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The current state of speech pedagogy does not fully reflect modern theory and research. This paper critically evaluates the best-selling public speaking textbook in America, Stephen Lucas’s The Art of Public Speaking, in terms of Kathleen Hall Jamieson’s redefinition of “eloquence in the electronic age.” This paper explores how, if at all, the Lucas text takes account of the latest developments in rhetorical theory and changes in media technologies. Finally, the paper suggests how public speaking texts might uphold the classical virtues of eloquence while taking account of changes in the rhetorical environment. Keywords: public speaking textbooks, eloquence, pedagogy, modern rhetorical situation

The current state of speech pedagogy does not fully reflect modern theory and research. With textbooks as the core of this pedagogy, we have failed to provide our students with the necessary information to succeed in the contemporary speech situation. Our most pressing problem is in our representation of the modern rhetorical situation. This manuscript explores this problem in greater detail, examines Kathleen Jamieson’s theory of modern eloquence, and investigates Stephen Lucas’s speech textbook for clues toward understanding if and where we might have gotten lost.

Our theory, typically derived from the latest research, reflects changes in the modern rhetorical situation, but by ignoring this research, we have rendered our current speech texts out-of-touch. Pearson and Nelson (1990) argue, for example, that “little change has been reported in the basic course even though dramatic changes have occurred in other avenues of the field” (p. 4). Likewise, Schwartz (1995) recognizes that “within the Communication discipline, a gap exists between our theoretical insights as scholars and our pedagogical practices in the basic Communication course” (p. 130). He calls for a more accurate accounting of reality, asserting that we have not been teaching “what works” in the world of speechmaking and everyday communication. By presenting an out-dated account of the world, we hinder our students from accurately assessing the beliefs, attitudes, values, and ideals of their audience, thus handicapping their progress toward becoming more effective speakers. Gray (1989), adding to this, shows us how inconsistent our textbooks are at investigating and explicating speech communication. Our journals and anthologies, for example, often focus on radical or marginalized public discourse, thus better reflecting the diversity of the modern rhetorical situation, while our textbooks have not. Schwartz (1995) likewise asserts that “despite the fact that ‘rhetoric’ is a broad rubric under which many approaches to communication and
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culture can be approached,” our textbooks present too rigid a picture of society, “signifying a lack of conceptual diversity in the classroom and a rejection of rhetorical and cultural plurality” (p. 136). Leff (1992) agrees with the assessment of these problems; after becoming director of the basic course in public speaking, he 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).

This research points to many complex problems plaguing current speech texts, but they all surround a fundamental absence of current research and theory, misrepresenting the rhetorical environment. For Jamieson, it is the modern situation that becomes the central issue and her findings mark an important advancement in theory that should, but has not yet been appropriated by our speech texts. Jamieson’s (1988) book, *Eloquence in an Electronic Age: The Transformation of Political Speechmaking*, was the winner of the Speech Communication Association’s 1989 Winans-Wichelns Award, and marks a beginning of successful books tracing the implications of and changes within political speechmaking (see, for example: Jamieson, 1992; Jamieson, 1996; Capella and Jamieson, 1997). *Eloquence in an Electronic Age* has been recognized by the community as an important and perceptive study into modern eloquence and, likewise, serves as the theoretical framework, or the version of eloquence to which we need to attend today. I say this partly because Jamieson is the first to observe a nuanced shift in modern audiences—they have been cultivated to expect speeches oriented toward mass-media’s standards, which do not maintain the levels of argument and logic necessary for responsible speaking.

