

2018

Revisiting delivery in the basic course

Caleb B. Evers
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Evers, Caleb B., "Revisiting delivery in the basic course" (2018). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 16350.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/16350>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Revisiting delivery in the basic course

by

Caleb Benjamin Evers

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Major: Rhetoric, Composition, Professional Communication

Program of Study Committee:

Richard (Benjamin) Crosby, Co-Major Professor

Denise Oles-Acevedo, Co-Major Professor

Amy Slagell

The student author, whose presentation of the scholarship herein was approved by the program of study committee, is solely responsible for the content of this thesis. The Graduate College will ensure this thesis is globally accessible and will not permit alterations after a degree is conferred.

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2018

Copyright © Caleb Benjamin Evers, 2018. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Status of the basic course	2
Research questions	6
Thesis outline	6
Historical Review	9
The roots of public speaking	9
Rhetorical education	11
The ancient history of delivery	13
Delivery defined	15
Delivery in Ancient Greece	16
Delivery in Ancient Rome	19
The Renaissance	28
The Elocutionary Movement	30
The basic course	32
Conclusion	35
CHAPTER TWO: TEXTBOOKS AS A RHETORICAL ARTIFACT	36
Genre defined	37
Genre scholarship	38
Textbook scholarship	40
Lucas as the touchstone	45
Features of a touchstone	45
Chapter 13 “Delivery”	47
Invention and arrangement	55
Conclusion	57
CHAPTER THREE: THE FUTURE OF THE DISCIPLINE	59
Challenging the status quo	59
Editing the touchstone text	62
Conclusion	64
Limitations	66
REFERENCES	68

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Benjamin Crosby and my committee members, Dr. Denise Oles-Acevedo, and Dr. Amy Slagell for their guidance and support throughout my research. These past two years have further shaped me into the man that I became, and will continue to shape me into the man that I will later to become. Through our time together during my undergraduate and graduate studies, these individuals have been monumental in my development as a scholar, and I am forever in their debt. Thank you all. In addition, I would also like to thank my friends, family, colleagues, fraternity brothers, the department faculty and staff for making my time at Iowa State University a wonderful experience.

ABSTRACT

When comparing the ancient and modern pedagogies of speech and speech delivery, discrepancies begin to emerge. The significance of delivery in today's speech pedagogy, for instance, is minimal, which is perhaps most evident in the foundational public speaking course (basic course) textbook. As my thesis demonstrates, speech composition receives far more consideration than speech performance, which marginalizes the canon of delivery as inferior to both rhetoric and speech communication. Supporting this notion is McClish (2016), who argues that while delivery remains germane to contemporary public speaking pedagogy, its treatment in the twenty-first-century basic course is widely understated. Moreover, McClish (2016) argues that, "contemporary speech pedagogy strives to communicate the importance of delivery to oratorical activity, but not its essential role in establishing extraordinary speech or eloquence" (p. 174). Eloquence, according to Emerson (1904), "...is the power to translate a truth into language perfectly intelligible to the person to whom you speak" (p. 130).

Delivery is often resented as a formality to speech, but not a skill worth mastering. By under emphasizing the role of delivery in public oration, textbook authors and editors are doing a disservice to instructors, students, and the discipline. I argue that by reevaluating delivery's role in course textbooks and the field of rhetoric, the foundational public speaking course will produce more persuasive and captivating public speakers. As my research shows, animosities against delivery emerged thousands of years prior to this thesis.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The studies of speech and speech delivery are as old as rhetoric itself, dating back to the work of Homer's *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (Delaunoy, 1956). Academic interests in public oration can be found in ancient Greek curricula offered at Plato's Academy, Aristotle's Lyceum, and within the lessons of Isocrates and the Sophists (Hauser, 2012). According to Aristotle, speech delivery, the last of his five rhetorical canons, is the manipulation of voice, gestures, speaking rhythm, breath, and bodily movements (Sloane, 2001). As such, delivery encompasses the various aspects of nonverbal communication, or the type of communication using "means other than written or spoken language that creates meaning for someone," (Beebe, Beebe, & Ivy, 2016, p. 22) and the "communication codes and symbols that are not words" (Pearson & Nelson, 1997, p. 82). As some research argues that non-verbal communication equates to roughly 90% of all communication, (Fromkin & Rodman, 1983; Mehrabien, 1967), these forms of communication remain rhetorically significant.

It was not until centuries after the death of Aristotle that a systematic treatise regarding the intricacies of non-verbal speech delivery is published. *Institutio Oratoria* (95 CE) by Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (Quintilian) considers the complexities within, and benefits of, actively developing corporal, vocal, and gestural speech delivery. Erik Gunderson (2000) even considers Quintilian's work as, "a crowning moment of a whole tradition of corporeal knowledge" (p. 59). The practicality and significance for understanding speech delivery, however, did not remain entirely pertinent to the field.

Status of the basic course

Countless universities and regional accrediting bodies either require or recommend the basic course before graduating (Morreale, 2006; Hunt et al., 2001). For instance, in 2013, roughly 1.3 million students enrolled in a basic public speaking course (Beebe, 2013). More locally, roughly 70% of undergraduate students at Iowa State University are required to complete the basic course before graduating (Slagell, personal communication, 2016). Fundamentally, the basic course instructs students on communication theory, the standard genres of speeches, and the rhetorically persuasive use of voice and language. Through educating students on these matters, and using methodologies such as peer-feedback, observation, critical thinking, speech outlining, and performance, the course aims to generate more persuasive and confident oral communicators (Hancock et al., 2010).

Learning how to assess and perform persuasive public speeches remains vital to a student's communication mastery (Joe et al., 2015). However, because the course relies on written work and speech performance, the assessment of a speaker's competence becomes quite complicated. Research shows that an individual's perception of their own performance is only minimally predictive of others' evaluations of the same performance (Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004). Therefore, the persuasiveness of student speeches considers not only *what* is said, but also, *who* says it and *how* they say it. Supporting this claim is Pierce (1971) who argues, "speech communication as a whole is interested in the effects of messages as well as in diagnosing characteristics of the speaker" (p. 177). Consequently, the creation and study of public oration require a simultaneous implementation of psychological, cognitive, linguistic, and paralinguistic communicative

abilities. Through developing these communicative abilities students leverage their academic, personal, professional, and civic endeavors (Gibson et al., 1970). Institutions also maintain that public speaking remains a vital skill for students from a wide array of subject disciplines to develop. For instance, Longnecker (2009) reasons that effective reading, writing, and presentation skills remain essential for communicating the complex subjects embedded within STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) related fields (Krajcik & Sutherland, 2010).

Yet, Longnecker (2009) also maintains that insufficient communication skills and insights, especially those practiced by STEM, continue. Such insufficiency continues, in part, because most undergraduate laboratory science courses do not adequately address the lacking communication abilities of their students (Watson & Lom, 2008). These courses focus mostly on the quality of students' scientific research, but not on how their work will be presented orally. Regarding speech delivery, the speech performance itself "has the power to make difficult concepts understandable and to convey urgency. Delivery is essential to persuasion" (Rude, 2004, p. 275); however, "poor delivery reduces the clarity of the message content" (Holladay & Coombs 1994, p. 181). As such, the significance of the basic course pedagogy, particularly how it teaches speech delivery, is undeniable. Students of STEM, however, are not the only ones who benefit from this course.

A 2014 study by the Center for Talent Innovation (CTI) identified public speaking as the primary skill that director-level executives found the most important. Moreover, Robles (2012) determined that 100% of executives he surveyed about workplace skills stated that mastering oral communication was essential to the corporate world.

In addition, research like that from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) states that a core set of higher education outcomes in public speaking are necessary for both a, “globally engaged democracy and for a dynamic-innovation fueled economy,” and that oral communication should be, “practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance” (Rhodes, 2010, p.10, 12). AAC&U also states that K–12 and higher education systems must recognize oral communication competence as a collection of skills that are critical to this nation’s social and economic growth, and are necessary skills for a student to thrive in the twenty-first-century (AAC&U, 2016).

Other studies from the National Association of Colleges and Businesses (NACB) (Ingbretnsen, 2009), the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA, 2008), and the Department of Education, Science, and Training (DEST, 2002), likewise stress the necessity of developing effective oral communication skills before entering the workforce. More specifically, a survey by NACE (Gray & Koncz, 2014), found that 68.9% of employers labeled strong verbal communication skills as vital to their hiring process. Countless other researchers agree (Darling & Dannels, 2003; Boyer, 1987; Wolvin & Wolvin, 1992; Ford & Wolvin, 1993). Realistically, however, the foundational public speaking course is often the only exposure to formal communication instruction that undergraduate students will have making any gaps in pedagogy significant (Teague, 1961).

The most substantial gap considers the superiority of speech content over delivery (Dedmon & Kowalzik, 1964; Rood, 2013; O’Hair, 2015). Moreover, research shows that

students enrolled in the basic course are often competent in composition skills, but remain deficient in public speaking delivery skills (Dunbar et al., 2006; Cohen, 2012). As a course on public speaking, these deficiencies are puzzling. It should be noted, however, that not all programs or educators are the same; the course's structure among institutions is not equifinal (Hogan & Kurr, 2015). To address this issue, the National Communication Association (NCA) developed a list of aptitudes relevant to the pedagogy of the foundational speech course (2013).

These seven competencies include: monitoring and presenting oneself, practicing communication ethics, adapting to the audience, practicing effective listening, expressing messages, identifying and explaining the communication process, and creating and analyzing message strategies (Engleberg, 2013). Upon reviewing this list one might notice no explicit reference to "delivery" or non-verbal communication. While it could be argued that "presenting oneself," and the "expressing of messages," adequately reflect the significance of delivery, the wording is not clear enough. These components of speech delivery are presented with hermeneutical ambiguity. Moreover, when weighted relative to the other canons of rhetoric, delivery appears underemphasized.

Consequently, if even the NCA does not express the importance of delivery, then I would argue that the entire discipline's attention to delivery remains insufficient. Others like Gundersen and Hopper (1976) support emphasizing content, and argue that in regards to subject recall, attitude change, and speaker credibility, it was speech composition, and not delivery, that remains most rhetorically persuasive. As such, they assert that delivery should be taught as a secondary, and not a primary, method of teaching public speaking.

Research questions

- R1.** Historically, what is the nature of the imbalance between delivery and the other canons within the discipline of public speaking?
- R2.** How is the imbalance maintained within the foundational public speaking course?
- R3.** What can be done to improve delivery's pedagogy?

Thesis outline

Chapter One investigates the fluctuating opinions towards delivery during Ancient Greece, the Roman eras, the Renaissance, the Elocutionary Movement, and the end of the nineteenth-century. Moreover, through citing ancient and contemporary literature, Chapter One clarifies why the debate surrounding delivery is concerning to the field, and why its mastery renders more authentic and rhetorically persuasive orators.

Chapter Two considers the ways in which the currently enacted Aristotelian pedagogical devalues the canon of delivery and places considerable favoritism on the canons of invention and arrangement. The impacts are most noticeable within the course's primary pedagogic tool, the textbook. To examine this phenomenon, Stephen Lucas' *The Art of Public Speaking* 12th Edition (2016) serves as the primary artifact of my investigation.

Chapter Three offers suggestions for challenging the current pedagogical paradigm which constrains public speaking pedagogy. This chapter also details how publishers can improve future editions of the discipline's touchstone text, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016). I conclude with the limitations of my research.

Historical Review

Chapter One correlates with the first research question of my thesis which asks, “Historically, what is the nature of the imbalance between delivery and the other canons within the discipline of public speaking?” This first chapter provides an in-depth exploration of delivery’s influence and fluctuating academic consideration throughout history. As stated by Reynolds (1993), “the problem canons of memory and delivery have never received the kind of widespread critical attention they deserve” (p. vii). Moreover, Jacobi (2006) argues that delivery has remained an afterthought to historians of rhetoric and public oration alike. Considering that the scholarships of both rhetoric and delivery span thousands of years, Chapter One focuses only on five select time periods, with particular emphasis on the ancient Greece and Rome.

The roots of public speaking

As with rhetoric and delivery, the fear of public speaking similarly spans the millennia. Public speaking anxiety (PSA) takes a variety names, though glossophobia is the medical term. The term originates from the Ancient Greek words γλῶσσα (glōssa), meaning tongue, and φόβος (phobos), meaning fear or dread (Hancock, 2010). Along with death, drowning, and failure, speech anxiety remains among the most common fears in America today (Bednar, 1991; Horwitz, 2002). In fact, a 2005 Gallup poll found that when orating, over 40% of Americans fear public speaking, and exhibit physical signs of glossophobia (Brim). But even before these contemporary studies, Roman orators like Marcus Tullius Cicero

(106–43 BCE) likewise grappled with glossophobia. In his text, *De Oratore* (55 BCE), Cicero confesses that as an inexperienced young orator, his face would become pale and his limbs would shake uncontrollably (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). Cicero, however, was not the only speaker to exhibit such symptoms.

Stein (1996) maintains that most people with PSA often suffer trembling, shaking, tightness of the throat, blanking of thought, and experience reduced blood flow to the surface of the skin. Together these symptoms result in an avoidance of speaking, decreased speech volume, an absence of speech fluency, weak eye contact, gestural stiffness, and physical discomfort, all of which directly impact speech delivery (Bednar, 1991; Laukka et al., 2008). Studies show that combatting PSA requires mindfulness and planning on the part of the speaker (Phillips & Metzger, 1973; Mandler, 1975; Greene & Sparks, 1983; Menzel, 1994), but without legitimate instruction, these combatting strategies do little to aid the orator (Burekel-Rothfuss, Gray, & Yerby, 1993). To many, delivery, therefore, can be a highly emotional and anxiety-inducing experience.

As stated by Harrington (2010), “Delivery is the body's trained response to emotions in the literary text” (p. 69). Delivery constitutes a more intimate display of self unique from that of speech composition. Though, historically, many scholars devoted more attention to the creation of sound argument and fitting language, and not to the mastery of speech performance. Speech delivery was often considered ornate and inessential to rhetoric and sound argumentation. To further explore these disapproving opinions towards delivery, one can turn to the ancient institutes of philosophers, sophists, and orators alike.

