active members still participate in the public through the circulation and consumption of lore.

In sum, positive identity content is not the primary criterion for participation in the public speaking public, nor is it completely irrelevant. Being a public speaking teacher does not “saturate” identity since it can be a temporary identity marker. Some individuals move on never to teach the public speaking course again, though they still participate in the public inasmuch as they continue to talk about the course and read and circulate the public’s texts. In fact, some influential texts circulating in the public are written by individuals who give their attention to lore, but reject the public speaking teacher label (for example, those who strongly critique lore and refuse to teach the
Such individuals affect the public since they circulate texts and provoke responses. They are thus members of the public even though they reject the positive identity marker. An example from the related body of literature dealing with general speech education might be Michael Burgoon’s article, “Instruction About Communication: On Divorcing Dame Speech.” Burgoon participates in the discourse about speech education while simultaneously refusing to be associated with departments of Speech. Ultimately, we can say that the public speaking public is defined primarily by its discourse rather than the positive identity content of its members because members can participate in the circulation of lore without actually being a teacher of public speaking. Most members are probably teachers of public speaking or have taught the course in the past, but this activity is not essential to the circulation of the public’s discourse.

Since positive identity content and institutional demands play such an important role in the nature of the public speaking public, we must ask the question: in what ways is the public speaking public a self-organizing, autotelic public? We might say that the public emerging from the “rhetoric of science” discourse is largely self-organizing and autotelic; apart from the pressures of tenure-track publishing, the rhetoric of science public is organized largely by its discourse and does not require the co-presence of readers and authors. Participants who circulate texts pertaining to the rhetoric of science need do nothing more than grant their attention to the discourse of the public in

---

4 The rhetoric of science public have circulated texts in various journals and books over the past ten years. This public both circulates their analysis of science texts and performs reflexive analysis of their methods for investigating scientific texts (Cecarelli, “Rhetorical Criticism”; Cecarelli, Shaping Science with Rhetoric; Constantinides; Desilet; Fuller; Fuller and Collier; Gross and Keith; Harris; Jorgensen-Earp and Jorgensen; Kepplinger; Kloep; Lessl, “The Galileo Legend as Scientific Folklore”; Lessl, “Intelligent Design”; Lessl, “Naturalizing Science”; Lyne; Nelson; Reeves; Taylor).
order to count themselves among its members. While the analysis of the rhetoric of science operates with a tacit faith that such scholarship can lead to an increased reflexivity on the part of science practitioners, the members of the rhetoric of science public may or may not be science practitioners. And while the economic pressures of publishing for tenure serve as a benefit of active participation in this public, an author could easily participate in some other academic discussion if her goals were simply economic. That is, the public is organized primarily by the discourse rather than by the member’s immediate need to perform science or produce the scholarship necessary to keep a job (though these considerations contribute to the structure of the public itself).

Charting the public speaking public’s self-organizing nature proves difficult since the public is not only tied to the economics of tenure track publishing but also some members’ immediate need to accomplish a specific task. We may thus refine our original question: does the task (teaching public speaking) organize individuals as a group or do individuals create a public by circulating lore? I believe it is the latter. First, since we can count as members of the public speaking public those individuals who do not currently teach the course, the task itself is not the sole criterion for membership in the public. Second, since the institutional nature of the task creates the shared conditions that provide the substance for the public’s discourse, institutions do not solely create or sustain the public itself. In fact, the institutions of teaching and publishing may in fact present obstacles to the wide circulation of lore (for example, textbooks are awarded less status than other scholarly ventures, the public speaking course is awarded less status as a class, etc.). Warner concedes that a public “appears to be open to indefinite strangers but in fact selects participants by criteria of shared social
space (though not necessarily territorial space), habitus, topical concerns, intergeneric references, and circulating intelligible forms” (Publics and Counterpublics 106). Warner thus recognizes that the institutional supports that predispose certain publics to their particular membership do not determine a public’s membership. Ultimately, the public speaking public is not entirely autotelic; it is discursive since it exists in order to circulate lore, but this lore exists in order to assist with the successful accomplishment of a practical institutional task. Therefore, the continued existence of public speaking courses at the institutional level ensures that individuals, who may or may not actually teach the course (but interact with it in some manner), will continue to have an interest in texts that address the public speaking course, thus the public will continue to have a reason to circulate the discourse of the public.

Additionally, published critiques of lore assume public characteristics. Discussion and debates about the public speaking course operate with the notion that public speaking pedagogy is both a private and public decision. While an individual’s unique teaching practices may not affect the nature of lore directly, more obviously public texts like textbooks may influence the nature of lore. Though syllabus decisions are framed as private choices, the debates over “the public speaking course” assume public importance since the decisions regarding textbooks and curricular matters are assumed to impact teachers as members of the public. This again demonstrates how this discourse community operates as a public. Olson and Goodnight write, “publicness is an immanent characteristic of argumentative engagements that are open by virtue of implicit or explicit claims to speak for or to those whose interests are affected in making common action” (250). Although public speaking textbooks are individual texts, they
operate as texts that represent “all of us” and can affect what “we” can teach. Critiques of lore thus assume, as in Goodnight’s formulation, public characteristics.

The Circulation of Lore in the Public Speaking Public

North correctly identifies lore’s oral nature as an important aspect of this type of discourse. However, teaching publics are both reading and speaking publics. I disagree with North’s notion that lore is primarily oral. A teaching idea or suggestion must be rendered in a manner that can be referenced across time (say a journal, or a textbook) in order to become a sustainable part of the tradition of public speaking education. Moving between oral and textual in this way allows the recommendation to reach a much broader segment of the public; otherwise, teaching ideas and lore would be very specific to certain universities and regions. This reticence to talk about circulation leads North to imply that all different aspects of lore are equal. He suggests a teaching exercise becomes part of the shared body of lore after a single practitioner generates an exercise and recommends it to another teacher. This oral lore, in North’s rendition, exists as accessible to all who would search out such teaching ideas. He even uses the metaphor of the “House of Lore,” which implies that individual practitioners contribute directly to a communal structure by making teaching recommendations; future practitioners are able to simply wander through this structure and take from it what they will in order to assist them in teaching the composition course. In this way, North does not make a distinction between those elements of lore that are widely shared and circulated and those elements that are not. He writes, “Various portions of it [the House of Lore] can almost certainly be forgotten and rediscovered again and again…..so the House of Lore
has many rooms that look very much alike” (27). This suggests that although some rooms remain tucked away, they are all more or less accessible to a diligent teacher willing to work his or her way through to this forgotten part of the House of Lore.

However, teachers separated by time and space may not have complete access to this House of Lore, and some may have access to many parts of lore, while others may only have immediate access to those most popular and widely circulated aspects of lore (as they appear in textbooks and IRMs). While anything might become a part of lore, we might say that there is common lore and uncommon lore. For example, while assigning speech outlines to students may be part of the common lore, having students deliver a single speech repeatedly over the course of a semester is uncommon lore.

Lester Faigley critiques North on a related point, arguing that North’s understanding of lore is mistakenly ahistorical. Faigley writes, “judgments of what works in writing are thoroughly cultural and change over relatively short historical spans” (137-38). Based on prevailing teaching ideologies, ideas may enjoy widespread or limited circulation within a teaching public. Those ideas that for one reason or another demonstrate their worth are often reused or adapted slightly and thus continue to be a part of lore since they continue to circulate. Ideas that do not circulate widely are uncommon lore and may be completely forgotten over time. At issue here is not whether a teaching idea is uttered, but whether it continues to circulate among teachers.

A text’s survival in a public is based on its ability to continue to circulate--either in its original form or through citations--in the public, which presumes the ongoing attention of the public’s members to the text itself. “A text, to have a public, must continue to circulate through time, and because this can only be confirmed through an
intertextual environment of citation and implication, all publics are intertextual, even intergeneric” (Publics and Counterpublics 97). Circulation here does not simply mean the physical exchange of isolated texts; it also refers to the temporal circulation of texts through references—a text continues to have life and thus continues to address the public so long as other texts continue to cite the original text. Warner thus distinguishes this discursive field from conversation, “The interactive relation postulated in public discourse, in other words, goes far beyond the scale of conversation or discussion to encompass a multigeneric lifeworld organized not just by a relational axis of utterance and response but by potentially infinite axes of citation and characterization” (Publics and Counterpublics 91). This shift implies that the terminology for describing conversation, rooted in the physical presence of interlocutors, fails to capture to the discursive process by which ideas circulate though and across texts separated by time and space.

While North may overestimate the role of conversations in the construction and maintenance of lore, Warner underestimates the role of such conversations. Actual conversations still play a role in the multigeneric lifeworld of the public speaking public. Conversation or, as Jane Mainsbridge terms it, “everyday talk” impacts the texts that are produced and circulated in the public speaking public. Mainsbridge suggests, “Everyday talk anchors one end of a spectrum at whose other end lies the public decision-making assembly” (212). Adapting this slightly, we could say that everyday talk about public speaking anchors one end of the public speaking public at whose other end lies the scholarly article and/or the public speaking textbook; both poles interact with public speaking lore. Conversation participates in shaping lore, but the public
speaking public is also an academic public that cannot survive on the exchange of verbal
information alone. This public needs to be able to exist across time and place.
Conversation and formal publication interact in a way that neither North’s nor Warner’s
theory anticipates.

Circulatory rates are important for understanding the circulation of public
speaking lore. Public speaking textbooks participate in the public speaking public in the
sense that they circulate lore broadly and are constantly revising their contents in order
to capture the most marketable and useful version of lore; yet, textbooks do not directly
register participation in the sense that they are not overtly multi-author works. Textbook
authors often summarize certain aspects of lore, and thus try to capture some of the
dynamism of daily vernacular exchanges, but the textbook itself is not a public space
where multiple members may freely participate in the shaping of the text. Though
indeed some textbooks are co-authored and many textbook publishers employ focus
groups of public speaking teachers in order to gain a sense of how the textbook matches,
validates, or rejects some of the concerns to the public. Daily discourse and textbooks
stand at opposite ends of the spectrum: textbooks circulate slowly but broadly, while
daily discourse circulates quickly but is much more bound to particular spaces. The
result is a public that circulates different aspects of lore at different rates of circulation.

However, I would exclude from the public those acts of pedagogy that occur in
classrooms. They are no doubt points of articulation of lore, but they do not directly
offer a text for circulation in the public. A member of the public speaking public
participates in shaping lore when interacting with the oral and written texts of the public.
While a teacher may be interacting with lore when using a public speaking textbook to
teach a class, we can not really say that that teacher is participating in the public speaking public until they transform that experience into a text that can be understood and circulated by other members of the public. While these moments of classroom exchanges are of obvious importance to lore, they are not episodes of participation in the public. Such classroom experiences serve as the basis for advice and lore. But the experience of interacting with students in a classroom and developing a perspective on lore is different from generating and circulating a text that contributes to how other public speaking teachers understand and interact with lore. Again, we return to Goodnight’s notion of a text manifesting its publicness by naming its exigency as a public problem. Individual episodes of successful or failed teaching do not become public and cannot affect lore until the teacher translates this private experience into a publicly accessible text.

This issue of circulation also throws into greater relief some of the problems with North’s sense of methodological communities. North suggests that lore is largely the product of the Practitioner methodological community. As we will see, texts that operate primarily in the practitioner mode are teacher-friendly in the sense that they minimize all non-essential elements in order to focus on teaching recommendations that teachers can implement into their lesson plans quickly and easily.5 Since lore privileges advice that has demonstrated its usefulness, it is not surprising that many practitioner texts participate significantly in shaping lore. However, in examining how texts are circulated in the public speaking public, we must avoid too closely identifying a type of scholarship with the supposed position of its author. Diesing’s methodological

5 North capitalizes the terms Practitioner, Scholar, and Researcher since, for him, they are proper nouns. I, however, use these terms to describe a mode of discourse and thus do not capitalize these terms. When reporting on North’s use of the terms, I will capitalize the terms.
communities and North’s categories are based on the types of persons that are assumed to produce such texts: non-tenure track teachers tend to produce practitioner knowledge; tenure track social scientists at research universities produce experimentalist knowledge, and so forth. However, once a text begins to circulate, the perceived position of the author is not vitally important to its circulation (beyond a concern for ethos). Moreover, a given individual may produce a number of different types of texts (practitioner, scholarly, etc.) and demonstrate a number of different perspectives within a given text. For example, what we might term an example of experimentalist scholarship may conclude with a recommendation for organizing the course that North would tend to classify as a practitioner comment. Instead of examining individual Researchers, Scholars, and Practitioners, I want to retain North’s general concern for the different modalities of research without reifying such categories. To do so is to identify how different researcher, scholarly, and practitioner modes function within and between texts, keeping in mind that such texts often perform multiple modes simultaneously.

In moving away from North’s understanding of distinct methodological communities populated by individual researchers, scholars, and practitioners, and moving instead towards a view of circulating texts, which demonstrate multiple modes of inquiry, we can see how those texts which operate primarily in a scholarly or researcher mode can also participate in shaping and reflecting public speaking lore—inasmuch as these various texts are read, cited, or circulated by members of the public. We might fruitfully combine Warner and North on this point to suggest that certain ideas are circulated often through both textual and oral means and thus stand at the center of a widely shared body of lore, while other ideas stand more at the periphery; keeping in
mind that both the center and the periphery constantly evolve over time. Lore thus is not a stable category of knowledge that emerges from a distinct group of individuals. For the purposes of this dissertation, lore is a term for those ways of organizing and teaching the public speaking course that enjoy considerable circulation in the public speaking public in a historical period. Lore includes a wide variety of topics that speak to the teaching and management of public speaking courses. These topics include the nature of the course, successful and unsuccessful teaching strategies, the implications of existing models and methods, the mission of the course, the course’s role in the university, and the basic content of the course itself. However, I do see a distinction between public speaking lore and the public speaking public. While lore makes up a significant portion of the public speaking public, it is not the sum total of the public speaking public. Conversely, all aspects of lore are part of the public speaking public since they explicitly address the course (there is no aspect of public speaking lore that does not address the public speaking course in some manner).

This dissertation thus faces a unique problem of terminology--this dissertation examines the public that is organized by the discourse surrounding the class “public speaking;” in the fourth chapter, the dissertation recommends strategies for restructuring the public speaking class in order to function as a “protopublic” in order to challenge aspects of lore. Given the multiple uses of the word public, some initial parsing is in order. The term “public” refers to a discursive entity where oral and written texts circulate. “Academic publics” are those publics that emerge from issues pertaining to academia and involve (at least centrally) academics enmeshed in the institutions of higher education. A “protopublic,” following Rosa Eberly, is a public that occurs in a
classroom, which, though it is not an entirely self-organizing public, still retains pedagogical merit as a place for practicing public discourse. Finally, “public speaking” refers specifically to a college class that aims to teach students how to compose and perform speeches. In sum, this dissertation examines both the content of lore and the circulation of lore in the public speaking public.

Lore in Textbooks, Journals, and Talk

Lore, as an evolving body of knowledge, appears in many different texts circulating in the public speaking public. Lore appears in textbooks, IRMs, journal articles, and conference panels. Lore also makes its way into course director comments, daily exchanges between teachers, and, of course, the teaching practices and syllabi decisions of individual teachers. Though this dissertation focuses on lore and critiques of lore as they appear in textbooks and academic journals, the dissertation also attempts to triangulate these findings with appearances of lore in more informal settings.

Much of the scholarship on textbooks, outside of the fields of Communication and English Composition, concerns itself with identifying the biases that distort the presentation of material in textbooks. These biases range from the historical (FitzGerald; Giordano; Green and Hurwitz; Lerner, Nagai and Rothman; Moreau), to the racial (Alspektor and Wirtenberg; Britton and Lumpkin; Klein; Wirtenberg, Murez and Alspektor), to the sexist (Michel; Sanders, Koch and Urso). Of course, Thomas Kuhn famously described the role of science textbooks in normalizing and stabilizing scientific knowledge. In a similar spirit, a number of Compositionists have explored the composition textbook as an articulation of the accumulated knowledge of the discipline
Clearly then, textbooks represent an important performance of disciplinary identity and any analysis of the public speaking lore must include an analysis of public speaking textbooks. Textbooks participate in the public since they reflect and shape lore and are often produced by individual members of the public in order to help others teach the course. Textbooks obviously address students in a declarative voice (i.e., “good public speakers do the following things…”); at the same time, textbooks address the teachers that use the textbook to assist in teaching the class.

Public speaking textbooks do not influence lore in the same way as IRMs, which address the teacher solely and do so largely in practitioner terms. Surprisingly, none of the previously listed studies of composition textbooks question the role of IRMs significantly, which suggests that these critiques are more focused on how textbooks address students than how they address teachers. The present study is just the opposite; this dissertation examines textbooks and IRMs in order to trace how they interact with the lore that circulates among teachers. North writes that IRMs “while obviously limited in their scope by the approaches they are designed to help implement, are at least written for Practitioners, not students, and so offer a somewhat clearer view of lore than the textbooks themselves” (31). By providing lecture outlines, exam pools, syllabi, recommendations for teaching, and class activities, the IRMs make normative claims about how the course should be organized. In a similar way, the layout of the textbook itself makes claims about how teachers should organize and teach the public speaking course. Taken in tandem, textbooks and IRMs represent a significant portion of public
speaking lore since they both provide guidance about how best to teach the public speaking course.

Textbooks and IRMs are just one aspect of the formal production and circulation of lore. Many teaching ideas and beliefs are worked out in academic journal articles. Journals serve as the shared communal space of any academic public. They are the town square where members of the public discuss and debate ideas, raise new concepts, and hash out personal disputes. Books similarly participate in the public by performing many of the same actions as journals, but with greater detail and circulating at longer intervals. Such articles and books circulate in the public speaking public in the sense that they are read by teachers, assigned to graduate students in teacher training programs, written by members of the public, and participate in arguments over the nature and direction of the course.

The informal vernacular discourse of the public speaking public rarely rises unaltered to the level of formal publication, but the sentiments and topoi of this vernacular discourse pervade formal texts; this vernacular discourse is summarized in textbooks and IRMs and often critiqued in academic texts. In this sense, I agree with Hauser’s sense of the vernacular as the specific, contextualized languages of publics, which thus reflect many of the values important to these publics. Hauser writes, “The language that dominates a discursive area is an index to the symbolic resources that contain the norms and values of groups and classes, their knowledge of their past and their commitments to the future” (78). The vernacular discourse of the public speaking public is like Mainsbridge’s conception of everyday talk in the sense that discussions among teachers and between faculty and graduate students learning how to teach the course
contribute to the construction of lore. The informal prefix here is meant to distinguish such talk from more formal means of circulating vernacular discourse (like IRMs, which mimic many features of the informal vernacular discourse). Since informal vernacular discourse interacts with formal texts, it participates in the construction and critique of public speaking lore. This is especially true of teacher training programs where graduate students come into contact with the public’s formal and informal discourse simultaneously. These graduate students then move on to teach public speaking at various universities in various ways still bearing the mark of their original entrance into the public and their initial contact with a certain interpretation of lore. While the public exists as a field of circulating texts, we might say that certain university programs serve as nodal points where future members of the public are introduced formally to aspects of public speaking lore. The training aspect of informal discourse is not the only reason to include it in a study of an academic public. The members of the public speaking public that do not circulate their texts through publication still participate in the public to the degree that they assist in developing lore orally. Hauser suggests that informal discourse participates in shaping the nature of the public itself, “The dialogic experience of vernacular exchange eventuates in the perception, if not the discriminable fact, of public opinion. Vernacular give-and-take is our prima facie rhetorical evidence (perhaps our only evidence) that a public exists and what its defining characteristics are” (105).

While the public speaking public has formal textual evidence of its existence, the informal exchanges also participate in the development of lore.

It is important to note that all aspects of lore (textbooks, journal articles, informal talk, etc.) are mapped out in relation to existing institutional constraints. Teachers of
public speaking are not free to develop and circulate teaching texts that ignore the demands of the university or textbook publishers. Each public speaking course and program exists within a constellation of unique constraints that affect the degree to which lore can be implemented. For example, professional schools can exert pressure on public speaking courses to adapt their content to include a greater emphasis on business presentations. This trend has resulted in the growth of public speaking textbooks that service such a business demand. In Presentations in Everyday Life, Daly and Engleberg organize the book around “presentational speaking” instead of public speaking because presentations are “more common,” “less formal,” and “more important to employers” (6). While Daly and Engleberg raise a cogent point, their book works in coordination with the increasing pressure to have public speaking programs educate students to perform certain speaking tasks. This example raises the additional institutional issue of textbook publishers who serve as a significant influence on the circulation of some forms of lore. Textbook editors and publishers have a clear incentive to cull from lore the most useful and marketable pieces of teaching advice in order to generate revenue.

Beyond such formal constraints lie more informal constraints on teacher resources. A public speaking teacher may choose to ignore or adapt some aspect of lore in order to have it function within his or her unique settings. Course directors must also balance these demands while still maintaining sufficient enrollment in the public speaking course. The university itself thus plays a role in the direction and implementation of lore. An individual teacher or course director may not have full control over the course if it is a required university or college course, and must perform
certain academic functions. Without such course requirements, a public speaking course may have more academic freedom but suffer from low attendance or less financial and departmental support. The list of institutional constraints could go on ad infinitum. The public speaking course exists within a complex web of institutional constraints. This dissertation does not, however, examine the material impact of such constraints on the development of public speaking programs. Rather, it looks at how these institutional constraints filter into the texts that circulate in the public speaking public. While the demands of professional schools serve as a material constraint on the course, this dissertation looks at how that constraint is discussed and/or ignored within the public. The focus of this dissertation is on understanding the construction and circulation of public speaking lore in the public speaking public, not on the material aspects of public speaking course that the public ignores or overlooks.

Studying Lore in the Public Speaking Public

By investigating representative textbooks, IRMs, and journal articles dealing with the public speaking course, this dissertation seeks to understand some of the ways by which public speaking lore is created and critiqued. Additionally, through interviews with textbook authors, as well as an investigation of three case studies (involving interviews with university basic course directors, tenure track and graduate student teachers of public speaking, and an analysis of their respective teaching materials), it seeks to gain an understanding of how lore appears in informal oral discourse. Ultimately, the texts of this public are mutually influencing and, at times, contradictory.
Regardless, by collecting texts from these various sources, this dissertation attempts to gain a sense of how the public operates at multiple levels.

Textbooks and IRMs

This study examines the textbooks and IRMs produced professionally for teachers of the public speaking course. In particular, it examines four public speaking textbooks and their respective IRMs and one hybrid textbook and its IRM. Most of the textbooks were selected for analysis because they were in use at a university that was being examined in a case study. Other textbooks were selected to provide a bit of diversity to the sample. For example, Cindy L. Griffin’s textbook was selected, not because it was in use at a university examined, but because this new textbook attempts to break with some of the traditions of public speaking textbooks, and it thus serves as an interesting rejoinder to some elements of lore found in most public speaking textbooks. The main textbooks and IRMs analyzed in this dissertation are:

Berko, Roy M., Andrew D. Wolvin, and Darlyn R. Wolvin. 


Please note that the IRMs for *Communicating, Public Speaking, and Public Speaking: Strategies for Success* are not the same editions as the textbooks analyzed. In the first case, the publisher issued these textbooks and IRMs to the researcher separately. In the second case, Zarefsky’s current IRM is simply a test bank with no recommendations for teaching. While the current test bank is examined, this dissertation also examines Zarefsky’s 1996 IRM, which comments on a text very similar to his current edition, in order to see what types of teaching recommendations he provides to the public speaking public. In addition to these texts, additional public speaking textbooks were utilized.
when necessary to illustrate a point. Previous editions of these textbooks were examined as needed to understand how the textbook itself was evolving.

The Lucas, Osborn, and Zarefsky texts demonstrate circulatory strength; all three ranked high in the 1999 Basic Communication Course survey as three of the most broadly used texts, first, second, and seventh respectively (“The Basic Communication Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: VI”). Additionally, all three have gone through numerous editions, indicating a long temporal presence in the public. The Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin text is a hybrid text combining chapters on public speaking with chapters on interpersonal relationships and group dynamics. This textbook represents circulatory longevity since it is now in its eighth edition. However, an argument could be made that the one hybrid model textbook is not representative since it is not as highly ranked or as widely used as other hybrid textbooks. The textbook was not listed as one of the seventeen most used textbooks in the 1999 Basic Communication Course Survey. This textbook and its IRM were included in this study since one of the universities examined required the book as part of their core hybrid course. While the university offered a public speaking course, which was also examined, there were many more sections of the hybrid course offered. Moreover, many more teachers at this university were devoted to the hybrid course than the public speaking course and, as such, those members of the public speaking public at this university experience this textbook as a key participant in the public. Since the hybrid textbook includes a section on public speaking, it reflects lore and contributes to an individual teacher’s understanding and appreciation of lore.
Journal Articles

In addition to exploring how public speaking lore appears in textbooks and IRMs, this dissertation examines how lore appears in and is critiqued in journal articles. It examines six quarterly Communication journals from 1990-2004: Communication Education, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Communication Studies, Communication Quarterly, Southern Communication Journal, and Western Journal of Communication. The first two are publications of the National Communication Association and the last four are publications of the Central States Communication Association, Eastern Communication Association, Southern States Communication Association, and the Western States Communication Association respectively. Regional publications were included in this study since they offered a more local outlet for publishing articles pertaining to the discourse of the public, although it became apparent that this outlet was only rarely used. In addition to these six journals, the dissertation examines the past 14 years of the Basic Communication Course Annual (BCCA). The BCCA is a yearly publication (founded in 1988) published by American Press; the articles reflect different methodological modes, often blending scholarly, practitioner, and research into a single article. As the title indicates, the BCCA focuses on various versions of the “basic communication course,” which include introductory courses in interpersonal communication, hybrid communication courses, and public speaking.

When examining these articles, attention was limited to those articles discussing the public speaking course primarily. No academic books focusing exclusively on the public speaking course were produced during this period, but book chapters addressing the public speaking course were included in this study when appropriate (Campbell;
Lucas, “Teaching Public Speaking”; Swartz, *Conducting*). Looking at six quarterly journals over 14 years (over 300 journals) and the many articles found in the past fourteen years of the BCCA produced a sizable body of texts. 145 articles dealing explicitly with the public speaking course were selected for analysis; a list of these texts can be found in Appendix A. The overwhelming majority of the articles examined came from *Communication Education* and the BCCA. This finding is revealing in and of itself since identifying where texts appear most and where they do not appear is important for charting the mechanisms of lore’s circulation. When combined with an examination of content, an examination of the means of circulation reveals some interesting dynamics about the public speaking public’s relationship with the larger academic public.

**Informal Vernacular Discourse**

This dissertation attempts to capture some sense of the informal discourse about lore circulating in the public speaking public by interviewing teachers of public speaking and authors of public speaking textbooks. Interviews are directive in a way that naturally emerging vernacular discourse may not be, but interviews can uncover some of the oral aspects of lore circulating in the public by soliciting responses from individual participants. Fifteen interviews were conducted with both teachers of public speaking and public speaking textbook authors. These interviews relied upon a common body of open-ended questions designed to probe the interviewees’ thoughts on the role of the public speaking course in the curriculum and in the discipline, the content of public speaking, teaching activities, the relationship between public speaking and civic
engagement, matters of class construction, and overall public speaking trends. These questions thus asked interviewees to identify aspects of lore, respond to lore, and critique lore. The questions for the teachers were slightly different from the questions posed to the textbook authors in order to address each group’s unique experiences (see Appendices B and C).

Participation in the interviews was voluntary; voluntary participation was a stipulation of the Human Subjects Committee review for this study (Study #02-7734), which was approved in November of 2002 by the Human Subjects Committee at Indiana University (the documentation can be found in appendix D). Interviewees were approached through email asking them to participate in a dissertation research project that examined the public speaking course. Some interviews were conducted in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans. Those individuals who could not meet for a face-to-face interview were interviewed by phone. Interviews lasted, on average, an hour. All transcription was completed by an outside transcriber. The interviews were transcribed in their entirety, but are not included in an appendix since the transcripts amounted to over 300 pages.