Jamieson (1988) distinguishes between two models of eloquence: the old and the new. “In the golden ages,” she asserts, “speakers spent time defining the terms, a process that forces assumptions into the open,” “routinely laid out the range of policy alternatives for examination, scrutinizing each in turn,” “lovingly explored the range of available evidence” (p. 11), and saw “new occasions on their own terms not as repeats of past occasions” (p. 31). While the old eloquence was of “fire and sword,” the new “has given way to an intimate disclosive art bent on conciliation, not conquest” (p. x). The television frames this new eloquence, characterized by the narrative, self-disclosive, and visual modes of persuasion. In this climate, the soundbyte has usurped sustained argument and personal stories have replaced statistics and well-grounded research. The most relevant change is not that speakers have or should adopt these measures, but that audiences have grown accustomed to and even expect them. Thus, a perpetual cycle is borne that unfortunately creates a mass, uninformed audience. At least, this is Jamieson’s next argument.

While speech audiences have adapted to the change, authors still resist teaching any form of this new eloquence in public speaking textbooks. Jamieson shows how current pedagogical practices fail to consider the contemporary rhetorical situation and its predominant medium of communication, the television. Specifically, Jamieson argues that television has changed the way politicians speak and, in the process, changed our very notion of eloquence. Yet the new is unsatisfactory. Jamieson, therefore, advocates “mating” the old and the new eloquence, uniting “pictures and
verbal propositions, argumentative substance, illustrative stories, and the conception and delivery of ideas (pp. x–xi). Her model synthesizes the old and the new—combining the visual with the substantive. However, she advocates taking account of the changing rhetorical situation while holding on to the classical rhetorical “virtues.” This synthesis is, she suggests, predicated upon the assumption that the decline of eloquence in society bears some relation to the quality and amount of public speaking found in the classroom (p. 15).

Jamieson’s arguments raise several questions. How is eloquence taught in schools? Have the ways in which schools teach public speaking upheld the “old” or the “new” eloquence? Are models of eloquence really behind the times, as Jamieson suggests? What models do we present in rhetorical and speech texts? Are these models based on an old orality that does not consider the narrative, the visual, or the self-disclosure? Must we replace our notion of eloquence with Jamieson’s synthesis or is there another option? And, in the end, what should the public speaking textbook of the future look like?

This paper asks how, if at all, does the best-selling text account for the latest research, and specifically Jamieson’s contention that television has changed modern speechmaking and, in the process, our very notion of eloquence. With these questions in mind, I critically evaluate Stephen Lucas’s (1995) The Art of Public Speaking as an exemplar of contemporary public speaking textbooks and one that presents a theory of speech eloquence. The first section elaborates Jamieson’s argument. Next, I examine Lucas’s theory of eloquence based upon the speeches he employs as models of eloquence and what he teaches us about effective public speaking. Finally, I advance possible directions that a future textbook might take into account based upon the modern rhetorical situation.

**Jamieson and Eloquence**

Many factors affect what audiences regard as eloquent in a given society. Among these are speaker, audience, time, context, precedence, topic, and the medium of communication. Jamieson argues that a society’s dominant forms of media shape our notions of eloquence and that television has shaped the modern definition. Thus, speakers like Ronald Reagan are considered “eloquent” in the television age because he utilizes emotional appeals, narratives, and a personal touch that is not recognized in the notion of “old” eloquence.

The old eloquence, fully realized in classical times, converged upon the argument (logic and structure), the speaker (character), and the audience (values, needs, expectations). The classical style was a masculine style: “effectiveness and manliness were symptoms” (Jamieson, 1988, p. 76). Speakers avoided the effeminate style as audiences associated it with weakness, emotionalism, and irrationality.

The new eloquence, which Jamieson characterizes as “effeminate,” has been fostered by television. The medium requires orators to “speak comfortably,” “project a sense of private self,” “self-disclose,” and “engage the audience in completing messages that exist as mere dots and lines on television’s screen” (p. 81). The medium is intimate; “the ability to comfortably express feelings is an asset on television” (p. 81). Likewise, the effeminate style is a repository for “parable-like dramatic vignettes” (p. 83), expresses “ideas and lessons in brief dramatic narratives,” and is better able to “respond to television’s narrative demands” (p. 84).