Rhetorical education

Rhetoric has always involved issues of power and social control as well as matters of truth and claims of superior knowledge. Since its initial appearance in Ancient Greece roughly 2500 years ago, rhetoric has acquired many definitions, each of which reflects the changing attitudes towards using language and symbols as tools of persuasion. Varieties in definitions include, “the study of strategies of effective oratory; the use of language, written or spoken, to inform or persuade; the study of persuasive effects of language; and the study of the relation between language and knowledge” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. i). Rhetoric also acquired pejorative definitions such as an empty, manipulative, and a dubious form of communication full of meaningless ornamentation. Nevertheless, rhetoric remains a complicated process through which people develop and refine beliefs, values, and views of reality. As an academic subject, however, it was primarily reserved for the wealthy.

Accordingly, civilizations were constructed not only by builders, architects, and sculptors, but also by wealthy orators, educators, politicians, and leaders. Take, for instance, Alexander the Great (356–323 BCE), who studied rhetoric and philosophy under Aristotle of Stagira (384–322 BCE). During his rule as king of Macedon, Alexander’s rhetorical education undoubtedly bolstered the persuasiveness of his orations and facilitated his leadership; though, perhaps it was not just the content of Alexander’s discourses that enthralled his audiences, but also, the manner with which Alexander delivered them. Research shows that nonverbal expressivity helps to develop interpersonal relationships (McCroskey,

1968; McCroskey, 1990). As the constructing and maintaining of relationships remain imperative to sustainable leadership, Alexander's successes further legitimizes the importance of a rhetorical education.

Ancient Greece also saw the rising influences of other ancient sophists (paid educators) like Gorgias of Lentini (died 375 BCE) and pre-sophists like Protagoras (490–420 BCE). There were also classic orators and philosophers like Socrates (died 399 BCE) and his student Plato (died 347 BCE). Each of these men was a master of their craft and contributed monumentally to their respective fields. Considering rhetoric, their interests focused primarily on universal truths and absolute wisdoms. Thus, while the rationality and ethics surrounding rhetoric showed significant advancement, the development of speech delivery did not. Nevertheless, both ontological and epistemological understandings of rhetoric transpired as a result of these men's work. However, perhaps the full persuasiveness of their speeches and other works can no longer be experienced.

Reading a speech informs us but does not entirely persuade us. Isocrates (died 338 BCE) remarks that speeches intended for reading, "robbed the prestige of the speaker, the tones of his voice, and the variations in delivery" (Norlin, 1980, p. 26). Later, Haynes (1990) deems that, "Writing is best for detail; writing is best for abstraction, and, in many respects, it is best for deliberate, thoughtful interaction. Speech is often best when relationship matters and when emotions are important" (p. 91). Thus, one can read and contemplate the brilliance of these men's work, yet remain apathetic to the speech's full persuasiveness. This apathy is due, in part, to an absence of emotionality as expressed through the prosody, pitch, emphasis, and

inflection used by the speaker during the speech's initial performance (Sander et al., 2005). Accordingly, by not observing the speech in its purest form, the reader does not receive the full effect of the speech's intended persuasiveness, and one's exegetical interpretation becomes insufficient. The rhetorical authorities of speech delivery are thus undeniable.

The ancient history of delivery

Delivery, the last of Aristotle's five canons of rhetoric, is the emotional stylization of Aristotle's rhetorical proofs called pathos (emotional appeals). Delivery likewise aids in determining a speaker's ethos (goodwill or character), and allows the more transparent presentation of self (Addington, 1971; Beebe, 1974; Fredal, 2001). Birgoon, Birk, and Pfau (1990) similarly maintain that greater perceived competence, composure, facial expressivity, kinesthetic proximity, vocal variety, and physical relaxation each dramatically increased speaker credibility. Such is true because delivery constitutes "non-linguistic bodily skill of character presentation" (Fredal, 2001 p. 252). Delivery also reflects the one-to-one relationship between voice, gestures, speaking rhythm, breath, and bodily movements as ways of elevating an audience's emotional reaction (Fredal, 2001). Nevertheless, both pathos and ethos must work concurrently; for when an audience finds a speaker's credibility inauthentic, the message is compromised (Rude, 2004).

Further emphasizing audience-centeredness, Kenneth Burke writes that, "you persuade a man [sic] only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your way as his" (Burke,

1950, p. 271). Moreover, as later argued by Bowen (1966), “Oral delivery should reflect the speaker’s immediate evaluation of the existing relationship among his thought, his personality, and his listeners” (p. 22). Accordingly, delivery requires a clear understanding of audience expectations, needs, and desires (Thourlby, 1978). This attentiveness reflects how “audiences bring particular histories and interests with them; therefore ethos and pathos cannot be merely supplemental modes of persuasion but rather are essential for the making of practical and aesthetic judgments” (Kastely, 2004, p. 224).

While some truths may be un-changing, the human experience is ever-changing. Effects of language, especially the symbols and codes exercised through delivery, might not universally interpreted by an audience. Furthermore, audiences are composed of active, thinking people, who might interpret messages in ways that are different from a rhetor’s intent. Accordingly, while the human ontological preference for rational arguments is undeniable, we are also products of our environment. Audience identification is thus accomplished not only through *what* is said, but also *how* it is said. All the same, by addressing just pathos and ethos, orators limit their persuasiveness, and therefore must appropriately balance their rhetorical appeals.

Perhaps this appropriateness is best defined by classicist George Kennedy who affirms, “appropriateness is a consideration in the use of any rhetorical technique including arguments, emotional appeals, arrangement, figures and rhythms, and delivery” (2013). As rhetoric concerns itself with the effects of language, then acknowledging delivery’s role in the facilitation or hindrance of

persuasion becomes imperative. Such an understanding elucidates our overall perceptions of self and audience members. Carlson (1999) supports this view, writing that, “theories of persuasion and audience, language, sociology, anthropology, and theatre, respectively create vast and rich theoretical relationships that investigate performance (delivery) as an act of constructing identity. . .” (p. 189). As a multifaceted subject which encompasses diverse disciplines, acknowledging the complexities of delivery remains relevant to both the study of rhetoric and public oration. But where does the term delivery come from and how has it changed over time?

Delivery defined

To better understand its origins, one must recognize the variety of terminologies that were once used to describe delivery. For instance, when researching its scholarship, one might search the term *hypokrisis*, translated from Greek as, “the playing of a part” (Nadeau, 1964). Other terminologies derive from the Latin-speaking Romans who termed delivery as *elocutio* (elocution), *pronuntiatio* (pronunciation), and *actio* (acting). As these translations illustrate, delivery often aligned closely with the theatric arts and theatrical appeals to emotion (Sloan, 2001). Considering gesture, more recent scholarship by Poggi and Pelachaud maintains that, “In the rhetorical tradition, gestures are studied as an indispensable part of *actio* (discourse delivery), due to their capacity for summoning, promising, exhorting, inciting, prohibiting, and approving, and to their ease in expressing, showing attitudes, and indicating objects of the orator’s

thought” (2008, p. 396). These capacities impelled those who viewed rhetoric as a dubious tool of cynical manipulation to deny delivery’s academic advancement and render it as inauthentic and inferior to logical reasoning.

Delivery in Ancient Greece

Mistrust towards delivery first started with Socrates’ disdain of the orator Gorgias. In *The Gorgias* (386 BCE), Socrates, a supporter of absolute knowledge and philosophy, does not support the ornate style and methods of delivery used by the orator and sophist, Gorgias. Socrates considered both rhetoric and delivery as inessential and beneath the dignity of philosophical inquiry; for both were illusionary topics of flattery used by those who were ignorant of what was best (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). Gorgias, most notable for his famed *Encomium of Helen* argued that speeches were like drugs; they could cause the body to seize from good or ill, delight or fear, and leave a hearer defenseless (Sprague, 1972). Gorgias’ ideology showed lack of concern for absolute knowledge and demonstrated his desire to use speech for manipulation and not for the greater good (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001).

One might, therefore, consider Gorgias as deceitful and not virtuous in his persuasive endeavors. Though controversial, Gorgias’ view of rhetoric and delivery stipulated profound perceptiveness into the psychophysiology of how the human mind and body respond to sounds produced by the voice. Such perceptiveness significantly benefited the study of rhetoric and speech (Johnstone, 2012). Nevertheless, the works of Socrates, not Gorgias, fundamentally shaped education,

philosophy, and rhetoric for millennia to come. Aristotle later agreed with Socrates' views. When writing about eloquence and delivery in, *The Rhetoric* (350 BCE), Aristotle states, "It is not right to pervert the audience by moving him [sic] to anger or envy or pity – one might as well warp a carpenter's rule before using it" (Jasinski, 2001).

Aristotle argued that delivery neglected authentic argumentation and was inessential to the development of persuasive oration. To him, fostering logos through the presentation of bare facts was the only just way to persuade; for anything beyond the bare facts lacked necessity (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). Aristotle also condemned the commonalities between delivery (hypokrisis) and the reciting of poetry (Burton, 2016) as well as, "the vulgar practice of staged theatrics," Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 180). Aristotle's deterministic opinion of knowledge deemed delivery as probable knowledge which lacked morality. Consequently, delivery received minimal consideration from Aristotle because of its emotional and illusionary, rather than dianoetic and logical, persuasive authorities.

Conversely, later in *The Rhetoric* (350 BCE), Aristotle acknowledges that sensitivity towards the emotions, arousals, and desires of one's audience are the defining factor of the speech's end and object. In Book Three, Part One Aristotle writes:

Since the whole business of rhetoric is with opinion, one should pay attention to delivery, not because it is right but because it is necessary, since true justice seeks nothing more in a speech than

neither to offend nor to entertain; for to contend by means of the facts themselves is just, with the result that everything except demonstration is incidental; but nevertheless, [delivery] has great power, as has been said, because of the corruption of the audience (Kennedy, 1991, p. 218).

Aristotle maintains that what was said to hearers was just as crucial as how it was said (Clark, 1977). In doing so, Aristotle clarifies how emotional delivery evokes through the modulating of vocal pitch, rhythm, and volume (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). He also acknowledges that both absolute and probable knowledge can persuade; therefore, accepting that speech delivery, and not just logic, is crucial to persuasion. Accordingly, the appeals to pathos that emerged through variations in corporal, gestural, and vocal delivery become recommended by Aristotle. After Aristotle yields to the persuasive powers of delivery, he nevertheless argues that delivery's persuasiveness comes from defects in the political arrangement; emphasizing delivery was necessary but absent of practical reasoning (Fortenbaugh, 1986).

Delivery remained a seemingly inauthentic component of rhetoric, for it gave little regard to the universe's elitist and absolute truths. Alongside this debate are other historical factors that impacted the advancement of scholarship surrounding delivery. For instance, Thomas Sheridan (1762) argues that war and the defense of the state influenced pedagogical interests and freedoms. Moreover, Sheridan (1762) maintains that since imitation was the primary form of developing speech delivery, the Greeks lacked a "refined sentiment of corporal and nonverbal

knowledge” (p. 147). Thus far this chapter has provided a brief history of rhetoric and delivery in Ancient Greece. To continue, let us turn now to three Latin texts that further shaped and progressed the scholarship of delivery.

Delivery in Ancient Rome

Written hundreds of years after Aristotle, the anonymously authored *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (84 BCE) provides less formulaic and more applied attention to delivery (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). Today, scholars remain uncertain of the books’ author, though it was once credited to Roman orator, Cicero. In its treatment of delivery, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (84 BCE) defines delivery by its vocal qualities and bodily movements. The author claims that delivery alone holds a particular power independent of the other departments of rhetoric; for without attention to the delivery, the other four canons lose their significance. The author likewise asserts that “many have said that the faculty of greatest use to the speaker and the most valuable for persuasion, is delivery” (Caplan, 1954, p. 189).

The author then details the importance of interweaving corporal and nonverbal components delivery. Physicality might include the stomping of feet, leaning of the body, rolling of shoulders, and minimal or dynamic gesticulation (Caplan, 1954). Considering the vocalized components of delivery, the treatise argues that speakers must modify the strength and tone of their voice to meet the demands of the “hearer’s taste” (Caplan, 1954, p. 195). To meet these demands, a speaker should apply three different types of vocal tonalities. First is the tone of conversation which is relaxed and most closely resembles our daily speech. The second tone is that of debate which is energetic, and

suitable both when proving and refuting. The third is the tone of amplification which either rouses the hearer to wrath or moves him to pity (Caplan, 1954). As such, different levels of vocal flexibility and physical correspondences, which demonstrates appeals to pathos and ethos.

Further explaining situational adaptability, the author writes, “with a gentle quiver in the voice, and a slight suggestion of a smile, but without any trace of immoderate laughter, one ought to shift one's utterance smoothly from serious to conversational tone to the tone of gentlemanly jest” (Caplan, 1954, p. 201). Later, when explaining the “sustained debate tone,” the author explains, “all you need is an occasional quick of the arm, a mobile countenance, and a knowing glance” (Caplan, 1954, p. 203). Such claims demonstrate a clear paradigmatic shift. These detailed explanations establish the importance of understanding not only *how* to deliver well, but also *how* it would be interpreted by an audience. Though, while practicing and refining delivery is essential, the author emphasizes that it is to natural talent that the rhetor owes the most thanks (Caplan, 1954). Accordingly, formal instruction alone is considered merely complementary to one's genetic aptitudes.

In closing, the author admits that although the treatise provides substantial detail, both vocal intonations and physicality lack sufficient consideration. He maintains that using words to describe performance is an inadequate method of pedagogy (Caplan, 1954). Thousands of years later, Gulikers, Bastiaens, and Kirshner likewise determine that effective oral communication cannot be studied merely by reading (2006). Nevertheless, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (84 BCE) was foundational in creating scholarship dedicated primarily to gesture and other forms

of non-verbal communication (Poggi & Pelachaud, 2008). Thirty years later comes *De Oratore* (55 BCE), by Cicero. Echoing Aristotle, Cicero maintains that the duties of a rhetor are to instruct the audience with reasoning (logos), demonstrate their goodwill (ethos), and stir audience emotion (pathos) (Sloan, 2001).