Before detailing the nature of both the interviews with the textbook authors and the individual teachers, a note about the notation system used in this dissertation is appropriate. For the sake of anonymity, each textbook author interviewed, teacher interviewed, and university examined was assigned a pseudonym. In order to keep the participants and their respective universities distinct, each university was assigned the name of one of Shakespeare’s tragedies (Othello, Macbeth, and King Lear) and each teacher at a university was assigned a character name from the corresponding play.
Textbook authors were assigned pseudonyms from Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*. In the two cases where a textbook author was also a professor at a university examined, the professor maintained the pseudonym from *Twelfth Night*. These names were assigned at random; there is nothing devious about the teacher who is designated “Iago,” nor anything particularly noble about the teacher designated “Cordelia.” The plays simply offer a way of keeping individuals and institutions distinct. For the sake of clarity, the names of the title characters were not used.

1. Textbook Authors

Five textbook authors were interviewed for this dissertation. Selection of an author for an interview was based on appropriateness and opportunity. Authors who had written a textbook used at one of the universities that was being examined were sought out. Additionally, textbook authors whose textbooks had been through multiple revisions and could thus comment on the development of textbooks were also sought out. Below are brief sketches of the authors interviewed:

1. **Olivia**: Olivia is a first-time textbook author who brings her research on persuasion and civic affairs to bear upon her textbook. She is an associate professor and teaches at a university that is not examined in this dissertation. The interview lasted 45 minutes and took place in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

2. **Viola and Orsino**: Viola and Orsino coauthored a textbook and are now emeriti. Orsino’s academic work is well published. Their
textbook has gone through multiple editions. The interview lasted approximately one hour and took place in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

3. Sebastian: Sebastian has written five textbooks, most of which have gone through multiple editions. Sebastian is a professor at the University of Othello and is discussed in more detail below. Sebastian is the only author interviewed that could be called more of an interpersonal researcher than a rhetorical scholar. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place in December of 2002 over the phone.

4. Feste: Feste is a professor at Macbeth University and is discussed in more detail below. He holds a named chair at his university and his academic work is well published. His textbook has gone through multiple editions. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

2. Teachers of Public Speaking

While the public speaking public consists of all members who attend to the discourse of the public, interviewing all such members would obviously be impossible. A case study approach proved most advantageous since it provided a convenient way to examine, in depth, how individuals engage in informal vernacular discourse about the course, and it offered a chance to see how teachers at different levels (graduate students
and tenured faculty) reacted to similar institutional conditions. At each university, faculty public speaking teachers, graduate student public speaking teachers, and the department’s public speaking course director were all interviewed. All interviews were conducted separately.

This case study approach is obviously different from the Basic Course Survey, which is the only other work that attempts to understand the nature of the public speaking public. The National Communication Association conducts a semi-annual survey to assess how teachers are teaching the basic course at different universities; the results are usually published in Communication Education or the BCCA (the most recent survey, the sixth version, was published in the 1999 edition of the BCCA). The survey attempts to gather a broad sense of what teachers are doing in Communication classrooms and the study’s statistical results reflect this desire for broad knowledge. Working with fewer instructors at carefully selected universities allowed the present study to examine this oral discourse in a way that a longitudinal analysis cannot. While a statistical approach may be able to demonstrate, for example, that most of the respondents teach critical thinking, it cannot explain the discursive process by which lore about teaching critical thinking circulates in the public speaking public and appears in textbooks. This is the key difference between the Basic Course Survey and this dissertation; while the Basic Course Survey catalogues the responses of autonomous public speaking teachers, this dissertation analyzes lore.

In total, thirteen teachers were interviewed: three course directors, six tenure-track professors (including one who also operated as a course director), and five graduate teaching assistants. Of these thirteen, two were also interviewed as textbook
authors. The interviews conducted were similar for each university, but each university is listed below separately in order to clarify the small changes between case studies due to the unique nature of each institution. Additionally, a summary of each university’s version of the public speaking course, based on the sample syllabi provided by the interviewees, is listed below. While each instructor no doubt changes the course slightly, these overviews are assumed to be the standard way that public speaking is offered at that particular university.

In addition to interviews with teachers and course directors, their unique teaching materials were analyzed. Interviewees were asked to provide copies of their syllabi and other teaching materials. These supplementary materials provide clues as to how an individual teacher interacts with public speaking lore. While not every teacher responded to this request, six individuals did provide syllabi and other teaching materials (grading sheets, assignment descriptions, etc.). An examination of privately produced teaching materials illuminates how lore affects (or does not affect) private pedagogical practice, which, in turn, can generate additional vernacular exchanges capable of further influencing the public’s lore.

The case studies selected include two large Midwestern universities and one large Eastern university. These universities are, of course, not representative of all the universities that offer public speaking which run the gamut from community college to elite universities. Schools with graduate programs were selected in order to include graduate student teachers in the sample. Again, these teacher training programs serve as nodal points in the circulation of the texts of the public speaking public since they attempt to introduce new members of the public to public speaking lore. Below is a
brief overview of the universities and the departments. These profiles were compiled from the university’s most recent enrolment statistics available online and in print. Due to anonymity purposes, no citation is given for these sources.

**University of Othello**--The University of Othello is a land grant university, a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU), and a Carnegie Research-I University. The university houses 13 separate colleges and professional schools employing 2,845 full-time faculty members (1,484 tenured or tenure-track) and 811 part-time faculty for a combined total of 3,656 faculty members. The university offers 111 undergraduate majors and 96 graduate degrees. The enrollment statistics for 2001 provide a glimpse into the make-up of the student body. In fall of 2001, there were 25,099 undergraduate students enrolled and 9,061 graduate students enrolled for a combined total of 34,160. For the same year, 19,668 undergraduate freshman applied to the university and 10,819 were accepted for a 55.0% acceptance rate. Of this combined total, 3,155 undergraduate students were enrolled in the Arts and Humanities College, placing it just behind Behavioral and Social Sciences (4,197) and undergraduate studies (4,574) and just ahead of the engineering school (2,955) and the business school (2,516). In fall 2001, 15,000 graduate students applied and 4,868 were accepted for a 32.5% acceptance rate. There were 4,223 full-time and part-time MA students, 3,956 full-time and part-time PhD students, and 882 full-time and part-time special degree students. There were 1,177 graduate students enrolled in the Arts and Humanities College, placing it behind the business school (1,279), the engineering school (1,279), and just ahead of the education school (1,091).
The Communication department analyzed is located in the College of Arts and Humanities. The department recently underwent a name change from a Department of Speech to a Department of Communication. At the time of the interview, the department employed 27 full time faculty (four professors, two visiting professors, six associate professors, six assistant professors, three visiting assistant professors, five lecturers, and one “outreach coordinator” who runs the internship program) and seven affiliate faculty. Study in the department is made up of four general research areas: Communication Studies, Public Relations, Social Influence, and Rhetoric and Political Culture. At the time of the interview, there were 50 PhD students and 28 MA students. These emphases are replicated in the undergraduate program. The department claims approximately 1,000 majors, making it one of the largest majors in the College of Arts and Humanities.

The introductory communication course is a hybrid course offering an introduction to public speaking, small group processes, and group decision-making. Additionally, the department offers an Advanced Public Speaking course that is dedicated entirely to public speaking. In the fall semester of 2003, the department offered 40 sections of the introductory hybrid course and four sections of the advanced public speaking course. The hybrid course uses Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin’s text, Communicating: A Social and Career Focus. The class is divided into four basic units over the course of the semester: the first unit runs approximately five class sessions and serves as an introduction to the communication process; the second unit deals with intrapersonal communication and last only two class sessions; the third unit deals with interpersonal communication and listening and lasts eight class sessions; and the final
unit deals with public speaking and runs for thirteen class sessions. The first assignment asks students to interview an individual from outside of class (some teachers at the University of Othello ask students to interview an expert in the student’s field of study, while other teachers ask students to interview a family member about a piece of family history) and write up a summary of the interview. The second assignment asks student groups to present a panel discussion for the class. The third assignment is an informative speech. The final assignment is a persuasive speech. Speaking assignments count for two-thirds of the final grade, with test and writing assignments comprising the remaining third. The teacher training program at the University of Othello consists of a semester long course taken in association with the teaching of the oral communication class.

The advanced public speaking class uses Lucas’s *The Art of Public Speaking*. The specific instructor interviewed augmented this textbook with selections from Chaim Perelman’s *The Realm of Rhetoric* and a reading packet that included readings from classical rhetoric. The course is not broken up into discrete units, but generally moves from methods for constructing arguments to methods for critiquing arguments. Students must present all their speeches on a single topic and this topic is different for each student. The first speech is an argumentative speech (what the teacher terms a destructive argument) and the second speech is a constructive argumentative speech.

The following individuals were interviewed at the University of Othello:

1. Sebastian: Sebastian is a full Professor who works in organizational communication and communication education. Sebastian serves as the course director for the basic hybrid course. Sebastian was
interviewed as a textbook author, but he also spoke about his experiences as a teacher and as a course director. Additionally, Sebastian has written a number of undergraduate textbooks, including a textbook for a hybrid course. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in December of 2002.

2. Cassio: Cassio is an Associate Professor who focuses on classical rhetoric. Cassio serves as the course director for the advanced public speaking course. Perhaps as a result, the advanced public speaking course includes a focus on classical rhetoric. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

3. Desdemona: Desdemona was an Assistant Professor at the time of the interview, but has now received tenure. Desdemona studies contemporary public address and political communication. She has taught the public speaking course at the University of Othello within the past few years, but was not teaching the course at the time of the interview. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in November of 2002.

4. Bianca: Bianca is a PhD student at the University of Othello. She researches contemporary public address and political communication. She has taught the introduction to communication course and the advanced public speaking course at the University of Othello. Bianca received her MA from another university, where she also taught
public speaking, before attending the University of Othello. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in April of 2003.

5. Emilia: Emilia is a PhD student at the University of Othello. She researches listening and interpersonal communication. She has coauthored an article with Sebastian. Emilia completed her MA at the University of Othello before continuing her research at the university. Emilia was teaching the introduction to communication course at the University of Othello at the time of the interview. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in April of 2003.

Macbeth University.--Founded in 1851, this large Midwestern private university is a Carnegie Research-I University. The university houses nine separate colleges including a law and medical school. In 2001, 2,466 full time faculty were employed by the university. Out of the 14,298 undergraduate applicants to the university in the fall of 2002, 4,938 were accepted with 2,036 deciding to attend. In fall 2001, there were 7,814 full and part time undergraduate students and 7,833 full and part time graduate students.

   The Communication department examined operates within a school of Communication instead of a College of Arts and Sciences. The School of Communication operates five separate departments (Communication Sciences and Disorders, Communication Studies, Performance Studies, Radio/Television/Film, and Theatre) and offers eleven graduate degrees. The School of Communication had 1,119
undergraduates and 408 graduate and professional students enrolled in full-time study during the 2001-02 school year. In 2001, the school employed 112 full-time faculty and 26 part-time faculty. The Department of Communication Studies employs 26 full-time faculty (thirteen professors, four associate professors, three assistant professors, five senior lecturers, and one adjunct faculty member) and also has seven joint faculty appointments (five professors and two associate professors). The graduate program offers MA and PhD study in three areas: rhetoric, interaction and social influence, and a new program in media, technology, and society. The graduate program also offers a Master of Science in Communication (MSC) degree, a professional masters-level program with specializations in Managerial Communication and Communication Systems Strategy and Management. The undergraduate program offers six different areas of specialization (organizational communication; communication industries and technologies; rhetoric, media and public culture; relational communication; media and politics; and argumentation and advocacy) and encourages majors to work in at least two areas. While undergraduate students can choose to focus in any two of these areas of specialization, all undergraduate majors must take a core set of four classes: Public Speaking, Theories of Persuasion, Theories of Argumentation, and Team Leadership and Decision Making.

The public speaking course at Macbeth University uses Zarefsky’s Public Speaking: Strategies for Success. In the fall semester of 2002, the department offered seven sections of the public speaking course. Students in this class must complete five speeches and three written assignments. The written assignments include a self-evaluation of a speech, a peer critique of a class member’s speech, and a critique of an
outside speech (a campus event or a recorded speech). The speeches include an introductory speech, an impromptu speech, an informative speech, a persuasive speech, and a professional development speech. The final speech asks students to imagine the class audience as a possible professional audience that a speaker might one day face (a sales meeting, a jury, a classroom, etc.). After dealing with delivery issues and impromptu speaking, the course devotes a unit to each one the three main speeches (informative, persuasive, and professional development). The teacher training program at Macbeth University consists of a semester long course taken in association with the teaching of the public speaking class. The following individuals were interviewed at Macbeth University:

1. Banquo: Banquo was a full Professor at Macbeth University at the time of the interview; he has since departed for a position at another university. His work on rhetorical theory and criticism has been well published. He was not currently teaching the public speaking course at Macbeth University at the time of the interview, but had taught it in the past. The interview lasted approximately 30 minutes and took place in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

2. Feste: Feste is a full Professor and holds a named chair at Macbeth University. Feste has written extensively in the area of public address. Feste was interviewed as a textbook author, but he also spoke about his experiences as a teacher at Macbeth University. He was not currently teaching the public speaking course at Macbeth
University at the time of the interview, but had taught it in the past. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place in person at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

3. Macduff: Macduff has served as the course director at Macbeth University for a number of years. He is also the coach of Macbeth University’s speech team. He was teaching the public speaking course at the time of the interview. The interview lasted approximately one hour and took place over the phone in June of 2003.

4. Hecate: Hecate is a PhD student at Macbeth University. She has taught the public speaking course twice at Macbeth University and was teaching the course at the time of the interview. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in April of 2003.

Lear University.--Lear University is a large Midwestern public university and a Carnegie Research-I University. It hosts twelve colleges on its main campus. In the Fall of 2002, the university employed 2,911 faculty and staff (744 professors, 545 associate professors, 518 assistant professors, 257 instructors, and 847 lecturers, librarians, etc.). During that time, Lear University had 34,829 undergraduate students and 6,616 graduate students.
The department is located in the College of Liberal Arts. The department employs 26 full-time faculty members (seven professors, five associate professors, nine assistant professors, and one lecturer). The graduate program offers study in four areas: interpersonal/family communication, health communication, intercultural communication, and rhetoric. The undergraduate program offers nine separate tracks for communication study: interpersonal communication, intercultural communication, rhetoric, communication and technology, legal communication, organizational communication, political communication, presentation skills, and health communication.

The department offers four different versions of the introductory communication course, with some combining public speaking with group communication or rhetorical criticism, and one version devoted to helping students with high communication apprehension.

This dissertation, however, examines the standard public speaking course. The department listed 59 sections of this version of the public speaking course in the Fall of 2004. This course is a required course for the college but does not count towards satisfaction of the major. Graduate students are required to participate in a teacher training program and take a three hour course that examines the “philosophical, theoretical and practical issues faced by the beginning college instructor” (as stated in the course description). Most sections of the public speaking course at Lear University use Zarefsky’s Public Speaking: Strategies for Success; however, some use Lucas’s The Art of Public Speaking. One of the syllabi received for the course at Lear University asks students to complete three speeches: The first speech is an informative speech on a social problem; the second speech is a policy speech that explores a possible solution to the social problem raised in the first speech; and the final speech is a motivational
speech, in which students must try to motivate their audience to take some type of personal action to help solve the social problem raised in the first speech. The following individuals were interviewed at Lear University:

1. Albany: Albany is an Associate Professor who has taught at Lear University for over 25 years. Albany works in classical rhetoric and civic issues, which is demonstrated in his syllabus for the public speaking course. During the time of the interview, Albany was a teacher of the public speaking course. Following Cordelia’s departure, however, he stepped in to work as the course director in addition to his standard teaching duties. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in December of 2002.

2. Cordelia: Cordelia was interviewed while she was the course director of the public speaking course at Lear University; however, at the time of writing, she had left the course director position. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place over the phone in March of 2003.

3. Cornwall: At the time of the interview, Cornwall was a PhD student at Lear University. At the time of writing, Cornwall teaches at another university. Cornwall published an article during his time as a graduate student on communication education. The interview lasted approximately one hour and fifteen minutes and took place in person.
at the 2002 National Communication Association meeting in New Orleans.

4. Gloucester: At the time of the interview, Gloucester was a second year graduate student finishing his MA. During his time at Lear University, Gloucester had taught the public speaking course. Upon finishing his MA, Gloucester plans to teach public speaking at the community college level before returning to earn his PhD. The interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and took place in person in July of 2003.

Conclusion

In their analysis of the rhetoric of literary criticism, Fahnestock and Secor articulate a truism, “we often judge the validity of an interpretation by how much of the text it can account for” (82). Accounting for the text proves difficult when dealing with an entity like public speaking lore where “the text” is ever changing. However, we can collect and analyze enough representative texts circulating in the public speaking public in order to make some defensible claims about the public’s relationship with lore. By bringing together public sphere theory, English Composition, and rhetorical studies, this dissertation examines how public speaking lore appears in and is shaped by textbooks, IRMs, journal articles, and vernacular exchanges.

Ultimately, any attempt to capture absolutely the nature of public speaking lore or a discursive entity like the public speaking public, with so many members participating in formal and informal ways, is similar to judging the nature of a stream by
cupping a handful of water. The limitation of this study at this point is that it is an initial study into the public speaking public--an entity that, when it was discussed in the past, has been represented numerically (Morreale et al., “The Basic Communication Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: VI”) or institutionally (Cohen), but never discursively. Yet, the sample of the public provided in this study is useful. While the public is ever shifting and changing, a close examination of five textbooks and their IRMs, fifteen extensive interviews, and an analysis of 145 articles dealing with the public speaking course represents a representative sample of how the public speaking public interacts with public speaking lore.

This dissertation analyzes lore, analyzes critiques of lore, and then concludes by challenging existing lore. It examines lore; it does not examine pedagogy necessarily, nor does it attempt to develop a detailed pedagogy for public speaking. Pedagogy, as the term is used in this dissertation, means the art and practice of teaching. This art requires that the skilled teacher operate with a strong model of how public speaking is learned, done, and taught. Not only should the teacher have a clear understanding of the process by which a student understands and refines public speaking ability, the teacher should also have a sense of how that speaking subject should ideally participate in public life. In the foreword to Giroux’s Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope, Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg suggest that pedagogy involves “the production and transmission of knowledge, the construction of subjectivity, and the learning of values and beliefs” (xii). The teacher of public speaking should thus have a theoretical understanding of the principles of rhetoric, an understanding of how different students learn public speaking, a model of how the speaking subject can ideally interact with
others, and an understanding and ability to translate this knowledge into artful teaching practice. Thus, public speaking lore and pedagogy are related, but different. While a pedagogy for public speaking would require a model of learning, a model of normative subjectivity, and a set of values, public speaking lore offers nothing so organized. Lore exists as a collection of various ideas and strategies that enjoy circulation in the public. This dissertation does not attempt to provide a full pedagogy of public speaking. While the final chapter does map out some teaching strategies for the development of an agonistic democratic subjectivity, this is only a small aspect of a complete public speaking pedagogy. This study is concerned with how lore operates in teaching texts, how the Communication discipline inadvertently supports this lore, and how the discipline can begin to challenge the existing public speaking lore.

Having established the basic theoretical framework in this chapter, chapter two examines how invention and audience are framed in the public speaking lore appearing in textbooks and IRMs. Chapter three examines how academic journals critique public speaking lore. Chapter four then develops some strategies for challenging the content of public speaking lore. Chapter develops some strategies for challenging the content and circulation of critiques of public speaking lore. A proposed syllabus and explanation are included in Appendices E and F. These chapters work together in the sense that the dissertation moves from a close reading of how lore appears in teaching materials to a discussion of how critical inquiry support this version of lore even as criticism attempts to dismantle it. The lessons of chapters two and three motivate the fourth and fifth chapters’ concerns with developing resources to open up lore to more critical interventions. This is not to suggest that all of lore is flawed; rather, the dissertation
aims to enrich lore by opening up some space for sustained and informed critique.

Through an investigation of public speaking texts and criticism, the dissertation explores how lore is created, maintained, and challenged.
Public speaking textbooks play a vital role in the development and maintenance of public speaking lore. North notes that textbooks serve a “catechetical function” in that they provide “a simplified version of the articles of faith” (30). Textbooks collect and print some of the most teaching-friendly aspects of lore. A textbook would no doubt be dismissed as impractical if it failed to connect with lore. While textbooks are not the sum total of lore, which circulates in the public speaking public in various forms, including conference panels and journal articles, they are the most widely circulated text of lore in the public speaking public. While conference presentations and journal articles speak to those members of the public that take an active concern with the shape and direction of lore, any one who has taught, is teaching, or may teach the public speaking course has come into contact with a public speaking textbook.

Just because textbooks offer a simplified version of lore, does not mean that they are simple texts. Unlike history textbooks, which may validate one particular narrative to the exclusion of others (FitzGerald; Lerner, Nagai and Rothman; Moreau; Perlmutter), public speaking textbooks contain many different pieces of advice, some complementary and some contradictory. Like North’s account of lore, public speaking textbooks absorb a variety of teaching ideas and anecdotal advice about public speaking, and, as a result, what we might see as good teaching advice is printed alongside bad advice, which also appears next to unnecessary advice. Public speaking textbooks thus prove surprisingly difficult to critique since they are such expansive texts.
This chapter focuses on two aspects of public speaking lore that appear in textbooks: advice about invention and audience adaptation. These two issues are interwoven. The lack of a discursive sense of audiences leads textbooks to place the focus for invention on the individual. An overemphasis on the individual as the primary source of invention minimizes the opportunities for an in-class public to form around a given topic. The difficulty for lore lies in sorting out the degree to which speakers and audiences are bound together as members of a public who are familiar with the topic under consideration and the degree to which speakers and audiences are relative strangers who share little more than co-presence at a speaking event. In order to highlight how a de-contextualized sense of rhetoric operates in the lore appearing in textbooks, IRMs, and syllabi, this chapter begins by examining how teaching lore frames invention; next, this chapter explores how lore frames audiences; finally, this chapter investigates how textbook comments on ethics are connected to this framing of invention and audiences.

Lore and Invention

We know more about the changes and developments in instruction on invention than perhaps any other topic related to rhetoric textbooks. English Compositionists have long analyzed the historical changes in invention pedagogy, using textbooks to trace differing conceptions of rhetoric. As with composition lore, we can say that there are two poles for invention pedagogy in public speaking lore. At one end, Belletristic theories suggest that invention lies outside rhetoric’s ability to teach. At the other end,
classical theories suggest that invention is rhetoric’s starting point for instruction. As we will see, public speaking textbooks contain elements of both theories.

The Belletristic theory of invention can be traced back to George Campbell, who drew heavily on Locke’s understanding of the human mind as a series of associations. As a result, Campbell, and other philosophical realists, argued that the mind understood new ideas according to universal associative patterns. Campbell argued that effective communication replicated in discourse the pattern by which the mind understood a concept. “Thus, the task of a rhetor was to locate the patterns inherent in subject matter and practice their effective use” (Rowan 238). Such a reliance on Scottish Realism thus discouraged forms of invention that required a creative interpretation of common opinion. Public opinion was viewed as a flawed form of knowledge; additionally, creative (and unscientific) invention implied that the rhetor was generating an idea that was not inherent to the subject. Sharon Crowley observes:

For the first time in the history of rhetoric, the invetional process was focused solely on the individual creative mind of a rhetor working in relative isolation[….]Add to this the assumption that her discourse would depend for its persuasive force in how faithfully it represented her introspective analysis of her own mind’s working, and you have a rhetorical theory that can only be described as author-centered. (32)

In this model, rhetors should possess well functioning minds that could apprehend concepts clearly and accurately, as well as the ability to recreate faithfully in speech the process of apprehension.
Like Campbell, other Belles Lettres rhetoricians adopted a similar stance by positioning invention outside the contingent domain of rhetorical study. James A. Berlin asserts that, for Blair, invention was “the product of innate gifts and meditation” and should “be left to the resources of the individual” (“The Transformation of Invention” 293). Berlin argues that collectively Blair, Campbell, and Whately cemented the transformation of rhetorical invention from a system for discovering arguments into a system for managing the arguments developed outside of the domain of rhetoric. Berlin names this a move from “an inventio of discovery” to an “inventio of management.” By 1878, the influential textbook author Adams Sherman Hill could write that rhetoric “does not undertake to furnish a person with something to say”; instead, it “shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation, discovery, or classification” (Crowley 85). While invention was an essential part of the classical strain of early American rhetorical study, the new rhetoricians, under the influence of British rhetorical pedagogy, framed invention as something beyond rhetoric’s ability to teach.

Contrast this Belletristic view of invention with the more audience-centered approaches of classical rhetoricians. We can trace most all concerns with invention back to Hermagoras, who influenced subsequent Greek and Roman thought. While no original texts of Hermagoras exist, his rhetorical theory is often referenced in other classical works. The key distinction between classical and Belletristic inventional systems is that classical systems begin with public opinion. By placing invention within the domain of rhetoric, invention deals with contingent truth. Instead of assuming that the rhetor should carry out the search for an argument in isolated research, classical
systems provide mechanisms for sorting through the existing discourse of a topic in order to discover or generate the material for an argument.

Though both Aristotle and Cicero developed rhetorical systems for inventing discourse, the Aristotelian topical system of invention is markedly different from the Ciceronian stasis approach.\(^1\) Michael Leff notes that while Aristotle’s topical system investigates either the audience or the proposition, it does not investigate the subject matter itself in order to create a proposition; alternatively, Cicero’s sense of invention is primarily concerned with the discovery of material and not the discovery of inferential connectives (“The Topics of Argumentative Invention”). Aristotle’s common topics (koinoi topoi) provide advice on structuring speeches (more/less, possible/impossible, past/future, etc.) and the special topics (idioi topoi) provide a useful list of issues to address for specific topic areas (political issues like city finances and war, and ethical issues like happiness, honor, reputation, etc.). Carolyn Miller notes that the principles underlying Aristotle’s special topics come from three sources: “conventional expectation in rhetorical situations, knowledge and issues available in the institutions and organizations in which those situations occur, and concepts available in specific networks of knowledge (or disciplines)” (67). Conversely, Ciceronian stasis theory looks to the case itself and focuses on the general concerns of persons and acts in order to generate content for an argument.

The lore that appears in public speaking textbooks wavers between Belletristic and classical modes of invention. Advice about selecting topics for speeches, developing arguments, and adapting to audiences all turn on this issue of invention.

\(^1\) Isocrates addresses invention in Against the Sophists, but his call for knowledge about ideas is similar to, though less spelled out than, Aristotle’s discussion of idia (Kennedy 45).
Public speaking lore, especially as it appears in textbooks, tends to support a model of instruction that places invention outside of rhetoric. We can see this in textbook advice on topic selection, which encourages students to reflect on their own personal experiences primarily instead of the concerns of the audience. We can see this in textbook recommendations on thesis construction, which encourages students to develop an argument prior to doing research on the topic itself. This section examines how public speaking lore, which circulates most widely in the public speaking public in the form of textbooks, addresses the issue of invention.

Experience and Topic Selection

In early American rhetorical instruction at Harvard, students kept with the classical tradition of relying on commonplaces in order to write in response to assigned general theses. With the rise of Romanticism in America there was an increased emphasis placed on the writer’s unique personality in rhetorical instruction and practice. Connors writes, “the personal feelings, experiences, thoughts, and appreciations of the writer acquire a centrality and power in rhetorical education after 1875 that would have shocked rhetoricians of even fifty years before” (Composition-Rhetoric 302). Though Romanticism validated the experiences of the individual as a valuable resource for composition, a major challenge to classical modes of invention came from the shift in the student body following the establishment of land-grant universities. While early American rhetoricians could expect that their students came to college with an understanding and appreciation of Livy, Tully, and others, post-Civil War teachers could not make such an assumption of the now much more socioeconomically diverse
students. These rhetoricians operated with the belief that their students’ soundest body of knowledge came from their own unique experiences. “During the 1870s we can see invention methods snap inside out, from primary emphasis on recall and synthesis of sources to a new emphasis on observation and on choosing and analyzing aspects of personal knowledge” (312).