Jamieson does not advocate that the effeminate style be taught, however. Jamieson
asserts that the move toward the effeminate style was an unfortunate one, caused by the rise and importance of the broadcast media. “The style traditionally considered credible,” according to her, “is no longer suitable for television” (pp. 87–8). “The broadcast age,” notes Jamieson, “has rendered the combative, data-driven, impersonal ‘male’ style obsolete” (p. 8). The age of television motivates politicians away from discussing their arguments and the substantive issues of the day. The core of Jamieson’s problem with the effeminate is, therefore, epitomized in Reagan. “Sacri-
ficed in Reagan’s preoccupation with pictures,” she says, “was the additional power his discourse might have drawn from a well-argued case capsulized in a memorable phrase” (p. 8). Jamieson condemns Reagan’s electronic eloquence in that “his subordination of fact to conviction and truth to ideological convenience ultimately cost him his credibility” (p. 245).

Jamieson suggests that there are important differences between presidents of the “old” eloquence and those of the “new.” Viewed from the classical perspective, an eloquent president did not inherit a legacy, but left one by imparting memories of historic proportion (p. 97). Eloquent presidents are distinguished by clearly defined principles and an understanding of the complex forces working against those principles (p. 97). The eloquent president creates a public sense of ethics from the exhausted rhetoric of predecessors by reassembling them “to argue that they and we have learned the lessons of the past” (p. 97). In the electronic age, a president uses the television to leave an audience with a visual legacy; this talent is “now more important to a politician’s survival than the capacity to forge an artful speech that sustains an important argument” (p. 114). An eloquent president in our age must decide in what situation the electronic message should be supplemented or “when it should constitute the entire message” (p. 115). Jamieson still laments, however, that the witty soundbyte has displaced eloquent speech and that visual artistry leads to simulacra: “such uses of the available means of persuasion confirm Plato’s concern that rhetoric can artfully make the untrue appear true” (p. 240).

If we must accept the effeminate style as inseparable from technological development, and we accept the rise of technology as inevitable, but are still to preserve our classical heritage, what are her solutions to the problem? “There is no reason to doubt,” she writes, “that speech that meshes the best of the old and the new can be fashioned in the ninth decade of the twentieth century” (p. 246). She suggests, in other words, that we ought to “mate” the old and the new. In fact, she says that the synthesis has been fashioned. In Jamieson’s perspective, Mario Cuomo exemplifies this synthesis: “In his keynote address at the Democratic Convention of 1984, Mario Cuomo’s style and delivery were conversational. But, unlike Reagan, who keeps tightly to his scripted texts in formal settings, Cuomo reworked the script as he was delivering it, a process that enabled him to adapt to audience response” (p. 246). Cuomo illustrates the ability, in Jamieson’s view, to combine both new and old styles into a modern sense of eloquence because he effectively used “personal disclosure to build a political case,” and “could argue cogently but conversationally and both dramatize and visually assert as well” (p. 247).

Jamieson envisions a political utopia in which eloquence would combine the old and the new. “As we consider the future,” she argues, “we would have one goal making the world safe for deliberation, for another, making deliberation possible, for a third, making it probable” (p. 254). If no one assumes such steps, “our horizon holds dystopia” (p. 254). Consequently, such a world must include many subtle and
overt changes. To summarize, this world would encourage politicians to address substantive issues thoughtfully and the media would graciously offer them the air-time necessary to relay their messages—all of this eventually becoming a symphony of speech making, civic enlightenment, and media generosity. Jamieson
asserts that

Rather than condemning every morselized bit of information as demeaning to democracy, we would encourage a mix of long and short forms; the longer messages would afford context and substance, the shorter, synopses. Those spots that contribute to our understanding of candidates and their positions would be applauded as would the sixty-second point-counterpoints on issues (p. 253).

Thus, this move toward political utopia could change the essence of contemporary American democracy and the world of speech making. Following Jamieson’s lead, we must first recognize that education is the foundation. Educators, she claims, would see the value of teaching both the visual and the verbal, and would teach students how to examine both aspects of messages critically. Furthermore, educators would begin to inspire a style of speechmaking that responsively considers the narrative, visual, and self-disclosive as legitimate forms of persuasion.