Cicero argues that, “The orator should feel the emotions that he wishes to evoke” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). To demonstrate this emotion, Cicero asserts that the practice of gesture would aid the orator greatly. Moreover, as with *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (84 BCE), Cicero notes that a speakers’ emotion, “is highlighted through the carriage of the body, gesture, and changing intonations of the voice” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 291). Cicero then associates delivery with the study of vocal modulation and considers intonation as, “the singular and unrivaled recommendation and prop of eloquence for the orator” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 318).

In fact, within his previous work *De Inventione* (85 BCE), Cicero describes rhetoric itself as the union of both eloquence (elocutio) and wisdom. He likewise associates delivery with music when writing, “the whole of a person's frame and every look on his face and utterance of his voice are like strings of a lyre, and sound according as they are struck by each successive emotion” (Sutton, 1967, p. 57). Though initially fearful of delivery (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001), Cicero eventually coins delivery as the first, second, and third most important component of oration (Grant, 1977). To these early Latin scholars, delivery was something to be treasured and not overlooked. A shift in scholarly weltanschauung between Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome becomes further evident.

As with *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* (84 BCE), Cicero believes that rehearsing delivery skills will aid orators, but also accepts that natural ability and genetic attributes remain critical. Examples of natural qualities might include, “the ready tongue, ringing tones, strong lungs, vigor, suitable build and shape of face and body” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 292). Therefore, as previously stated, when becoming a persuasive speaker, rhetors nevertheless owe thanks to natural endowment (Clark, 1977). Lacking natural talent, however, did not inevitably deter the greatest of orators.

In *De Oratore* (55 BCE), Cicero details the training practices of esteemed Athenian, Demosthenes (384–322 BCE). As one of the ten Attic Orators, or the best speakers in Greece between 450 and 350 BCE, Demosthenes composed speeches that resembled the purest form of the Attic Greek dialect, producing the most exceptional models for imitation by students. Demosthenes’ true devotion was to delivery, and deemed that all of rhetoric was delivery (Nadeau, 1964). Yet, Demosthenes was not born with natural ability. According to Nadeau (1964), Demosthenes’ soft physique, and sickly constitution impacted his abilities to address large assemblies of senators successfully. Demosthenes struggled with a weak and indistinct voice and profound shortness of breath (Perrin, 1919). He was therefore unable to display, “strict regimen of vigorous physical self-mastery to which all male Athenian citizens were expected to discipline themselves” (Perrin, 1919, p.19).

To address these natural ailments, Demosthenes trained rigorously. His training consisted of practicing in front of large mirrors and observing his bodily

carriage and expressiveness (Clark, 1977). Other methods included practicing his para-verbals by placing pebbles into his mouth. Comparable methods persist among singers and actors today; however, instead of pebbles, para-verbals are sometimes trained by putting pencils between one's teeth. To improve the vigor of his breath and vocal tone, Demosthenes performed his speeches while ascending steep mountainous slopes, and by holding his breath followed by extended exhalation. Consequently, Demosthenes enhanced his tone, enunciation, articulation, pronunciation, and defeated his slight stutter and other factors that impeded his confidence (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001).

Clearly, then, a lack in genetic aptitude did not stop Demosthenes. Despite his physical hindrances, relentless self-disciplining resulted in substantial rhetorical successes (Nadeau, 1964). Such regimen substantiates Eysenck and Calvo's 1992 research arguing that anxious individuals are more motivated to overcome debilitating speech apprehensions. Through lauding him as one of the Attic orators, history confirms Demosthenes as one of history's greatest speakers. Nevertheless, Demosthenes' triumphs are just one example of how practice addresses natural inabilities (Collins, 2004). The mindset of, "practice makes perfect," was not endorsed by everyone. For instance, the first century BCE philosopher Philodemus maintained that delivery depended solely upon genetic aptitudes, and that delivery should be denied of formal instruction. However, Philodemus later argues, like Cicero and Demosthenes, that delivery remains the most critical action for rhetoric (Goodwin, 1878). Perhaps Cicero included the story of Demosthenes in *De Oratore* (55 BCE) because as an inexperienced young orator, Cicero's face would become

pale and his limbs would shake uncontrollably (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001), or maybe in referencing an Attic Orator, Cicero felt that his ideologies would appear more credible. Regardless, Cicero demonstrates that the Stoic doctrines of absolute knowledge and reasoning were not the only methods for developing persuasive public speakers.

By this point in the Current Era, the animosities against delivery were assuaging, yet trepidations against delivery remained evident within treatises on rhetoric. There have been few scholarly reports on this phenomenon, but perhaps the emphasizing of natural endowments was the preferred stance. All the same, the disputes surrounding nature versus nurture surrounding delivery continued. Not until *Institutio Oratoria* (95 CE) by Quintilian was there a comprehensive “how-to training manual” for delivery (Valenzano, 2014, p. 4). *Institutio Oratoria* (95 CE) includes 12 books and 111 chapters; though, considering the text’s ample detailing of composition and instruction, the brevity of Quintilian’s single section on delivery is paradoxical. His treatise on delivery is rather concise and appears only in Book Eleven, Chapter Three. Nevertheless, this single chapter is considered the most comprehensive treatise on delivery thus far (Johnstone, 2012).

Quintilian argues that while exceptional speech composition remains necessary, the most significant component is how the speech is delivered (Clark, 1977). Like Cicero, Quintilian states that, “All emotional appeals will inevitably fall flat unless given the fire that voice, look, and the whole carriage of the body can give them” (Russell, 2001, p. 246). Such bodily carriage considers the protruding of the chest and stomach, or the untimely swaying of balance (Russell,

2001, p. 245). Quintilian's meticulousness relates to his assertion that, "For my own part I would not hesitate to assert that a mediocre speech supported by all the power of delivery will be more impressive than the best speech unaccompanied by such power" (Russell, 2001, p. 245). Appeals to emotion, however, were not the only influences Quintilian associated with delivery.

Quintilian also supports delivery's influence on ethos (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001), and emphasizes the role of linking voice to the ears and gestures to sight (Sloan, 2001), for the eyes and ears are the conduit for which all emotion reaches the soul (Clark, 1977). Considering mindful delivery, Quintilian believes that it is capable of producing a physiological *phantasia*, a vision that impresses the imagination and stirs the emotions of both speaker and audience (Sloan, 2001, p. 561). These appeals to the soul are dissimilar to those supported by Socrates, who believed that philosophy and absolute truths acted as the only such conduits. Quintilian's view demonstrates the continuation of a paradigmatic shift emphasizing delivery's necessity to rhetoric.

This shift is further confirmed when he notes that, "Motion is generally divided into six kinds, but circular motion must be regarded as a seventh. The latter alone is faulty when applied to gesture. The remaining motions — that is, forward, to right or left and up or down — all have their significance" (Russell, 2001, p. 299). Although a praising of gesture appeared in previous texts, gesture's scholarly pedigree was mostly absent before Quintilian's highly detailed Latin text (Hall, 2004). Alongside Valenzano's claim that *Institutio Oratoria* (95CE) was a "how-to training manual," I argue that the treatise likewise serves as a "why-to training

manual.” For instance, Quintilian details gesture and bodily movement that are common within Roman culture, writing:

One of the commonest of all the gestures consists in placing the middle finger against the thumb and extending the remaining three: it is suitable to the exordium, the hand being moved forward with an easy motion a little distance both to the right and left, while the head and shoulders gradually follow the direction of the gesture. It is also useful in the statement of facts, but in that case the hand must be moved with firmness and a little further forward, while, if we are reproaching or refuting our adversary, the same movement may be employed with some vehemence and energy, since such passages permit of greater freedom of extension (Russell, 2001, p. 293).

Like a physiologist, Quintilian then specifies the various minute bodily manipulations, from eyebrows, nostrils, and eye contact, to thighs, feet, and direction of one’s stance (Russell, 2001). For example, he posits, “It is not often that the lips or nostrils can be becomingly employed to express our feelings, although they are often used to indicate derision, contempt or loathing” (Russell, 2001, p.287). Later, he writes, “Our attitude should be upright, our feet level and a slight distance apart, of the left may be very slightly advanced. The knees should be upright, but not stiff, the shoulders relaxed, the face stern, but not sad, expressionless or languid” (Russell, 2001, p. 333). Furthermore, as he explains the effect of every vocal timbre, rate, volume, and pause, Quintilian seemingly approaches delivery like a symphonist. To him, a persuasive voice “is easy, strong,

rich, flexible, firm, sweet, enduring, resonant, pure, carrying far and penetrating the ear, for there is a type of voice which impresses the hearing not by its volume, but by its peculiar quality” (Russell, 2001, p. 265). Though perhaps pedantic to some, without access to pictures or sketches, Quintilian’s work required comprehensive language and detail.

As a final note on *Institutio Oratoria* (95 CE), one should consider how this single chapter details the importance of appropriate fashion for an orator. Quintilian describes jewelry as essential, but only if it does not distract an audience. He likewise details the proper length, color, pattern, and fold of one’s garments. According to Quintilian, consideration for the toga, the style of the shoes, or the arrangement of the hair, is just as, “reprehensible as excessive carelessness” (Russell, 2001, p. 319). Including these elements further substantiates the visual authorities of delivery.

Quintilian understood the complexities and persuasive capacities of mastering delivery, as such, this work is indeed a crowning moment for delivery. Extensive consideration to Aristotle’s fifth canon was unprecedented before this text. Following Quintilian’s work, however, later handbooks on rhetoric mostly omitted attention to delivery (Sloan, 2001). Like the paradigmatic shifts between Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome, later eras also impacted sentiments towards delivery. To further explore this trend, I now turn to the works of Petrus Ramus and Francis Bacon during the European Renaissance, Thomas Sheridan during the Elocutionary Movement, and the establishment of the foundational public speaking course during the early twentieth-century.

The Renaissance

Covering a span of roughly 400 years, from the Renaissance, or “rebirth,” was a time of significant change throughout Europe and the rest of the world. Major changes in art, music, religion, and even rhetoric were occurring during this era. Regarding delivery, a substantial decline in academic interest occurred. Novice speakers were often advised merely to practice a lot and observe skilled actors instead of receiving formal instruction or guided rationalization (Sloane, 2013). The ideologies surrounding delivery likewise continued to vacillate, for many Renaissance educators ignored delivery in favor of other rhetorical issues (Sloan, 218). One reason for this change relates to the invention of the Gutenberg Press (1440). This invention removed the direct connection between the speaker and the hearer, making voice, gesture, and emotionality less critical. Another reason delivery lost substantiation was because of teachers and rhetoricians like Petrus Ramus (1515–1572).

Ramus was violently opposed to classical Scholasticism, and instead favored his own methodologies. More specifically, Ramus contested the works of Aristotle in the 1543 publication *Aristotelicae Animadversiones*, the work of Cicero in 1547’s *Brutinae Questiones*, and of Quintilian in 1549’s *Rhetoricae Distinctiones in Quintilianum* (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001). Through burying Ancient Greek and Roman scholars in trivialities, Ramus became, “a doughty warrior opposing all stultifying traditions” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 674). Ramus did not believe that reasoning required classical education. Reasoning, according to Ramus, was, instead, instinctive. Moreover, rhetoric constituted only

the canons of style and delivery, though delivery was the lesser art. Therefore, rhetoric was diminished to merely, “a person who can speak well with skilled delivery and style” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 676).

The other canons of invention, arrangement, and memory were instead categorized as dialectic, and not rhetorical. According to Ramus, Cicero’s ideas of delivery and rhetoric were useless because they “muddled dialectic and rhetoric” together (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 680). Considering his attacks on Quintilian, Ramus finds that Quintilian’s advice on invention, arrangement, and rhetoric’s necessity of a “good man speaking well,” are impractical (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 679). While this thesis strongly supports a reemergence of attention towards delivery, a sensible and authentic balance remains essential. Ramus, however, was not the only one stimulating the arguments surrounding delivery.

English philosopher and statesman Francis Bacon (1561–1626) staunchly opposed the “bloodless prose of Ramism.” Bacon did, however, support Ramus’ disinterest in the ancient Scholasticism, for such Ancient educating, “relies on received wisdom and the tautologies of syllogism and so can discover nothing new” (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 737). Furthermore, Bacon refutes Plato’s belief that rhetoric distorts the truth. Bacon deems rhetoric as a skill which helps convey knowledge to those less capable, since rhetoric was able to create imagery to impress the mind (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 575). Moreover, instead of searching for probable truths, Bacon favored a more inductive and scientific methodological approaches to learning. In doing so, Bacon preferred observation, experimentation, and classification (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 737).

Considering delivery's effects on knowledge and truth, Bacon categorized four types of rational knowledge, the fourth of which was the, "expressing or transferring our knowledge to others" (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 742). Accordingly, Bacon likewise found delivery's capacity for transferring knowledge as necessary, but remained unclear about the complexities of developing delivery. Accordingly, delivery was considered necessary, but nevertheless, inattentive to observable truths. The ambiguity surrounding the applications, definitions, and complexities of both rhetoric and delivery did not stop after the Renaissance. Following the works of Ramus and Bacon comes a momentous shift in both rhetoric and the credence of speech delivery, the era known as The Elocutionary Movement.

The Elocutionary Movement

The movement emphasized the influence of elocution (elocutio) to both action (actio) and delivery, with particular stress on the latter. This period begins during Britain's Age of Enlightenment (1600–1800) and is a time where delivery gains the most praise. Unique to this era was an "obsession" with establishing correctness in pronunciation and eloquent delivery (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 792). Such obsession was, however, at the expense of speech content and arrangement (Crocker, 1958). Linguistically, the Elocutionary Movement arose out of English's perceived inferiority to Latin (Mazzio, 2009).

As stated by Haberman (1954):

The Elocutionary Movement's emergence was the result of several factors. Such factors included the increased interest in standardizing and improving the English language; the poor speaking by preachers in Protestant churches, where sermons had become the center of the worship service; the recognition of the power of public speaking in democratic societies; the resurgent popularity of the theatre; the demands of the middle class for training and education; and an increased interest in psychology (p. 109).