Current advice on topic selection continues this tradition of encouraging students to select topics from their personal experiences. This is not due necessarily to a lack of faith in students’ preexisting knowledge, but due to the dominant model for teaching the public speaking course. Most public speaking classes do not pre-assign topics to students (either individually or through a topic-focused class). Helping teachers address topic selection is vitally important when we consider that a speech class requiring a separate topic for each assigned speech (assuming an average class size of 25 students) must generate between 50 and 75 different topics. Since syllabi often rely on this topic selection practice, the lore appearing in textbooks merely helps teachers clarify the issues surrounding choosing a topic for the public speaking class. Having each teacher assign 75 separate speech topics would place a significant strain on his or her resources; having students pick their own topics, however, shifts the responsibility for this sizable task from the teachers to the students. In the absence of a common focus for the public speaking class, textbooks are forced to discuss “topic selection” knowing full well that speakers outside the public speaking classroom rarely enjoy such latitude in deciding on what to speak. The Lucas textbook acknowledges this:

---

2 A class size of 25 per section seems to be the norm. Morreale et al. report that most respondents to the Basic Course Survey (46.5%) claimed to teach an average class size of 25 to 30 students per section, and 39.9% of all respondents claiming an average class size of 18 to 22 (“The Basic Communication Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: VI”).
The first step in speechmaking is choosing a topic. For speeches outside the classroom this is seldom a problem. Usually the speech topic is determined by the occasion, the audience, and the speaker’s qualifications[...]. In a public speaking class the situation is different. Most of your speech assignments will not come with a designated topic[...]. Yet there may be no facet of speech preparation that causes more gnashing of teeth than selecting a topic. (86)

The Lucas textbook follows this with advice tailored to public speaking students in their search for a suitable topic. All of the syllabi examined in this dissertation required students to select their own topics. This includes both the syllabi of individual teachers and the recommended syllabi found in IRMs. Individual topic selection is obviously a pervasive practice and an established aspect of lore.

Regardless of the reason, public speaking lore encourages students to begin their search for a topic by combing through their individual and personal experiences. Lucas suggests, “There are two broad categories of potential topics for your classroom speeches: (1) subjects you know a lot about and (2) subjects you want to know more about” (The Art of Public Speaking 87). This suggestion is augmented with an annotation to the instructors, “Ask students to divide a sheet of paper into two columns: ‘Things I Know About’ and ‘Things I’d Like to Learn More About’” (The Art of Public Speaking 87). In this formulation, selecting a topic is based more on sorting through one’s interests than speaking to an existing exigency. The Griffin IRM and the Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin IRM include identical worksheets designed to help students generate potential speech topics. The worksheet itself is divided into six sections...
labeled, “I like to,” “I like to talk about,” “I would like to learn more about,” and then a space under each of these categories simply labeled, “Possible topics” (Scholz 71). Such self-oriented invention presumes that audiences and speakers share little in common, or if they do, this commonality need not serve as the basis for a speech for this audience. Topic selection moves the locus for invention away from the public’s discourse and towards the speaker herself, encouraging an almost myopic focus on student interests as the primary source and arbiter of quality speech topics. As the Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin textbook states, “If you are given latitude in selecting your topic, know that you are your own best resource” (297).

Not only do textbooks recommend that topics be drawn from personal experiences, but the topics themselves should be novel and interesting. Instead of starting from a common concern, students begin with personal experience and then must face the demands of entertaining an unknown audience. Griffin acknowledges this need to encourage each speaker to develop novel topics as a way of maintaining the interest of an audience subjected to 24 other novel speech topics. “Remember, you are speaking to them and you want them to be interested in and appreciate your subject” (30). This concern with novelty appears later in the text as Griffin adapts her general concern with topic selection to the more immediate challenge of topic selection for the public speaking classroom. She notes that students speaking to their classmates can be difficult since “they’re also searching for interesting topics, so try to avoid commonly used topics” (81). Good topic selection seems to reward novel and unique personal experiences. This focus is quite different from the common public concerns emphasized by classical inventional theory.
As a result of this valorization of personal experience and personal interests, speech topics come with few attachments to the audience, further minimizing the opportunities for the in-class audience to develop an ongoing interest with a common theme. Lucas advises students to brainstorm some potential topics, “make a quick inventory of your experiences, interests, hobbies, skills, beliefs, and so forth. Jot down anything that comes to mind, no matter how silly or irrelevant it may seem” (89). When personal experiences are the main source of speech topics, such brainstorming techniques can probably generate a number of possible topics. The only skills students need for such topic invention is an ability to reflect on their individual experiences. As such, the resulting topics must explain some part of the speaker’s personal history to an audience. Lucas lists some sample topics that might emerge from this type of brainstorming activity: “Hong Kong: City of Paradox,” “The Basics of Backpacking,” “Diabetes: You Can Live with It,” and “How to Have a Successful Job Interview” (The Art of Public Speaking 88). Again, such speech topics may inform the audience about a particular issue or personal experience, but none respond to an existing issue that has been discussed by the class. These self-evaluation exercises tend to surrender topics for informative speeches--topics that are potentially interesting to an uninformed audience but do not require a significant amount of preparation on the part of the student speaker since they already have a personal experience with the topic itself and can claim some form of expertise.

Griffin’s advice on topic selection is interesting since she discusses invention as discursive. She begins by writing:
The first step in the invention process is to identify your audience. Make every choice from the moment you are asked, decide, or are required to speak with the audience in mind. Your goal is to consider the kind of information your audience needs or wants and the best, most ethical way to present this information to them. (29)

Here the topic itself does not necessarily emerge from the audience in a classical sense, but she emphasizes that the individual is neither the sole source of a topic nor the sole judge of its merit. Even though she says that the first step in the invention process is the audience, it is, in fact, the second step because the topic itself (and perhaps the basic outlines of the argument) have already been determined. Griffin also includes personal inventory techniques for finding a topic, and she struggles to balance this self-centered invention with a concern for the audience’s history with the topic. “As you use these techniques, ask yourself why your audience might be interested in your topic, how they feel about your topic, and what their experience with that topic might be” (29).

Contrast Griffin’s efforts to balance personal experiences with audience interests with her concerns about speakers finding topics in their personal histories. “As you translate your experiences into speech topics, be certain you can talk about them easily without getting upset or revealing more than you are comfortable with” (85). Part of her concern here with delving too deeply into personal experiences is due to Griffin’s larger public dialogue framework and her attempt to adapt the dialogic spirit of personal sharing to the public speaking classroom. Beyond this however lies a practical concern about student topic selection that can only emerge when the locus of invention is the speaker’s interior. Griffin is not concerned about the speaker being too passionate about
a public issue, but about becoming upset at revealing some aspect of the speaker’s self-rooted in his or her personal experiences. Griffin is unique in this sense. Other public speaking textbooks focus on internal invention but aim at the expertise inherent in talking about one’s personal experiences; Griffin alone worries about this issue of revelatory speech. But Griffin is unique in degree not in form; the vision of a student becoming unstable when talking about a personal experience is only the most extreme case of a student speaking from personal experiences. Readers of Zarefsky’s text could be said to be in the same danger of revealing too much personal information as these readers of Griffin’s text; however, Griffin’s focus on dialogic speech makes this personal expression issue more identifiable.

Up to this point, we have been looking at textbooks’ comments on topic selection that occur in the chapters on topic selection. Since such chapters often precede more content specific chapters (like those on informative, persuasive, and ceremonial speaking), they tend to provide more generic advice. However, personal experience is also the primary mode of topic selection advised in the more content specific chapters. The model for topic generation in these early chapters and the chapters on persuasive speaking changes from “topics I’m interested in” to “topics I care about,” but the speaker’s personal experiences remain the primary focus. When selecting persuasive speech topics, Lucas writes, “think of subjects about which you hold strong opinions and beliefs” (88). Of course, this is not bad advice—students no doubt benefit from speaking on an issue they hold dear; yet, the focus again is on what the speaker finds important rather than what the audience, as a public, has defined as important. Griffin offers a

---

3 In this way, Griffin’s public dialogue mirrors some of the work in expressivist composition. Personal topics in Griffin are unbounded in the sense of free writing; speakers, like writers, are never entirely sure of what the process will produce.
number of examples where the speaker attempts to persuade his or her audience to take a specific action; yet, in the absence of a history with the topic, such examples indicate the audience’s lack of familiarity with the topic. For example, Griffin outlines the steps Courtney Stillman took in developing her speech on light pollution. Stillman’s specific purpose (“To persuade my audience that although light pollution is a problem that affects us increasingly every day, we can implement simple solutions to reduce the effects of this pollution”) led her to address three problems: light pollution affects astronomy adversely, light pollution is a waste of energy, and light pollution causes some medical conditions. Stillman concludes with two solutions: a call for increased governmental regulation and a plea to take personal actions to reduce light pollution. While Courtney Stillman asks her audience members to act, the speech itself does not evolve from in-class discussions about light pollution; therefore, Stillman spends the majority of her time informing her audience about the problem.

The Development of Thesis Statements

A weak sense of rhetorical invention is also noticeable in textbook comments on drafting thesis statements. Textbooks discuss the formal properties of thesis statements (they should be a full sentence, contain one major thought, etc.) and provide examples of good sample thesis statements. Textbooks do not, however, provide advice about how a rhetor actually develops thesis statements. Textbooks provide a good overview of finished products, but few comments about the process of writing and refining thesis statements. If we take invention to be an art for discovering arguments, then invention is largely absent from the textbook discussion of thesis statements.
Comments on thesis statement writing generally appear in the first few chapters of public speaking textbooks and thus offer generic advice that can apply to a variety of speech topics. This placement of specific purpose and thesis statement writing is no doubt strategic; these first few chapters quickly address matters of topic selection, drafting thesis statements, and gathering materials in preparation for the first speech that students must give. But in trying to get students up to speed on thesis statement writing quickly, textbooks provide general advice about the formal qualities of generic thesis statements. Such advice ignores the inventional process of creating thesis statements and arguments. The Lucas textbook, for instance, emphasizes the importance of developing a specific purpose to guide composition, but it does not provide guidance about how to move from general topic areas to specific thesis statements. For example, the textbook contrasts the ineffective specific purpose statement, “Stem cell research,” with the more effective specific purpose statement, “To persuade my audience that the federal government should increase funding for stem cell research” (The Art of Public Speaking 95), and the ineffective specific purpose statement, “To inform my audience about the Civil War” with the more effective, “To inform my audience about the role of African American soldiers in the Civil War” (The Art of Public Speaking 96). These specific purposes are more detailed, but Lucas does not explain how a rhetor can narrow his or her topic area.

This linear model of thesis development, wherein the writer simply narrows the topic more and more until it surrenders and appropriate thesis statement, appears graphically in many textbooks. Lucas represents the move from topic to thesis statement (or as he refers to it, “central idea”) as a natural, logical, and linear process. He charts
one student’s clear progress from a topic area to a specific thesis statement complete with subpoints:

**Topic:** Alternative-fuel vehicles.

**General Purpose:** To persuade.

**Specific Purpose:** To persuade my audience that the federal government should speed up efforts to develop alternative-fuel vehicles.

**Central Idea:** Developing alternative-fuel vehicles will help reduce American dependence on foreign oil and will help reduce air pollution. (original emphasis 101)

How this speaker decided to address federal policy, dependence on foreign oil, and air pollution is left unexplained. The Osborn and Osborn textbook also graphically represents this move from general to specific, but omits the first two lines and thus simply demonstrates that one should move from a specific purpose to a thesis statement, without explaining how a speaker might accomplish this (135-136). The Griffin IRM provides a handout designed to aid students in selecting a topic and starting the work on their speeches. The handout does not attempt to demystify the process by which one creates an argument from a topic; rather, the handout points to milestones in the speech composition process:

**Topic Choice #1**

**Topic:**

**General purpose:**
The handout suggests that a speaker can develop an entire speech in isolation by simply refining the topic until it naturally surrenders certain main points. This topic selection handout insinuates that rhetorical invention can be an isolated and internal affair.

Beyond suggesting that topics, closely examined, will surrender thesis statements, textbooks imply that a speaker can develop an argument prior to engaging in research on the topic. Richard Ohmann saw the same problem of topic selection facing composition textbooks in the 1970s. He writes, “Textbook writing begins in the nowhere of the assignment, moves into the unbordered regions of the student’s accumulated experiences, settles on one region--the topic--and then looks around for feelings and beliefs to affix to that topic, with supporting details to be added afterward” (original emphasis 153). Griffin’s comments on developing clear thesis statements serve as a good illustration of this point:

The clarity and focus you get when you develop your thesis statement and main points guides your research efforts and supporting materials, your reasoning, and your organizational patterns[....]Use your thesis statement in combination with your general and specific statements of purpose to help you identify your main points. You can then move to the next steps of putting your speech together. (96)
All of the textbooks examined emphasize the importance of the thesis statement in
guiding the composition process, yet none of them provides advice on how a rhetor
moves from topics to specific purposes to thesis statements.

Textbook chapters on thesis statements generally precede chapters on research or
chapters on persuasive speaking. As such, these chapters attempt to provide advice
about thesis statement writing that can apply to all the thesis statements that students
will write for their informative and persuasive speeches for the public speaking class, as
well as the thesis statements that they will write for every imaginable future speech.
This attempt at comprehensiveness leads to focus on the imitation of polished products
instead of a focus on the process of generating a thesis statement. A discussion of
process would inevitably lead to a constant looping of thesis construction into a variety
of chapters. While there are clearly some benefits of this type of discussion of process,
the time demands of the public speaking class mitigate against such discussions of
revision and process. While composition classes offer students the opportunities to
revise papers multiple times, the public speaking public does not circulate many such
options.

Textbooks circulate widely in the public speaking public and thus exert a
significant influence on the nature of public speaking lore. But teachers always use and
adapt to this lore in specific ways. Here it is beneficial to examine how two specific
teachers attempt to respond to this lack of inventionalc instruction in public speaking lore.
The teacher Albany requires that each student speak to the same issue for the entire
semester. Without a prompt from the interviewer, Albany acknowledged his reliance on
classical invention. He states, “I’m big on invention[….]So it’s not just if you can give
a speech, but rather that you can give an effective speech that’s suited to this audience at this time in their own history and that makes use of all the available means of persuasion that are appropriate to the situation and to the audience and so on.” By having students stay with the same topic, Albany aims at developing an informed audience that the speaker must then use as a resource for invention.

Cassio also claims a dedication to classical invention. Both Cassio and Albany are thus working to bridge the divide between speakers and audiences in the public speaking classroom, especially as this pertains to matters of policy argument. Cassio includes an assignment that he terms a “constructive speech to a hostile audience.” While this requires the audience to assume a somewhat fictive position of a hostile audience, it also forces the speaker to begin with an assumption of an informed audience. Cassio states in his syllabus that these speeches “should display...support for assertions made by the speaker that is drawn from the hostile audience's beliefs, attitudes, and values.” Investigating common opinion in order to generate and support claims before an informed audience thus aids with the invention of material for specific proofs. It is this focus on the invention of material that textbooks omit when individuals select topics from personal experience.

The above comments on invention are not meant to suggest that students are incapable of inventing compelling arguments or using stasis theory as a guide for developing their main points. Rather, I am concerned that public speaking lore has yet to restore invention fully as a canon of rhetoric. In essence, public speaking textbooks do not provide much instruction on invention since they encourage students to develop topics out of their unique private interests and then develop an argument before
exploring the existing public opinion and established arguments on the topic. Once this
inventional material is settled, however, textbooks provide a wealth of information about
how one might choose to arrange and refine that material.⁴

English Composition has investigated how the Belles Lettres inventional theory
affected the teaching of written rhetoric. Daniel Fogarty, James A. Berlin, Sharon
Crowley, and Robert J. Connors have all traced how the lack of a strong inventional
rhetorical theory contributed to the development of “current-traditional” rhetoric—a
pedagogy of written rhetoric that emphasized form over content. Since the discovery of
material lay outside of the domain of rhetoric, composition instruction was left to focus
on the mechanics of writing. As the critique of current-traditional rhetoric and pedagogy
crystallized, Compositionists developed a number of responses that emphasized process.
Ken Macrorie, Peter Elbow, Janet Emig, and others looked to writing assignments that
escaped mechanistic current-traditional rhetoric by turning to personal student writing.
Alternatively, others like Robert J. Connors, Sharon Crowley, Susan Wells, and others
turned to more public writing. Regardless, the identification and critique of current-
traditional rhetoric in composition led to a number of proposals for restoring a strong
inventional theory to writing instruction. Public speaking lore has yet to offer some
alternatives to its relatively weak model of invention. Albany and Cassio offer some
attempts to develop the type of public opinion that serves as an aid to invention, but their
suggestions have not experienced significant circulation in the public speaking public.
Their suggestions however indicate that teaching a rich form of invention requires
rethinking the dominate model for organizing the course.

⁴ Of course, advice on arrangement speaks to inventional issues. In this way, textbooks do, in fact,
provide some suggestions about how rhetors might use the situational expectations as a means for
developing their argument.
Lore and the Construction of Audiences

Public speaking lore struggles to define classroom audiences in terms of their physical and discursive qualities. The public speaking classroom itself presents one of the main challenges in resolving this tension satisfactorily since it is labored with the task of functioning as a teaching space and as a site that should mimic the conditions of non-classroom speaking situations. In response to this demand to operate as both a real and practice space, textbooks provide a set of generalizable public speaking skills while simultaneously functioning as a guide for negotiating the unique demands of the public speaking course. The former emphasis leads to general principles like “always remain audience centered” while the latter emphasis leads to performing a demographic analysis of the in-class audience. Ultimately, public speaking lore generally isolates the public speaking classroom as a separate and unique space. In so doing, the lore in textbooks highlights the physical nature of audiences over their discursive qualities. Since the in-class audience has no common concern (as evidenced by multiple speech topics), it is defined largely in terms of its physical existence. To use Warner’s terminology, since this group cannot identify as a public, it must function primarily as an audience.

For example, Lucas writes of *The Art of Public Speaking*, “Because the immediate task facing students is to present speeches in the classroom, I have relied heavily on examples that relate directly to students’ classroom needs and experiences” (*The Art of Public Speaking* xix). This student emphasis is present throughout *The Art of Public Speaking*: Lucas’s examples focus on students in public speaking classrooms and his discussion of topic selection and audience adaptation highlights the concerns of classroom audiences. However, Lucas also asserts, “Rather than dismissing the
classroom as an artificial speaking situation, it needs to be treated as a real situation in which students can--and do--affect the knowledge, values, beliefs, and opinions of their classmates” (xxi). Griffin follows suit, trying to balance “real life” examples with the demands of the classroom setting. She writes, “This book will facilitate your success as a beginning public speaker. It presents the practice of speaking in as many natural settings as possible and allows you to practice this skill in a classroom environment” (4). The IRMs that accompany these textbooks also speak to this difficulty of transforming the public speaking classroom into a realistic rhetorical situation without losing its educational benefits. The Osborn and Osborn IRM, for instance, includes a teaching exercise that attempts to teach the need for sensitivity to unique speaking situations by having students prepare a pretend speech in which they introduce their “Dream President” at a National Party Convention (497). Such fictitious solutions are common when the classroom aspires to mimic the conditions of a non-classroom space without actually leaving the classroom. Cordelia, a basic course director using the Lucas textbook, suggests that textbooks’ failure to strike this balance appropriately is one of the worst trends in public speaking lore. She states, “Many of the textbooks that I’ve looked at have shifted toward that ‘in the classroom here are the kinds of things that you could talk about’ vs. ‘elsewhere.’ And I think that’s a very artificial and inappropriate distinction.” In essence, Cordelia is suggesting that textbooks that focus too exclusively on functioning as a guide to the public speaking classroom fail to retain a sufficient emphasis on non-classroom speeches.

When textbooks resolve this tension in favor of emphasizing classroom speeches (which all of the textbooks examined do at some point), they tend to highlight the
physical rather than discursive qualities of the rhetorical situation. This emphasis on the physicality of audiences appears early on in the Lucas text. The introductory chapter of The Art of Public Speaking introduces students to the concept of public speaking as an “expanded conversation.” In essence, Lucas suggests that conversational speaking and public speaking are quite similar, with the only real differences being that public speaking requires more structure, formal language, and a slightly different set of delivery behaviors (9). Osborn and Osborn’s Public Speaking also adopts the expanded conversation model for discussing the qualities of public speaking. This expanded conversation could potentially animate a sense of the public sphere as the ongoing exchange of ideas and reasons similar to Burke’s parlor metaphor (and in fact Griffin’s text does use Burke’s metaphor for talking about the public sphere), but the Lucas textbook and the Osborn and Osborn textbook do not encourage this understanding of the public sphere since the “conversation” is extended physically rather than discursively. Lucas does not define public speaking as a means of exchanging ideas and arguments in an immediate or extended public sphere; rather, public speech simply involves more audience members than conversational speech. Lucas writes:

Imagine that you are telling a story to a friend. Then imagine yourself telling the story to a group of seven to eight friends. Now imagine yourself telling the same story to 20 or 30 people. As the size of your audience grows, the manner in which you present the story will change. (9)

This physicality is not as evident in Osborn and Osborn’s treatment of the expanded conversation, but they too identify audience size as one of the few aspects that changes
from conversation to public speaking. They write:

In public speaking classes your speeches will probably all be presented in one place--your classroom. This simplifies the problem of physical setting: You can get used to speaking in one place. On the other hand, the move from three people to twenty-four complicates the psychological aspects of the communication environment. (15)

Attempts to frame public speaking in terms of a conversation are, no doubt, motivated by a desire to soothe student fears about public speaking by emphasizing how public speaking is similar to the types of communication tasks students accomplish deftly everyday. Unlike a conversation with friends, in which both speaker and audience share some sense of a pre-existing relationship, textbooks transform this conversation into a chance meeting between passing acquaintances.

Contrast this conversational model with the models offered in Griffin’s Invitation to Public Speaking and Zarefsky’s Public Speaking: Strategies for Success; both Griffin and Zarefsky opt for a less physical and more discursive understanding of the rhetorical situation. Zarefsky avoids framing public speaking as an expanded conversation; rather, he adopts Bitzer’s model for the rhetorical situation. Zarefsky also discusses public speaking in terms of public forums, which he defines as “A space (imagined, rather than physical) in which citizens gather to discuss issues affecting them” (442). Griffin even critiques an overemphasis on the physical aspects of public speaking, “We often think of public speaking as an isolated, individual act. We imagine one person standing in front

---

5 It is worth noting that Zarefsky’s comments on relating the public speaking class to this type of public discourse were originally positioned as foundational material in the first edition of the textbook but then moved back to an appendix starting with the second edition. We can perhaps read this as an unsuccessful attempt to deviate significantly from established lore.
of a group of people presenting information to them. We forget that public speaking occurs because individuals belong to a community and are affected by one another” (10). Even though the Zarefsky and Griffin textbooks begin with a more discursive understanding of audiences, they, along with the other textbooks examined, often minimize the discursive histories that speakers and audiences might share through their comments on topic selection.

Given the lack of a preexisting relationship between speaker, audiences, and topics, many textbooks attempt to demystify aspects of this relationship by predicting potential public beliefs through demographic analysis and polling privately held opinions through opinion surveys. The Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin text, the Osborn and Osborn text, and the Lucas text all demonstrate some similarities when it comes to this type of audience analysis. These textbooks list and describe a number of potential demographic features (age, gender, religion, political affiliation, race, etc.) and potential situational factors (size of the audience, occasion, and emotional climate) that rhetors should keep in mind when developing a speech. The impression of audiences that emerges from such an emphasis on demographic features is that members of audiences identify more strongly with their individual demographic features than with the public called into being by the discourse of a particular topic.

Textbooks focusing on demographic analysis tend to encourage speakers to make their comments more inclusive in order to adapt to composite audiences comprised of individuals marked by significant racial, gender, or socioeconomic differences. Lucas, for example, focuses on avoiding the exclusion of possible demographic segments of an audience. His comments on the categories of age and gender suggest simply that a
speaker should keep age and gender in mind when crafting a speech. In fact, his audience-centered tips really amount to warnings against the use of age specific language, sexist language, and language that presumes a sexual orientation. He writes, “When you work on your speeches, keep an eye out for language, examples, and other elements that may unintentionally exclude listeners with same-sex partners” (The Art of Public Speaking 117). In fact, all of Lucas’s examples reinforce the lesson that demographic analysis leads by necessity to more inclusive comments. He tells the story of a sales director who did not account for female sales representatives by using a universal “he” in his comments. Lucas points to the positive example of a speaker who used the term “partners” as well as spouses in order to account for diverse sexual orientations. Lucas recounts the negative experiences of a library director who ignored the religious diversity of his audience in assuming that all audience members would be in church on Sunday morning. In each of these examples, and the many more in the chapter on audience analysis, the speaker who tailors his or her comments to be inclusive of all possible demographic groups is rewarded with praise and the speaker who fails to do so is punished with criticism.

The Osborn and Osborn text also performs similar moves between encouraging speakers to identify potential demographic groups and warning speakers to not make assumptions based on group membership. However, the Osborn and Osborn textbook separates the two sections, placing all descriptive comments about demographic groups in one section before moving to another section that warns against the dangers of ethnocentrism, sexism, and racism. The result is that some of their comments on demographic features do not come with the immediate caveat about relying on such
demographic features. The Osborn and Osborn text suggests that a well-educated audience will place more significant demands on the speaker than a less-educated audience without immediately warning the reader to avoid making assumptions about educational level (100). Yet, when it comes to other demographic features like religious affiliation or gender, Osborn and Osborn, like Lucas, emphasize the importance of recognizing the importance of such features and encourage speakers to make their comments more inclusive.

Such calls to become less exclusive and more inclusive are good lessons in tolerance, but not really lessons in audience adaptation. This is not to say that speeches should become less tolerant or more exclusive, but simply to point out that when talking about group membership, such textbooks do not suggest the ways in which speakers can focus rather than expand their messages. Indeed, it would prove difficult to craft a more specific speech using these comments on demographics since these textbooks also work with a model of a diverse audience that lacks a strong sense of identification with the topic under consideration.

When audiences are defined primarily as physical entities, speakers must primarily adapt to the individual characteristics of their members. Speakers are encouraged to modify the surface features of their speeches in order to account for the audience members’ positive identity content since it is on display at the moment of speaking. Gloucester, a graduate student teacher at Lear University, exemplifies the consequences of using demographic analysis to adapt a speech to an audience that is assumed to have no prior knowledge of the topic under consideration. He states that his
goal in teaching public speaking is to improve students’ communication abilities, which means that:

No matter what situation, you are now a better communicator in that I can look into my audiences and say these are the kinds of things that will appeal to them, these are the ideas in my head, how can I get them across so as not to offend, so as not to turn off, how can I get them across to get my desired response in return.

Invention here is entirely internal and the audience places few demands on the speaker save the requirement to include inclusive language (or as he states, “so as not to offend”). Audience adaptation does not function as a means for creating or sustaining a level of identification, but as a mechanism to avoid offending any potential demographic category. Since Gloucester indicates that the core argument itself (“the ideas in my head”) remains unchanged in the process of audience adaptation, rhetoric only adapts certain stylistic choices in order to produce the desired result. Becoming a better communicator thus requires being able to clothe arguments developed outside of the domain of rhetoric in a manner appeasing to static audiences; this view of rhetoric has some obvious instrumental tendencies. It is worth noting that Gloucester is a beginning graduate student and has thus come into contact public speaking lore only recently. Regardless, his comments here seem to indicate that lore’s lessons about invention and adaptation can manifest in obviously instrumental ways.