This is, as Jamieson says, a utopia. In “real” life, however, the media battle each other for ratings, and thus, for profit. Their survivability depends upon airing a number of diverse programs as often as possible, since they must appeal to many different audiences in order to recruit a large viewing public. Air-time is expensive, however, and the media must subsidize their programs by airing commercials that advertise products usually irrelevant to the program being broadcast. These in themselves prove a formidable obstacle to her utopia. The politicians, another
barrier, have found the visual so powerful and appealing, it is questionable whether they would switch to lengthy speeches performed before an audience long-socialized against them? Jamieson seems to understand these concerns and asks, “can an eloquence that conjoins the best of the old and new survive in the electronic age” (p. 255)? It is with these words that Jamieson ends her book and, thus, swiftly and skillfully averts the matter that this paper seeks to examine—where do we go from here? Stephen Lucas’s textbook acts as a model of pedagogy, establishing what path a speaker should take toward eloquence. Thus, we can examine Lucas’s text as a prescriptive theory and see if it achieves the types of goals that Jamieson advocates.

Lucas’s The Art of Public Speaking

Stephen Lucas’s The Art of Public Speaking in its 5th edition is, according to McGraw-Hill, “the best selling public speaking text” and “the bestselling text in the communication discipline” (McGraw-Hill, 1998). According to recent figures, Lucas’s text outsells its nearest competitor by a factor of 2 to 1 (Byers, 1999). With more than 600,000 students in speech classes yearly, according to Byers, the textbook reaches a wide audience, signifying a significant focus on its form of instruction. But why so much popularity? McGraw-Hill (1998) praises the text’s “clarity, well-chosen examples and speech excerpts that further clarify the important concepts, annotated sample speeches and outlines,” and the “solid grounding in theory and classical and contemporary research.” Additionally, McGraw-Hill asserts that the text includes “expanded coverage of current issues such as multiculturalism, changing demographics and their influence on audience analysis, nonexistent language, emotional appeals and the role of argumentation in persuasive speaking.” They tell us that Lucas’s text
is “thoroughly updated for the 90s.” Here, indeed, is the crux of the concern. Testing
this, I have discovered that the 5th edition is not updated for the 90s—for the
electronic age—by looking at instances where the text fails to prescribe the narrative,
the visual, and the self-disclosive as legitimate modes of persuasion, while it holds
fast only to classical modes of thought.

is arranged in five parts or eighteen chapters, with one appendix. Part One, Chapter
1 introduces public speaking as a process, ethics in 2, and listening in 3. Part Two has
four chapters, including topic and purpose selection in 4, audience analysis in 5,
gathering materials in 6, and supporting speech ideas in 7. Part Three consists of
organization in 8, speech beginnings and endings in 9, and outlines in 10. Following
these preparatory sections, Lucas advances to speech presentation in Part Four;
Chapter 11 addresses language use, 12 highlights delivery, and 13 looks at visual
aids. In the final section, Part Five, Lucas describes types of speaking, including
informative in 14, persuasive in 15, methods of persuasion in 16, *epideictic* speaking
in 17, and small group communication in 18. Beyond these chapters, Lucas employs
sample speeches both throughout the text and in his appendix, used as both
examples and models. These speeches provide a starting point into what form of
elocution he believes ought to be privileged.

The following textual analysis reveals in what ways Lucas prescribes a theory of
elocution. These two major sections are arranged, not by any classification of
components designed by Jamieson, as she does not offer any such system, but by
applying her major criticisms to specific parts of Lucas’s text. The first section
examines the speeches Lucas employs in the appendix and those throughout the
chapters. These speeches act as models of eloquence—the type of oratory Lucas
privileges. I examine not only the types of speeches that Lucas employs, but his
comments about those speeches. Few of these speeches exhibit characteristics of the
new eloquence, but Lucas’s comments are characteristic of the old, thus downplaying
the importance of the visual, narrative, and so forth. The second section
addresses the content of the text itself: what does Lucas teach us about effective
public speaking and the modern rhetorical situation, based upon his review of
current research and theory? Here, we find Lucas’s pedagogical theory and the
research that he believes to be important evidence for his claims. Lucas develops his
text alongside classical “virtues,” not providing what Jamieson sees as a modern and
accurate representation of public speaking today. This second section examines the
text’s main weakness as Lucas fails to demonstrate the importance of the narrative,
visual, and self-disclosure and how they relate to modern public speaking.