At the forefront of this movement was Irish actor, teacher, and "proselytizer for elocution," Thomas Sheridan (1719–1788) (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 879). While not the only advocate of speech over text, Sheridan was perhaps the most influential. He deemed that speaker's must first believe the message themselves, to establish ethos and thus empower pathos. Such believability emerges through the speaker's authentic vocal tone, gesture, and look (Sheridan, 1756). Sheridan set out to restore delivery to its proper status within rhetoric and to propose a reform of Irish education (Sheridan, 1756). To him, vocal performance, and not mere memorization, should be priority of all Britons. Moreover, echoing Roman views of delivery, Sheridan believed that writing was inferior to speech; for the primitive language of speech, gesture, and expression were "gifts of God" (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 803).

Eloquence, according to Sheridan occurred, "Whenever the force of these passions is extreme, words give place to inarticulate sounds: sighs, murmurings, in love; sobs, groans, and cries in grief; half choaked [sic] sounds in rage; and shrieks in terror,

are then the only language heard” (Sheridan, 1756, p. 102). These sounds and tones, Sheridan insists, have, “more power in exciting sympathy, than anything that can be done by mere words” (Sheridan, 1756, p. 102). Supporting Sheridan a century later, Kirkham (1846) finds that, “Gesture and expression of countenance are the languages of nature. . .they convey a language that reaches the heart” (p.147). Conversely, the Elocutionary Movement was not always supported by historians.

According to Golden and Corbett (1990), even in the eighteenth century, the elocutionists were criticized for their “excesses” including their “development of a complex marking system to be used in oral reading” and their “absurd and ludicrous categorization and description of the emotions” (p. 8). Others, like Harrington (2010), deem that many historians found this movement to be an odd and insignificant part of rhetoric, and one that deserved minimal attention. This view, according to Spoel (2001), relates to the “uneasy status of pathos and bodily rhetoric within the rhetorical tradition” (p. 49). History also confirms that by the twentieth-century, elocution’s popularity fell significantly and that elocution virtually disappeared from American academia, both within textbooks and classroom pedagogy (Sloane, 2013). What followed was another shift in both the study and pedagogy of speech delivery, with the development of the foundational university public speaking course.

The basic course

By the late 1890’s a gradual paradigmatic shift from studying oration as an act of elocutionary entertainment to a more audience-centered, pragmatic, and

conversational style of discourse occurs. Then, by the early 1900's, professors like James A. Winans started teaching students how to craft, instead of just perform, their own speeches (Medhurst, 2010). These pedagogical changes asked not "How good of a performer are you?" but rather "How well do you engage your audience for a purpose?" (Sproule, 2012). Accordingly, while elocution (delivery) remained significant, it was superseded by audience-centered content (invention and arrangement) (Medhurst, 2010).

Fundamentally, the move towards re-emphasizing the audience was found to be vaguely Aristotelian in its framing (Crocker, 1958). The field of Speech Communication had returned to its ancient Greek origins, which was most evident in popular public speaking textbooks. Most notably, Ripplingham's (1813) *Publique Speaking*, which accentuated the minute rules of pronunciation and gesture was succeeded by Fulton and Trueblood's (1903) *Practical Elocution*, A. E. Phillips' (1905) *Effective Speaking*, and Winan's (1915) *Public Speaking*. These newer texts instead featured the practical, conversational, and democratic forms of oral rhetoric, and critiqued the triviality of delivery. While these books marked a shift in pedagogy in the American speech classroom, it was not the textbooks alone that confirmed a significant change—institutions themselves became academic battlegrounds.

Scholars like Winans openly opposed speech's ties to university English departments. For Winans, the only way to flourish as a discipline was to sever such ties and to establish a new department all together as he had done at Cornell University (Medhurst, 2010); however, other elements such as financial,

institutional, and practical factors likewise led to the breaking of ties (Mountfourd, 2014). As a result, the Elocutionary Movement lost meaningful influence.

Furthermore, by 1913, the newly titled Eastern Communication Association voted to remove all study of public speaking from English departments. Though, perhaps most emblematic was Trueblood's 1915 article within the inaugural issue of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Therein, Trueblood (1915) considers the need for two concurrent speech courses. The first would teach "proper expression to the best thoughts of the great authors" and the other "the best expression of one's own thoughts" (p. 260). The latter line of reasoning (which Trueblood termed the "self-expressional" or "oratorical" line) included a proposal for a stand-alone course in public speaking. Trueblood explains:

In this course, students should be required to make at least eight speeches, each about seven or eight minutes in length. These speeches should be prepared for different occasions. Briefs of speeches should be required: first, a trial brief to be presented for criticism, and, second, a corrected brief, which should appear on the table of the instructor at the time of the speech. Speeches should be extemporaneous as far as the words are concerned, but the outline should be very carefully memorized (p. 262).

The basic public speaking course had thus taken shape. Speech had been accepted as an essential aspect of general education. The field's identity, however, would need addressing. By the late 1980's Seiler and McGukin (1989) noticed that the speech communication discipline still had no agreement about what the basic

course was or what course best represents it. To further advance speech communication pedagogy, the discipline must reassess its identity, and find common grounds.

Conclusion

As demonstrated in Chapter One, the phenomenon that continually challenged the discipline of rhetoric was the disregard of delivery. Delivery was shown to be either loved or hated, trusted or doubted, natural or rehearsed, probable or improbable, primary or secondary, necessary or unethical. Like a multi-sloped Bell Curve, the ebbing and flowing of the discipline's attitudes towards delivery have always been, and perhaps forever will be, highly debated. The following chapter examines the imbalance against delivery in the twenty-first century by analyzing the Aristotelian framing of structure and content in the twelfth edition of Stephen Lucas', *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016). In doing so, I postulate that the Aristotelian framing maintained within public speaking textbooks neglects the rhetoric of delivery. As a result, speeches become less emotionally expressive and overall, less persuasive.

The cyclical return to the Aristotelian views of absolute truths and knowledge is not conducive to the instruction of delivery. To investigate this phenomenon, I use the term genre as a tool of analysis. Through illuminating this imbalance, I likewise offer insights which validate how a disservice is being done to students and educators. In doing so, I aim to illustrate how texts themselves also serve as conduits for rearticulating the collective ideologies embedded within the discipline.

CHAPTER TWO: TEXTBOOKS AS A RHETORICAL ARTIFACT

History matters, for what comes first conditions what comes later. While Chapter One examined the history of trepidations against delivery, Chapter Two asks, “How is the imbalance maintained within the foundational public speaking course?” I argue that the imbalances are most noticeably maintained within the course's primary pedagogic tool, the textbook. Using the rhetorical concept of genre, Chapter Two asserts that the genre of public speaking textbooks places clear favoritism on the canons of invention and arrangement, while considerably devaluing the canon of delivery. This trend echoes the Aristotelian pedagogical reframing transpiring at the end of the Elocutionary Movement (Crocker, 1958). To demonstrate such favoritism, the twelfth edition of Stephen Lucas’ textbook *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016), serves as the primary artifact of examination. This text was chosen due to its current role as the touchstone artifact to the field of public speaking; rendering it the epitome, or standard example, for generic classification.

I address my arguments in two steps. First, I review scholarship highlighting genre and textbooks. In doing so, I suggest that the overshadowing of delivery has become standardized within public speaking textbooks. Second, using the methodology of close-reading, I validate why Lucas’ (2016) text serves as a suitable artifact for analysis. Moreover, I consider how the Aristotelian framing within *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016), disserves both students and instructors. Chapter Two, therefore, contributes to conversations surrounding pedagogical development, the impact of genre on audience expectation, and basic course instruction.

Genre defined

Conceptually, genres identify certain kinds, types, and categories of artifacts. Fundamentally, a genre establishes audience expectation. Considering the terms' ancient roots, one might recall Aristotle's division of oration into three discursive speech genres known as judicial (forensic), deliberative (legislative), and epideictic (demonstrative or ceremonial). Those speech genres established oratory expectations for both speaker and audience. The notion of genre, however, no longer applies exclusively to speech types. For instance, a genre now encompasses classifications of music (rap, rock, classical, jazz, among others) or books (fiction, non-fiction, mystery, and the like). Thus, genres adhere to the formulated and identifiable characteristics shared between comparable rhetorical artifacts.

Further defined by Campbell (1972), "A genre is a classification based on the fusion and interrelation of elements in such a way that a unique kind of rhetorical act is created". These similarities can transpire in many ways. For instance, genres might reference reoccurring styles, arguments, structures, or situations within which these artifacts transpire (Jasinski, 2010). Reappearing rhetorical objectives also aid in determining a genre's existence, creating opportunities for rhetorical genre analyses. Such methodology is supported by Jamiesen (1973) who speculates, "When a critic compares a contemporary critical object to great specimens of that same type, he [sic] is merely formalizing a natural process. . . .The human need for a frame of reference lures the mind to generic classification" (p. 167). By analyzing genres, critics can penetrate the internal workings that preserve the recursive elements of the genre itself. Ironically, like speech delivery, the scholarship surrounding genre is not without debate.

Genre scholarship

It was arguably Bakhtin's criticism of Aristotle's division of speech genres where genre's rhetorical influence first received attention. In his work, "The Problem of Speech Genres". Bakhtin (1953) argues that critics must consider all forms of speech (not only deliberative, forensic, and epideictic), and that discourses should adhere to complex, and require knowledge of, previous examples of similar speech acts. This work by Bakhtin establishes that fixed attitudes towards genres do not reflect their real intricacies and applications. While Bakhtin's work progressed genre scholarship, it was disputably Herman Northrop Frye's, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (1957), where genre scholarship gained the most momentum.

In his piece, Frye (1957) maintains that genres consider analogies in form. These forms emerge through recurring imagery, associative clusters, and complex variables; each of which compares to rhetorical commonplaces called topoi. Additionally, like Bakhtin (1953), Frye (1957) posits that prior artifacts influence all rhetoric, and thus, resemblances must emerge. By this point, as a concept, genre no longer persists only as a topic of oration, nor is it as effortlessly discernable or categorized. Still, the limited literature had yet to recognize fully the depths of genre's influence. Further recognition of genre's rhetorical capabilities was yet to transpire.

Addressing this gap was Edwin Black's 1965 critique of the neo-Aristotelian form of rhetorical analysis. Therein, both genre and genre analysis receive explicit affirmations of rhetorical significance. Black (1965) assesses the persisting restraints placed on rhetorical artifacts by rhetorical situations. To Black (1965), there are a limited number of rhetorical situations which consequently limit opportunities for response. He maintains

that reoccurring rhetorical situations, and not just style, form, and structure, are what lend utmost credence to the forming of genres. Accordingly, both internal and external variables establish genres.

As later maintained by Lloyd Bitzer (1968), “From day to day, year to year, comparable situations occur, prompting comparable responses; hence, rhetorical forms are born and special vocabulary, grammar, and style are established” (p. 13). Contesting these ideologies Arthur Miller argues that, “a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not on the substance or the form of discourse, but on the actions it uses accomplish [sic]” (1984, p. 154). Additionally, Garver (1994) argues that genres are, “kinds of rhetoric that are defined by their purposes and ends, by their practical and conventional contexts, and by the methods they usually employ to accomplish those ends” (p. 55). As such, genres can be consciously identified by their re-articulating of rhetorical forms and ideologies. Therefore, genres possess another unique power, that of a conduit.

Sociocultural scholar Kamberelis (1995) considers that, “Genres are primary carriers of ideologies” (p. 146), that they, “can rearticulate collective ideologies” (p. 148), and that, “genres occur throughout all facets of society” (p. 149). Bahtia (1997) echoes these assertions and considers the manifestation of genres within professional settings. He notes that:

Genres are dynamic constructs, even though they are essentially seen as embedded in conventions associated with typical instances of language use in social, academic or professional settings. An understanding or a prior knowledge of conventions is considered essential for its

identification, construction, interpretation, use and ultimate exploitation by members of specific professional communities to achieve socially recognized goals with some degree of pragmatic success (Bahtia, 1997, p. 367).

The rhetorical implications of genres are thus undeniable. Once applied only to speech types, genres now encompass structural characteristics, situational occurrences, and rhetorical ends. To return to the objectives of this chapter, I now examine an example of a currently enacted genre, the academic textbook.

Textbook scholarship

As stated by Foshay (1990), “A textbook carries with it the assumption that it contains the uncontroverted truth” (p. 33). Textbooks function as mediums for rearticulating collective academic ideologies, and aid in determining the strengths and weaknesses of certain practices maintained within academic subjects (Nichol, 2003). Since roughly 80% of basic course programs used a commercially published textbook, and many course directors will continue using the same book and author from year to year, such re-articulation is rhetorically significant (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010). Moreover, being the primary carriers of ideologies, textbooks serve as the primary references for both teacher and student (Westbury, 1990). Later, Nichols (2003) claims that both teacher and textbooks remain the “two key vehicles for the transmission of knowledge” (p. 9). These two transmitters of knowledge thus serve as the dominating authoritative educational stakeholders for students, and the public speaking textbook genre serves as the conduit through which both vehicles operate.

Not all instructors have a comprehensive knowledge of their course's subject matter when they start teaching. For example, consider the experiences of graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants. As stated by Pearson and Nelson (1990), "graduate and undergraduate teaching associates may face some problems including less credibility, less knowledge of the subject matter, poor teaching skills, little experience, and an inappropriate attitude toward teaching" (p. 1). One method for bolstering instructor credibility and developing subject knowledge is through referencing the course's required text. Therefore, perhaps the more powerful transmitter of knowledge is the textbook, and not the instructors themselves.