Another related aspect of lore that appears in textbooks is an emphasis on polling. Most of the textbooks examined also included a brief section of polling the
audience in order to determine beliefs and opinions prior to delivering a speech.\footnote{The Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin book did not include a sample questionnaire or a survey, but I attribute this primarily to the space restrictions of a hybrid textbook.} Since speakers cannot look to the public’s discourse to identify important issues, textbooks encourage speakers to explore the wants and desires of individual audience members. It is illuminating that many textbooks begin their comments on audience polling by relating the practice to consumer marketing or political campaigning. Zarefsky suggests that like company surveys conducted to “learn the needs and desires of consumers,” speakers can use surveying methods to learn about the general likes and dislikes of the classroom audience (82). Osborn and Osborn suggest that demographic analysis can be as useful to speakers as it is to marketing and political campaigns in identifying “important attitudes, preferences, or concerns” of consumers (95). Such marketing surveys, of course, do not attempt to speak to a public or influence the discourse surrounding a particular topic, but to sell products to individuals. In order to generate the information necessary to sell the speaker’s ideas to individual audience members, textbooks provide sample surveys that the speakers can reproduce to chart the in-class audience. The sample surveys provided in textbooks are more or less similar, some focusing on surveys aimed at deciphering general audience attitudes and political orientation and others seeking to chart specific attitudes on a particular topic.

This type of surveying and head counting is a poor means for teaching adaptation since it simply captures people’s private opinions about public subjects. As Gerard Hauser points out, one of the problems with polls as a way of registering public opinion is that such polls frame the public as an existing collection of individuals instead of as a rhetorical construct that comes into being through the act of communication. Hauser
suggests that the opinion poll model “depicts public opinion as an objective datum that may be detected without attention to the processes of personal interactions producing it. Instead, it conceptualizes public opinion in scientific terms as a naturally occurring phenomenon that can be observed and described quantitatively” (83-84).

The same holds true, to a lesser degree, in the public speaking classroom: speakers who register their classmate’s privately held opinions on a specific topic do not gain a sense of the class as a public, but simply as a collection of individuals. For example, the Lucas textbook describes how a student, Amy Shapiro, uses polling techniques to develop a speech on organ donation. After disturbing surveys, Amy learns that three audience members “are opposed to donating their organs under any circumstances. I can’t persuade them no matter what I say….The other 15 students could be persuaded if they knew more about the need for organ donors and about how the process works” (399). Amy then explains that seven students “give ‘fear of being pronounced dead prematurely’ as their main reason for not signing organ cards; 5 are concerned about their body being ‘cut up or disfigured’;….The questionnaires also show that 8 of the 15 don’t fully understand the need for organ donors” (The Art of Public Speaking 399-400). In this example, Amy enters into a speaking situation with no significant discursive history; her classmates, while aware of the topic as a result of the survey, have not had the opportunity to deliberate about the issue. Amy’s persuasion is thus not aimed at a public with a collective past, but at a collection of individuals with privately held reasons. If the class discussed and debated the topic of organ donation, then public positions and opinions would form that would place real constraints (and invention opportunities) upon Amy’s speech. When such opinions are not voiced and
discussed publicly, then the pollster/speaker can choose to use or disregard such
information without public censure.

In addition to polling efforts to make the speech more inclusive of the various
demographic segments that comprise the audience, the surveyed textbooks’ comments
on adaptation also suggest making a speech more and more acceptable for general
audiences that have no background with a topic. In this way, adaptation translates to
diluting a speech so that an audience of strangers hearing the topic for the first time can
understand it. Lucas provides an example of a geology student speaking on earthquakes
to his public speaking class; the speaker in this example “carefully avoided technical
terms” and “prepared visual aids diagramming fault lines so his classmates wouldn’t get
confused.” Zarefsky warns, “Speakers sometimes mistake intelligence for knowledge,
this overestimating what the audience knows. Fearful of condescending to listeners--of
talking down to them and assuming that they can’t think for themselves--some speakers
cover complex material too quickly” (original emphasis 72). Textbooks rarely, if ever,
provide examples of speakers who were able to make their speech more specific because
the audience was both aware of and invested in a speech topic.

Some teachers are so suspicious of the tenability of the in-class audience when it
comes to teaching audience adaptation, that they ask the actual in-class audience to
perform the role of a fictive audience--usually an audience with whom the speaker
shares some discursive history. Hecate, a graduate student teacher at Macbeth
University, includes on her syllabus the following speech assignment, which is worth a
quarter of the final grade:
Professional Development Speech (25 points) As your final project in this class, try and imagine a future situation that you will have the opportunity to use the skills you developed over the quarter (e.g. a sales meeting, closing argument in a legal case, a class lecture, or even a particular social event) and create a speech that fits this situation. The speech must reflect the situation as you envision it, as well as address your fictive audience (original emphasis).

Hecate states on the handout for this professional development speech, “You are expected to create your own audience, inform us of your position and our role in the communication event prior to beginning the presentation, and allow at least 1 minute for question and answer following your speech” (original emphasis). The desire to teach genuine audience adaptation in the face of a classroom audience that has no supposed discursive history gives rise to this type of solution. Hecate, in fact, highlights the importance of audience adaptation when faced with a particular, albeit imagined, audience. She writes, “Audience analysis will also become an important part of your evaluation—both how your content appeals to the audience and the manner in which your delivery reaches them. Be clear about who your audience is and how best to engage them in your presentation” (original emphasis). Gloucester, at Lear University, asks student speakers to “pretend that the audience that they’re speaking to is not their classmates, but the actual persons or people who can make that change, so that they are getting the best practice they can.” Like Hecate, Gloucester justifies this assignment on the basis that student appeals must be more tailored to the audience if the speaker is speaking to decision makers who obviously know the topic well.
In the syllabi of Hecate and Gloucester, the desire to talk about a rich sense of audience bumps up against the dominant model for the course, which, in requiring multiple various speech topics, eliminates the possibility of the in-class audience performing this role realistically. Contrast this solution with the solution offered by Albany (see above). Albany’s assignments, like Gloucester’s, also aim at policy solutions; however, since Albany has students speak on the same topic over the entire semester, a more informed audience is allowed to develop in the class itself thus eliminating the need for this type of role playing. Both Albany and Gloucester teach the same course at the same university, but resolve this tension in lore in different ways.

The Need for Ethical Constraints

In *Phaedrus*, Socrates asks Phaedrus:

> when the orator who does not know what good and evil are undertakes to persuade a state which is equally ignorant[....]by praising evil under the name of good, and having studied the opinions of the multitudes persuades them to do evil instead of good what harvest do you suppose his oratory will reap thereafter from the seed he has sown? (113)

To which young Phaedrus dutifully responds, “No very good harvest” (113).

Contemporary discussions of ethics in the public speaking public bear the marks of this long discursive history and impose ethical constraints on the practice of public speaking in order to ensure that rhetoric is not used unethically.

The public speaking lore found in textbooks places invention outside of the domain of rhetoric, thus relying on the capacity and ethics of the individual rhetor.
Similarly, by emphasizing the physicality of audiences, textbooks minimize the ability of audiences to hold speakers accountable. Speakers draw their topics and research from personal experience and audiences are assumed to know little about the topic discussed. It is no great surprise then that lore identifies the individual speaker as an ethical threat. Speakers hold all the cards in this scenario; they control the information and speak to uninformed and atomized audiences. Combine with this a long-standing social distrust of rhetoric and you have a fairly combustible situation that demands a textbook section on ethical speaking.

In addressing this dilemma, textbooks do not dwell on the complex questions of ethics that emerge out of a discursive understanding of the rhetorical situation. In fact, if textbooks did operate with a discursive understanding of audiences, then audiences would be capable of judging the credibility of the speaker and speech. Rather, textbooks tend to adhere to a clear set of ethical behaviors like honesty and cheating, undimmed by the complexities of the situation. Generally, discussions of honesty are not left open to interpretation, especially in the case of plagiarism, but remind students that speaking publicly is an ethical act that must remain honest. All the textbooks examined include some counsel to use evidence honestly. The Griffin textbook urges students to conduct ethical interviews (145) and avoid unethical hypothetical examples (159). The Lucas textbook devotes an entire chapter to ethics, but his comments regarding honesty bear a strong resemblance to the other textbooks, especially his comments on quoting out of context. Zarefsky’s section on ethics echoes this theme of honest use of evidence, “Particularly in speaking (since listeners cannot see the printed word), you need to distinguish between fact and opinion, being careful not to misrepresent one as the other”
The Osborn and Osborn text provides ten “Guidelines for the Ethical Use of Evidence” (392). The Osborn and Osborn text is fairly clear about what constitutes ethical evidence in the case of quoting, “The unethical use of a quotation distorts its meaning. In effect, it lies and deceives its audience” (20).

Textbooks often default to a common construction for discussing ethics: “the ethical speaker/listener.” This is an interesting construction since it adopts a descriptive mode to make a prescriptive point. Students are rarely told what they must adopt a certain ethical stance, but are often told what “ethical speakers” do. This construction allows for textbooks to list ethical behaviors without discussing them at great length. For example, the Griffin textbook states, “An ethical listener, then, considers the moral impact of a speaker’s message on one’s self and one’s community. Ethical listeners attend to the standards and principles advocated by a speaker” (original emphasis 67). The Osborn and Osborn text adopts a similarly distancing tone, “Ethical listeners do not prejudge a speech, but keep an open mind” (81). Zarefsky writes, “Ethical public speakers take their membership in this community seriously, and they accept their responsibility to sustain the community by adhering to high ethical standards” (28). Similarly, the Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin text argues, “As an ethical public speaker, you must understand that you are a moral agent. When you communicate with others and make decisions that affect yourself and others, you have a moral responsibility” (294).

These concerns with marshalling the lines of ethical speakers seems to gain greater traction when speakers are decoupled from audiences; meaning, when the audience is uniformed about the topic itself, these concerns about lying and plagiarism
take on a greater immediacy. Textbooks thus switch between a view of the student speaker as a potential liar in front of an uniformed audience and a view of the speaker as a potential dupe when listening without knowledge. The resulting view suggests that students must be ethically trained to avoid taking advantage of audiences or being taken advantage of by speakers. Consequently, publics and audiences rarely emerge as knowledgeable enough to identify and dismantle unethical speakers. The balancing of rhetorical ability against ethical responsibility seems to support a rather instrumental view of rhetoric. In his critique of public speaking lore, Jon Hess writes:

If forced to choose, it would be better for educators to train students who understand the role of their public speaking in the common good and work toward that end despite mediocre content and delivery skills, than to produce speakers who are narcissistic manipulators with refined, polished, and influential speaking style. (“Rethinking Our Approach to the Basic Course” 85)

It is hard to imagine Plato in the Phaedrus reaching a dissimilar conclusion.

Conclusion

Ultimately, public speaking textbooks are defined largely by their purpose: to help students navigate the demands of the public speaking classroom and develop some public speaking skills. As such, they provide rather general advice about the highly context-dependent process of rhetoric. In a similar vein, Mike Rose writes that composition textbooks “are, by nature, static and insular approaches to a dynamic and highly context-oriented process, and thus are doomed to the realm of the Moderately
Useful” (65). This is not to say that textbooks are not useful at all or that they could not be better, but when judging textbooks we should recognize that they operate in relationship with lore’s dominate model for organizing the course. As textbook authors and publishers attempt to interpret lore and respond to its dictates, they end up entrenching this model of the course further. Olivia, a textbook author, suggests that this inherent conservative nature on the part of textbooks to appeal to established public speaking curricula represents the worst trend in public speaking textbooks. She states:

I think the worst trend is to be afraid to step outside the traditions. I see that we just regurgitate the same thing over and over and over again[...]. The worst trend I think is the fear of loosening up a little, of the unwillingness to recognize that we can teach what we’ve always taught and we can teach that better, plus some new things if we’re willing to open up a little bit.

This textbook author recognizes the institutional demand for supporting a dominant version of public speaking lore, even as she works with and against it.

The current version of public speaking lore that appears in textbooks and many teaching materials tends to support a model of rhetoric that lacks a strong invention theory. At their most extreme, public speaking textbooks suggest that speakers, audiences, and topics meet for the first time at the moment of speaking, and thus define the relationship between speaker and audience primarily in terms of their shared physical presence at a speaking event. The presumed absence of a pre-existing relationship between speakers, topics, and audiences is enabled, in part, by the emphasis on topic selection in textbooks; a move that ensures that public speaking classrooms
witness an ever-changing parade of topics, preventing classes from forming publics around ideas. The demand for interesting and unique speech topics places the focus of rhetorical invention on the personal experiences of the isolated speaker. And when invention occurs apart from audiences, adaptation cannot explore the public’s history with the topic to identify some starting points for arguments; instead, students are encouraged to chart and adapt to the most obvious demographic features of individual audience members. Without the language of invention, public speaking textbooks frame rhetoric as an instrumental art that enables rhetors to communicate static ideas to static audiences. Writing in *Communication Education* in 1983, Charles Kneupper argued, “the absence of an inventional component in either rhetorical theory or pedagogy tends to diminish the importance of the substance of discourse and elevate the attention to stylistic features” (39).

Understanding this aspect of textbooks advances our understanding of the lore that circulates in the public speaking public. While individual teachers may choose to reject public speaking textbooks, the simplified version of lore that appears in textbooks continues to affect the public. This means that a critique of lore demands a critique of textbooks. This chapter does not, however, classify textbooks as inherently bad. Such critiques often ignore the influence and pervasiveness of lore. As this chapter has demonstrated, inventional issues in public speaking lore are interwoven with concerns about audiences and practical concerns about students making their way through the public speaking class. Lore in this way, as it is circulated in the public speaking public, cannot be understood solely in terms of theory or practice. Rather, the public speaking
public contributes to the multifaceted nature of lore by combining practical concerns
with everyday teaching practice, rhetorical theory, and pedagogical criticism.

Just as a critique of lore demands a critique of textbooks, a critique of textbooks
demands a critique of the larger body of lore. As we will see in the next chapter,
critiques of public speaking lore too often fail to analyze carefully the texts and practices
of lore as they circulate in the public speaking public. The above analysis of public
speaking lore attempts to sort through how and why textbooks operate with their models
of invention and audience. What emerges is a set of strategies that respond to the
dominant model for the course. What is absent from many critiques of public speaking
lore is close critique of teaching texts and teaching institutions. Writers have proven
willing to critique lore in very general terms. Few critiques, however, investigate the
mechanisms by which the circulation of lore reinforces certain teaching practices. An
appreciation of the rich and complex traditions of lore does not mean acceptance of
existing lore. It means a readiness to read lore as a set of practices that merit serious
criticism. Since some of the problems with the relationship between speakers, topics,
and audiences are rooted in the organization of the public speaking classroom, a
thorough critique should examine how the classroom may be realistically altered given
its constraints.
Chapter 3: Critiques of Lore

While textbooks and teaching materials offer the most tangible evidence of the existence and shape of lore, they are by no means the only aspect of lore worth investigating. Textbooks and critiques both circulate in the public speaking public influencing the pedagogical lore. Textbooks provide a version of teaching lore that speaks to both teacher and student. Academic publishing, on the other hand, speaks directly to those academics that claim an interest in the health of the discipline and its pedagogical practices. Textbooks and criticism exist in tension with one another. Textbooks attempt to render lore in a useable form to assist both teacher and students to navigate the demands of the public speaking course. Pedagogical critiques tend to isolate, investigate, and solve problems with lore. Textbook authors and publishers are aware of critiques of lore and attempt to develop new products that respond to such critiques. Textbooks circulate more broadly in terms of sheer numbers, but texts critical of public speaking lore also have a significant influence on the public. We must look at both textbooks and critiques of lore in order to understand how they function to establish and maintain certain social truths regarding the teaching of the public speaking course.

Following Stephen North, we can divide critiques of lore into three basic categories: practitioner, researcher, and scholarly. These categories are not mutually exclusive; critiques often mix these different critical impulses in a single article. They do however provide a useful way of analyzing the force and theoretical background of the different critiques. Appendix A provides a graphic illustration of the circulation of the texts critical of lore that appeared in peer reviewed journals from 1990 to 2004. There are 145 separate texts on this chart. Due to multi-listed texts, the combined total
comes to 162 texts. Of this number, there are 30 practitioner critiques, 76 researcher critiques, and 56 scholarly critiques.

Practitioner critiques are only critical in the vaguest sense. They seek to provide teaching recommendations that can assist teachers in classrooms. Practitioner critiques are often extensions of the types of teaching materials we find in IRMs. Practitioner critiques are included in this chapter for two reasons. First, they circulate differently than textbooks and IRMs. Practitioner critiques appear in academic journals, not IRMs. As such, they speak to a different aspect of the public than textbooks. Second, practitioner critiques emerge in response to some felt problem with the standard lore. This exigency may be muted in order to devote more space and attention to the teaching recommendation, but it is present nonetheless. Regardless, practitioner critiques begin by identifying and then solving a problem with lore. Since practitioner critiques are less likely to mount an articulated attack on public speaking lore, these texts circulate less broadly than researcher or scholarly texts. Practitioner critiques only rarely appear in Communication Education and more often appear in the BCCA, The Speech Communication Teacher, and other spaces that are marked off from mainstream academic literature.

Researcher critiques demonstrate a dedication to positivist research and focus on the act of public speaking as a unique phenomenon. These texts examine aspects of public speaking like communication apprehension, verbal immediacy, and other public speaking issues. These are critiques of lore in the sense that they reject lore as a flawed method for generating and testing teaching strategies, arguing instead that an empirical approach to understanding public speaking issues is preferable to lore’s oral and
pragmatic nature. Yet, researcher articles also seek to contribute to lore by offering some teaching recommendations.

Scholarly critiques rely on non-empirical theory to critique public speaking lore. As we will see, such critiques tend to create a caricature of lore that serves as a springboard for some theoretically informed way of teaching the course. These scholarly critiques thus reject some aspect of lore, but rarely investigate lore as a rhetorical construction or way of knowing. Such scholarly articles demonstrate a stronger interest in theoretical complexity than many of the texts that operate primarily in the practitioner mode, yet they also speak in a practitioner mode inasmuch as they provide a normative vision for how teachers might choose to organize the course itself.

This chapter explores how practitioner, researcher, and scholarly critiques of lore interact in the public speaking public. Though both researcher and scholarly texts tend to attack a caricature of lore, there is a surprising lack of close analysis. As such, there is no strong and sustained critique of public speaking lore. This chapter begins by examining how the experiential nature of practitioner critiques frame teaching suggestions as curricular add-ons that do not call larger pedagogical issues into question. Second, this chapter argues that, while researcher critiques’ positivistic tendencies ensure their ongoing circulation in the public speaking public, such articles fail to critique lore seriously despite a professed suspicion of it. Third, this chapter explains how scholarly critiques create and reject a caricature of lore in order to outline an alternative vision for the course.
Practitioner Criticism

Stephen North charts two formal features of lore. First, it is pragmatic. “It is concerned with what has worked, is working, or might work in teaching, doing or learning writing” (23). Second, it is experiential. “I will create my version of lore out of what has worked or might work--either in my own experience or in that of others--and I will understand and order it in terms of the circumstances which it did so” (23). In other words, teachers develop a sense for what it means to teach the class successfully by reflecting on their experiences and the experiences of others. Though the practitioner mode for circulating lore is primarily oral, rooted in the experience of sharing teaching ideas, there are a number of practitioner texts that extend and critique public speaking lore.

Practitioner critiques of lore aim to convey some type of recommendation for teaching the public speaking course successfully. Teaching recommendations that do not directly speak to teaching the course effectively are often transformed into pragmatic teaching recommendations. This is often the case with the research on communication apprehension. Communication apprehension research, as we will see below, often distills some teaching recommendation from its findings. These teaching recommendations are then further simplified when they appear in textbooks as techniques for overcoming communication apprehension. Textbooks thus include

---

1 This practitioner mode is not simply restricted to teaching ideas or in-class exercises; it expands to all aspects of experiencing the course. Topics span from teaching assistant training programs and course direction issues (Buerkel-Rothfuss; Nancy L. Buerkel-Rothfuss and Pamela L. Gray; Nancy L. Buerkel-Rothfuss and P.L. Gray; Gray and Murray; R. L. Weaver and Cotrell; G. Williams, “[En]Visioning Success”; G. Williams, “TA Training Beyond the First Week”; G. Williams, “Setting Realizable Goals in the Basic Course”) to using video as a teaching tool for the course (M.W. Cronin and Kennan; C. Newburger, Brannon and Daniels). I focus here on those ideas that critique and extend the teaching practice lore circulating in the public.
communication apprehension research, but only the most pragmatic recommendations (dispensing with the methodological and positivist concerns of the communication apprehension research community).² Most of the texts examined include some nod to the practitioner demand for a pragmatic piece of advice about how to implement findings into a teaching plan. This section is concerned with those texts that are, in essence, defined by this teaching recommendation.

Communication Education participates in the circulation of texts written primarily in the practitioner mode, especially with their recent addition of a “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” (SOTL) section, which seeks to avoid “abstract theoretical claims” in favor of “contextualized accounts of our efforts to understand teaching better and to enhance student learning” (Darling 48). Such practitioner texts have only recently begun to reappear in Communication Education, though they made up a significant portion of The Speech Teacher prior to its name change in 1976 to Communication Education (see Sprague, “The Spiral Continues”). The BCCA publishes a fair number of texts that primarily operate with a practitioner mode and make recommendations about teaching, directing, and organizing the course, but these texts have been significantly outnumbered by the texts that demonstrate a greater researcher or scholarly emphasis. While practitioner texts do circulate in peer reviewed journals, they are far outnumbered by scholarly and researcher texts (see appendix A).

² Finding an example of public research that resists this transformation into lore proves almost impossible since most current texts in the public speaking public actively seek to link their research to some type of teaching implication. Perhaps the history of speech education serves as a good example; Borchers and Wagner’s analysis of speech education in nineteenth century schools overviews the historical influences on early speech education, but theirs is a wholly historical study that makes no significant link to the course in its current incarnation. While the lessons of nineteenth century could perhaps be transformed into a pragmatic piece of lore, the onus for such a task lies with the reader since the authors do not provide such a link. Perhaps this difficulty to transform such historical work into a manageable piece of lore easily is one explanation for the near absence of work on the history of the public speaking course.
Practitioner critiques respond to a perceived problem with lore by providing a teaching suggestion that can be implemented easily without calling into question other aspects of the course. Practitioner critiques of lore eliminate discussions of the historical, theoretical, or methodological issues that bear on a particular pedagogical choice in order to quickly and effectively provide a teaching solution to a perceived problem. In recent years, *The Communication Teacher*, a now online only resource, has even supported this tight focus on teaching recommendations graphically by trimming published articles down to three essential sections: the goals of the assignment, the assignment itself, and a brief one or two sentence appraisal of the assignment. For instance, when Larry J. Whatule explains his assignment in “The Name Speech: Preview of a Process,” he begins with a brief statement of the assignment’s goals, “To illustrate the basic steps of speech preparation with a short speech model” (online pagination); walks through the five steps involved in this assignment; then concludes with a personal assessment of how the assignment has worked for him in the past, “students generally find the experience a positive ‘first time up,’ thus boosting their confidence. Finally, they appear to take my advice and have fun” (online pagination). These bullet point recommendations can be read quickly and implemented into an existing curriculum without necessarily contradicting or calling into question the larger goals of the curriculum.

North’s concept of lore as sprawling proves relevant here. These teaching recommendations avoid any discussion of the structural problems with lore (or the institutions that influence lore) and avoid a discussion of the comparative merit of different teaching practices. These practitioner critiques need not demonstrate that one
particular teaching strategy is qualitatively better than any other strategy; these texts merely need to demonstrate that such an exercise worked in the past or has the potential to work. In “Speech Criticism and Group Presentations,” Ayers and Ayres Sonandre write:

A couple of the frustrations we encounter in our public speaking classes involved using group presentations in a maximally profitable way and finding the time to meaningfully discuss speech criticism. To address these frustrations, we decided to have groups analyze speeches and report their findings to the class. The result improved presentation skills and enabled students to become better consumers of public discourse. (online pagination)

Ayers and Ayres Sonandre’s discussion of the problem is minimized in order to quickly move on to the more pragmatic solution to the problem. Moreover, they do not demonstrate that their recommendation is better than other existing recommendations, nor do they demonstrate that the problems with speech criticism are rooted in the way that teachers currently organize such assignments; they only prove that their speech exercise holds out the possibility of working for others since this exercise has worked for them in the past.

The structure of such recommendations tends to be anecdotal, along the lines of, “I experienced this problem and here is how I solved it.” It is this anecdotal evidence that researcher critiques attack (see below). Though The Communication Teacher encourages brief articles, longer journal articles allow for writers to provide a personal narrative as evidence of the success of a particular teaching strategy. For example,
Jensen and McQueeney provide a number of teaching tips and exercises for increasing the amount of focused writing in the public speaking classroom. While they nod to Janet Emig’s work on writing to learn, they do not concern themselves with the theory of writing to learn; instead, the paper itself outlines three writing assignments that can be used in the public speaking class. As with many other practitioner texts, each summary of these assignments begin with a general statement of goals, moves step-by-step through the assignment, and concludes with recommendations for evaluation of the assignment. Thus, the evidence that Jensen and McQueeney use to support their claims that these strategies work to improve student learning is not rooted in theory or positivist results, but in personal experience. In fact, they write that the article itself is “a summary of the rationale and strategies that we offer to the Communication Studies teaching assistant” (37). Since the article is simply a textual version of their oral comments, it thus retains much of its pragmatic practitioner voice.

These more narrative practitioner texts are firmly rooted in the author’s unique experience in and with the course, which serves as the primary body of evidence. In “The Em-Powter-ing of America: Using Info-mercials to Teach Persuasion and Popular Discourse in the Basic Communication Course,” Daniel W. Heaton explains why he uses Susan Powter’s Stop the Insanity! info-mercial to teach persuasion. He notes that his students claimed that the assigned textbook reading on persuasion was boring. “I re-read the chapter about persuasion. It was boring. I will not mention which text we used, but the way the book’s author explained persuasion made an exciting, life-changing topic sound like a recipe for burnt toast” (original emphasis 80). There is a bit of an implied critique of public speaking lore here, but what is more notable is Heaton’s
reliance on a personal experience to set up the pragmatic problem he faced while teaching the course. Heaton then narrates his exposure to Powter’s info-mercial and his use of the video for the class. Heaton roots some of his defense of this assignment in comments from students (these comments coming from personal conversations, class discussions, and student papers rather than actual transcripts). Heaton writes:

The assignment has been so successful in my classes that I have even had former students request copies of the video for use in a variety of other classes as a way of encouraging in-class discussions about such topics as: fad dieting in Health class; use of persuasive language in an English Composition class; truth in advertising in a Business class; use of gender stereotypes in a Women’s Studies class; and the culture of weight loss in a Sociology course. (87-88)

Heaton’s success narrative here proves the assignment’s worth and also indicates its potential for use in a variety of settings. The exercise is not discussed or defended in relationship to learning theories or pedagogical philosophies, but solely on the basis of personal experience.

In IRMs, the personal and anecdotal history of a specific teaching suggestion is eliminated. In fact, “I” is largely absent from IRMs. While some IRMs (Lucas, Osborn, Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin, Griffin) all begin with a personal statement to the readers of the IRM, the recommendations themselves adopt a more distant stance, opting for directives. The Zarefsky IRM, instructs teachers to “Evaluate Mario Cuomo’s use of signs in his keynote address” (161). Lucas instructs, “Have students prepare an Audience Analysis and Adaptation Worksheet” (Instructor's Manual 146). Scholz writes
in the IRM for the Griffin textbook, “Prompt students by having them think about politicians with who they agree or disagree” (original emphasis 158). This elimination of a supporting narrative is not unreasonable, given the already voluminous size of many IRMs and the perception that a good IRM, as a teacher resource, cuts immediately to a successful teaching tip. But, as teaching recommendations contract in space, they lose their narrative nature opting instead for a directive tone.

Denying a specific authorial voice in this way also grants the teaching recommendation a different ethos rooted in its institutional setting; the teaching idea is not coming simply from another teacher, or even from a master teacher explaining his or her master syllabus, but from the IRM itself, which mimics the declarative and imperative voice of the textbook itself. David Bleich suggests that the declarative and imperative moods in composition textbooks “are related to the lack of experience of most writing teachers” (18). He continues, “Graduate students adapt parts of their individual experience to what textbooks offer, but this adaptation is not the exercise of writing pedagogy; it is individual survival that ultimately serves the suppression of professionally grounded, independent writing pedagogy” (18). We can read Bleich as suggesting that an independent pedagogy is one that links individual teaching ideas to the larger ideology of the course. IRMs sever this connection between individual teaching ideas and larger ideologies by eliminating the histories of teaching suggestions and thus rendering them as context free ideas to be applied or ignored as the individual teacher sees fit.