**Elocution from Example**

In his appendix, Lucas presents seven speeches including orations from Barbara
Bush, Alan Alda, Martin Luther King, Jr., Mary Fisher, Steven Harris, Sandy Hefty,
and Kyle Knoeck. Bush’s speech concerns woman’s role in the world and includes
several personal stories—one of which includes her husband and a friend. The speech
lacks specific argument, statistical or factual support, and consists, instead, of words
of advice and hope. Alda’s speech gives practical advice to doctors, and Lucas, in his
commentary, notes “how skillfully Alda” answers his purpose, “builds his credibility,”
and “establishes common ground with his audience before offering them advice”
(p. 440). Just before introducing King’s speech, Lucas claims that his speech is an
example of greatness by virtue of King’s “use of language to make the abstract principles of liberty and quality clear and compelling” (p. 450). Other qualities that prompt Lucas’s praise include King’s “rich baritone voice,” his “fervor,” his use of “familiar, concrete words that create sharp, vivid images” (p. 451), and his extensive use of metaphor, repetition, and parallelism. Fisher spoke emotionally about her own disease, appealing to the American audience to acknowledge AIDS and HIV as real problems that they should not avoid. Lucas calls her speech “one of the most admired speeches of recent years” due to her “somber words and heartfelt delivery” (p. 457).

The remaining three speeches are from undergraduates at the University of Wisconsin. Harris “seeks to convince listeners that they should create a family medical history to help deal with the threat of hereditary diseases” (p. 445). Lucas suggests that Harris effectively “uses statistics, examples, and testimony,” “presents a workable solution to the problem,” and uses a “striking visual aid in the solution section of his speech” (p. 454). Hefty, in her speech, urges us to volunteer “to help people less fortunate” (p. 459). Lucas suggests that she defines the problem and defends her solutions well. He also suggests that she establishes a positive ethos, appeals to pathos and logos by offering personal stories about her volunteering experiences, and attempts to qualify and answer potential objections and excuses that people may have. Lucas praises Knoeck for his exploration of “facts,” “how clearly Kyle organizes his ideas,” and “how well he employs a wide range of supporting materials to provide an entertaining, as well as instructive, look at his subject” (p. 445).

These speeches often do show the evolution toward the new eloquence while holding to the classical ideals. The reader will most likely agree that the first five speeches are easily identifiable. King uses carefully planned, but familiar language to achieve his goals. Alda appeals to ethos and offers practical advice (phronesis). While Harris uses an effective visual aid, he appeals to logos and ethos by using effective speech support, and offers practical solutions to the problem. Knoeck purposefully organizes his points, uses effective support, and is instructive. Hefty is self-disclosive, but Lucas’s commentary focuses on her appeals to ethos, logos, and pathos. Both Bush and Fisher are self-disclosive and make use of narrative without a significant attempt at providing facts or an argument. Yet they still do not embody Jamieson’s notion of the effeminate style: they do not use the narrative, for example, as an end to itself, but as a means to achieve the end. In Bush’s case, the goal is to raise the audience’s consciousness about women’s roles. Fisher tries to persuade the audience to acknowledge HIV and AIDS as real threats. The speeches themselves, then, often reflect the new eloquence, but Lucas’s praise of them focuses only on the classical, suggesting, like Jamieson, a privileging of the old, without reference to modern expectations of eloquence.