More specifically, consider the foundational public speaking course. Conceivably, not all instructors will have the adequate experience or knowledge necessary to instruct students on public oration. Moreover, as glossophobia remains a significant fear among individuals, instructors may lack the skills required to teach public speaking, especially delivery. As a result, many instructors resort to compositional, instead of performance-based, elements of public speaking. Echoing this notion are Jones and RiCharde's (2005) who find that public speaking is, "an enormously complex activity, which cannot be separated completely into parts. Yet there is a tendency for most new instructors to misunderstand the basic course. Beginning instructors often focus only on products (e.g., outlines and bibliographies) that stand in as tangible evidence of mastery rather than the process of developing skilled communicators" (p. 2). Considering that Morreale, Hugenberg, and Worley (2006) find that 71.5% of basic course programs use graduate teaching assistants, as carriers of ideologies, the information provided in textbooks remains crucial to both student and instructor. Moreover, bearing in mind the collective

ideologies rearticulated within public speaking textbooks (Clevenger & Phifer, 1959; Pelias, 1989; Pearson et al., 2006), analyzing their affinity to a genre remains warranted. Equally important is examining the scholarship presented within the texts themselves.

Allen and Preiss (1990), find that many modern textbooks make claims unsupported by current research. Additionally, when considering the basic course itself, Pearson and Nelson (1990) find that, “little change has been reported in the basic course even though dramatic changes have occurred in other avenues of the field,” and that, “Publishers sometimes make decisions which inhibit accuracy in textbooks. Marketing experts and reviewers will often choose the ‘tried and true’ over the innovative and accurate” (p. 4). In addition, while serving as national director of the foundational public speaking course, Michael Leff (1992) observed that:

The syllabi for the course looked very much as they did in 1970, and the instructors (all of them graduate students) adhered to the same objectives and methods that were in vogue two decades ago. The textbook was more attractive in format and better written than the ones I had used, but it included almost the same set of topics arranged in more-or-less the same order... During the past two decades, the academic study of rhetoric has passed through profound and revolutionary changes...Yet they still teach public speaking very much as I taught it (p. 116).

There is undoubtedly a rearticulated collective ideology embedded within the curriculum and its texts (Westbury, 1990) Moreover, Schwartz (1995) argues, “within the Communication discipline, a gap exists between our theoretical insights as scholars and our pedagogical practices in the basic communication course” (Schwartz, p. 130). Others

researchers agree (VerLinden 1997; Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003; Gaer, 2002; Billings, 2005; Epping & Labrie, 2005; Paine, 2005). The rhetorical objectives of both the course and its texts are thus impacted by the limitations maintained by the public speaking textbook genre. As such, “because textbooks are at the core of the speech pedagogy, we have failed to provide our students with the necessary information to succeed in the contemporary speech situation” (Frobish, 2000, p. 239). More recent scholarship echoes these claims.

In their 2013 article, McGarrity and Crosby claim that “textbooks themselves are responsive products to the pedagogical paradigm that constrains them” (p. 169).

Consequently, if textbooks continue their inadequate addressing of all five of the rhetorical canons, then ideological gaps in pedagogy will further entrench themselves. I too believe that the current pedagogical paradigm restrains public speaking textbooks. We owe it to our students to supply the best and most accurate information. However, unlike McGarrity and Crosby (2013), I argue that the current paradigm to which current textbooks respond results in constraints on the teaching of delivery.

This paradigmatic shift allowed the Aristotelian framework to reemerge and resurface outdated attitudes towards speech performance; thus restraining both the discipline and the public speaking textbook. McClish (2016) argues a similar notion.

In his piece, McClish (2016) examines the canon of delivery within three popular public speaking textbooks. McClish (2016) argues that public speaking textbooks fail to consider the canon of delivery adequately. As with my analyses, McClish’s 2016 work warrants the academic interest of addressing delivery’s detailing in modern textbooks. McClish (2016) does not, however, consider the controversial history of delivery's

pedagogy, how an Aristotelian framing adversely impacts speech delivery, genre's fixed attitudes, and how these pedagogical gaps influence the discipline as a whole. How, then, do genres relate to touchstone artifacts?

Returning to Edwin Black (1965), "touchstones are 'not models for copying', but rather, are referents which can inform our expectations of 'what rhetorical discourse ought to do' and of what it is 'capable of doing'" (1965, p. 30). Now in its twelfth edition, I argue that because of its role as the touchstone text, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) by Stephen Lucas has significantly limited what other public speaking texts "ought to do" of "have done". Moreover, since genres guide expectations which preserve ideologies, analyzing the genre's current touchstone remains an adequate approach for understanding public speaking pedagogy. It should be noted, however, that some scholars would discredit this methodology.

Gray (1989) argues that issues found in course pedagogy relate to the inconsistencies, rather than similarities, within course textbooks. Moreover, Campbell (1972) finds, "When completing a genre analysis a critic may fail to delineate the essential characteristics of the model so that the base for comparison is faulty," and "a generic 'fit' is asserted although certain essential characteristics are absent or significant dissimilarities exist" (p. 454). I disagree. I found reoccurring rhetorical objectives, topoi, content, and formatting characteristics within dozens of public speaking textbooks and nonacademic texts alike. However, in narrowing this chapter's focus, I argue that analyzing only the Lucas text remains an acceptable approach. Here is why.

Lucas as the touchstone

Stephen Lucas, *The Art of Public Speaking*, has long stood as a top-selling public speaking course textbook. In fact, it has been considered among the top three speaking course texts both domestically and abroad since 1988 (Gibson et al., 1988). First published in 1983, *The Art of Public Speaking* has since been translated into several languages including Chinese, Portuguese, Korean, and Romanian (Lucas, 2016, p. iii). Further validating the significance of this textbook, in 1998 Lucas' publisher McGraw-Hill stated that the Lucas textbook remained, "the best selling public speaking text," and, "the best selling text in the communication discipline" (McGraw-Hill, 1998).

Additionally, as with my assertions, Frobish's 2000 evaluation of the Lucas text finds that, "*The Art of Public Speaking* is an exemplar of contemporary public speaking textbooks" (p. 241), and that, "Stephen Lucas' textbook acts as a model of pedagogy (p. 243)." Therefore, the Lucas text carries with it a power that lesser-known texts do not, the power to maintain or challenge the genre and the discipline's identity. According to Stohl and Cheney (2001), "Power defines influence and has the capacity to affect interpretive processes, and the overcoming of resistance (p. 360)." Additionally, as stated by Foucault (1977), "Power produces reality, identity, and rituals of truth" (p. 504). Thus as the exemplar, this text serves as perhaps the most agenda-setting pedagogical tool of the foundational speech course.

Features of the touchstone

Upon receiving the Lucas text, instructors and students are provided an array of resources in addition to the textbook itself. These include a variety of online learning

platforms, supplementary study resources, as well as dozens of student speech examples and excerpts. The textbook divides into five primary sections, each of which acknowledges the different elements of speech production and establishes the common topoi surrounding public speaking pedagogy. The first section titled, “Speaking and Listening,” occurs between pages 35 and 111 (76 pages). With four chapters, this initial section highlights speaker confidence, preparation, and the ethics of both speaking and listening. The second section, “Speech Preparation: Getting Started,” aligns most closely with the canon of invention. Between pages 112 and 201 (89 pages), this chapter provides readers with four chapters regarding topic selection, audience analysis, information gathering, and establishing credibility. The third section, “Speech Preparation: Organizing and Outlining,” considers the canon of arrangement, and spans from pages 202 to 259 (57 pages). While the third section is the shortest, due to the chapters' division of speech introduction, conclusion, and speech body, it is arguably the most loyal to its canon.

The fourth section, “Presenting the Speech,” occurs from 259 to 323 (64 pages), and addresses the canons of style, memory, and delivery. The three chapters therein are then divided by the categories of language choice, speech delivery, and visual aids. This section highlights speaking eloquently but does not provide extensive detail on the three canons mentioned. Whereas entire sections are given for both speech invention and arrangement (seven chapters), those concerned with speech delivery, style, and memory are clustered into just one. Moreover, the formatting of information is rhetorically significant considering that space, “has always helped define the boundaries of memory” (Zelizer, 1995, p. 223), and as the touchstone to the genre of public speaking textbooks,

the structuring of its content both guides and restricts the reader's collective conception of how the elements of public speaking ought to be prioritized. As a text for a course on foundational public speaking, and not composition, such structuring is perplexing.

Lucas concludes the text with a portion titled, “Varieties of Public Speaking,” which describes the rhetorical aims of the different rhetorical objectives, or genres, of public speaking. This overview provides a brief outlining of the text's arrangement. It also demonstrates a clear Aristotelian framing of content. Moreover, my summary indicates that the canons of arrangement and invention are provided significantly more detail than components of speech delivery and eloquence. A clear return to the Sophistic mentality towards public speaking is therefore present. In the following section, I consider Lucas’ specific detailing of speech delivery, how it compares to speech invention and arrangement, and why these characteristics remain rhetorically significant.

Chapter 13 “Delivery”

Lucas begins the chapter with a vignette describing the comedy routines of comedian Ellen DeGeneres. Therein, he explains that fans could memorize all of her jokes word-for-word, but could never successfully match, “her manner of presentation, her vocal inflections, her perfectly timed pauses, her facial expressions, or her gestures” (p. 279). Such is the case, according to Lucas, because DeGeneres has effectively mastered her delivery. To validate the significance of such mastery, Lucas notes, “Even a mediocre speech will be more effective if it is presented well, whereas a wonderfully written speech can be ruined by poor delivery” (p. 279). It is thus evident that Lucas

regards delivery as a fundamental element of oration worth mastering, and encourages readers to agree.

On the following page, Lucas provides a formal definition of what he acknowledges as delivery. He writes that “Speech delivery is a matter of nonverbal communication. It is based on how you use your voice and body to convey the message expressed by your words” (Lucas, 2016, p. 280). Readers are then prompted with the statement, “In this chapter, we will explain how you can use nonverbal communication to deliver your speeches effectively and to increase the impact of your verbal message.” Here, Lucas highlights elements of good delivery by stating that speakers, “should use vocal and facial expressiveness,” and how they should appear intelligible by, “avoiding distracting mannerisms and establishing eye contact with listeners.” All of these elements align with his definition of speech delivery, and the highlighted aspects of his earlier vignette, demonstrating consistency with his message.

Immediately following, Lucas reminds readers, “You cannot become a skilled speaker just by following a set of rules in a textbook. In the long run, there is no substitute for experience” (Lucas, 2016, p. 280). As mentioned in Chapter One of this thesis, Gulikers, Bastiaens, and Kirshner (2006) agree with Lucas. Absolute sets of rules do not exist for delivery. Delivery supports humanistic views self-expressivity, dynamism, and personality. Its mastery requires an interpretive and not an absolutist or universalistic mindset. Still, being a chapter titled, “Delivery,” readers will plausibly expect formal instruction on nonverbal communication. Moreover, considering that a fundamental difference between public speaking and other forms of communication is the aspect of speech presentation or performance, anticipating both sufficient detail and

instruction is not unreasonable; however, this detailing does not occur. Delivery is presented formulaically, but not applicably.

Lucas begins this chapter on delivery by offering approximately three pages specifying the various methods of speaking (memorized, extemporaneous, impromptu). While these methods of speech are worth consideration, their placement in a chapter dedicated to nonverbal communication appears unnecessary. Moreover, these types of speech have little to do with the elements of, “good delivery,” stated by Lucas on page 280. Continuing to page 283, however, Lucas returns to delivery techniques and explains the various characteristics of a speaker’s vocal variety: volume, pitch, rate, pauses, pronunciation, articulation, and dialect, all of which, when mastered, have favorable impact on speaker credibility, likeability and dynamism (Mehrabian, 1971; Aronovitch, 1976; Beebe, 1980; Barge, Schlueter, & Pritchard, 1989). Lucas does not provide substantial formal instruction for how and why to use these elements. Like Aristotle, Lucas offers definitions, but not reasoning. This vagueness becomes significant considering that Quianthy and Hefferin (1999) find that, “[e]ffective oral communication involves generating messages and delivering them with attention to vocal variety, articulation, and nonverbal signals” (p. 28). Though Lucas formulaically defines what each of these vocal elements is, he offers limited guidance for how or why to incorporate and practice these factors.

Perhaps Lucas should consider scholarship surrounding inductive reasoning. Such scholarship reflects how one is enabled not only to focus on the *what* of learning, but also on the *how* and *why* of learning. He could also turn to theories of Naturalistic Generalization, which argues that when students better understand the intricacies and

applications of delivery, they can more fittingly apply such techniques in their speeches. Applying these theories into his detailing would allow readers to understand better how best to address their weaknesses as speakers (Dell'Olio & Donk, 2007; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Maki, 2010). Otherwise, students will lack the metacognitive awareness of self required when developing their delivery.

To effectively teach students the impact of strategic delivery, students must learn to remain self-aware of their corporal and other non-verbal delivery habits (Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004; Miller, Katt, Brown, & Sivo, 2014). Such self-awareness correlates directly with the four stages of learning: unconscious incompetence, conscious incompetence, conscious competence, and unconscious competence. If not adequately addressed, these skills will likely deteriorate post-graduation. Students will not have obtained a complete internalization of these newly developed skills in delivery. Though, considering that Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* (95 BCE) was deemed as the crowning moment for delivery and that Quintilian's chapter on delivery, like Lucas', comprises only one chapter, perhaps delivery has always been, and always will be, given less attention. While twenty-first-century pedagogy is quite different from that featured in the Quintilian's text, its tendency to preserve the status quo should nevertheless be scrutinized (McGlish, 2016). This is particularly important when viewing the publication of *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016), as the most recent example of a crowning moment in speech pedagogy. Perhaps Lucas, like his ancient counterparts, assumes that readers and instructors will already have knowledge of what constitutes authentic versus inauthentic speech delivery, thus requiring less formalized instruction.

Such mentality relates to Ramus' assumption that delivery could be taught through watching and practicing. For example, when specifying pitch, Lucas writes, "work on varying your pitch patterns to fit the meaning of your words" (p. 284). On the same page, while detailing vocal rate, Lucas writes that speakers can resolve issues with vocal rate by, "becoming aware of the problem and concentrating on solving it." Though, formal instruction for addressing these issues remains absent. This same pattern continues throughout the chapter on delivery.