The BCCA and Communication Education allow authors to explore a narrative and explain their reasons for choosing a particular strategy; IRMs on the other hand
focus solely on the recommendation itself. While more narrative practitioner texts provide a richer account of the history leading up to the creation of the exercise, they too are defined largely by their effort to outline a successful teaching strategy. This drive to provide recommendations for teaching, either in a bulleted form or in a narrative form, limits practitioner texts’ ability to critique existing public speaking lore. This lack of a critical voice in practitioner critiques, when combined with the drive to frame teaching ideas as context free, deflects questions concerning the dominant ideologies for teaching the public speaking course.

Researcher Criticism

The majority of public speaking research and criticism published in academic journals is written from a researcher standpoint--specifically experimental research. Jo Sprague notes that instructional communication research is more prevalent than communication education research in general (“The Spiral Continues”). The same holds true for work dealing with the public speaking course specifically (Appendix A). While practitioner and scholarly critiques of public speaking lore appear primarily in the pages of Communication Education and the BCCA, researcher critiques circulate more broadly. In addition to these two journals, researcher critiques of public speaking lore regularly appear in Communication Monographs and Communication Studies. Researcher critiques of public speaking lore are far more visible than either practitioner or scholarly critiques. While there are a number of trends in the research literature dealing with public speaking, two stand out both in terms of size and persistency: communication apprehension and communication assessment. Both issues thus indicate
the flexibility with which we must approach North’s categories--both issues are studied
from a social scientific perspective and operate with a sense of positivism, but both also
adopt a practitioner voice in calling for specific teaching recommendations. Texts
addressing communication apprehension circulate more than other researcher issues and
thus merit some investigation here.

The positivist tendencies of communication apprehension (CA) research
encourage a testing and retesting of the community’s concepts and explanations—a
tendency that reinforces the dominance of CA research. Since the methods for studying
CA encourage multiple studies (out of a need for confirmation and validation), there are
simply more texts on communication apprehension in circulation than any other public
speaking concept. For example, Ayres and Hopf confirm that visualization helps
individuals control CA over the course of a semester. Kelly, Duran, and Stewart
confirm that rhetoritherapy is a good treatment for CA, which is later re-validated in
Kelly and Keaten, and critiqued and extended in Keaten and Kelly (“Effectiveness of the
Penn State Program”). Ford and Wolvin (“The Differential Impact”) return to validate
their 1992 article (“Evaluation of a Basic Communication Course”) by examining the
impact of a hybrid class on perceived communication competence. Rosenfeld, Grant,
and McCroskey follow up and confirm many of the findings of Chesboro et al. Finally,
Bourhis and Allen conducted a meta-analysis of 23 articles in order to confirm a
significant negative correlation between CA and cognitive performance. Such a meta-
analysis exemplifies this methodological community’s dedication to and faith in
validation. Compare this expansive literature base with scholarly texts that address
rhetorical invention. While the literature base on rhetorical invention may continue to
draw upon and reference an influential text, the humanistic topic itself does not demand multiple studies to validate existing knowledge.

Combined with this tendency for multiple tests is a tendency to recognize and name the tradition of the communication apprehension research history. McCroskey goes so far as to argue that the study of communication apprehension “represents the oldest continuing research effort in the field of communication” (“The Communication Apprehension Perspective” 1). Dwyer also references the longevity of communication apprehension, “For over five decades, communication researchers have examined the ways to help people overcome communication apprehension” (“The Multidimensional Model” 72). Keaten and Kelly (“Reticence: An Affirmation and Revision”) return to Phillips original 1965 formulation of the concept of reticence and then examine the concept’s historical trajectory. Situating communication apprehension as one of the oldest research traditions in the communication discipline obviously serves intellectual and political purposes--it validates the topic as a matter of significance and ongoing intellectual concern and it performs an identity function for the researchers engaging in this work. This tendency to affirm the historical legacy of CA research also indicates an awareness of the larger evolving methodological community.

The positivistic assumption that increased study will eventually lead to an increasingly correct understanding of communication apprehension (and thus correct treatment) encourages repeated study of communication apprehension. Research literature with positivistic assumptions (which communication apprehension serves as a good example) is self-replicating (most studies demand validation) in a way unlike other bodies of public speaking research and criticism. This systematic quality ensures that
the majority of the published texts on public speaking bear the mark of this methodological approach. This demand for validation is supported institutionally--some universities (West Virginia University, Kent State, etc.) have made communication apprehension a research focus and thus generate junior scholars willing to continue the research.

The work on communication apprehension also demonstrates a remarkably high level of methodological agreement. While there are, of course, disputes over particular approaches, there is a general agreement on certain methodological instruments. For example, many, if not most, of the articles on communication apprehension published over the past 14 years have used the Personal Report on Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) as one of, or the only, instrument for measuring CA. This is not to suggest that the PRCA-24 is flawed; though, it is rather surprising that there is little disagreement over the suitability of the PRCA-24 (at least no criticism significant enough to warrant a major change in the instrument itself). In fact, McCroskey, in an often cited 1978 article, surveyed the work using the PRCA-24 and surmised that the instrument is generally valid (“Validity of the PRCA as an Index of Oral Communication Apprehension”). This communication apprehension literature base thus enjoys a high degree of methodological agreement, a shared recognition of its history and intellectual importance, and an inclination to retest and revisit its previous knowledge. It is no great surprise then that texts addressing communication apprehension continue to outpace and out-publish other types of issues and other types of texts in the public speaking public.
In addition to dominating the published work in the public speaking public, researcher texts addressing communication apprehension adopt a practitioner mode in order to condense their findings into teaching recommendations. That is, articles on communication apprehension and other pathological issues often end with an attempt to draw implications for teaching public speaking. Additionally, such attempts to study speech pathology are absorbed into public speaking textbooks (either explicitly cited in the body of the text or as footnotes) and IRMs. However, the advice on treating communication apprehension found in these researcher articles tends to be vague and commonplace. For example, in their study of CA and cognitive performance, Bourhis and Allen conclude, “Educators must continue to be sensitive to the special needs of the apprehensive student, adapt instructional strategies accordingly, and encourage these students to participate in treatment programs to alleviate their apprehension” (75). But Bourhis and Allen do not address how educators might adapt their strategies and encourage students. Chesboro et al. found that “at risk” students in middle and junior high schools were more apprehensive about communication and had lower self-perceived communication competence. In terms of treatment, they name a few CA tips (visualization and desensitization), but suggest more generally that teachers simply “be sensitive to the problem.” Dwyer draws extensive implications for teaching, but even the most specific feels rather vague:

HCA [high communication apprehension] women in a CA-treatment program might learn best to overcome their anxiety when a combination of watching, doing, and coaching is offered. Such a combinational program where students evaluate their thinking processes and learn new
coping statements (cognitive restructuring) in combination with practicing techniques, like visualization or systematic desensitization, and receiving skills training with coaching, could be the most effective.

(“Communication Apprehension and Learning Style Preference” 147)

This combination of watching, doing, and coaching sounds remarkably similar to many current methods for teaching public speaking to both high CA students and non-high CA students. CA literature often provides teaching recommendations that teachers of public speaking already employ.

It is not surprising then that this literature makes its way into textbooks and IRMs since researcher texts largely support existing advice about public speaking. Menzel and Carrell prove that practice and preparation improve performance and write, “This study offers tentative confirmation for the general hypothesis that more preparation time leads to better speech performance” (23). Interestingly, Menzel and Carrell then reference textbooks (including the Lucas textbook) as supporting the idea that realistic rehearsal leads to better performance. They conclude:

As teachers, coaches, and scholars of public speaking, we have long recommended rehearsal and preparation, offering this advice with only personal experience and observation as a guide. The results of this study provide preliminary quantitative conclusions that support this perceived relationship between preparation and quality of performance in public speaking. (25)

Bippus and Daly chart what non-communication specialists believe to be the causes of communication apprehension and note that the nine factors that most people think cause
communication apprehension “match quite well with what empirical research has revealed about the causes of stage fright” (69). Robinson surveys how public speaking teachers treat CA and found that instructors tend to address CA in a manner recommended by CA research.³

Communication apprehension research seems to validate public speaking lore in the sense that it provides scientific support for existing practices. However, CA research demonstrates a suspicion of lore’s mode of justification. Lore, in its practitioner form, relies on anecdotal evidence and personal experiences to identify and propagate good teaching practices. Lore, in this form, fails reliability tests. The teaching practices that emerge from this experiential framework “are mere conjecture seemingly based on tradition and historic practice” (Hugenberg and Moyer 166). Hugenberg and Moyer explicitly reject “[m]ost of the research on the basic course” because it is “opinion-based, based on personal preference or personal experience” (169). Hickson simultaneously rejects scholarly and practitioner texts while validating the experimentalist approach to understanding public speaking. Hickson’s comparison between classical rhetorical knowledge and positivist knowledge is telling. He compares the concept of ethos (with its categories of character, intelligence, and good will) to the category of trustworthiness. “In some ways, the difference is similar to that found between a witch doctor saying one’s illness is caused by the devil and a

³ Joe Ayers is perhaps alone in directly interrogating practitioner texts and existing lore regarding communication apprehension treatment. Ayers argues that high CA individuals are going to suffer in public speaking situations regardless of how “supportive” the classroom is—“We cannot overlook the harm we are inflicting on such people” (“Situational Factors and Audience Anxiety” 290). Both Ayers’s “Situational Factors and Audience Anxiety” and “Speech Preparation Processes and Speech Apprehension” challenge lore and simultaneously rely on lore. Neither article demonstrates that public speaking teachers presently ignore the dangers of communication apprehension, nor do these articles demonstrate that existing teaching strategies are aimed solely at delivery, yet both assumptions are necessary in order to challenge such practitioner practices with the findings of positivist research.
contemporary physician calling it a virus. The difference is that character, intelligence, and good will were not measurable. Trustworthiness and competence were” (original emphasis 99). This passage is obviously rich with assumptions about public speaking and the nature of social scientific research; what is most relevant to our present concern is the absolute debasement of those elements of lore that are not scientifically demonstrable. While there is a suspicion of lore in these experimentalists’ texts, they seem more concerned with discrediting the practitioner and scholarly mode of analysis than debunking any actual teaching lore that emerges from such texts.

Despite indications that researcher texts would adopt a constantly critical stance towards lore, researcher critiques have a more complicated relationship with lore. In the case of communication apprehension research, this could be due to the fact that communication apprehension research has so effectively circulated its most enduring findings that these have become part of lore and thus appear in textbooks and IRMs. In other words, the basic findings of communication apprehension research have now become so commonplace in lore that experimentalist texts tend to critique lore’s mode of justification.

Scholarly Criticism

Much like practitioner critiques of lore, scholarly critiques of lore begin with an experienced problem with lore framed in personal terms. Unlike practitioner critiques, scholarly critiques turn to a body of theory instead of personal experiences in order to justify their amendments to lore. Many of these scholarly critiques begin with a vague attack on the presumed public speaking lore, which serves as a springboard for an
equally vague vision for an improved course. As we will see, this type of inquiry tends
to frame the public speaking course as a zone for applying a rhetorical, or feminist, or
interpersonal theory. However, scholarly critiques tend to attack an overstated version
of lore rather than closely examining the actual practices of public speaking teachers,
students, and materials.

A significant number of scholarly critiques of public speaking lore begin by
identifying a problem with how the public speaking course is experienced by teachers
and students currently. Such texts suggest that the course in its current incarnation fails
to meet a particular need; this can be a problem with the way gender is constructed and
represented in the course (Borisoff and Hahn; K. K. Campbell; Cawyer et al.; Janefsky),
a problem with diversity issues (Hugenberg; Powell; Treinen and Warren), a lack of
theoretical complexity in the course (Frobish; Rowan; Schwartzman; Spano,
“Delineating”; Spano, “Rethinking”; Troup; Yoder and Wallace), an overemphasis
(Haynes, “The Case for a Speech-Based”; Haynes, “Some Notes”) or an underemphasis
(Leff, “Teaching”) on written communication, a lack of critical thinking education
(Beall; Sandman), an underemphasis on social justice issues (Frey et al.; Pollock et al.),
an overemphasis on argumentation (Makau), or an underemphasis on ethics education
(Hess, “Rethinking”; Hess, “Teaching”). After identifying some missing component
from the course, these texts develop and apply an appropriate remedy to the course.
That these texts begin by identifying a problem with the course is not surprising—such
criticism begins by demonstrating its own exigency. What is interesting is how this
problem is constructed for the reader.
In identifying a problem with how the course is currently experienced, such texts argue that the offending version of the course is, in fact, taught by some teachers. Yet, such texts are often at a loss to prove that such versions of the course actually exist. For example, Pearson and Nelson critique the lack of theoretical sophistication in the public speaking course, writing, “We should be ashamed that Aristotle is more consistent with what is known than we are ourselves. And we need to overcome the comfortable myth that we can be teachers without a healthy sense of inquiry that keeps our pedagogy on top of our knowledge base” (6). This myth is never proven, yet still serves as a prompt for Pearson and Nelson to outline a remedy to this myth. In calling for a “transactional” approach to teaching public speaking, Yoder and Wallace assert, “No two situations are the same, yet we teach ‘public speaking’ as if there is a particular model of public speaking that can be applied to all similar situations” (91). The problematic pedagogical model here is framed as enjoying strong support among existing teachers. In their defense of Whiteness Studies as a potential anti-racist organizing logic for the public speaking course, Trienen and Warren opine:

In our experience, the basic course asks students to deliver highly structured speeches that are modeled after white, elite men who invented the process for men like them. Not only is the structure, organization, and delivery of a speech modeled after the dominant class, it is also a reflection of the way the dominant society engages in public discourse. (62)

This strong critique is dropped as soon as it is raised, and serves not as a claim meriting support, but as evidence in support of their claim concerning the need for Whiteness
Studies in public speaking pedagogy.

My point is not that these arguments fail the standards of proof required of experimentalist arguments; rather, my concern is that these texts tend to depict lore as a settled oppressive doctrine that enjoys the support of a majority of public speaking teachers. For example, Peterson suggests that public speaking lore is sexist and that this sexism is perpetuated by the many teachers who subscribe to this vision of lore. He writes:

In the tradition of public speaking this [androcentric] emphasis can be seen in the concern with ‘a good man speaking well’ and in the study of ‘great men’ in the history of public address. Public communication courses teach practices and skills that enhance an individual’s abilities to perform in an environment of public argumentation and disputation. Communication practices that do not further an individual’s abilities and exercise of power are discarded or ignored. (62)

Public speaking pedagogy here emerges as a body of knowledge that takes its direction from Quintilian’s views on gender. This knowledge is framed as dangerous since it continues to exert significant normative force on the teaching practices of a mass of teachers who follow its dictates. Similarly, Hugenberg suggests that public speaking lore resists attempts to make the course more culturally diverse:

Accommodating different points of view, different ways of thinking, and different ways of communicating goes counter to the way we traditionally teach the basic course. For the most part, we expect students to become
In “Revising Public Speaking Theory, Content, and Pedagogy,” Nancy Rost Goulden writes, “today’s public speaking teachers for the most part teach what public teachers [sic] have traditionally taught” (5). Such criticism suppresses the history of public speaking lore, reducing lore to a set of unchanging status quo assumptions against which criticism proposes a progressive answer. She writes that there has been little change in public speaking theory in the past 80 years; she even divides the literature on public speaking theory into the categories of “traditional” and “progressive”—she places all criticism in the “progressive” category, while the “traditional” category includes a few public speaking textbooks, which stand in as markers of this unchanging lore. Placing most criticism in the progressive category erases the differences between such critiques so that the resulting lesson is, “any change is a good change.”

While public speaking lore is often conservative in its development, it does change. For example, while a special section on persuasive speaking has remained an important aspect of public speaking textbooks since the foundation of the discipline, the same cannot be said of informative speaking or ceremonial speaking. Earlier texts, like James O’Neill’s 1921 voluminous casebook, Models of Speech Composition, groups 95 speeches in 18 different modes of speech. Other texts, like Brigance’s 1953 edition of Speech Composition, lumped what we would now call informative speaking with ceremonial speaking under the larger heading of “Demonstrative Speaking.” Eugene White’s 1964 edition of Practical Public Speaking does distinguish between persuasive, informative, and ceremonial speaking, but all are treated in one chapter as different ways
of organizing the body of the speech, not necessarily as different modes of speech entirely. Even a staple speech like the informative speech, which circulates so widely in its current form, has undergone significant changes and adaptations in order to emerge as a distinct type of speech requiring a chapter dedicated to its exposition.

Criticism of lore not only freezes this discursive process, it also depicts lore in extreme terms. In this way, criticism isolates lore as a distinct target of criticism and then amplifies its characteristics into caricatures. Much scholarly criticism of lore does not critique an actual text; rather, it critiques a myth. Scholarly critiques that emphasize the importance of teaching ethics in the public speaking class serves as a good example here. Such calls for increased ethical instruction operate with the fear that public speaking teachers may turn out a number of highly skilled and morally dubious students unless teachers carefully teach the proper ethics of public speaking. Jon Hess points out that one of the dangers of teaching public speaking as a technique (i.e., without an informing sense of ethics) is “that it increases the possibility that students, no matter how well-intentioned, will use the techniques they learn to harmful ends” (“Rethinking Our Approach to the Basic Course” 79). Roy Schwartzman fears, “The basic communication course easily becomes an amoral laboratory to test techniques that can yield individual benefits rather than a forum for engaging students in the challenge to consider their mutual responsibilities” (124). These texts frame lore in such extreme terms that, if left unchecked, it threatens to undermine the humanistic mission of the university and do harm to the larger culture.

By talking about the effects of lore on students, Hess and Schwartzman bypass the teacher altogether and ascribe to lore such power that individual teachers are
incapable of overcoming its deleterious effects. Hess later implies that the effects of lore are so dangerous that “Not teaching ethics implicitly sends the message that the topic is less important than other topics, a message that is ill advised” (original emphasis “Teaching Ethics in Introductory Public Speaking” 102). Here the individual teacher can fight against the amorality of public speaking lore, but the task lies with the individual teacher since lore itself is so pervasive. Such critiques depict lore as a straw figure and avoid close analysis of the texts and practices that may actually contribute to the forms of lore operating in classrooms.

These critiques are not taking aim at specific practices performed by actual teachers in classrooms (it is doubtful that many teachers allow their classrooms to become “amoral laboratories”). The function of such criticism is not to critique actual manifestations of shared knowledge; lore functions instead as a jumping off point for the critic’s counterproposal. That is, once such texts identify lore as damaged and discredited, they outline proper practices that better match the goals of tolerance, inclusion, and civic humanism. As North points out, such critiques are notably vague in their curricular recommendations. These critiques seek to remedy the problems identified with existing lore, but since the problems identified with existing lore are so vague (and often so extreme) that the resulting remedy is similarly unclear. Kimberly A. Powell argues that public speaking textbooks are too Western. She lists a number of textbooks (Beebe and Beebe, Gamble and Gamble, Lucas, Osborn and Osborn) that she claims adhere to Western modes of speech, but she only cites one passage from Lucas and avoids examining any of the offending textbooks closely. This problem of ethnocentrism sets up her counterproposal, “grading criteria should allow styles outside
the Eurocentric norm. Training graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) to recognize a variety of speaking styles may aid in the incorporation and valuing of cultural diversity in the basic course” (198). While grading outside the Eurocentric norm is an admirable goal, matters of curricular reform are sidelined; all that matters for this critique is that the reader recognizes the need to displace the hegemonic totality called “Eurocentric speech.”

Even when a vague critique of lore is absent, many scholarly texts postulate a view of the course that avoids questions of content and pedagogy, opting instead for a vague sense of the public speaking course’s humanistic mission. Osborn discusses three metaphors for explaining how students experience the public speaking course: builder, weaver, and climber. Osborn theorizes about what students should experience as they move through the course, and he provides a loose framework for understanding and advancing the liberal mission of the public speaking course. However, questions of how we should nurture creativity are avoided since this is an article about guiding metaphors. Osborn thus ignores more tangible questions of syllabus construction and the inclusion and exclusion of specific assignments. Similarly, Williams defends a vision for public speaking, “we are helping to prepare an active, watchful, caring, and able citizenry who have a strong sense of ethics, duty, and accountability” (“[En]Visioning Success” 42). While one might disagree with this statement as a factual account of what occurs in public speaking classrooms, it is doubtful that many would disagree with the potential of the public speaking course to meet this goal or the goal’s desirability. Such “visions” for the public speaking course rarely address difficult questions: What type of ethics are we teaching? What type should we be teaching? Should we be teaching a sense of civic
duty? What would such a curriculum include and exclude? After arguing that classrooms should not be amoral laboratories, Schwartzman suggests instead, “Classrooms need to be ‘safe zones’ where students can experiment and fail without becoming failures” (138). Creating a “safe zone” requires more than simply “vision,” it means making decisions about class construction, pedagogical philosophy, and classroom speech codes.

Recommendations like these feed into the sprawling nature of lore rather than critique it. These critiques adopt a practitioner voice when it comes to providing recommendations for teaching and, like practitioner texts, they avoid addressing the exclusions necessary in course construction; the course itself becomes a space of infinite possibility. A public speaking course cannot simultaneously adopt all the recommendations for changing the content of the syllabus, yet these questions of hierarchy and preference are deferred.

Scholarly critiques avoid suggesting that a particular teaching strategy should replace existing teaching strategies; rather, such pedagogical choices are often framed as “add-ons.” For example, Marcia D. Dixon recommends orienting the public speaking course around social constructionist theory (SCT), but concedes, “The integration of contexts and SCT is not a radical transformation of the basic communication course. The content of the hybrid course remains essentially unchanged” (167). Olsen and Bollinger, after lamenting the lack of a critical thinking focus in most public speaking classrooms, back away from suggesting that this focus should come at the expense of any other potential focus. “The addition of critical questions in the basic course text should be just that, an addition” (325). Hess, who argues for focusing the public
speaking course on ethics, writes, “Approaching the introductory public speaking course from an ethical perspective does not require abandoning the standard course format or making a radical departure from what had been taught before” (“Rethinking Our Approach to the Basic Course” 102). After articulating an organizing vision for the course, these scholarly critiques attempt to frame the curricular changes in practitioner terms—as add-ons that enhance but do not necessarily change existing syllabi. These articles advance claims about the importance of the public speaking course, they argue that the public speaking course is a suitable venue for some particular issue or theory, but then these articles minimize the immediate changes that implementing such an idea would require.

But since such critiques simply provide curricular add-ons that hold out the potential of success, they operate as one-time articles that do not enjoy ongoing circulation. That is, there is no pressing need for the public speaking public to return to such ideas after their initial entry into the public since these recommendations are easy to agree with and then subsequently ignore. To return to Kimberly A. Powell’s critique of the Western bias in public speaking textbooks, she writes that a survey of public speaking texts “shows that the Western tradition of linear organization, formal yet conversational delivery, and well documented content are the focus of our courses” (198). In response, she asserts, “grading criteria should allow styles outside the Eurocentric norm. Training graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) to recognize a variety of speaking styles may aid in the incorporation and valuing of cultural diversity in the basic course” (198). Public speaking textbooks most certainly demonstrate some Western biases, and most would agree that GTAs should question their evaluation
strategies (thus making them less likely to grade with a strong cultural bias). The internal logic of these critiques is easy to agree with—as teachers we prefer ethical teaching over unethical teaching or diverse classrooms over homogenous classrooms—but the lack of a careful analysis of lore or the ways in which lore is used and abused in classrooms make it easy to agree with such critiques while simultaneously ensuring that such critiques enjoy little circulation in the public speaking public. Remember that Warner points out, “A text, to have a public, must continue to circulate through time, and because this can only be confirmed through an intertextual environment of citation and implication” (Publics and Counterpublics 97). I can find no mention or citation of Powell’s text in any texts that discuss diversity in the classroom texts regardless of methodological orientation. A text like Powell’s would continue to circulate if it made a specific recommendation that could be either used or further critiqued or if it providing a strong and enduring critique of the Western orientation of public speaking textbooks; yet Powell’s text does neither. And Powell’s text is not unique in this way.

While an individual may publish a couple of texts on the same issue (Hess on ethics for example), there are rarely multiple texts that interrogate a particular topic for any significant period of time; at least nothing resembling the duration of communication apprehension research. There are a few texts that address ethics, a few dealing with whiteness studies, and so on, but these are often repeated articles by the same author, not multiple members of the public addressing a given topic.4 If the experimentalist literature base enjoys greater circulation due partially to the demands of replicability and validation, these scholarly critiques are a mirror opposite. The critiques

---

4 The exception to this might be the discussion of “diversity,” but here the discussion of diversity actually encompasses multiple topics (racism, intercultural diversity, etc.).
of lore and the resulting visions for the course are absorbed into the public, but are not replicated, validated, or critiqued. The public speaking public continues to circulate lore, but scholarly critiques of lore simply do not enjoy ongoing circulation in the public after their initial appearance.

Conclusion

Overall, these various critiques demonstrate insufficient critical analysis of those aspects of lore that are circulated most in the public speaking public. The practitioner mode is operative in almost every text that circulates in the public speaking public, and this mode rarely rejects another practitioner text. North writes, “Lore’s various elements are not pitted against one another within the framework of some lore-specific dialectic, or checked and re-checked by Practitioner experiments, so that the weakest and least useful are eliminated” (24). As such, the critical impulse is often muted in texts that address the public speaking course.

Practitioner texts generally avoid a critique of lore. It simply is not a function of the practitioner mode to spend time critiquing existing practice or perceived lore. Since practitioner critiques focus on addressing some practical problem with the course, they emphasize specific teaching suggestions. In this case, any problems with public lore are solved through the lens of private experiences. These suggestions, despite emerging from the unique socio-political conditions of a specific classroom, are framed as neutral and capable of being implemented into any public speaking classroom. These solutions are thus not subject to public debate.
While researcher critiques maintain a suspicion of lore, they have yet to provide a strong critique of lore. Rather, researcher critiques adopt a more technical stance to attack the anecdotal justifications of lore for failing scientific standards of proof. At the same time, researcher texts also demonstrate the general validity of practitioner recommendations. The standard researcher approach is to frame the class as a data set—a collection of materials that can be studied. This chapter looked at communication apprehension, but the same could be said of assessment or verbal aggressiveness studies.

Scholarly texts also remain insufficiently critical of lore. To be sure, they provide a strong critique of lore, but it is often too vague to affect significantly the primacy of some aspects of lore. Scholarly critiques often aspire to little more than a soft nod from their audience, a murmuring agreement to the dangers of status quo assumptions, which apparently motive some unseen “other” teachers. These scholarly texts seem to take a much keener interest in framing the public speaking class as a zone for applying some rhetorical/feminist/interpersonal theory. Thus scholarly critiques often move from a critical stance into a practitioner stance before they can render a close examination of the texts that comprise lore, opting instead of a brief caricature of these assumptions.

These critiques, by rejecting lore, also reinforce the nature of the public speaking public. This is less a function of the materiality of the public speaking public, than it is a function of the publicness of the arguments against lore. Returning to Goodnight, we can see that these arguments operating with more technical (researcher) and/or more private (practitioner) reasons assert that lore is a common issue that affects all members of the public. Though these critiques frame lore as a public problem, they solve this
public problem in private and/or technical ways. Technical expertise in the form of empiricist validity or theoretical mastery and/or private reasons in the form of personal experience are framed as the soundest resources to solve the problems with lore. Curiously, though lore is framed as a public problem, the solutions are not framed as public in the sense that they are open to public deliberation. In order to render lore open to public discussion and debate, lore itself must be seen as a complex set of texts and strategies. So framed, lore is thus not an unseen other or a foreign practice, but the subject and product of the debating public speaking public.