This pedagogical stance runs throughout the text. In the chapter on informative speaking, Lucas introduces Susan Hirsch’s speech about dandelions as an uncommon, but useful weed. Lucas praises many of her choices: her use of a rhetorical question as an attention-getting device, her topic sentence, appeal to ethos, preview, use of a visual aid, vivid accounts of history, clear and straightforward explanations, transitions, her well-chosen supporting materials, identification of referent experts, effective use of a story, a quotation that acts as “a perfect ending for the body of the speech,” her short conclusion that cues the listeners that the speech is at its end,
the repetition of her thesis statement (pp. 329-31). In the chapter on persuasion, Lucas includes another sample speech, this time by Susan Ingraham. This speech, according to Lucas, “deals with a question of policy and provides an excellent example of problem-solution structures” (p. 357), and is praised for its attention to need, plan, and practicality (p. 358). Lucas states that she used “clever variations” on her theme as an attention-getting device, questions to guide her audience into a particular way of thinking; repetition, statistics and examples, stories, testimony, transitions, clearly and concisely explained points, workable plan, an effective summary and closing appeals (p. 390-4). These two speeches are indicative of the entire book in that we see a particular focus on organization, argument and its support, and the practicality of the appeals and goals. And while we must acknowledge that Lucas mentions and sometimes even praises the use of the visual and narrative (never the self-disclosive), he does not show how we can adapt these forms for a television audience, nor how we can synthesize them with the old. He simply focuses upon them as tools to be used toward an end goal—classical conceptions of eloquence. While many of these speeches do show qualities of the new eloquence, it seems that his theory fails to come to grips with that.

**Elocution by Instruction**

Lucas defines public speaking for us in the traditional way. First, Lucas states that “public speaking is more highly structured” than conversation because the situation demands “much more detailed planning and preparation than ordinary conversation” (p. 7). Second, Lucas says that “public speaking requires a different method of delivery” (p. 7), and that speakers should be clear, project their voices, and avoid personal mannerisms that may distract the audience. Third, “public speaking requires more formal language” since “slang, jargon, and bad grammar have little place in public speeches” (p. 7). “Despite the increasing informality of all aspects of American life,” according to Lucas, “listeners usually react negatively to speakers who do not elevate and polish their language when addressing an audience” (p. 7). The absence of particular arguments in his characterization of public speaking and the modern situation is significant. He does not acknowledge the evolution toward a more conversational style, he says nothing about how media affect this distinction, and he still discusses style in terms appropriate only to the platform oration.

Still, Lucas does point to the similarities between public speaking and conversation. Lucas states that a conversational speech is organized logically, the message or topic is tailored to the speaker’s particular audience, uses stories for maximum impact, and adapts to listener feedback. But while he advocates adaptation of the message to the audience, he does not tell us how one goes about this with the narrative, self-disclosive, or visual. Furthermore, he does not explain how speakers can use these on audiences socialized to expect television’s brand of eloquence. His distinction between conversation and public speaking reinforces the traditional notion of eloquence, not the “mating” that Jamieson advocates.

While a principal aspect of Jamieson’s theory of eloquence is the use of the narrative, Lucas rarely emphasizes this mode of persuasion. In Chapter 7, Lucas advances three types of speech support: examples, statistics, and testimony. Lucas elaborates on differing types of examples for five pages, statistics for eight, and testimony for another five. He pigeonholes the narrative as a form of extended example and, surprisingly, Lucas offers only a half page to explain its importance.
This implies, of course, that Lucas sanctions the use of statistics and other forms of support over the narrative. We realize the core of this observation when he states that “extended examples are often called illustrations, narratives, or anecdotes. They are longer and more detailed than brief examples. By telling a story vividly and dramatically, they pull listeners into the speech” (p. 147). He suggests later in a section entitled “Tips for Using Examples,” that examples, assuming the narrative, should be used to clarify, reinforce, and personalize ideas (p. 148–9). He does not, in any way, assert that the narrative is a unique persuasive strategy or that speakers can use it as an end-goal in the speech. Yet he celebrates the narrative by citing, in the bibliography, Kirkwood’s (1985) article on parables, Fisher’s (1989) book on communication as narration, and Brown’s (1990) essay on the functions of stories in organizations. Lucas also cites Reinard’s 1988 work on the persuasive effects of evidence and Haynes’s (1990) essay on public speaking pedagogy in the electronic age, both of which establish the narrative as an important persuasive strategy. Lucas, nevertheless, pays lip service to the narrative approach in his text. He tells us little about how to tell a good story, about narrative fidelity or coherence, or about the work of narrative to construct social realities. Furthermore, unlike Fisher in his appendix, he does not treat the narrative as the central paradigm, and therefore does not teach us much about good and bad narrative.