In further describing vocals, Lucas states that strategic pauses are, "a major challenge for most beginning learners," for practicing them, "requires common sense and experience" (p. 285). Yet, the attributes of effective or ineffective vocal delivery remains unclear. Lucas asserts that natural aptitudes are indeed the defining characteristics of a persuasive speaker. Perhaps Lucas has forgotten about Demosthenes, the attic orator with neither the natural attributes nor the experiences of a good speaker, and who instead, relied not on common sense, but on practice and instruction. However, Lucas assumes that both students and instructors will already know how to address these issues accurately, and, thus, not require formal guidance. Readers should instead be motivated to apply and cognitively internalize these concepts, not just memorize them.

A similar display continues as Lucas specifies the visual physicality of speech delivery. Here (p. 288), Lucas indicates the rhetorical significance of matching physical delivery with the meaning of a speaker's message. Lucas highlights personal appearance, movement, gesture, and eye contact, which he, and others, argue are crucial variables for successful oration (Krauss & Hadar, 2001; Wagner, 2014). Though, Lucas again makes assumptions about the abilities of his readers. When describing body movement, for

example, Lucas writes that “Novice speakers are often unsure about what to do with their body while giving a speech” (p. 288), but does not indicate what speakers should do with their bodies. Considering anxiety’s physical and mental impacts on speaker performance, credibility, and emotionality, perhaps Lucas should reference research by McGinley et al. (1975) or André et al. (2011). These articles examine how speakers can address the evolutionary protective body language which arises during stressful situations (e.g., crossed arms, self-touching, clenched palms, stiffness, among other movements).

Next, Lucas quotes Greek historian Herodotus who argued that, “People trust their ears less than their eyes” (p. 288). Lucas details what constitutes physical delivery, but he does not define the attributes of effective and ineffective physical delivery. For instance, when emphasizing the use of hand gestures, Lucas writes that, “more nonsense has been written about gesturing than any other aspect of speech delivery,” that gesticulations, “will take care of themselves as they do in conversation,” and that a speaker's hands should simply, “appear natural” (p. 290). One is left wondering, however, what steps *should* be taken to acquire such naturalness, *why* do gestures matter, and what research Lucas is not presenting. Moreover, what about those students who lack the genetic aptitudes and require further guidance? Additionally, conversational style does not necessarily equate to professional sounding speeches. If Lucas feels otherwise, perhaps he could warrant such a claim, and further define its vital role in the establishing of an extraordinary speech.

The chapter concludes by encouraging speakers to practice recording their speeches and staying mindful of the verbal and kinetic characteristics of delivery. Lucas (2016) also prompts students to practice post-speech audience question and answer

sessions, to be cognizant of the expectations set by different physical settings, and offers a summary of the chapter. While Lucas begins this chapter with praise of delivery, his overall detailing remains brief and relatively ambiguous. If Lucas does, in fact, consider speech delivery as a significant component of teaching public oration, then delivery necessitates guidance and instruction. Moreover, many other features could have been detailed.

For instance, Lucas (2016) never references staging, practicing facial expressivity, posture, or how to reduce vocalized pauses. Instead, readers receive a mere summary of what elements comprise delivery. Lucas seemingly implies that instructors remain the primary resource for teaching these components. To Lucas' credit, he does frequently reference the sample student videos. When writing about eye contact, Lucas states, "Look at Video 13.4 in the online Media Library for this chapter to see a fine example of good eye contact" (p. 288). None of the provided videos, however, prompt students with specific instruction on how to evaluate and analyze the speakers. Considering how Sheridan (1756) believes that Greeks lacked a refined sentiment of corporal and nonverbal knowledge due to their reliance on imitation, then perhaps today's students lack such sentiment as well. Therefore, students might be able to identify characteristics of good delivery but remain unaware of why the speaker's delivery was either effective or ineffective at achieving the speaker's rhetorical intentions.

Consequently, the Lucas text leaves readers to teach themselves. These features are considerably different than earlier works on delivery found in John Bulwer's *Chirologia* (1644), or Fulton and Thomas Trueblood's *Practical Elements of Elocution* (1893), which offers 335 concepts supported by roughly 180 figures or diagrams, 50 lists,

20 charts, seven tables, and 200 marked passages for vocalizing. Yet, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) is a textbook and not a manual. Moreover, The Elocutionary Movement has long since concluded and its treatment of delivery has widely been challenged. Nevertheless, as the field's touchstone artifact, Lucas' methodologies for teaching speech delivery significantly impacts the genre of public speaking textbooks, and conceivably, the Speech Communication discipline as a whole. Perhaps Edwin Black (1965) would similarly assert that the current textbook genre continues to foster limitations. Or maybe Kambrelis (1995) would agree that the embedded genre has created the expectation that delivery should be minimized; but it does not have to be this way. As stated by West (2012), "the time is ripe to start this challenging conversation about how best to conceptualize and structure the basic communication course" (p. 1).

One might argue that since *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) continues to be successful, why "fix what is not broken?" It needs fixing because as the genre embedded within this textbook functions like a conduit for rearticulating collective ideologies, further solidifying the strengths and weaknesses of the practices perpetuated within the basic course (Nichols, 2003). As the touchstone text the purposes and ends of *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) significantly impacts the identity not only of the foundational communication course but also the discipline's identity. Academic disciplines, according to Mumby and Stohl (1996) are, "A community of scholars which constitutes a disciplinary matrix where they share a set of paradigmatic assumptions about the study of certain phenomena. This does not mean that there is a consensus on every issue, but rather that scholars set objects of study in similar ways, and use the same language game in describing these phenomena" (p. 52).

Furthermore, as argued by Wieland (2010), “If we take identities as constructed rather than given, then identities become sites of struggle at which various values and interests meet and are negotiated” (p. 504). Because of its role in perpetuating the paradigmatic assumptions within the genre, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) is hindering advancements of the discipline and restraining the discipline’s identity. As such, the means by which this carrier of ideologies accomplishes its pedagogical ends is worth renegotiating and evaluating. If not addressed, the imbalances against delivery will endure, and perhaps provoke further constraints to both the course and the discipline. Analyzing one chapter, however, does not adequately demonstrate the depth of this issue. Perhaps equally significant is the extensiveness of instruction regarding the canons of arrangement and invention.

Invention and arrangement in the touchstone text

Allusions to both speech invention and arrangement appear throughout this text; however, section two and three align most closely with these subjects. As previously mentioned, chapters 5–8 highlight invention, and chapters 9–11 detail arrangement. Such structuring in both form and content illustrates a disproportional detailing of rhetorical canons provided to the reader. Whereas delivery receives one chapter, invention and arrangement each receive several. In this sense, Lucas (2016), like his ancient counterparts, ascertains that all speeches will fail without mastering delivery (p. 280), these disproportions show he may feel otherwise. However, it is not just the sheer number of chapters that confirm the inequity.

As with delivery, each of the seven chapters on invention and arrangement begins with a brief vignette. These vignettes demonstrate the importance of the chapters' themes and provide a short narrative for readers. Stylistically, these chapters include a variety of headings, images, and guidelines. However, the amount of detail provided to the various components of invention and arrangement is immediately noticeable. For instance, on page 183, readers are instructed on the ethical uses of statistics. This topic alone receives roughly eight pages of text. Being a subcomponent of speech invention, this is excessive, especially considering that the components of verbal and physical delivery were collectively provided less than eight pages. Additionally, this section concerning statistics provides unnecessary detail on effective and ineffective examples of their use in a speech. Readers are not only instructed on what statistics are; they are informed how statistics are to be used, why they are rhetorically significant, and where they should appear throughout the speech. As previously stated, delivery, an entire canon of rhetoric, is given no such focus. Another instance of disproportionate emphasis appears on page 232. There, Lucas dedicates an entire page just to preview statements.

Though previews are undeniably important, considering the lack of information regarding the various components of delivery, the mastery of which Lucas deems as indispensable, readers are coaxed to spend more time on the speech composition than they are on the principal elements of performance. Lucas, therefore, does not affirm that "People trust their ears less than their eyes" (p. 288). Delivery is presented not as a binding agent for all public speaking, but instead, as a topic unworthy of critical analysis and understanding. Delivery thus remains necessary, but not ethically accurate.

Conclusion

The Elocutionary Movement was arguably the tipping point for the discipline's interest in speech delivery. By the twentieth century, the pedagogy had returned to its past and exposed the discipline's fixed rhetorical attitudes. Currently, the field and its literature are bound by an framework that is resistant to change. Highlighting Lucas' disproportional detailing demonstrates that the "problem canon of delivery" remains unappreciated within the genre of public speaking textbooks, which impacts the paradigmatic assumptions of the discipline as a whole. While Lucas himself did not establish the current genre, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) has the agentive capacity to challenge the current paradigmatic restraints.

Fortunately, the debate surrounding delivery's influence on rhetoric stimulated paradigmatic shifts in the field before and can do it again. Ancient scholars came to accept the rhetorical powers of delivery, and so should scholars today. Thus, we ought not to preserve the recursive ideologies maintained within course textbooks, and need to alter how textbooks responds to pedagogical paradigms. Still, now on its twelfth edition, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) became the field's touchstone text for a reason. So why challenge "the tried and true?" Because if textbook publishers, authors, and scholars do not become more innovative and accurate with both the ideologies and pedagogies surrounding speech delivery, then both the field and the expectations of the foundational course will stagnate.

We live in the time of social media, a time where one's image and relationship building have become fundamental to self-identity, delivery is, and perhaps always was, rhetoric. We are no longer in the time of philosopher-kings, but rather, a time where self-

expression plays a vital role in day to day lives. The field must remain adaptable to the internal and external influences that shape the discipline. While tangible mastery of delivery may be more subjective than objective, thus generating subjective-objective dualism within the field, sacrificing performance for invention and arrangement limits our pedagogy. Chapter Three explains some ways to address these limitations.

CHAPTER THREE: THE FUTURE OF THE DISCIPLINE

The purpose of this thesis was not to reinvent the wheel, but instead, to uncover gaps within the discipline's pedagogical and scholarly identity. In doing so, my argument examined rhetoric's trepidations surrounding speech delivery. To conclude, Chapter Three addresses the final research question which asks: "What should be done to improve delivery's pedagogy?" I discuss this question in two steps. First, I offer suggestions on how publishers can improve future editions of the discipline's touchstone text, *The Art of Public Speaking*. As a referent, I believe other textbooks will make similar changes. Second, alongside editing the discipline's touchstone text, I offer suggestions for how institutions and the scholars can challenge the pedagogical paradigm which constrains public speaking pedagogy. I conclude with limitations to my research.

Challenging the status quo

Public speaking pedagogy is perhaps the most enduring pedagogical element within the entire communication discipline. Often the only communications course taken by undergraduate college students, its pedagogy warrants examination. As previous chapters argue, the reemergence of Aristotelian framing has reverted public speaking pedagogy to its ancient roots. We must not forget, however, that Aristotle once equated speech delivery to the reciting of poetry and the "vulgar practices of staged theatrics" (Bizzell & Hertzberg, 2001, p. 180). He was a man who despised delivery and expressed firm apprehensions about delivery's rhetorical power. He recognized delivery as a canon, but not as a canon worth legitimate consideration. Delivery was necessary but not ethical. Aristotle was not alone. Various other educators within Ancient Greece such as Socrates,

Plato, and Philodemus likewise shared his sentiments. Regardless of their apprehensions, each of these men later accept the rhetorically persuasive power of delivery, sparking significant changes to the discipline. The Romans likewise sparked paradigmatic shifts in favor of performance.

Speech delivery gained not only credibility, but praise. Through meticulous research, scholars learned to embrace the rhetorical prowess of delivery. In fact, Cicero, Quintilian, Demosthenes, and the anonymous author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (85 BCE), ultimately deemed that delivery alone bound all other facets of public speaking; for without speech delivery, all other elements of speech would inevitably fall flat. As Chapter One of this thesis later detailed the historical shifts transpiring after the fall of the Roman empire hindered the progress of scholarship surrounding speech performance. Not until centuries later during the Elocutionary Movement did delivery receive the utmost adoration. Such a movement, however, was short-lived. By the start of the twentieth-century, the discipline of public speaking had returned to the absolutist Aristotelian epistemology of public speaking. Audience-centeredness through invention and arrangement, rather than through self-expression, became the sole aim of the orator leading to delivery's rhetorical significance to be doubted once again.

The discipline of public speaking should build on knowledge to create something new. Just like the paradigmatic shift occurring between Ancient Greece and the Roman empire, I believe that the discipline should reconsider its animosities against delivery. We should be teaching our students all available means of persuasion, and why delivery plays an essential role in persuasion. Delivery is not persuasive because of the “defects of the listener,” but instead, because speakers and audiences are thinking and feeling beings.

Debates surrounding delivery have challenged the status quo before, and I argue that by reemphasis it within the current pedagogy, delivery can do it again. Such reemphasizing would transpire through addressing the field's uneasiness towards teaching the physical and psychological persuasiveness of speech delivery. In doing so, I argue that foundational public speaking students will become more credible, self-aware, and effective public speakers. Such reconsidering would likewise advance the field forward beyond its ancient past. But how would such revitalizing occur?

Trueblood (1915) once argued that foundational communication courses should be divided into two separate courses. He also argued that seven to eight lengthy speeches should be required per course. The Scholasticism maintained within the modern university, however, is perhaps not conducive to such demands. Also, considering budget cuts, time, and teaching resources, adding additional public speaking courses to general education requirements becomes improbable. Thus, the information provided within the current one-semester system remains rhetorically significant. Still, considering my experience as a speech instructor, additional provisions would render students further unenthused by the basic course.

Research maintains that the information and ideologies embedded within course textbooks are outdated, and that little change has occurred to the course itself. Yet, the foundational course has remained popular throughout secondary institutions for a reason. The course has succeeded in reducing public speaking apprehension and increasing feelings of confidence and competency among students (Hancock et al., 2010). While I agree, I likewise assert that more could be done to improve the persuasiveness of students, and to train speakers to use all forms of persuasion, making their knowledge

more intelligible to their an audience. The academic reemphasis on the language of nature, speech delivery, would foster such improvements. I suggest we start by updating ideologies found within the discipline's touchstone text, *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016).