There are few works that frame the public speaking class as a text meriting close criticism. Some of the Whiteness Studies approaches do actually discuss the class as a text and investigate how various elements function within this text, especially some of the ethnographic participant criticism (Warren, “The Body Politic”; Warren, “Doing Whiteness”). However, the best example comes from Jo Sprague’s work, which is often cited in various types of public speaking scholarship (an indication of its circulation within the public). Sprague engages in a close reading of the written and oral evaluations given by teachers to students (“Reading”). She reviews and critiques the existing literature on teacher empowerment (“Critical Perspectives”). She identifies a number of issues that currently go unaddressed in the existing communication literature (“Expanding”); a task continued in future articles (“Retrieving”). These critiques of the ways in which the Communication discipline discusses pedagogy provoked specific argumentative responses. Rodriguez and Cai defend the researcher position against Sprague’s charge that “compliance-gaining” research seeks to resolve the teacher-student power dynamic in favor of teacher control. Sprague responds to Rodriguez and
Cai’s critique in an argumentative manner--using it as an opportunity to dissemble further the rhetorical strategies of instructional communication and the ways in which the Communication discipline frames discussions of education (“Ontology”). It is therefore not surprising that Sprague’s work has been cited in every volume of BCCA save two (volumes 5 and 13) since the publication of her 1992 research. Her 1992 article, “Expanding the Research Agenda for Instructional Communication: Raising Some Unasked Questions,” which calls for communication researchers to address the power dynamic in communication classrooms from a critical perspective has been cited in at least 25 separate articles and as recently as January 2004 (Fassett and Warren). Her other articles also continue to circulate, especially “Retrieving the Research Agenda for Communication Education: Asking the Pedagogical Questions That Are ‘Embarrassments to Theory’,” which is her follow up article to “Expanding the Research Agenda for Instructional Communication.”

Sprague’s critique of lore differs from other critiques in its willingness to closely examine and debate lore as a public subject. First, Sprague’s critiques tend not to be a general assault on lore, but a critical reading of a set of texts that embody some aspect of lore. Instead of simply rejecting lore as flawed content or method (or both), Sprague’s work starts with the actual texts that make up public speaking lore (evaluation
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5 For the hearty, those articles are listed here. The figure 25 is simply a raw number in the journals that I examined. There are no doubt more articles that reference this particular article that are not listed here. Also, the depth with which Sprague’s argument is treated varied widely--some respond to her work directly and others simply cite her as a source. There are many more articles that cite Sprague in Communication Education than in the BCCA. This fact points to two implications: first, there are more scholarly texts appearing in Communication Education than suggested when simply looking at scholarly critiques of public speaking lore; second, pedagogical work is rarely cited outside Communication Education and the BCCA. The articles are: Clark; Cooks and Sun; Dannels, “Communication across the Curriculum and in the Disciplines”; Darling, “Instructional Communication”; Darling, “Scholarship”; Fassett; Fassett and Warren; Friedrich; Fuoss and Hill; Goulden, “Revising”; Hohmann; Hunt and Staton; Johnson and Bhatt; Johnson, Pliner and Burkhart; Kerssen-Griep; Kuehn; May; McComb; Perkins; Rodriguez and Cai; Sprague, “The Spiral Continues”; Sprague, “Critical Perspectives”; Sprague, “Why Teaching Works”; Vaughn; Wood and Fassett.
measurements, textbooks, other public speaking research). Her research critically
analyzes teaching texts (the discourse of the public, teaching evaluations, etc.) and thus
assumes an argumentative stance. While she may draw on more technical or private
reasons, her overall argument is essentially a public argument aimed at the members of
the public speaking public about public speaking lore and the public speaking public.
Her critiques address existing practices and challenge members of the public to debate
these practices in the public. Members of the public speaking public cannot simply
absorb Sprague’s recommendations as curricular add-ons since her critiques call for
excluding certain teaching practices and research traditions. Sprague’s critiques cannot
be dismissed as private choices or technical expertise, but as public critiques that merit a
public response.
Chapter 4: Challenging Lore

We have thus far investigated how public speaking lore circulates in the public speaking public. As should be clear by now, textbooks and teaching materials as well as public speaking criticism all circulate in the public and influence (and are influenced by) lore. A significant challenge to lore should contain a critique of the dominant model of lore as well as a critique of how the public circulates lore. While this chapter challenges public speaking lore’s lessons about invention and audience, chapter five challenges the manner by which public speaking lore is critiqued. As chapter two indicated, the problems with invention and audience are built into the dominant model for teaching the course. The practical demands of finding appropriate speech topics in a short period of time interact with more theoretical concerns about the nature and role of rhetoric. In order to challenge this aspect of lore, we must step outside the dominant model for the course.

Challenging the problems with the dominant course model requires challenging one of its basic assumptions: public speaking courses should encourage students to select their own public speaking speech topics. Below is a discussion of a possible alternative model for the public speaking course that begins from the standpoint of a common course topic. By having students work in a topic-centered course, public speaking instruction can emphasize the discursive nature of audiences and provide resources for invention. Having spent some time in chapter two unpacking some of the problems emerging from an understanding of the public speaking classroom as a physical space primarily for the performance of student speeches, this chapter offers an
alternative way of structuring the classroom as a discursive space that offers resources for the study of invention (a sample syllabus for this class is provided in appendices E and F). In order to explain the nature of this topical agonistic protopublic public speaking classroom, this chapter begins by explaining and critiquing Rosa Eberly’s concept of protopublic classrooms; second, it unpacks and critiques Chantal Mouffe’s theory of agonistic pluralism; and finally, it examines how combining these two theories place special demands on the public speaking teacher.

Protopublic Classrooms

In Citizen Critics, Rosa Eberly examines the public debate surrounding the publication of four controversial literary works (James Joyce’s Ulysses, Henry Miller’s Tropic of Cancer, Easton Ellis’s American Psycho, and Andrea Dworkin’s Mercy) in order to explore American literary public spheres. In her analysis, she foregrounds the role of “citizen critics,” a term that is meant to distinguish literary experts from average citizens who entered public debates about the relative merits of these controversial books. These four case studies reveal a decline in debate about books as public issues, and an increasing tendency to frame literary debates in terms of “literary merit,” which privileges the opinions of literary experts. Eberly draws a pedagogical lesson from this analysis of the decline of literary debates. She suggests that the disciplines of Communication and Composition can foster the development of “protopublic classrooms,” which allow students to work on becoming citizen critics.

Briefly, a protopublic classroom is organized as a type of public space where students emphasize their civic identities and refine their abilities to participate in public
discourse. Ultimately, protopublic classrooms are constrained by their location within institutions of higher learning, which foster complex power arrangements based on the implied distribution of knowledge in classrooms and a grading process that cements this power dynamic. While the “institutional structures” of the classroom “keep it from being a public space, students can study and practice the discourses of literary public spheres as well as compose arguments that they may choose to publish or broadcast, thus engaging with and perhaps even forming publics--ephemerally or sustainably” (“Rhetoric and the Anti-Logos Doughball” 293). The larger goal for protopublic classrooms is that the act of discussing and debating public issues “can form collective habits, these habits can be experienced as pleasurable, and these shared rhetorical practices can sustain publics and counterpublics--on campus and beyond campus” (“Rhetoric and the Anti-Logos Doughball” 294).

When discussing English Studies pedagogy, Eberly identifies two distinct advantages that a protopublic approach holds over more traditional approaches. First, Eberly suggests:

studying and producing discourses that form or sustain literary public spheres can help create a public-oriented agency or subjectivity in students that transcends the limits of liberal democratic citizenship as well as formalist criteria for ethos--“good sense, good will, and good moral character.” (Citizen Critics 170)

We can take Eberly to mean that this type of agency-building classroom frames life in publics as something richer that traditional liberal visions of voting or participating in a predefined political sphere. Since students are invited to see themselves as participants
in a number of different publics, which may privilege different norms and values, they are less likely to define ethos as an unchanging category. Instead, student rhetors can think “about how they might construct various ethe to invent and present themselves in different publics or at different points in a public’s process of forming” (Citizen Critics 171). Second, Eberly notes that a protopublic classroom allows “for the study of how publics form and, perhaps, disintegrate” (Citizen Critics 171). As such, students and teachers both develop a better understanding of the nature of publics if they are working to become active participants in existing publics. Eberly’s concept of the protopublic classroom is thus an attempt to develop a greater sense of publicness within the constraints imposed by the physical location of most classrooms in institutions of higher education.

One strategy for nurturing this sense of publicness is to organize public speaking courses around contemporary public issues; instructors can frame public speaking courses around issues like “The War in Iraq,” “Affirmative Action in America,” or more university specific controversies. These topics could be listed in the schedule of classes to allow students to register for those topics that reflect their interests. The previous chapter examined the limitations of public speaking syllabi that deny the class a sense of publicness by atomizing students with a demand for separate topics culled from the students’ personal experiences. Structuring classes as topics courses enables students to develop a type of public around a specific issue. Such context-dependent public speaking courses might work better to highlight rhetorical invention and offer a more nuanced understanding of audience adaptation.
All assignments in this topics class should deal with the topic itself (ex. assignments designed to spark invention, speaking assignments, in-class discussions and debates), which could allow students to focus more on honing certain rhetorical techniques instead of generating and researching three separate speech topics. A topical model examines a specific case study to demonstrate how publics themselves recommend strategies for crafting situation appropriate responses. Listing the topic for the course in the bulletin of classes permits students, much like the members of a public, to choose which public they join. As a result, members in any particular class would face an informed audience in the classroom and would be better prepared to identify forums outside the classroom for engaging in public speech.

This shared topic does raise a practical problem. Unlike a composition class organized around a theme in which students engage in private writing, students in a topical public speaking class listen to their peer’s speeches, which will now demonstrate significantly greater overlap. However, a good topics course would allow varied speech topics while retaining a common focus. The sample syllabus organizes the course around the topic of “Hate Speech on the Indiana University Campus,” a theme that encourages a cluster of unique but related speech topics. Some students may choose to address the particulars of one of the two case studies; some may speak to the appropriateness of university speech codes; and some may use the work on speech codes to address some other related issue. While each of these speeches will be different, each also draws from a common body of assigned readings and speaks to an informed and partisan in-class public.
Not all good topics need necessarily be as traditionally political as the war in Iraq or affirmative action. John Dewey writes in *Democracy and Education*, “schooling must provide genuine situations in which personal participation brings home the import of the material and the problems which it conveys. From the standpoint of the pupil, the resulting experiences are worth while on their own account” (233). The challenge then is to identify a topic that will offer students a worthwhile experience in addition to the public speaking skills derived from the course. Inasmuch as this topic must give rise to an active protopublic, the topic itself must be inherently interesting to students in their current situation. This places a demand on teachers to search for topics that will be of interest and importance to students, instead of simply identifying topics that will be of interest to the teacher.

Such an attempt to focus the public speaking class around the study of unique discourse practices bears some similarities to the work addressing Communication Across the Curriculum (CXC) programs. CXC programs vary in the sense that some are oriented towards specific pre-professional groups while others are organized more around a liberal arts theme, but most CXC programs attempt to investigate the discursive practices unique to publics. Darling and Dannels note that pre-professional CXC programs, like those aimed at teaching engineering students to investigate and imitate the discourse of engineering communities, “should focus on the oral genres, standards of effectiveness, and evaluation practices of the target discipline” (3). Similarly, Garside argues that communication educators need to teach CXC with an eye to the identifying and adapting to the local norms of effectiveness for a particular public. In essence, the CXC literature identifies existing professional spaces and calls for studying their unique
discourse instead of discussing generic rhetorical skills that can be applied to a variety of unknown future situations; this allows CXC teachers to discuss process skills such as interpretation and invention with reference to specific constraints. However, in orienting CXC around the examination of the unique discourse of professional discourse communities, Dannels implies that public speaking functions as a service course that can only provide a general introduction to presentational speech:

Assuming a context-driven perspective on learning to communicate does not negate the need for a basic communication course. Rather, it justifies the need for this kind of course. A basic course in public speaking or hybrid course provides students with general information, language, and introductory glimpse of communication theory and practice. (“Time to Speak Up” 152-53)

Dannels enables a study of process in unique rhetorical situations by confining the public speaking course to presentational skills.

Moving to a topical model for the public speaking class also allows for a study of invention. When rhetorical instruction surrenders its ability to speak to the creation of discourse, teachers of rhetoric are left in the position of arranging and polishing ideas formed elsewhere. While textbooks’ current comments on invention focus on the arrangement of proofs, a study of discourse in a protopublic classroom allows for the invention of material. An instructor can assign a few key texts for a given topic area and ask the students to identify the stasis points, which can thus serve as inventions resources for student speeches. In the sample syllabus provided in appendices E and F, students are assigned readings dealing with specific case studies of campus hate speech.
and also assigned texts addressing the nature of university speech codes. An assignment
devoted to invention asks students to identify the stasis points in the assigned readings
and in the in-class discourse; a follow up assignment asks students to develop arguments
in response to these stasis points. These assignments are complemented with readings
and instruction on classical invention. These assigned readings provide useful texts for
identifying stasis points and, additionally, provide some background knowledge on the
topic itself. Not only are members of this protopublic better equipped to identify the
arguments advanced by speakers, but they are also better equipped to question the
interpretations of texts used for evidence. In such a context, traditional textbook
concerns about the ethical responsibility to use sources honestly are now tied to matters
of rhetorical effectiveness since the in-class public is informed enough to render
judgments about honesty and propriety. The fact that members of this protopublic share
some common texts prevents much plagiarism and egregious misuse of sources.

A topics-based class may provide the means for more in-class discussion and
debate, but how is such a class a public? It is clearly not a public in Michael Warner’s
sense of an entity “that comes into being only in relation to texts and their circulation”
(“Publics and Counterpublics (Abbreviated Version)” 413). The classroom itself and its
assigned topic minimize the degree to which the public is entirely self-organizing. Class
size minimizes the effect of stranger relations. Such small class size poses a unique
challenge since a lower teacher-student ratio enables more direct instruction but also
limits the number, and potentially the diversity, of opinions in this protopublic. And
given that this protopublic classroom occurs within the larger setting of the university,
where traditional students may be taking multiple classes that do not function as
protopublics, the public nature of this particular classroom may be lost occasionally when individuals define themselves and their responsibilities primarily in terms of “student” or “teacher” instead of members of a public. While the classroom will never be a pure public, teachers of rhetoric can attempt to define the classroom space less as an area where physical student audiences gather to listen to student speeches and more as a public that circulates and discusses texts and opinions.

Eberly notes that scholars in Speech Communication “have a chance to influence how rhetoric is practiced in our wider culture by thinking critically about what attitudes they implicitly and explicitly teach their students when they teach them what it means to speak and when they practice speaking with them” (“Rhetoric and the Anti-Logos Doughball” 291). She claims that the classroom can function as a public space, but she does not outline the normative model of communication that should obtain in this public space, though we might find a civic republicanism operative in her calls for a stronger sense of civic identity. Similarly, Eberly discusses the need to retain the positive elements of Habermas while ignoring the more utopian bits of Habermas. For example, she calls for retaining “the promise of Habermas’s insights into language use in political economies, into structures of legitimation, into social reproduction” while getting rid of his “philosophical idealism” (288). Yet, it is unclear how Habermasian her vision of the protopublic classroom is. Taking the model of the protopublic classroom, we can fill in the normative model of public communication with a modified form of agonistic pluralism.
Agonistic Pluralism

Chantal Mouffe’s theory of agonistic pluralism provides an appropriate starting point for the development of a normative communication model for a topical protopublic classroom. Agonistic pluralism represents an attempt to fashion a vision of the political sphere that begins from non-foundationalist assumptions, but works towards a vigorous political life instead of degrading into nihilism. Mouffe suggests that democracy is best secured by a vibrant clash of different political positions. Societies that deny this robust contestation of political values may experience a dangerous and violent confrontation between “non-negotiable moral values and essentialist identities.” In place of either principled foundations as in Rawls or discursive procedures as in Habermas, Mouffe locates a complex web of hegemonic tokens of democratic discourse that function as guides for political discussions. Mouffe suggests that “what makes us fellow citizens in a liberal democratic regime is not a substantive idea of the good but a set of political principles specific to such a tradition: the principles of freedom and equality for all.” Identification with these principles, she argues, will “provide the common substance required for democratic citizenship” (The Return of the Political 129). She suggests that in the fray of political contestation, principles of equality and freedom are completely open to interpretation and thus reflect different groups’ conceptions of the good life in potentially different ways.

Efforts to control and dominate the tokens of this hegemonic discourse occur in a broad and highly contentious political sphere defined by political agonism. As citizens struggle to gain support for their particular hegemonic definition of key political terms, they engage in robust forms of persuasion, all the while recognizing that they cannot call
for the total elimination of their opposition. Mouffe recommends that political actors conceive of their rivals as adversaries rather than enemies in order to prevent political spheres from devolving into dangerous spaces marked by few actors defending their beliefs intransigently. She writes:

An adversary is an enemy, but a legitimate enemy, one with whom we have some common ground because we have a shared adhesion to the ethico-political principles of liberal democracy: liberty and equality. But we disagree concerning the meaning and implementation of those principles, and such a disagreement is not one that could be resolved through deliberation and rational discussion. (The Democratic Paradox 102)

At its core, agonistic pluralism remains functionally liberal in its dedication to liberty, equality, and tolerance, while recognizing that liberty and equality are tropes that gain meaning in specific settings. While a definite and universal set of procedural rules that eliminate power from the realm of deliberation, as in Habermas, cannot exist, we can establish a set of temporary and partial guidelines, which are rooted in a particular tradition of democratic language games.

There are two distinct benefits that emerge from framing the topical protopublic classroom in terms of agonistic pluralism. First, agonistic pluralism highlights the need for rhetorical skill in deliberative encounters. Agonistic pluralism raises an important question for teachers of rhetoric: how can rhetors craft arguments from the existing discursive terrain of liberal democracy to persuade their peers in public deliberations? The principles of agonistic pluralism suggest that rhetoricians should not teach a general
effectiveness for all spheres or for all potential forms of public speaking; rather, rhetoricians should assist students in using the language of democracy to achieve effectiveness in specific public spheres. Second, agonistic pluralism counters the rhetorical idealism of deliberation with a theory that emphasizes the dynamics of power and language in deliberative encounters. As such, this approach better responds to students who dismiss deliberative democracy as so much foreign sounding civic virtue. However, to say that agonistic pluralism is less idealistic does not mean that functions as a Hobbesean rhetorical war of all against all. The theory acknowledges the inevitability of power and disagreement in deliberative encounters while seeking to establish the dominance of a democratic language game.

In applying Mouffe’s theory, we move to an agonistic topical protopublic classroom. This classroom approach requires exclusions; a protopublic challenge to lore cannot simply be grafted onto existing syllabi. Such a classroom is obviously different than the one proposed by Schwartzman, “Classrooms need to be ‘safe zones’ where students can experiment and fail without becoming failures” (138). Classrooms that focus on developing the habits and practices of civic argumentation should avoid becoming power-free zones of self-expression and safety. The agonistic topical protopublic classroom does not impose conversational constraints on students to protect members of this protopublic from the arguments arising from adversarial relationships. A protopublic space challenges students to learn and practice the elements of strong public argumentation that might encourage and support engagement in other publics. Following Mouffe, students should prepare for the types of practices that they will use in other publics, both expressivist and deliberative. Such a classroom should be a tolerant
space, but also a realistic space that balances the demands of production, performance, and critique.

Simply raising the issue of public discussion and debate assumes that students need opportunities to practice deliberative speech. This call for rhetorical skills education is not a call for the “postponement” of democratic participation. Robert L. Ivie suggests that the traditional deliberative approach, with its emphasis on preparing for deliberation, postpones democratic practice “indefinitely into a hypothetical future where the condition of diversity would no longer apply and where participatory democracy would be sufficiently disciplined by an illusion of universal reason to yield a reliable and supposedly rational consensus” (278). However, not all attempts to improve discussion and debate render participatory democracy anemic. Kevin Mattson’s concerns about the nature of popular deliberation are appropriate here. He notes that since civic education has fallen into disarray, a “gathering of citizens about pressing matters might not produce the most satisfying results” (328). Simply calling for immediate and widespread deliberation evades the fact that many students lack a background culture or interest in deliberative practice. Ivie fears that some calls for participatory democracy still rely on the deep belief that “the people must be properly educated to an appropriate level of civic literacy before they can be trusted to practice democracy safely” (original emphasis 279). This is a real concern that requires teachers to balance public education with the recognition that immediate deliberation may suffer when practiced by citizens ill equipped for such an activity; worse yet, attempts at deliberation may lead to increased apathy. Educators of rhetoric should look for ways to
improve deliberation and public debate by helping students refine their invention and performance skills as rhetors.

In raising the issue of public issues and public spaces, it is important to chart out how this agonistic topical protopublic classroom differs from the theories of both Habermas and Rawls. This model assumes that shared discourse rather than procedural principles (Habermas) or political principles (Rawls) binds this class together as a public. The difference being that the shared discourse remains open to interpretation and revision while a set of moral or political principles may not.

In his influential *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Habermas traces the role of English coffeehouses, French salons, and German Tablesocieties in the development of the historic bourgeois public sphere. These various organizations “preserved a kind of social intercourse that, far from presupposing the equality of status, disregarded status altogether” (36). Even though this sense of equality was never fully realized, it served as an ideal guiding talk in these public venues. This leads Habermas to conclude that the public sphere presumed universal access despite its bourgeois origins. He writes, “the public that might be considered the subject of the bourgeois constitutional state viewed its sphere as a public one in this strict sense; in its deliberations it anticipated in principle that all human beings belonged to it” (85). Of course, we can see here the beginnings of the ideal speech situation, which grants universal access and eliminates power differences in discussions. The protopublic classroom does not presume universal access while attempting to bracket status differences in the in-class discussions and debates. However, questions of access and power take on a different character in a classroom.
setting since the protopublic classroom can practically reduce some power inequities. The assigned class readings provide an opportunity to counter some of the inequalities built into differences in participants’ level of expertise with an issue. Since the classroom is a space for both developing and performing rhetorical ability, it operates against, but of course does not eliminate, differences in rhetorical skill. This does not mean that students are epistemic or rhetorical equals. The protopublic classroom confronts the question of access not by assuming universal access of all students to the discussion, or even assuming equal access on the part of the students present in the classroom, but by enabling access by working to establish some equality in terms of expertise and ability.

Even though the classroom addresses some power issues, this does not mean that it attempts to bracket power issues. As we have seen, Mouffe seeks to pull power to the center of her theory; Nancy Fraser also challenges Habermas on this score. Fraser argues that Habermas assumes “that societal equality is not a necessary condition for political democracy” (117). That is, if participants can successfully bracket power differences in order to debate public matters as equals, then reforms aimed at addressing power inequities are not essential to a well functioning democracy. Fraser writes, “such bracketing usually works to the advantage of dominate groups in society and to the disadvantage of subordinates. In most cases it would be more appropriate to unbracket inequalities in the sense of explicitly thematizing them” (original emphasis 120). This leads her to conclude that a truly effective deliberating public works to highlight structural inequalities and thus open them up to critical interventions.
The risk to the protopublic classroom is to assume that students come to this classroom with few power differences. Teachers must avoid erasing the histories of individual students and placing them all under the totalizing sign of “student.” Richard Ohmann notes that most composition textbooks treat students as if they are preparing for their future role in society when they might have a history, interests, and power. This holds true of public speaking textbooks, which justify the study of public speaking by promising some future benefits. Ohmann writes:

> though these writers see the student as moving toward a place in society (free citizen; mover and shaker), they do not locate him in society now. They see him as newborn, unformed, without social origins and without needs that would spring from his origins. He has no history. Hence the writing he does and the skills he acquires are detached from those parts of himself not encompassed by his new identity as student. (original emphasis 148)

Students come to the protopublic classroom already formed with histories of power and histories with power. Failing to address these power inequities undermines much of the legitimacy of attempts at civic engagement and empowerment. Bracketing power differences in the protopublic classroom would further marginalize the disempowered within the classroom. Moreover, highlighting and problematizing the power differences between teacher and student serves to radicalize the classroom itself, a move that dovetails with Henry Giroux’s call for more democratic forms of authority in classrooms. Giroux critiques traditional models of teacher authority that emphasize control over students and the transmission of content. He opts instead to frame teachers
as intellectual workers who enter into the classroom in order to cultivate democratic
subjectivities. Giroux writes that educational practices:

> can be organized around forms of learning in which the knowledge and
skills acquired serve to prepare students to later develop and maintain
those counterpublic spheres outside of schools that are so vital for
developing webs of solidarity in which democracy as a social movement
operates as an active force. (106)

Subjecting power relations to critical investigation thus throw into greater relief the
limitations of a traditional classroom structure to practicing classroom democracy.

The protopublic classroom is neither procedural in Habermas’s sense, nor is it
wholly deliberative or thickly liberal in Rawls’s sense. While Habermas offers a
comprehensive theory of discussion, Rawls’s limits his theory to a political account of
principles. Rawls seeks to develop a theory to address the question, “How is it possible
that there may exist over time a stable and just society of free and equal citizens
profoundly divided by reasonable though incomparable religious, philosophical, and
moral doctrines” (xx)? For Rawls, a freestanding conception of political liberalism must
be formed independently from any particular comprehensive doctrine and be familiar to the
political culture of the people forming this liberal conception. A Rawlsian account
of political liberalism relies on public reasons and public reasonableness to establish
political principles that can be affirmed by different comprehensive doctrines. These
reasons thus serve as guides to public political deliberations. While public reason
establishes guidelines for public inquiry (establishing the range of acceptable moral
claims and acceptable evidence), public reasonableness establishes behavioral guidelines
for engaging in social cooperation. Such principles guide citizens profoundly divided by reasonable, though incompatible, religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines in creating and sustaining a fair and equal system of social cooperation.

Pedagogically, this call for public reasons can be operationalized in a number of different ways (O'Connell; O'Connell and McKenzie). Amy Gutmann’s model in Democratic Education serves as a well known attempt. In it, Gutmann focuses on both the goals of a democratic education and the limits that such goals place on educational authority and policy. She argues, “a society that supports conscious social reproduction must educate all educable children to be capable of participating in collectively shaping their society” (39). The aims of education, for Gutmann, are to prepare people to deliberate the ends of society freely and effectively. In addressing the question of authority for the education of future citizens, Gutmann outlines some of the content of a deliberative education, which emphasizes a strong sense of civic virtue:

Civic education should therefore also include helping students to develop the ability to deliberate about their political disagreements with others. Helping students develop this ability also entails helping them cultivate the deliberative virtues of being well-informed, open-minded, and opinionated about politically relevant issues and the performance of office holders. (37)

Here and in other passages, Gutmann emphasizes deliberative virtues (rationality, equality, a lack of bias) over rhetorical skills (invention, tropological awareness, argumentation). In fact, Gutmann even seems suspicious of argumentative skill. She writes, “People adept at logical reasoning who lack moral character are sophists of the
worst sort; they use moral arguments to serve whatever ends they happen to choose for themselves” (51). Here we can begin to see a distinction between civic education and an education aimed at public participation.

The model for the public speaking class mapped out in this chapter is more public than it is civic. Civic education implies a set of civic values and an established set of appropriate locations for engaging in civic speech. In a related way, many service-learning programs aim to improve civic space and communication. The National Communication Association’s *Service-Learning and Communication: A Disciplinary Toolkit* asserts, “the service-learning community affirms two cardinal values, personal responsibility for civic participation and institutional responsibility to participate with the community to improve society” (Conville and Weintraub 6). This emphasis on improving society finds its outlet in service activities that assist local communities. An agonistic topical protopublic classroom however focuses more on public discussion and debate than it does on social improvement. The topical protopublic public speaking course emphasizes effective public participation, and thus aims to provide students with the argumentative and political skills necessary for public discussion and debate. These educational goals may be a poor fit for service-learning programs. When the educational goal is to empower students with the ability to argue effectively about public issues, it is difficult to imagine an activity that could satisfy a community need and provide opportunities for enhanced learning. We might say that approaching public speaking as a means for increasing participation in public sphere debates satisfies a community need for healthy and active public spheres, but this is to take a long view of “social improvement.”
Such protopublic classes are thus closer in spirit to discussion forums. Herbert W. Simons has recently written on Temple University’s effort to revive such forums as pedagogical tools for teaching the skills of public discussion and debate. Similarly, William Keith has traced the discipline of Communication’s historic links to the discussion movement in America (“Democratic Revival and the Promise of Cyberspace”; “Dewey, Discussion, and Democracy in Speech Pedagogy”). As Keith points out, the American discussion movement in the 1920s and 1930s sought to link education with public participation by encouraging citizens to discuss public matters. So too should the topical agonistic protopublic classroom encourage students to discuss and debate public issues.