A second primary point in Jamieson’s notion of the effeminate style is the visual. In Chapter 13, Lucas (1995) describes the visual as that which includes models, photographs, drawings, graphs, the computer, and the speaker’s body. Foremost, he diverges from what Jamieson’s discussion would seem to suggest is the issue—using words to create visual images. This is, it seems, closely related to his lack of attention to narrative form. Lucas offers much of the traditional advice on the use of visual aids such as “talk to your audience, not to your visual aid,” and “make sure visual aids are large enough” (p. 302–5). Lucas asserts that the visual mode has much value for public speaking, arguing that “visual aids offer several advantages” including clarity as the primary advantage, followed by the interest generated in the audience, and retention of the information (p. 290–1). Supporting his claim that the visual mode has value, he cites some relevant research on visuals as they relate to increased perception of credibility, effectiveness, and preparedness (Vogel, et al., 1986). Lucas interjects what seems to be a disapproving voice, that we must accept the visual as a necessary channel of communication because “we live in a visual age” (p. 290). He states that since movies and television have conditioned us “to expect a visual image,” we ought to use them when we speak to assist listeners to “understand exactly what you are trying to communicate” (p. 290). Although his lamentation is consonant with Jamieson’s, his focus differs. Lucas, for example, does not talk about adapting the speech to an audience that expects televised eloquence by exploiting the visual elements in the speech. He cannot explain Reagan’s success, therefore, because Lucas sees the visual mode as an aid to reinforce the message, not as the message itself.

Lucas, therefore, eschews the narrative as anything more than an extended example, and virtually ignores the process of using the visual effectively in our electronic age. So how does Lucas attend to Jamieson’s notion of self-disclosure? Other than employing some speeches in the appendix that illustrate the use of the self-disclosing, Lucas seems to hedge on this point in the text. There is little, if any, mention of “self-disclosing” in the index. While it seems that, with the apparent
absence of the topic, he may regard self-disclosure in the classical sense, or as a function of ethos, even this appears ambivalent. The absence is a curiosity since there is much research indicating the importance of self-disclosing in public and interpersonal settings (see Derlaga and Berg, 1987; Hansen and Shult, 1984). Moreover, Lucas does not show us how we should use self-disclosure to adapt the old eloquence to the new age, bringing “fire and sword” to “an intimate discursive art” (Jamieson, 1988, p. x).

We need to resolve several conflicting ideas in Lucas’s text, however. At times, Lucas seems to promote the narrative, visual, and the self-disclosive as when he presents speeches that embrace these forms. Other times, Lucas appears to discount any value for the narrative mode besides secondary status, sees the visual in only the traditional way, and ignores self-disclosure. Apparently, Lucas favors statistics and examples, organization, rhetoric, arrangement, Aristotelian proofs, the grand style of language, practical knowledge, and such things as conciseness and clarity. And while these are noble “virtues” for a speaker to embrace, these alone do not an eloquent speaker make, according to Jamieson, at least, not in the electronic age. It is exactly as the research shows us, that our modern speech texts are based upon an Aristotelian epistemology. We can also come to the same conclusion as Schwartz, Pearson and Nelson, Gray, and Leff have, that while our knowledge base has changed dramatically and our theories of human communication have evolved significantly, speech pedagogy has not come to terms with the modern rhetorical situation. We may assert, specifically then, that Lucas fails to show us how one can adapt the old to the new, adapting speech to audiences conditioned by the television.