Editing the touchstone text

If delivery indeed cannot be taught through reading texts, then the additional material provided by Lucas becomes significant, especially the supplemental videos and online components. Yet, these video examples do not prompt students how to analyze the speakers. References are made to the speeches for their quality, but students remain uninformed as to why. Lucas should offer additional guidance for his readers. By highlighting the various corporeal and non-verbal intricacies that render each video, “good examples of delivery,” viewers would better internalize not only what makes a good speech, but also, *how* and *why* the speaker's delivery reinforced their persuasiveness. These minimal edits could be added in a variety of ways.

Video pop-down descriptions highlighting particular enacted components of delivery could be offered. An example of such highlighting would be, “See here how the student uses gesture to emphasize his citation further. How do these gestures demonstrate the speaker’s goodwill and improve intelligibility?” or, “Notice how the speaker appeals to both pathos and ethos using eye contact with her audience. How does her eye contact make the speech more believable?” By adding more speech interactivity, students may become more critical audience members, and achieve more profound cognitive internalization. Another option is for Lucas to provide training videos. These videos

would include methods for practicing, analyzing, and incorporating components of delivery. Lucas could also include examples of when delivery was used nefariously and examples of “a good person speaking well.” These additions would further highlight the ethics of speech delivery.

Admittedly, these changes might be too complicated for some students and new instructors. Lucas could instead simply provide speech examples with “Director’s Commentary.” Otherwise, Lucas could merely include the video transcript and viewing prompts in the back of the textbook. Either way, by highlighting the role of delivery in establishing persuasive speakers, Lucas would redefine the purpose and ends of his text. Any of these changes would lessen the burdens placed on the shoulders of new instructors, and make teaching speech delivery more tangible and less intimidating. If, however, neither Lucas nor McGraw-Hill are willing to incorporate these video edits, then perhaps, like Fulton and Thomas Trueblood’s *Practical Elements of Elocution* (1893), Lucas could provide more figures and diagrams; delineating further detail of the components of speech delivery.

Such edits would offer guidelines for purposeful movement, posture, and marked passages for practicing vocals. Additionally, other resources for developing speech delivery could be referenced. For instance, Lucas could mention The Alexander Technique for developing posture, the International Phonetic Alphabet for improving pronunciation, or theatrics for developing the blocking or staging of a speech. Still, textbooks are expensive to reformat, and indeed, to print. More content requires more pages, resulting in higher prices for consumers.

To combat these costs, Lucas could discard the information not related directly to non-verbal delivery. For instance, the pages specifying the various methods of speaking (memorized, extemporaneous, and impromptu) could be excluded. Similar edits could be made to areas with too much text, like those regarding the ethical use of statistics. By offering more focused information, students would further acknowledge the importance of speech delivery. An alternative would be simply placing chapters on delivery in the beginning, and not the end, of the text. The role of delivery makes public speaking unique from other courses. By acknowledging these differences within the first chapters, students will place delivery in the forefront of their minds. As a result, the newly allotted space for delivery will re-conceptualize the collective memory for how the elements of public speaking ought to receive priority. As stated by Mumby and Claire, “The most effective use of power occurs when those with power are able to get those without power to interpret the world from the former’s point of view” (1997, p. 184). Being the touchstone text, Lucas’ reemphasizing of delivery could have a catalytic effect on other texts, and perhaps, the discipline as a whole. If, however, changes to the textbook do not transpire, then the burden of progressing the discipline befalls on the shoulders of instructors.

Conclusion

Alongside the debates surrounding delivery, the persisting tug-of-war between English, Communication Studies, Rhetoric, and Theater departments has similarly impacted public speaking pedagogy. These factors, among others, challenged the practicality of understanding delivery and coaxed the discipline to return to its ancient

roots. The field of Speech Communication severed ties to become more autonomous, unique, and influential to the discipline of rhetoric. However, I believe that incorporating multidisciplinary scholarship would advance the field, especially its sentiments towards delivery. The discipline can only develop if the widest possible range of interests is articulated, and the widest range of ideas are considered, tested, and ideologies are updated. Though, perhaps rhetoric and speech communication would risk losing their identity, and thus spread the discipline too thin. Nevertheless, the time has come to challenge the status quo. Regardless of one's sentiments towards delivery, it remains a tool for rendering speakers more intelligible and persuasive. We ought not deny our students of the persuasive powers of speech delivery and embrace, not fear, its emotionally stirring capacities.

To better achieve the audience-centeredness, the discipline and its textbooks should reaffirm delivery's role in establishing pathos and ethos. Changes made to *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) could reshape student and scholarly opinions of public speaking. The outdated ideologies maintained by the current pedagogical paradigm and its texts falsely classify delivery as intangible, subjective, and impractical. Such homeostasis establishes a collective identity which restricts the instruction of delivery and hinders advancements to the field. Without delivery, all other rhetorical canons will fail. Attempts at persuasion may be relatively successful, but ultimately remain incomplete. Thus, the more we understand Aristotle's fifth canon, the better we understand ourselves, our audience, and our discipline. Still, such an argument is not without limitation and disaccords.

Limitations to the argument

A significant limitation of my research is the methodologies that I used to create my argument. One might argue that analyzing only one book is non-representational of the whole public speaking textbook genre. Further research would require more in-depth analyses of other public speaking books currently in circulation. Though, as previously mentioned, the decision to analyze only *The Art of Public Speaking* (2016) made examining textbooks more tangible. Still, perhaps analyzing the material added or removed within each edition of *The Art of Public Speaking* would better contextualize the shifts in the discipline's scholarly identity. Such in-depth analysis would likewise require how other textbooks changed in response to each of Lucas' twelve editions.

Another limiting factor considers the limited number of resources and course structures that I referenced. The basic course at Iowa State University is just one example of how the course is taught, and my role as instructor generates a subjective-objective duality. Future research requires collaboration with other institutions and agenda-setters. However, the feasibility of collaborating with authors, publishers, the NCA, and entire speech departments may not be possible. Therefore, the transferability of my argument is restricted. To address this problem, future research would require my suggestions to be applied within an actual basic course classrooms. This step would also allow me to test the viability of my suggested changes.

Furthermore, an ablest view of both physical and mental aptitudes advanced by my research. Also, I do not address the contextual, socioeconomic, and historical dissimilarities of students, or the specific costs of adding new technology or written content to the Lucas text. Therefore, I have limited my requisite variety and applied broad

nonrepresentational brush strokes; establishing an unequivocal view of delivery's instruction. But maybe Aristotle's placing of delivery within the realms of rhetoric was a mistake. However, if this notion is true, then what course best represents delivery? Further research should consider delivery with lenses outside the scope of the discipline, such as sociology, kinesiology, psychology, or theatre. Lastly, researching paradigmatic and pedagogical understandings of delivery could take a lifetime to complete. Thus, my research is just the beginning. Nevertheless, delivery has been redacted noticeably within public speaking pedagogy and the time is kairotic for reshaping our discipline.

REFERENCES

- Addington, D. W. (1971). The effect of vocal variations on ratings of source credibility. *Speech Monographs*, 38, 242–247.
- Allen, M., & Preiss, R. W. (1990). Using meta-analysis to evaluate curriculum: An examination of selected college textbooks. *Communication Education*, 39, 103–116.
- Allen, T. H. (2002). Charting a communication pathway: Using assessment to guide curriculum development in a re-vitalized general education plan. *Communication Education*, 51, 26–39.
- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (2008-2009). The AICPA core competency framework for entry into the accounting profession. Personal competencies. Retrieved from <http://www.aicpa.org/edu/corecomp.htm>.
- André, E. (2011). Non-verbal Persuasion and Communication in an Affective Agent in P. Petta et al. (eds.), *Emotion-Oriented Systems*, Cognitive Technologies, Springer-Verlag Berlin: Heidelberg.
- Aristotle. (1991) *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford.
- Aronovitch, C. D. (1976). The voice of personality: Stereotyped judgments and their relation to voice quality and sex of speaker. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 255–270.
- Bahtia, V. K. (1997). *World Englishes* Vol. 16, no. 3, 359–371.
- Barge, J. K., Schlueter, D. W., & Pritchard, A. (1989). The effects of nonverbal communication and gender on impression formation in opening statements. *Southern Communication Journal*, 54, 330–349.
- Bednar, R. C. (1991). *Effect of public speaking anxiety on student academic learning in oral performance courses*. Texas: Graduate Faculty of Texas Tech University.
- Beebe, S. A., Beebe, S. J. & Ivy, D. K. (2016). *Communication Principles for a Lifetime*, (6th e.d.) Boston: MA.
- Beebe, S. A. (1980). Effects of eye contact, posture, and vocal inflection upon speaker credibility and listener comprehension. *Journal of Human Communication*, 7(57), 1–35.
- Bitzer, L.F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1, 1–14.
- Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (2001). Aristotle. Rhetoric. In *The Rhetorical Tradition*, 169–242. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

- Black, E. (1965). *Rhetorical criticism: A study in method*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bowen, H. W. (1966). A reassessment of speech delivery. *Today's Speech*, 14(4), 21–24.
- Brim, B. (2005). The talent to communicate. *Gallup Management Journal*.
- Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., Fray, P. L., & Yerby, J. (1993). The structured model of competency based instruction. *Communication Education*, 41, 68–76.
- Burgoon, J. K., Birk, T., & Pfau, M. (1990). Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility. *Human Communication Research*, 17(1), 140–169.
- Burton, G. (2016). "Delivery." *Silva rhetoricae: The forest of rhetoric*. Birmingham Young University, n.d. Web.
- Campbell, K. K. (1972). The rhetoric of radical black nationalism: A case study in self-conscious criticism. *Central States Speech Journal*, 22, 151–160.
- Caplan, H. (Anonymous) (1954). *Ad C. herennium de ratione dicendi - Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Carlson, M. (1996). *Performance: A critical introduction*. London, England: Routledge.
- Cicero. (1949). *De invention* (H. H. Hubbell, Trans.). London: Heinemann.
- Clark, D. L. (1977). *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Clevenger, T., & Phifer, G. (1959). What do beginning college speech texts say about stage fright. *Speech Teacher*, 9, 1–7.
- Cohen, S. D. (2012). *Listening to student voices: A case study on the basic communication course* (Order No. 3587415). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1426849381). Retrieved from: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1426849381?accountid=10906>.
- Collins, J. (2004). Education techniques for lifelong learning. Giving a PowerPoint presentation: The art of communicating effectively. *RadioGraphics*, 24(4), 1185–1192.
- Connors, R. J. (1993). Actio: A rhetoric of written delivery (Iteration Two). *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery: Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication*. Ed. John Frederick Reynolds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Crocker, L. (1958). The break with elocution: The origins of James A. Winans' public speaking, *Today's Speech*, 6(2), 23–26.

- Day, D. G. (1960). Persuasion and the concept of identification. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 46, 270–273.
- Dedmon, D. N., & Kowalzik, J. (1964). The elocution specter and the teaching and researching of speech delivery. *Central States Speech Journal*, 15, 100–106.
- Delaunois, M. (1959). *Le plan rhétorique dans l'éloquence grecque d'Homère a Démosthène*, Brussels, Belgium.
- Dell'Olio, J. M., & Donk, T. (2007). *Models of teaching: Connecting student learning with standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dragga, S., & Gong, G. (1989). *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric*. Amityville, NY: Baywood. Environmental Law & Policy Center. Chicago: www.elpc.org/index.html.
- Dragga, S. (1993). "The Ethics of Delivery." *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery: Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication*. Ed. John Frederick Reynolds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 79–95.
- Dunbar, N. E., Brooks, C. F., & Kubicka-Miller, T. (2006). Oral Communication Skills in Higher Education: Using a Performance-Based Evaluation Rubric to Assess Communication Skills. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(2), 115–128.
- Dunning, D., Heath, C., & Suls, J. (2004). Flawed self-assessment: Implications for health, education, and the workplace. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5, 69–106.
- Emerson, R. W. (1904). Eloquence. In R.W. Emerson, *The complete works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Vol. 8, Concord ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Engleberg, I. N. (2013, December 16). *NCA Core Competencies Report, December 2013* [PDF]. National Communication Association.
- Epping, D., & Labrie, J. (2005). You did what?!?: An expectancy violation approach to normative behavior in collegiate forensics. *Forensic*, 90(1), 18–29.
- Eysenck, M. W., & Calvo, M. G. (1992). Anxiety and performance: The processing efficiency theory. *Cognition and Emotion*, 6, 409–434.
- NACE. (2016). *Job Outlook 2016: The Attributes Employers Want to See on New College Graduates' Resumes*. N.p., n.d. Web.
- Ford, W., & Wolvin, A. (1993). The differential impact of a basic communication course on perceived communication competencies in the class, work, and social contexts. *Communication Education*. 42, 215–223.