The Role of the Teacher

Given the need to balance elements of agonism with elements of liberalism in the service of education, the topical agonistic protopublic classroom demands that we question the role of teacher authority. Generally, this classroom calls for a coach who works with students to develop their own situation specific responses; yet, this teacher should not clearly identify a specific ideological perspective on the topic under consideration and seek to convince students to adopt this privileged position. This means that the goal of agonistic pluralism in this topical protopublic places more conversational constraints on the teacher than it does on the students. While the agonistic elements of this topical protopublic space are designed to challenge students to identify and defend their own unique interpretation of issues and political tropes, the pedagogical spirit of this classroom is undermined by a strong teacher defense of a
specific ideological stance. Admittedly, the agonistic topical protopublic adheres to a liberal normative vision of democratic discourse, and thus is not neutral with regards to either the good or the right. However, to go beyond that general dedication to agonistic debate of liberal values to a more articulated defense of a particular stance on the course topic inserts a power dynamic that could reasonably be avoided. The teacher can choose to voice an argument about the issue under examination, though choosing to avoid adopting a specific position allows the primary power dynamic in debates to occur between students. While we can never ignore the influence that the presence of the teacher has on in-class debate, limiting the teacher’s role in the agonistic exchange of arguments enables a more equal deliberative encounter among students.

A protopublic classroom is thus different from Omar Swartz’s model for a critical pedagogical public speaking class. While a topical protopublic classroom, like Swartz’s approach to the course, would require a process-centered curriculum, the basic goals and assignments diverge. Briefly, Swartz recommends six assignments designed to help students “understand the criteria under which ‘power’ and ‘knowledge’ contribute to the articulations of social belief and desire” (*Conducting* 165):

1. A speech of dissent “designed to resist some localized manifestation of power at the point at which the student is directly involved” (165).

2. A speech in support of marginalized positions designed to illustrate that “what most Americans take for granted, the conditions of the status quo, only exists and thrives in relationship to some marginalized position” (166).
3. A speech of self-criticism design to “explore how [students’] privileged life habits impact the lives of others” (166).

4. Journal assignments that call for application of the critical concepts learned in class to popular culture.

5. A letter to the editor that asks students to “explore the alternative media and to compare these viewpoints with those of the dominant media” (167).

6. A book review of “a book critical of traditional American beliefs, culture, or social institutions” (167).

These are valuable assignments, but they point towards a course goal very different from an agonistic topical protopublic classroom. Swartz’s course is a detailed and theoretically grounded attempt to nurture students’ critical thinking skills. While this course highlights the connections between language and oppression for students, Swartz’s assignments do not necessarily develop students’ abilities to discuss and debate public issues (though indeed they might). For example, the letter to the editor assignment asks students to “take a position on a cultural issue that directly affects their lives (i.e., sexism, racism, the state of the economy, foreign affairs, etc.)” (167). While writing a letter to the editor is an excellent form of public speech, and while directing students to select an issue of personal importance is always necessary for good writing, the scope of the letter seems rather broad. Similarly, the speech of self-criticism seems to reinforce lore’s assertion that invention is primarily internal and meditative. The problem is not with Swartz’s goals (recognizing the power of discourse to privilege and
marginalize) nor even with Swartz’s critical pedagogy; rather, the problem is that this course seems to use public speaking as a means for teaching a specific critical point.

Such a critical pedagogy runs the risk of beginning with problems that students may not claim as their own. Critiquing the more oppositional tendencies of critical pedagogy, Fishman and McCarthy point to Dewey’s suggestion that true development requires an active attempt on the part of the student to wrestle with difficult issues. “It follows that Dewey would oppose teachers who have static pedagogical ends, for example, particular political positions which they want students to adopt before leaving their classrooms” (347). Dewey’s general dedication to student debate and resolution is more effective for an education in effective public disputation than a critical pedagogy that seeks to arrest developing student debate with an instructor’s strong defense of a particular privileged position. At the very least, an agonistic topical protopublic approach combats apathy by providing students with an opportunity to develop and defend their own informed opinion on a specific public issue. Ideally, students would leave the class with a developed opinion on a pressing public matter, and this opinion would have developed out of their deliberations and debates with fellow students.

Increasing students’ ability and willingness to engage in more public debate thus reflects a desire to see more public debate in non-classroom spaces. Henry Giroux argues that these active classrooms, or as he terms them “democratic counterpublic spheres,” can be organized around:

forms of learning in which the knowledge and skills acquired serve to prepare students to later develop and maintain those counterpublic spheres outside of schools that are so vital for developing webs of
solidarity in which democracy as a social movement operates as an active force. (106)

The protopublic version of the course outline in this chapter also differs from Donald Lazere’s efforts to use conflicts as a way of studying ideological bias. In his composition class, Lazere begins by walking students through matters of definition, denotation, and connotation; next, Lazere sensitizes students to their own biases and the biases of others; finally, he ends with a paper in which students do not render an opinion, but “make a balanced summary of the strong and weak points made by each of the limited number of sources they have studied, and then to make--and support--their judgment about which sources have presented the best-reasoned case and the most thorough refutation of the other side’s arguments” (202). While Lazere has avoided some of the problems bundled with oppositional pedagogy, he has faulted in the other direction--the class is no longer about forming and defending opinions, but recognizing bias and evaluating arguments based on their logical components. He writes, “One must judge a partisan argument on the basis of how fully and fairly it represents the opposing position and demonstrates why its own is more reasonable” (201). This critical thinking goal is valuable, but falls short of empowering students to develop and articulate intelligent opinions that recognize and critique potential counter-arguments.

Thomas West similarly seeks to use disagreement as a way of leveraging critical distance on an issue. He argues against seeing the composition classroom as a community, but rather as a “polyphonic space composed of students with various interests, goals, ethnicities, modes of expression, and relations to the benefits of
dominant culture” (146). Yet, West uses dissensus as a way of triggering some type of inner reflection. He writes:

Each time they write, students reposition themselves in relation to the various and competing discourses that comprise their lives. The point is not to arrive at a place where every student has the right to his or her own opinion--where pluralism rules--nor to get students to wholly accept hegemonic values, not to get them to comply with the radical teacher’s position--to diametrically oppose hegemonic values, say--but to encourage them to realize the subjugating and formative powers of discourse. (147)

For West, the goal is to enable students to rise above the political fray and understand discourse, but his proposal does not emphasize using discourse politically or effectively. This critical perspective on subjectivity stretches even further. “If students are able to imagine new ways of positioning themselves in society, then they might be able to realize how their choices--of lifestyle and careers, for example--are limited by the normalizing and marginalizing effects of discursive formations in general” (147). But here we have left the actual classroom space far behind in the hopes that a writing assignment will transcend the particulars of disagreement and encourage a radical self-reflexivity. The agonistic topical protopublic classroom’s goal of empowerment does not aim at a telos of critical thinking or critical distance, but at critical engagement in actual publics. Teachers in protopublic classrooms should help students to develop and refine their opinions, not default to the safe space of critical distance where we might
claim to evaluate arguments objectively; in this sense, the teacher adheres to a general belief that more discussion and debate (of various political stripes) is a primary good.

Instrumentalism

Instructional communication research suggests that students often see the basic public speaking course as a key means for acquiring job-related skills (Ford and Wolvin, “The Differential Impact of a Basic Communication Course;” Frymier and Shulma; Hunt et al.). Such findings lead Hunt et al. to argue, “Clearly, communication scholars must develop an understanding of the skills their students perceive to be most useful and relevant to their future careers” (4). Some public speaking textbooks also recognize and speak to this demand for job-related skills. For example, in Speak with Confidence: A Practical Guide, Vasile and Mintz explain to the reader “What this course can do for you.” In addition to standard claims of building confidence and developing listening abilities, the authors suggest that a course in public speaking can help students to: “learn the secrets of meeting and being accepted by people,” “be more assertive,” and “sell yourself to an employer, a group, or friends.” The textbook offers an entire chapter devoted to presenting oneself in professional settings (this chapter includes the section headings: “How to Sell Yourself to a Prospective Employer” and “How about a Raise?”), as well as chapters on group work and conversational speaking. While the text continues to teach many of the same lessons as other textbooks (evidence, argument, persuasive speaking, informative speaking, etc.), the book reinforces the idea that public speaking is a gateway skill for professional success. Speak with Confidence: A Practical Guide is simply one example of a larger trend to provide a strong business focus for the
basic course. John A. Daly notes, “The very capitalistic biases of our service courses reflect a certain philosophical approach to communication— it is a tool, something we use to accomplish things that will lead to extrinsic success” (378). Daly states this matter of factly while discussing the lack of institutional histories for communication education; however, Daly’s own public speaking textbook treats communication as a tool for business success. In *Presentations in Everyday Life*, Daly and Engleberg organize the book around “presentational speaking” instead of public speaking because presentations are “more common,” “less formal,” and “more important to employers.” Daly and Engleberg continue:

> Businesses need good presenters, not public orators. When employers are asked about the skills they are looking for in new employees, public speaking is not at the top of their list. What does emerge, however, is a clear preference for communication skills, including the ability to present ideas and information to colleagues and clients. (original emphasis 7)

Yet, defining public speaking in terms of its professional applications places rhetoric in the position of simply arranging the knowledge produced by more serious content-based disciplines.

The agonistic topical protopublic model for the course developed here rejects this business orientation and its accompanying instrumentalism. By focusing on public communication, an agonistic topical protopublic classroom seeks to encourage students to operate as critical consumers and producers of rhetoric in publics. The agonistic topical protopublic model does defend “skills” training, where skills means providing students with the options to further develop their communication repertoire. But it
would be naïve to presume that any attempt to help students refine their communication strategies automatically amounts to subjecting communication education to market forces.

Public speaking instruction will always address public speaking skill. As we have seen, the very concept of skill is hierarchically positioned against knowledge in the scholarly critiques of lore. What results is a rush to dismiss public speaking as mere skill, just as philosophers denounced rhetoric as mere. Yet, there are very different types of public speaking skills. The form of instrumentalist knowledge discussed above frames public speaking as a skill that will reap economic benefits in the marketplace. Such a model displaces concerns about argument and invention in favor of clear communication and presentational acumen. The type of public speaking skill fostered in an agonistic topical protopublic classroom fosters a skill in analyzing and produce public arguments. While such rhetorical ability might prove economically beneficial, it is not justified in those terms. At its worst, the instrumentalist tendency in communication education attempts to respond to market demands by tailoring a pedagogy that will produce workers that can easily participate in the language of business. The model of the class discussed here makes no such promise. Indeed, this model for the course does not prepare students for the workforce, but rather, helps students analyze and produce public discourse. Roderick Hart, one of the few rhetoricians who speaks to this need for a rich sense of rhetorical education, writes, “When I, as a citizen, learn to use the language of power successfully, I decrease my chances of being victimized by the entrenched, antediluvian forces in my society. By learning how to listen to the language of power I learn how power is constructed and how it can be dismantled” (102-3).
Conclusion: Implementing Agonistic Topical Protopublics

This model for the course is intended as a means for addressing some of the shortcomings with the dominant course model circulating in the public speaking public. The public’s general suspicion of public speaking lore indicates an uneasiness with the current model for the course. This chapter has attempted to respond to the problems with the structure of the course discussed in chapter two without falling into many of the pitfalls common to such criticism outlined in chapter three. The public speaking classroom, when framed as a public space for the agonistic exchange of arguments, adheres to the possibility that communication education and rhetorical pedagogy can assist in nurturing subjects, who, in Greene’s words, “recognize themselves as public subjects” (439).

It should come as no surprise that English Composition has already found the usefulness of using topical classrooms to teach rhetoric. Composition programs have long utilized this strategy, but the composition classes at the University of Texas at Austin serve as a good model. At the University of Texas at Austin, students taking composition can choose from multiple different topics courses ranging from the use of comedy, to American Indian affairs, to the rhetoric surrounding September 11th. Composition teachers, mostly graduate students, can pick and develop topics for their courses. The courses have no common textbook or common syllabus. In class, students and teachers come together around specific topics in order to develop writing strategies in specific contexts. Given the wide range of topics, students can enter into a writing classroom with a background on the topic and an interest to investigate its implications. The composition course offers between 20 and 30 sections each semester. In the Fall of
2004, there were 22 different topics for the same basic writing course.\(^1\) The breadth and sustainability of such an analogous program quickly answers concerns about the practicality of the course described above.

The composition program at the University of Texas at Austin has thus reached some tangible success conditions. Based on a rhetorical model of invention and audience, these topics courses have worked well enough to continue to grow. The success conditions for the agonistic topical protopublic model for the public speaking course described above are a bit harder to chart out since the course is not, to my knowledge, in place at any university. It is important to establish conditions to measure the results of such a course in order to avoid the pitfall of scholarly criticism that simply proposes an alternative model to lore and then quickly moves on. We could identify some internal and external success conditions for the proposed course. The internal success conditions speak to the course’s ability to accomplish its goal of better teaching invention and adaptation. The external success conditions speak to the course’s ability to circulate in the public speaking public and thus challenge lore by providing an alternative model for organizing the course.

Using an agonistic topical protopublic approach requires examining the benefits and limitations of this approach for teachers and students. The proposed model described here requires significantly more teacher preparation since it asks teachers to not only teach public speaking, but also develop and investigate public issues. Additionally, students must commit to readings and preparation that would not be necessary in a traditional public speaking course. Yet, as Richard J. Light points out in

\[^1\) The course is Topics in Writing (RHE 309K). For more information, please see the Division for Rhetoric and Composition’s website at http://www.drc.utexas.edu/index.php.
Making the Most of College, increased levels of student engagement with course materials and time spent on course work often correlates with increased engagement with the course concepts. Future study should compare this model for the course against a more traditional model for the course to determine student benefit. Such a study could compare students from an agonistic topical protopublic classroom and students enrolled in more traditional classroom and ask them to observe a public debate over a pressing public matter. Students could then be asked to insert themselves into the debate and develop arguments (the type of analysis and invention that members of public are asked to do daily).

We can also attempt to track the degree to which the model described above (and related models) are effective in challenging the dominant model found in lore. Such study requires a more genealogical approach to the circulation of knowledge. This would necessitate investigating where alternative models appear and are discussed in the public (in journals, at conferences, etc.). Also, a much more intensive study of individual programs would probably reveal more localized attempts to refine and reject lore. Future study should examine how such challenges to lore are institutionalized in terms of departmental requirements and larger university requirements. How the public speaking course is written into civic education programs at universities offers a particularly rich opportunity to see how public speaking lore adapts to institutional demands for public participation.

The agonistic topical protopublic classroom described above is just one challenge to the dominant lore. More models that step outside the existing reasonability for organizing the course serve to broaden our pedagogical imagination. This model can
prompt greater discussion and interrogation of the lore that permeates the public speaking public. However, such a challenge to lore cannot simply take the form of new models for the course, the public must fundamentally change the way in which it circulates and interrogates lore.
Summarizing Habermas’s work, Craig Calhoun writes that a well-functioning public sphere “depends upon both quality of discourse and quantity of participation” (2). The preceding chapters have demonstrated that the public speaking public needs to improve both the quality of its discourse and the quantity of its participation. Quality and quantity are clearly intertwined; as more members circulate solid critiques of lore, a greater diversity of critiques could emerge, which would give rise to more critical participation as members wrestle with the benefits and limitations of public speaking lore. In other words, better criticism drives more participation, which in turn sustains better criticism. As chapter three indicated, critiques of lore tend to reject lore as a stable body of knowledge without interrogating the actual texts of lore. This conclusion attempts to map out a model for encouraging more critical interaction with lore’s texts. This is, in effect, a call for a more critically active public speaking public. As should be evident by now, English Composition provides a good model for critical interaction with lore.

More and Better Critiques of Lore

A dominant theme in this dissertation has been the need for better criticism of lore. Scholarly, practitioner, and research critiques tend to denigrate lore rather than critique its practices and manifestations. This is not terribly surprising given the lack of critical frameworks for interacting with lore. Jo Sprague correctly points out, “Pedagogical theory cannot develop without a strong strand of critical and philosophical
work that provides standards against which to evaluate the practical techniques generated by teachers and scholars” (“Reading Our Own Speech Critiques” 180).

The Berko, Wolvin, and Wolvin IRM includes the exercise, “You, the Professor as Verbal Rapper,” which provides a script for the teacher to rap in class. This script includes passages like, “Some people think I’m no good at doing a rap / But that don’t mean you can just take a nap” (27). Such an exercise is ripe for criticism on many different levels. Many critical pedagogues would rightly be suspicious of some of the race and class work occurring when teaching strategies like this are framed as “reaching” the “Non-European-American students” in Communication classrooms (27).

We could also investigate how this exercise circulates in the public. We could explore how this exercise fits in with lore (what are the aspects of lore that gave rise to this type of exercise?). This type of exercise is problematic, but it should be studied in order to discern what conditions permitted this teaching exercise to make its way into a widely circulated and revised IRM.

A critique of lore is different from vilification of lore. As we have seen, scholarly and researcher critiques are quick to vilify the practices of lore as flawed and dangerous. What is not as present in critiques of lore is the recognition that lore as a body of knowledge worthy of study. North saw a similar type of uncritical vilification of lore in Composition. “If lore and its production can be said to have a positive function at all, it is only as a starting point--a foil, almost--for investigations seeking real knowledge” (331). This vilification of lore in general spills over into general distrust of teachers of public speaking apparent in scholarly and researcher critiques of lore.
Teaching materials also presume an under-qualified public speaking teacher. The Osborn IRM also states, “We realize that many of you are teaching the course for the first time, and that others of you have been teaching the course for so long you have reached a state of ‘burn out’ and could benefit from updating your knowledge of the subject area and teaching methods” (2). The very first passage in the preface for the Lucas IRM states, “It [the IRM] is intended primarily for the benefit of new and less experienced instructors, but I hope you will find it valuable even if you have been teaching public speaking for many years” (xvi). The Lucas textbook offers “The Integrated Teaching and Learning System,” which includes eleven separate print resources ranging from a test bank to a guide to using the textbook with non-native English speakers and twelve media resources including videotaped student speeches, historical speeches, women’s speeches, CDs and an “Online Learning Center.”

These resources are not bad in and of themselves but they work in tandem with the assumption that public speaking teachers need such resources because they lack the necessary skill and experience to teach the course well. The aspects of the public speaking public that serve to produce the materials that entrench lore (textbooks and IRMs) are working in relation to those aspects of the public speaking public that critique lore as entirely flawed (scholarly and researcher criticism). In other words, the public speaking public denounces public speaking teachers on the one hand and the public speaking public produces more texts that perpetuate the dominant model of lore in order to compensate for the increase of supposedly under-qualified teachers.

---

1 The Lucas IRM even attempts to sell other products. When discussing a particular exercise, the Lucas IRM announces that the videotape “Be Prepared to Speak” (sold separately) is “Entertaining as well as informative” (67). The Lucas IRM also remarks that the supplemental video “Speaking Effectively to 1 or 1,000” is “an excellent videotape” because it deals especially well with such issues as the importance of public speaking and how to deal with stage fright and it is “Entertaining and well-produced” (67).
Whether the widespread lack of skilled public speaking teachers is real or imagined (and we have only anecdotal evidence to support either conclusion), the production of textbooks aimed largely at helping students navigate the demands of the course in the presence of a potentially bad teacher leads to problematic practices. The resulting textbooks are so adapted to the classroom setting and the presumed model syllabus, that the actual teacher is almost irrelevant. Indeed, it is not a huge leap from Giroux’s fear about the deskilling of teachers that occurs when an emphasis is placed on standardized testing, to the deskilling of public speaking teachers that occurs when researcher critiques demand greater standardization in public speaking evaluation or CA education, or when scholarly critiques express an undemonstrated fear that an uncritical mass of teachers are currently teaching in sexist, racist, and oppressive ways. This is not to suggest that unskilled teachers are not teaching public speaking classes, or even that such teachers do not benefit from the texts that easily introduce them to public speaking lore. The problem arises however in crafting textbooks and materials to speak to this lowest common denominator primarily.

Inevitably, a more sustained approach to the criticism of lore’s pedagogical texts leads to their improvement. Robert J. Connors’s analysis of the relationship between advanced composition theory and the basic composition textbook is instructive. He suggests that following the explosion of advanced composition texts in the late 1800s, the composition textbook remained unchanged until the 1940s. He argues that these textbooks failed to change with the discipline because no scholars were engaged in a theoretical discussion of composition pedagogy. “In most developed intellectual disciplines, the function of texts has always been essentially conservative: textbooks,
which change with glacial slowness, provide stability amid the shifting winds of theoretical argument” (“Textbooks and the Evolution of the Discipline” 190). But Composition had no specialists in the early 1900s, no academic public to drive the development of pedagogical lore. The normal balance between theory and textbooks was destroyed. Consequently, we could say that the current public speaking public’s reluctance to perform close studies of lore’s texts contributes to the conservative nature of textbooks. Fortunately, the converse also holds true: a more active public speaking public can lead to improvements in the lore appearing in public speaking textbooks.

More Critical Venues

This need for a variety of different forms of criticism also highlights the public speaking public’s need for more critical forums. Scholarly critiques of lore circulate most in the BCCA. Of the scholarly articles on pedagogy published in the past fourteen years, over half are published in the BCCA (see appendix A). The BCCA aims at a much smaller segment of the public speaking public. The BCCA is difficult to locate since very few libraries have a complete collection of all sixteen volumes, and those libraries that do have more complete collections often employ one of the former editors for the annual (Minnesota State University, Mankato serves as one such example). The quality of the BCCA is also a relevant issue; some annuals include a number of quality articles, while others demonstrate less intellectual engagement. Additionally, some annuals include a number of typographical errors.

Institutional history highlights the decrease in the number of scholarly texts on public speaking pedagogy and the decrease in the number of publication venues for such
texts. The migration of scholarly texts about the public speaking course to the BCCA is a relatively recent event, traceable, in part, to the inclusion of Communication Studies into the discipline of speech/rhetoric in the 1960s and the concomitant increase in instructional communication research. The early editions of Quarterly Journal of Speech included a number of articles that dealt explicitly with teaching speech and rhetoric and this demand for pedagogical research and inquiry led to the creation of The Speech Teacher in 1952. It is worth noting that The Speech Teacher was only the third publication for the Speech Communication Association (SCA), with the QJS and Speech Monographs being the first two. The SCA did not start up another new publication until the first 1973 edition of the Journal of Applied Communication Research. The Speech Teacher maintained the tradition of QJS in the sense that established scholars continued to publish articles about pedagogy in addition to their primary area of research.

The rise of communication studies in the 1960s significantly altered the Speech discipline and understandings of the content and role of the public speaking course. As Pearce points out, the inclusion of communication reshaped the field, which until that point was defined in terms of the poles of rhetoric (Cornell tradition) and speech (Midwest tradition). The more social scientific instructional communication research began to dominate many discussions about communication education, including discussions of the public speaking course. The Speech Teacher and Communication Monographs each retained a unique character up until the 1970s, with Communication Monographs publishing a number of instructional communication studies and The Speech Teacher continuing to publish pedagogical work. However, an increasing instructional communication emphasis slowly filtered into The Speech Teacher leading
up to its 1976 name change to Communication Education, which adapted the journal’s mission to include a greater emphasis on instructional communication. Sprague notes that by the middle of the 1980s some editions of Communication Education were devoted almost entirely to social scientific instructional communication studies ("The Spiral Continues" 344). This change in the journal devoted to pedagogical issues mirrored the change in the other disciplinary journals, with a sharp drop off in the attention paid to pedagogical issues in the Quarterly Journal of Speech and other Speech Communication/rhetoric journals. While pedagogical articles never completely died out, there was a significant decline in the attention the public speaking course received in peer reviewed journals.

A more critical public speaking public must return to the more integrated days of The Speech Teacher and restore more venues for the circulation of pedagogical criticism. We can currently find some works on rhetorical pedagogy and public speaking pedagogy occurring in more diverse spaces, but these are still in the overwhelming minority of public speaking texts (J. A. Campbell; Eberly, “Rhetoric and the Anti-Logos Doughball”; Keith, “Dewey, Discussion, and Democracy”; Keith, “Identity, Rhetoric, and Myth”). These works provide an indication of how rhetoricians can return to the public speaking course as a source for both developing and evaluating rhetorical theory. In addition to increasing the quality of criticism of the public speaking public, the public would benefit by having more members circulate more texts in a greater variety of venues. Moving such critical scholarship out of Communication Education and the BCCA would also serve to remind the rest of the discipline of the merit of pedagogical research.
Conclusion: The Case for Composition

English Composition offers a number of lessons about the healthy interrogation of teaching lore for the public speaking public and the Communication discipline. Composition has already debated the role and function of the basic composition course in relation to its theory and overall curriculum. The breadth of English Composition research has challenged its lore by naming the dominant model of lore, seriously critiquing lore, and mapping out alternatives in a number of different publishing venues.

To begin with, Composition has devoted considerable attention to identifying some of the persistent traits of their dominant model of lore. While the “current-traditional rhetoric” remains a contested issue, critics of lore have a common reference point. While “current-traditional rhetoric” continues to exert considerable influence in composition, it is recognized as a force that merits criticism. The recognition of a pervasive model for teaching the composition course has prompted many critiques of lore: its origins, its evolution, its effects on students and teachers, and its potential for improvement. This recognition of the nature of lore has provoked a number of stark alternatives that seek to escape the boundaries of lore (specifically expressionist writing as a way of rejecting current-traditional rhetoric). Finally, this healthy understanding and criticism of lore appears in numerous journals (College Composition and Communication, College English, Composition Studies, Journal of Advanced Composition, Pre/Text, Rhetoric Review, The Writing Instructor) and a host of books from established university presses.

As a field, Composition also enjoys a sense of history and institutional legitimacy. Omar Swartz suggests that the rich conversation about composition vis-à-
vis the weak conversation about public speaking stems from three factors: the field of composition is more reflexive and ideologically sophisticated, it operates with a historical consciousness, and it is able to blend theory with practice in textbooks and journals (Conducting 153). We might add one additional factor: debate. Since Composition supports a number of forums for discussing pedagogical strategies, discussion and debates over pedagogical choices can emerge. Where Composition rhetoric has an active public that debates teaching issues, Communication rhetoric does not. Communication rhetoric, as hopefully this dissertation has demonstrated, has much to gain through an examination of how Composition has managed to maintain the integrity and intellectual tradition of rhetorical pedagogy. Michael Leff has also made the argument that public speaking would benefit by following the example set by English Composition. Leff notes that while rhetoricians in English departments continued to teach writing and thus fostered a common identity and a research tradition that was rooted in pedagogy. He writes that in Communication departments:

rhetoricians have tended to act much like literary scholars in English Departments; they have abandoned performance courses as soon as possible, leaving the teaching of public speaking, debate, and practical argumentation to adjuncts and graduate students, and their scholarship almost never refers to pedagogy. (“Rhetorical Disciplines and Rhetorical Disciplinarity “ 90)

The composition public thus operates more as a critical public and interrogates its lore. The public speaking public, however, may critique its lore from a technical stance (rhetorical theory, whiteness studies, social science), but few members position
lore itself as an emerging body of knowledge that can be debated publicly. Locating lore as the subject of this debating public serves to open up lore to more interrogation and reformulation. Composition’s relationship with its lore as a public serves as a good prompt for the public speaking public, encouraging more and better debates about the nature and direction of public speaking lore.
Appendix A: Texts in the Public Speaking Public

This is a chronological list of the various texts examined for this study that appeared in peer reviewed journals from 1990 to 2004. The texts are divided into practitioner, scholarly, and research texts. Texts were placed into categories based on which mode was most dominant in a given text. In those cases where texts were thoroughly multi-modal, texts were placed in multiple categories; these texts are noted below. There are no listings for articles from the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. My survey of these journals revealed that *QJS* had not published a single article with a significant focus on the public speaking course in the past fourteen years. There are 145 separate texts on this chart; due to multi-listed texts, the combined total comes to 162 texts. These are simply the texts that deal with public speaking explicitly; there are, no doubt, more articles that circulate in the public speaking public that are not listed here.

36 Research texts from *Communication Education*


1 Research text from Western Journal of Communication

12 Research texts from Communication Quarterly


No Research texts from Communication Studies
Communication Studies did not publish articles demonstrating a significant research orientation during the period examined.

4 Research texts from Southern Communication Journal


23 Research texts from Basic Communication Course Annual


4. Gibson, James W., Michael S. Hanna, and Greg Leichty. “The Basic Speech Course at United States Colleges and Universities: V.” *Basic Communication Course Annual* 2 (1990): 233-57. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly and Practitioner text)

5. Neer, Michael R., and W.F. Kirchner. “Classroom Interventions for Reducing Public Speaking Anxiety.” *Basic Communication Course Annual* 3 (1991): 202-23. (Note: This article is also listed as a Practitioner text)


7. Hess, Jon A., and Judy C. Pearson. “Basic Public Speaking Principles: An Examination of Twelve Popular Texts.” *Basic Communication Course Annual* 4 (1992): 16-34. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly and Practitioner text)

8. Cronin, Michael W., and William R. Kernan. “Using Interactive Video Instruction to Enhance Public Speaking Instruction.” *Basic Communication*
9. Cronin, Michael W. “Interactive Video Instruction for Teaching Organizational Techniques in Public Speaking.” Basic Communication Course Annual 6 (1994): 19-35. (Note: This article is also listed as a Practitioner text)


13. Newburger, Craig, Linda Brannon, and Arlie Daniel. “Self-Confrontation and Public Speaking Apprehension: To Videotape or Not to Videotape Student Speakers.” Basic Communication Course Annual 6 (1994): 228-36. (Note: This article is also listed as a Practitioner text)


17. Jensen, Karla Kay, and Elizabeth R. Lamoureux. “Written Feedback in The Basic Course: What Instructors Provide and What Students Deem Helpful.” Basic Communication Course Annual 9 (1997): 37-58. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly text)

19. Morreale, Sherwyn P., et al. “The Basic Communication Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: VI.” Basic Communication Course Annual 11 (1999): 1-26. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly and Practitioner text)


**76 Total Researcher Texts**

**20 Scholarly texts from Communication Education**


13. Jensen, Karla Kay, and Vinnie Harris. “The Public Speaking Portfolio.” *Communication Education* 48.3 (1999): 211-27. (Note: This article is also listed as a Practitioner text)


1 Scholarly text from Western Journal of Communication

1 Scholarly text from Communication Quarterly

4 Scholarly texts from Communication Studies


2 Scholarly texts from Southern Communication Journal


28 Scholarly texts from Basic Communication Course Annual


4. Gibson, James W., Michael S. Hanna, and Greg Leichty. “The Basic Speech Course at United States Colleges and Universities: V.” Basic Communication Course Annual 2 (1990): 233-57. (Note: This article is also listed as a Research and Practitioner text)


6. Hess, Jon A., and Judy C. Pearson. “Basic Public Speaking Principles: An Examination of Twelve Popular Texts.” Basic Communication Course Annual 4 (1992): 16-34. (Note: This article is also listed as a Research and Practitioner text)


10. Beall, Melissa L. “Teaching Thinking in the Basic Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 5 (1993): 127-56. (Note this article is also listed as a Practitioner text)

11. Mino, Mary, and Marilynn N. Butler. “Improving Oral Communication Competency: An Interactive Approach to Basic Public Speaking Instruction.” Basic Communication Course Annual 7 (1995): 36-58. (Note this article is also listed as a Practitioner text)

12. Yoder, Donald D., and Samuel P. Wallace. “Context vs. Process: Revising the Structure of the Basic Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 7 (1995): 83-99. (Note this article is also listed as a Practitioner text)


15. Jensen, Karla Kay, and Elizabeth R. Lamoureux. “Written Feedback in The Basic Course: What Instructors Provide and What Students Deem Helpful.” Basic Communication Course Annual 9 (1997): 37-58. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher text)


19. Jensen, Karla Kay, and David E. Williams. “Teaching the Honors Public Speaking Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 10 (1998): 133-56. (Note: This article is also listed as a Practitioner text)

20. Hugenberg, Lawrence W., and Barbara S. Moyer. “The Research Foundation for Instruction in the Beginning Public Speaking Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 10 (1998): 157-70. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher text)


56 Total Scholarly Texts

2 Practitioner texts from Communication Education

1. Jensen, Karla Kay, and Vinnie Harris. “The Public Speaking Portfolio.” Communication Education 48.3 (1999): 211-27. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly text)


No Practitioner texts from Western Journal of Communication

The Western Journal of Communication did not publish articles demonstrating a significant practitioner orientation during the period examined.

No Practitioner texts from Communication Quarterly

Communication Quarterly did not publish articles demonstrating a significant practitioner orientation during the period examined.

No Practitioner texts from Communication Studies

Communication Studies did not publish articles demonstrating a significant practitioner orientation during the period examined.

No Practitioner texts from Southern Communication Journal

The Southern Communication Journal did not publish articles demonstrating a significant practitioner orientation during the period examined.

28 Practitioner texts from Basic Communication Course Annual

1. Gibson, James W., Michael S. Hanna, and Greg Leichty. “The Basic Speech Course at United States Colleges and Universities: V.” Basic Communication Course Annual 2 (1990): 233-57. (Note: This article is also listed as a Research and Scholarly text)

3. Neer, Michael R., and W.F. Kirchner. “Classroom Interventions for Reducing Public Speaking Anxiety.” Basic Communication Course Annual 3 (1991): 202-23. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher text)

4. Hess, Jon A., and Judy C. Pearson. “Basic Public Speaking Principles: An Examination of Twelve Popular Texts.” Basic Communication Course Annual 4 (1992): 16-34. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher and Scholarly text)


8. Beall, Melissa L. “Teaching Thinking in the Basic Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 5 (1993): 127-56. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly text)

9. Cronin, Michael W., and William R Kernan. “Using Interactive Video Instruction to Enhance Public Speaking Instruction.” Basic Communication Course Annual 6 (1994): 1-18. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher text)

10. Cronin, Michael W. “Interactive Video Instruction for Teaching Organizational Techniques in Public Speaking.” Basic Communication Course Annual 6 (1994): 19-35. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher text)


13. Newburger, Craig, Linda Brannon, and Arlie Daniel. “Self-Confrontation and Public Speaking Apprehension: To Videotape or Not to Videotape Student Speakers.” Basic Communication Course Annual 6 (1994): 228-36. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher text)

14. Mino, Mary, and Marilynn N. Butler. “Improving Oral Communication Competency: An Interactive Approach to Basic Public Speaking Instruction.” Basic Communication Course Annual 7 (1995): 36-58. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly text)


16. Yoder, Donald D., and Samuel P. Wallace. “Context vs. Process: Revising the Structure of the Basic Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 7 (1995): 83-99. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly text)


25. Jensen, Karla Kay, and David E. Williams. “Teaching the Honors Public Speaking Course.” Basic Communication Course Annual 10 (1998): 133-56. (Note: This article is also listed as a Scholarly text)

26. Morreale, Sherwyn P., et al. “The Basic Communication Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: VI.” Basic Communication Course Annual 11 (1999): 1-26. (Note: This article is also listed as a Researcher and Scholarly text)


30 Total Practitioner Texts
Appendix B: Interview Questions for Public Speaking Textbook Authors

Below is the list of potential questions used when interviewing textbook authors. While most of these questions were addressed, the interviewer attempted to account for questions already answered by previous comments and the nature of the conversation.

Opening questions

1. Why did you choose to write a public speaking textbook?

2. What are your primary goals for the textbook? That is, what do you most want students to gain from a study of your text?

3. What audience do you see your book appealing to?

4. Briefly explain the extent to which and the ways in which you incorporated a sense of civic engagement into the text

5. What do you mean by civic engagement? What counts as civic and what qualifies as engaged? That is, define each term.

Locating public speaking

6. What role do you believe public speaking should play at your institution? What role does it currently play at your institution?

7. What is the relative importance or status of public speaking in the field of communication? What status should we afford public speaking?

8. Should public speaking be required of all students? Why? Why not?
The relationship between public speaking and civic engagement

9. Why is public speaking a good candidate for civic engagement? As a civic-minded course, does public speaking hold any advantages over other courses?

10. What civic attitudes should public speaking encourage? Civility, argumentativeness, engagement, etc. That is, what normative communication model do we want to encourage?

11. What can public speaking not accomplish when it comes to civic engagement? What lies outside its mandate or its ability to teach?

The content of public speaking

12. Do you define public speaking as a skills course? If so, how are defining skills? If not, why not?

13. What content, or core concepts, are really essential to the teaching of public speaking?

14. If we adopt a civic focus that emphasizes persuasion and argumentation, is there some risk of inordinately de-emphasizing presentation skills? To what extent should this be a concern?

15. What role should critical thinking play in public speaking?

16. What role should criticism play in public speaking?

Text construction

17. Todd S. Frobish has recently argued that contemporary rhetorical theory, “typically derived from the latest research, reflects changes in the modern rhetorical situation, but by ignoring this research, we have rendered our current speech texts out-of-touch” (Frobish 239). How do respond to the charge that
public speaking textbooks are “out of touch” with the modern rhetorical situation?

18. If we forgot about market forces for a moment, what would you change about your own textbook? That is, what do you feel you could not communicate as directly or clearly as you would have liked due to the concerns of a highly competitive textbooks market?

19. Why do so many public speaking textbooks follow the same basic model (informative speech, ceremonial speech, and a persuasive speech)? Is this a bad thing for the discipline?

20. How do you respond to the calls for increased rhetorical theory in public speaking? That is, should we be teaching Burke’s comic corrective along side Aristotle’s proofs?

21. Now for the question that all teachers, and I assume all writers, hate. Students often bristle at the introductory nature of many public speaking textbooks and levy the claim that much of the information is commonsensical. How do you respond to the claim that much covered in the public speaking text is commonsensical? What have you done in your text to address such claims?

22. What type of teacher did you envision when writing your textbook? Community college professor? Graduate student teacher? How did this choice affect some of the textbook’s content?

23. Could you comment on textbook design? That is, the trend in public speaking books is towards more bullet points, more side bars and topic boxes, and more
pictures. How did these marketing/design concerns affect the content of your book?

Public Speaking trends

24. What is the worst trend you perceive in public speaking textbooks? Why? What would be the best response to this trend?

25. What is the best trend you perceive in public speaking textbooks? Why? What can be done to encourage this trend?
Appendix C: Interview Questions for Public Speaking Teachers

Below is the list of potential questions used when interviewing public speaking teachers. While most of these questions were addressed, the interviewer attempted to account for questions already answered by previous comments and the nature of the conversation.

**Opening questions**

1. What are the primary goals of the public speaking course that you teach?
2. Briefly explain the extent to which and the ways in which you try to teach public speaking as a way of encouraging civic engagement.
3. What do you mean by civic engagement? What counts as civic and what qualifies as engaged? That is, define each term.

**Locating public speaking**

4. What role do you believe public speaking should play at your institution? What role does it currently play at your institution?
5. What is the relative importance or status of public speaking in the field of communication? What status should we afford public speaking?
6. Should public speaking be required of all students? Why? Why not?

**The relationship between public speaking and civic engagement**

7. Why is public speaking a good candidate for civic engagement? As a civic-minded course, does public speaking hold any advantages over other courses?
8. What civic attitudes should public speaking encourage? Civility, argumentativeness, engagement, etc. That is, what normative communication model do we want to encourage?
9. What can public speaking not accomplish when it comes to civic engagement? What lies outside its mandate or its ability to teach?

10. Are you aware of any civic engagement program (that includes the teaching of public speaking) that is working especially well? That is, what are the best models we are aware of?

**The content of public speaking**

11. Do you define public speaking as a skills course? If so, how are defining skills? If not, why not?

12. What content, or core concepts, are really essential to the teaching of public speaking?

13. If we adopt a civic focus that emphasizes persuasion and argumentation, is there some risk of inordinately de-emphasizing presentation skills? To what extent should this be a concern?

14. What role should critical thinking play in public speaking?

15. What role should criticism play in public speaking?

**Class construction**

16. Is there a theorist or rhetorician your base your course on? That is, do you teach the course with Aristotle in mind? Or Burke? If so, how does this affect the way you teach the course?

17. Does a civic orientation in a course require some additional reading? Or can this all be done through traditional public speaking sources? If so, what readings/authors?
18. What needs to change about public speaking textbooks in order to make them more useful for civic-minded public speaking classes?

19. You have given me a number of examples of how you have infused civic engagement into your public speaking course. By doing this, what assignments have you removed or de-emphasized? That is, are some speaking assignments ill suited to a civic engagement orientation?

20. Could you talk about some experiences where you really felt that the public speaking class worked well to encourage civic-mindedness or civic participation? Why did they succeed?

21. Could you talk about some of your experiences where the class or the assignments failed to encourage civic-mindedness or civic participation? Why did they fail?

22. How do you perceive your relationship with a civic-based class? That is, do you play a slightly different role, perhaps changing the power dynamic with the class?

23. Do we operate with an outmoded vision of citizenship when we encourage letter writing campaigns and speeches to city councils?

24. How do we, as professors, assess civic speeches/projects? Is a letter to an editor substantially different from a ceremonial speech delivered in class?

**Public Speaking trends**

25. What is the worst trend you perceive in public speaking courses? Why? What would be the best response to this trend?
26. What is the best trend you perceive in public speaking courses? Why? What can be done to encourage this trend?
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the role of civic participation in undergraduate rhetorical education.
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Appendix E: Explanation of the Sample Public Speaking Syllabus

This particular class is organized around the topic of “Free Speech and Hate Speech on the Indiana University Campus.” Indiana University, like most large Universities, has seen its fair share of hate speech. A number of pro-life and anti-GLBT groups visit campus to protest on a semi-regular basis; additionally, there have been incidents involving the distribution of white supremacist literature on campus. In July of 1999, Indiana University student Benjamin Smith, a campus follower of the white supremacist World Church of the Creator, shot and killed two people and injured nine before killing himself. The Bloomington community founded Bloomington United, a community group dedicated to rejecting publicly the presence of hate literature in the Bloomington community. This is the larger discursive history of hate speech on the Indiana University campus; the class readings however will address two more recent episodes of free speech/hate speech on campus.

In early 2002, the Black Student Union filed a formal protest against the presence of a mural in one of the campus classrooms. The mural, originally painted in 1933 by Thomas Hart Benton as part of a multi-panel mural representing the history of Indiana, depicts Klu Klux Klan members burning a cross. The Indiana University Black Student Union called for the removal of the mural from the classroom claiming that it created a hostile learning environment. Defenders of the mural claimed that it was a piece of art that reminds students of the state’s regrettable racist history. Ultimately, the administration kept the mural in the classroom, but produced a video about the mural and its implications for race relations, which is shown to all students who have class in the classroom. More recently, Eric Rasmusen, a professor in the business school,
touched off a debate about free speech. Rasmusen’s web log, which is on the Indiana University server, contains a number of anti-homosexual comments. In response to the initial discovery of Rasmussen’s online comments, the University removed and then subsequently restored Rasmusen’s web account. The campus community debated the limits of professorial free speech in light of the University’s code of Academic Ethics.

These assigned reading, which are not included here due to space limitations, are comprised of letters to editor published in the Indiana Daily Student, the campus newspaper. In addition to readings addressing these two specific episodes, students are assigned readings concerning the general nature of university speech codes. The invention essay asks students to study the assigned readings as well as the in-class discussion of these readings in order to identify some stasis points in these debates. The goal of this assignment is to prompt students to develop arguments in response to existing arguments rather than defaulting to the more internal and personal invention systems outlined in chapter two. For example, students will hopefully avoid arguing that speech codes are entirely good or bad; rather, students should argue that specific aspects of existing speech codes are more or less useful or justified.

Such a topics based approach allows for some revision in the sense that a speaker can continue to develop their arguments on a particular issue. The syllabus is structured so that students will have time to revise their first major speech and deliver it again for a larger audience. Hopefully, providing students with the opportunity to revise and deliver a speech again, when combined with the multiple opportunities to engage in discussion and debate about the same topic, will reinforce the idea that public speaking and opinion formation is not a linear process but a circuitous one. After the initial
speech, students will discuss their speeches and proposed revisions in workshop groups.

A cursory glance at the syllabus reveals a few notable omissions. First of all, there is no day devoted to a discussion of public speaking ethics. The fact that the audience is educated on the topic imposes ethical constraints that might normally be absent in a traditional public speaking class. Since students are drawing from a common body of texts and thus have a common body of knowledge, the protopublic militates against quoting out of context and/or plagiarism.

It is worth noting that after an investigation of public speaking textbooks, this syllabus relies on a handbook. The selected handbook minimizes some of the problems associated with the narrative rendering of the speech composition process found in the public speaking textbooks analyzed in this syllabus. While The Speaker’s Handbook suffers from many of the problems discussed in the preceding chapters, its design makes it easier to navigate around problems with topic selection and demographic analysis. Moreover, a handbook does not speak with the same authorial voice as a textbook; the handbook, in fact, presumes a teacher and assumes a support function. This type of teacher-textbook relationship seems to assume a slightly more skilled user than most public speaking textbooks. Also, the syllabus utilizes Corbett and Eberly’s The Elements of Reasoning since it is a text aimed at teaching the principles of invention; additionally, The Elements of Reasoning provides a section on the type of citizen criticism encouraged in this class.
Summary of the assignments

1. Article Presentations: The article presentations have two goals. First, they are
designed to circulate opinions about free speech on campuses. Oral presentations
stimulate the circulation of both oral and written texts in order to support the
development of the in-class public. Second, having students present summaries of these
articles/arguments allows students to have another opportunity to speak in front of the
class.

2. Invention Essay: The invention essay is an important assignment since it begins the
process of speech composition. The essay itself is broken into two main sections: a
descriptive section where students identify and describe a stasis point in the articles and
in-class discussion, and an argumentative section where they begin to develop an
argument from that stasis point. While some students may choose to argue vehemently
against a particular stopping point, others may choose to search for compromises.

3. Speech Outline: This outline is similar to the existing model for speech outlines. It is
designed to encourage student to develop an argumentative framework in a format
conducive to extemporaneous speaking. This assignment also gives the instructor an
opportunity to respond to students’ thinking at this stage in the speech’s composition.

4. Initial Speech: This speech is similar in format to standard persuasive speeches found
in other public speaking classrooms; the speech is policy-oriented and requires students
to refine their arguments against the counter-arguments circulating in the protopublic.
The difference is that the in-class audience is knowledgeable about the topic ahead of
time and has already developed opinions.
5. Revision Plan: The revision plan is a prompt to focus students’ thinking about how they should revise their speech. Additionally, this plan provides the instructor with a list of things to look for in the performance of the revised speech.

6. Revised Speech: Delivering a speech twice for a grade carries both benefits and limitations. This speech is beneficial in the sense that students have an opportunity to fine tune issues of writing and delivery. During the first speech, the speaker will address an audience of about seven students; speakers will then deliver the revised speech for the entire class. This does present the problem of diminishing the importance of the first speech as simply a practice speech, but this can be combated by weighting both speeches the same.

7. Open Speech: As the title indicates, this speech is an opportunity for students to develop a speech designed to speak to the in-class public. While for most this may serve as an opportunity to respond to the issue of free speech on campus one last time, it may serve as an opportunity for others to reflect on the in-class public as a public. As such these speeches may urge any particular type of action.

8. Final Essay Exam: The final exam is a take home essay exam designed to pull together the hate speech topic with the readings on rhetoric. While the act of writing and performing speeches in class enacts the theory of interpretation and invention, the final exam provides a spaced to make these links explicit. This essay may also serve as a way of encouraging students to carry the opinions developed in this protopublic into other larger publics.
Appendix F: Sample Public Speaking Syllabus

Public Speaking

Required Texts:
- McGarrity, C121-Public Speech Reading Packet (also available online)
- Corbett and Eberly, The Elements of Reasoning (available at the bookstore)
- Sprague and Stuart, The Speaker’s Handbook (available at the bookstore)

Course Objectives

Good public speaking involves much more than the ability to stand in front of an audience without saying “um.” The best public speakers not only speak smoothly, they also say important and interesting things. This class focuses on the composition and delivery of speeches. The course objectives are deceptively simple: By the end of this quarter, you should be able to critique established positions in public debates, develop solid arguments in response to these positions, and effectively voice these arguments to appropriate audiences. In service of this goal, we will study the principles of argumentation and organization, critically examine our own speeches and the speeches of others, and practice, practice, practice. By becoming a student of public speaking, you join a long history of rhetorical study dating back to ancient Greece.

In order to focus our study of public speaking, this class is organized around a contemporary public debate: free speech on the IU campus. The skills discussed in this class apply equally to all public issues. We will focus on the free speech/hate speech debate simply as a way to organize our time and thoughts on the practice of rhetoric. You can expect to leave this class with argumentative and public speaking skills, as well as an informed opinion on campus free speech issues. You do not need to be an expert on free speech issues (or even an expert on Indiana University) to take this class; this is a significant public issue that affects us all as campus citizens.

Assignments

1. Article Presentations
There are 20 articles dealing with the role of free speech on college campuses in the reading packet. Each student will be assigned an article to present. The presentations should be brief (two minutes) and summarize the argument made in the article.

2. Invention Essay
This essay asks you to identify the stasis points in the debate concerning the role of free speech on the IU campus and develop an argument in response to one or more stasis points. As such, this essay should be divided into two sections. In the first section, you should use The Elements of Reasoning as a guide to identify 2-3 stasis points in the articles we have read thus far concerning the role of free speech on the IU campus. In
the second half of this essay, you need to develop an argumentative response to these stasis points. You will develop this essay into your initial speech.

3. Initial Speech Outline
A good speech requires sound planning and good writing. In order to assist you on that path, this assignment asks you to compose a formal outline of your initial speech, complete with a bibliography. I will return these outlines with suggestions for improvement one week before you are scheduled to speak. See Chapter 9 in The Speaker’s Handbook for a sample outline.

4. Initial Speech
After researching the topic, composing the argument, and practicing delivery, you will deliver your speech in class. Emerging from your invention essay, this speech should address some aspect of the debate over free speech/hate speech on the IU campus.

5. Revision Plan
Having delivered your speech, you should work on revising your speech to deliver it a second time. In a brief report, identify the elements that you wish to change in your second performance. This should include a brief two-page summary of what aspects of your speech you are changing. You should also provide a revised outline that demonstrates changes in your evidence, reasoning, and argument. This revision plan is due on the day you present your revised speech.

6. Revised Speech
As the title suggests, after revising your speech, you will deliver it again for a larger audience.

7. Open Speech
This speech provides you the opportunity to address the in-class public as a public. Following the in-class debates, what do you want to speak to the in-class public about? Have we overlooked some important issue in our discussions? Do we lack sufficient civility? Do we need to explore a common solution? There will be a short question and answer period following each speech.

8. Final Essay Exam
The final essay will ask you to respond to the readings on public debate and relate these readings to their own debate experiences in this class. I will hand this essay exam out in class and you will have a week to complete the exam.

9. Quizzes
Periodically, I will quiz the class on the readings. These quizzes may be announced ahead of time and they may be pop quizzes. You should always come to class prepared to take a quiz.
Policies

1. Ethics
The University’s definitions of academic and personal misconduct are contained in the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct. You have already received a copy of the code from the Dean of Students; excerpts from the code are printed every semester in the Bulletin/Schedule of Classes (see pp. 105 through 107). It is your responsibility to read and understand the University’s expectations in this regard. Until you have read the Code, do not assume that you know what this University defines as cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic misconduct.

2. Attendance
Attendance is essential to the successful completion of this course. If you miss a class, do not send me an e-mail asking me if we covered anything important (of course we covered something important) or ask me to summarize the class. As a student, it is your responsibility to seek out a classmate, discuss the class with him or her, and get a copy of his or her notes. If you have any questions or concerns after reviewing the material for the missed class, please come see me during office hours.

Office Hours

Please come by during my office hours if you have any questions about the course or the course material. Educational research has shown that a student’s grades are directly correlated to her/his level of engagement in a class. Discussing the class concepts leads to higher levels of engagement. So, come by and discuss the class. Additionally, I am more than happy to look at early drafts of papers and provide you with some feedback. If you cannot make my office hours, please set up an appointment.
Grading

Final course grades are determined on the basis of a cumulative point system. There are a maximum of 500 points in the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percent of Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article Presentation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention essay</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech outline</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial speech</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision plan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised speech</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final speech</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final essay</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 500 points 100%

After any adjustments for unexcused absences, final grades will be assigned according to the following point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>485-500</td>
<td>97 – 100%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465-484</td>
<td>93 – 96.9%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-464</td>
<td>90 – 92.9%</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435-449</td>
<td>87 – 89.9%</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-434</td>
<td>83 – 86.9%</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-414</td>
<td>80 – 82.9%</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385-399</td>
<td>77 – 79.9%</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365-384</td>
<td>73 – 76.9%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-364</td>
<td>70 – 72.9%</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335-349</td>
<td>67 – 69.9%</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315-334</td>
<td>63 – 66.9%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-314</td>
<td>60 – 62.9%</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 300</td>
<td>59.9% or less</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semester Schedule

Week One

Day 1  Introduction to the course
       No reading assigned

Day 2  The democratic classroom

Week Two

Day 3  The role of public speech

Day 4  What is invention?
       Rasmusen articles #1
       The Elements of Reasoning ch. 1

Week Three

Day 5  Stasis points
       Rasmusen articles #2
       The Elements of Reasoning ch. 2

Day 6  Conjecture and definition
       The Elements of Reasoning ch. 3&4

Week Four

Day 7  Cause/consequence and values
       Woodburn 100 articles #1
       The Elements of Reasoning ch. 5&6

Day 8  Proposals
       Woodburn 100 articles #2
       The Elements of Reasoning ch. 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week Five</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Day 9** | Argumentative logic: developing a sound argument  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch. 14  
Invention Essays Due |
| **Day 10** | Argumentative logic: using evidence  
Rasmusen articles #3  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch. 13 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week Six</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Day 11** | Models of arrangement: the trophy model  
Rasmusen articles #4  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch. 7 |
| **Day 12** | Models of arrangement: organizing a speech according to argument  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch. 8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week Seven</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Day 13** | Models of arrangement: intros, conclusions, and transitions  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch.s 10, 11, &12  
Outlines Due |
| **Day 14** | Delivery: vocal performance  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch. 25 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week Eight</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Day 15** | Delivery: physical performance  
The Speaker’s Handbook ch. 26 |
| **Day 16** | Initial Speech |
Week Nine

Day 17  Initial Speech

Day 18  Initial Speech

Week Ten

Day 19  Style: Writing for the ear
        No reading, in-class workshop

Day 20  Interpretation of speech norms: constructing meaning
        Woodburn 100 articles #3
        Flower, Linda. “Constructing Negotiated Meaning” The
        Construction of Negotiated Meaning: A Social Cognitive

Week Eleven

Day 21  Interpretation of speech norms: negotiating meaning
        Woodburn 100 articles #4
        Flower, Linda. “Constructing Negotiated Meaning” The
        Construction of Negotiated Meaning: A Social Cognitive

Day 22  Revised Speech

Week Twelve

Day 23  Revised Speech

Day 24  Revised Speech

Week Thirteen

Day 25  Possibilities for dialogue
        Yankelovich, Daniel. “What Makes Dialogue Unique?” The
        Tannen, Deborah. “Fighting for Our Lives.” The Argument
        Culture : Stopping America's War of Words. New York:

Day 26  Benefits and drawbacks of debate
        Mouffe, Chantal. “Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic
Week Fourteen

Day 27  How does what we say make a difference?
Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement.

Day 28  Final Speech

Week
Fifteen

Day 29  Final Speech

Day 30  Final Speech

The Final Essay is due on the Monday following the last day of class
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