- Fortenbaugh, W. W. (1986). "Aristotle's Platonic Attitude toward Delivery." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 19(4), 242–254.
- Foshay, A. W. (1990). Textbooks and the curriculum during the Progressive Era, 1930–1950. In D. L. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States* (pp. 23–41). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punishment, The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Fredal, K. (2001). The language of delivery and the presentation of character: Rhetorical action in Demosthenes' and Meidias. *Rhetoric Review*, 20, 251–267.
- Frobish, T.S. (2000). Jamison meets Lucas: Eloquence and pedagogical model(s) in the art of spublic speaking. *Communication Education*, 49(3), 239–252.
- Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. (1983). *An introduction to language* (3rd ed.), NYC, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fulton, R. I., & Trueblood, T. C. (1893) *Practical Elements of Elocution*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Fulton, R. I. (1914). College courses in public speaking. *The English Journal*, 3(3), 160–165.
- Garver, E. (1994). *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An art of character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gaer, D. (2002). Formulaic forensics: When competitive success stifles creativity. *National Forensic Journal*, 20, 54–56.
- Gibson, J. W., Gruner, C. R., Brooks, W. D., & Petrie, J. (1970). The first course in speech: A survey of U.S. colleges and universities. *Speech Teacher*, 19, 13–20.
- Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S., & Leichty, G. (1988). The basic course at U.S. colleges and universities: V, *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 2(16), 415–437.
- Golden, J., & Corbett, E. (1990). "Introduction," in *The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately*. NYC, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1–22.
- Goodwin, W. (1878). *Plutarch, Plutarch's Morals*. Translated by William W. Goodwin, 5 Volumes. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Grant, M. (1977). *Cicero, Marcus Tullius., Selected Political Speeches of Cicero*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Gray, P. (1989). The basic course in speech communication: an historical perspective. *Basic Course Communication Annual*, 1–27.
- Gray, K., & Koncz, A. (2014). The skills/qualities employers want in new college graduate hires. Retrieved from <https://www.naceweb.org/about-us/press/class-2015-skills-qualities-employers-wants.aspx>.
- Greene, J., & Sparks, G. (1983). Explication and test of a cognitive model of communication apprehension: A new look at an old construct. *Human Communication Research*, 9, 349–366.
- Gulikers, J., Bastiaens, T., & Kirschner, P. (2006). Authentic assessment, student teacher perceptions: The practical value of the five-dimensional framework. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 58(3), 337–357.
- Gundersen, D. F., & Hopper, R. (1976). Relationships between speech delivery and speech effectiveness. *Communication Monographs*, 43(2), 158–165.
- Gunderson, E. (2000). *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan.
- Haberman, F. W. (1954). “English Sources of American Elocution,” in Karl Wallace, ed., *History of Speech Education in America*. NYC, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 105–126.
- Hall, J. (2004). Cicero and Quintilian on the oratorical use of hand gesture. *The Classic Quarterly*, 2(54), 143–160.
- Hancock, A. B., Stone M. D, Brundage, S. B, & Zeigler, M. R. (2010). Public Speaking Attitudes: Does curriculum make a difference. *Journal of Voice*, 24(3), 302–307.
- Harrington, D. (2010) Remembering the Body: Eighteenth-Century Elocution and the Oral Tradition. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 28, 67–95.
- Hauser, G. (2002). Introduction to rhetorical theory. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Haynes, L. (1990) Beyond writing: A case for speech-based basic course in vid-oral world, *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 2, 89–100.
- Hill, F. I. (1995). The Rhetoric of Aristotle. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A synoptic history of classical rhetoric* (2nd rev. ed.). Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press.
- Hogan, M. J. (2014). *Public Speaking and Civic Engagement*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Hogan, J. M., & Kurr, J. A. (2015). "The Future of the Basic Course in Communication," Center for Democratic Deliberation, 2015, <http://cdd.la.psu.edu/education/future-of-the-basic-course-white-paper>.
- Holladay, S. H., & Coombs, W. T. (1993). Communicating visions: An exploration of effects of content and delivery on perceptions of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6, 405–427.
- Holladay, S. H., & Coombs, W. T. (1994). Speaking of visions and visions being spoken: An exploration of effects of content and delivery on perceptions of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 8(2), 165–189.
- Horwitz, B. (2002). *Communication Apprehension: Origins and Management*. NY: Singular.
- Hunt, S. K., Ekachai, D., Garard, D. L., & Rust, J. H. (2001). Students' perceived usefulness and relevance of communication skills in the basic course: Comparing university and community college students. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 13, 1–22.
- Jacobi, M. (2006). *The canon of delivery in rhetorical theory: Selections, commentary, and advice*. Delivering college composition: The fifth canon. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton; Cook Publishers.
- Jamieson, K. (1973). Generic constraints and the rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 6, 162–170.
- Jasinski, J. (2001). "Genre." In J. Jasinski, *Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical studies* (268–276). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jasinski, J. (2001). *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Job Outlook 2016: The Attributes Employers Want to See on New College Graduates' Resumes." *Job Outlook 2016: The Attributes Employers Want to See on New College Graduates' Resumes*. N.p., Web. 1 Dec. 2016.
- Joe, J., Kitchen, C., Chen, L., & Feng, G. (2015). A prototype public speaking skills assessment: An evaluation of human-scoring quality. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2, 1–21.
- Johnstone, C. L. (2012). Speech is a powerful lord: Speech, sound and enchantment in Greek oratorical performance, *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 8, 1–20.
- Jones, E. A., & RiCharde, S. (2005). NPEC Sourcebook on assessment: Definitions and assessment methods for communication, leadership, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and quantitative skills. Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

- Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E. F. (1996). *Creating Learning Experience: The role of instructional theory and research*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kamberelis, G. (1995). Genre as institutionally informed social practice. *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues*, 6, 117–171.
- Kastely, J. L. (2004). Pathos: Rhetoric and emotion. In: *A companion to rhetoric and rhetorical criticism*. Jost, W & Olmstead, W. (Eds.)pp. 221–238. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Keith, W., & Mountford, R. (2014). The Mt. Oread Manifesto on rhetorical education 2013, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 44, 1–5.
- Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture – Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1991). Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* New York: Oxford.
- King, P. E., & Finn, A. N. (2017). A test of attention control theory in public speaking: Cognitive load influences the relationship between state anxiety and verbal production, *Communication Education*, 66(2), 168–182.
- Kirkham, S. (1986). *An Essay on Elocution*. New York: Pratt, Woodford & Co.
- Krajcik, J. S., & Sutherland, L. M. (2010). Supporting students in developing literacy in science. *Science*, 328, 456–459.
- Krauss, R. M., & Hadar, U. (2001). The role of speech-related arm/hand gestures in word retrieval. In: Campbell, R., Messing, L. (Eds.), *Gesture, Speech, and Sign*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 93–116.
- Lair, D. L., Sullivan, K., & Cheney, G. (2005). Marketization and the recasting of the professional self: The rhetoric and ethics of personal branding. *Management Communications Quarterly*, 18(3), 307–343.
- Laukka, P., et al. (2008). In a nervous voice: Acoustic analysis and perception of anxiety in social phobics' speech. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 32, 195–214.
- LeFebvre, L. (2017). Basic course in communication. In M. Allen (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research methods* (pp. 87–90). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Leff, M. (1986). Genre and paradigm in the second book of *De Oratore*. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 51, 308–325.
- Leff, M. (1992). Teaching public speaking as composition. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 4, 116–22.

- Lucas, S. E. (2016). *The art of public speaking* (12th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Longnecker, N. (2009). Sharing science with better science communication. *Issues*, 87, 37–40.
- Maki, P. L. (2010). *Assessing for learning: Building a sustainable commitment across the institution* (2nd ed.). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Mandler, G. (1975). *Mind and emotion*. New York: Wiley Publishing.
- Mazzio, C. (2009). *The Inarticulate Renaissance: Language Trouble in an Age of Eloquence*. Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania Press
- McClish, G. (2016). “A Kind of Eloquence of the Body”: Quintilian’s advice on delivery for the twenty-first-century rhetor. *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 19(2), 172–187.
- McCroskey, J. (1990). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 5(2), 19–37.
- McGarrity, M., & Crosby, R. B. (2013). Rhetorical invention in public speaking textbooks and classrooms. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 42(2), 164–186.
- McKinley, H., LeFevre, R., & McKinley, P. (1975). The influence of a communicator’s body position on opinion change in others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31(4), 686–690.
- McGraw-Hill: Higher Education. (1998). Retrieved from: <http://www.mhhe.com/catalogs/0070390150.mhtml>.
- Mehrabian, A. (1967). Orientation behaviors and nonverbal attitude communication. *Journal of Communication*, 17, 324–332.
- Mehrabian, A., & Williams, M. (1969). Nonverbal concomitants of perceived and intended persuasiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 13, 37–58.
- Menzel, K. E., & Carrell, L. J. (1994). The relationship between preparation and performance in public speaking. *Communication Education*, 43, 17–26.
- Miller, A. N., Katt, J. A., Brown, T., & Sivo, S. A. (2014). The relationship of instructor self-disclosure, nonverbal immediacy, and credibility to student incivility in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 63, 1–16.
- Miller, C.R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151–167.

- Morreale, S. P., et al. (2016). Study IX of the basic communication course at two and four-year U.S. colleges and universities: A re-examination of our discipline's "front porch". *Communication Education*, 65(3), 338–355.
- Mumby, D. K., & Clair, R. P. (1997). Organizational discourse. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies, vol. 2: Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 181–205). London: SAGE.
- Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (1996). Disciplining organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10, 50–72.
- Nadeau, R. (1964). Delivery in ancient times: Homer to Quintilian. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 50, 53–60.
- Nichol, J., & Dean, J. (2003). Writing for children: History textbooks and teaching texts. *International Journal of Historical Learning and Research*, 3, 1–29.
- Norlin, G. (1980). Isocrates. Isocrates with an English Translation in three volumes, by Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd.
- O'Hair, D. (2016). *A Pocket Guide to Public Speaking*. 5th ed. Boston, MA: Bedford. 129–136.
- Parry-Giles, S. J., & Hogan, J. M. (2010). *The handbook of rhetoric and public address* (pp. 19–66). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pearson, J. C., & Nelson, P. E. (1990). The future of the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 2, 1–26.
- Pearson, J. C., Child, J. T., & Kahl, D. H. (2006). Preparation meeting opportunity: How do college students prepare for public speeches?, *Communication Quarterly*, 54(3), 351–366.
- Pease, A., & Pease, B. (2004). *The Definitive Book of Body Language*. Australia: Pease International.
- Pelias, M. H. (1989). Communication apprehension in basic public speaking texts: An examination of contemporary textbooks. *Communication Education*, 38, 41–53.
- Perrin, B. (1919). *Plutarch. "Demosthenes Lives."* Vol. 7. Cambridge: Harvard. 2–7.
- Phillips, G. M., & Metzger, N. (1973). The reticent syndrome: Some theoretical considerations about etiology and treatment. *Speech Monographs*, 40, 220–230.
- Poggi, I., & Pelachaud, C. (2008). Persuasion and the expressivity of gestures in humans and machines. *Embodied Communication in Humans and Machines*. 391–424.

- Quianthy, R., & Hefferin, D. (1999). Speak up! A college competency assessment tool. *Popular Measurement, Spring*, 27–30.
- Quintilian, & Russell, D. A. (2001). *The Orator's Education*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. Print.
- Reynolds, J. F. (1993). (Ed.) *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery: Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Rhodes, T. (2010). Assessing outcomes and improving achievement: Tips and tools for using rubrics. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Robles, M. M. (2012). Executive perceptions of the top 10 soft skills needed in today's workplace. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 75(4), 453–465
- Rood, C. (2013). Rhetorics of civility: Theory, pedagogy, and practice in speaking and writing textbooks. *Rhetoric Review*, 32(3), 331–348.
- Rude, C. (2004). Toward an expanded concept of rhetorical delivery: The uses of reports in public policy debates. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 13(3), 271–288.
- Russell, D. A. (2001). *Quintilian. The Orator's Education*. Ed. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Sander, P., & Sanders, L. (2005). Students' presentations: Does the experience change their views? *Psychology Teaching Review*, 11, 25–41.
- Schwartz, O. (1995). Interdisciplinary and pedagogical implications of rhetorical theory. *Communication Studies*, 46, 130–139.
- Seiler, W. J., & McGukin, D. (1989). What we know about the basic course: What has the research told us? *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 1, 28–42.
- Seneca. *Moral Letters*. Translated by M. Gummere. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA., 1917.
- Sheridan, T. (1756). *British education: Or, The source of the disorders of Great Britain. Being an essay towards proving, that the immorality, ignorance and false taste, which so generally prevail, are that natural and necessary consequences of the present defective system of education. With an attempt to shew that a revival of the art of speaking, and the study of our language, might contribute, in a great measure, to the cure of those evils. In three parts*. London: Printed for R. and J. Dodsley.
- Sheridan, T. (1762). *A Course of Lectures on Elocution: Together with Two Dissertations on Language* London, England; NYC, New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968.

- Sloane, T. O. (2001). *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Sloane, T. O. (2013). From elocution to New Criticism: An episode in the history of rhetoric. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 31(3), 297–330.
- Spoel, P. M. (2001). Rereading the Elocutionists: The rhetoric of Thomas Sheridan's *A Course of Lectures on Elocution* and John Walker's *Elements of Elocution*," *Rhetorica*, 19, 49–91.
- Sprague, R. K. (1972). *The Older Sophists*. Columbia, S.C.
- Sproule, J. M. (2012). Inventing public speaking: Rhetoric and the Speech Book, 1730–1930. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 15, 563–608.
- Stein M. B., Walker J. R, & Forde D. R. (1996). Public speaking fears in a community sample: Prevalence, impact on functioning, and diagnostic classification. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 53, 169–174.
- Stohl, C. & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices: Communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14(3), 349–407.
- Sutton, E. W. (1967). *Cicero. De Oratore*. Trans. Vol 4. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Teague, O. (1961). Selecting a speech textbook. In W. W. Braden (Ed.), *Speech methods and resources*. pp. 469–480. New York: Harper & Row.
- Trueblood, T. C. (1915). College courses in public speaking. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1, 260–265.
- VerLinden, J. (1997). The unwritten rules in public address. *Speaker Points*, 4.2. Retrieved from <http://ole.blc.edu/prp/spkrpts4.2/verl.html>.
- Wagner, P., et al. (2014). Gesture and speech in interaction: An overview. *Speech Communication*, 57, 209–232.
- Watson, F. L., Lom, B. (2008). More than a picture: Helping undergraduates learn to communicate through scientific images, *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 7, 27–35.
- Wesley, J. (2015). Rhetorical delivery for renaissance English: Voice, gesture, emotion, and the sixteenth-century vernacular turn, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 68, 1265–1296.
- West, R. (2012). Message from the president. *Spectra*, 48, 1.
- Westbury, I. (1990). Textbooks, textbook publishers, and the quality of schooling. In Elliot, D. L. & Woodward, A. (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 1–22.

- Wieland, S. (2010). Ideal selves as resources for the situated practice of identity. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(4), 503–528.
- Wolvin, D. R., & Wolvin, A. D. (1992). Speech fundamentals: The basic course. In L. Lederman (Ed.) *Communication Pedagogy*, 281-302. Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing.
- Zelizer, B. (1995). Reading the past against the grain: The shape of memory studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12, 214–239.