Discussion

This paper originally asked how, if at all, does the best-selling text account for the latest research, and specifically Jamieson’s contention that television has changed modern speechmaking and, in the process, our very notion of eloquence. Lucas, we have learned, only nods to research showing the changing roles of narration, the visual mode, and self-disclosure. Moreover, Lucas does not acknowledge, as Jamieson does, the “effeminate” style. Nevertheless, both, we may observe, fail to show us how to construct a textbook that does both.

Lucas, to be fair, is not the only author who does not meet these high ideals. We will find that Lucas, and by extension others, should broaden his scope to include research and theory that might better aid the student in understanding the modern rhetorical situation. Michael and Suzanne Osborn’s (1999) text, Public Speaking, also portrays the visual mode only as an aid and narration as a form of evidence. Self-disclosure is again downplayed; it is, in fact, explicitly absent from their discussion on public speaking. While their concept of mythos could offer a potential corrective, it too is used as a proof of persuasion and not as a complete form of expression. Each text seems to be a mirror image of the other, and neither represents the modern rhetorical situation in a way consonant with Jamieson’s perspective—a view that should seriously be considered and implemented in the basic course.

Peripheral textbooks may offer better alternatives or unique models of instruction that take account of the modern rhetorical environment. According to a National Communication Association online resource, there are fifty-seven recognized speech textbooks between 1982–1997 and nine between 1997–1999, seven of which are simply revised texts from the first list. Sampling from the fifty-seven mutually
exclusive texts, eliminating both Lucas's and the Osborn's text from the list, I reviewed eight of these. Few of these texts hint toward alternative models, such as that which Jamieson advocates, while the majority endorses the same brand of classical eloquence.

Three of these texts suggest positive alternatives, but none break completely away from the traditional brand of teaching to promote Jamieson's "effeminate" style of speaking. The first text, Kearney and Plax's (1996) *Public Speaking in a Diverse Society*, acts as a corrective for many of the problems inherent to most public speaking texts, and is probably the closest to what Jamieson advocates (p. 244). In "Organizing and Outlining Your Speech," they address different organizational forms. Citing from feminist scholarship, they claim that there is a variety of alternative organizational patterns that represent more configural thinking. ... Recall that speeches organized configurally require the audience to participate actively in interpreting what is often only implied. Rather than explicitly lay out the purpose or main points, configurally organized speeches provide subtle cues for the audience to interpret (p. 244).

Following this, Kearney and Plax offer several strategies including the narrative organizational pattern; here, narration is not just an extended example, but an entire structure from which speakers can design their presentations (p. 244). The authors, furthermore, advise students to discover their own rhetorical style, even "before reviewing the characteristics of some well known rhetorical styles" (p. 389). Students are counseled not to simply follow models, but to design a style that flows from their own character. The authors do suggest several options, however, including a dramatic style encouraging a performance-like strategy, an animated style encouraging "energy enthusiasm, and excitement," and an open style that encourages self-disclosure—a point not yet considered in other textbooks (pp. 392–7). While these moves are significant, Kearney and Plax are not quite where Jamieson believes we ought to be. In their explanation of audience adaptation, they contribute a page to "The Media Audience" which seems to be a good place for a conversation about media effects (p. 158). Yet, this space is reserved for a discussion on media diversity and why speakers are often vague. There is a discussion of feminine and masculine communication styles, and they do note that influential speakers like Bill Clinton and Phil Donahue assume the feminine (p. 399). In fact, the authors claim that "speakers who demonstrate a predominantly feminine style of communicating are easy to find in the media" (p. 400). Why the feminine form is pervasive in the media is not answered, so the real implications of the broadcast media are left untold and students are hindered from appreciating why speakers should consider a feminine or "effeminate" style when speaking.

Beebe and Beebe's (1997) *Public Speaking: an Audience-Centered Approach*, the second book reviewed, appears by its title to suggest a rhetorically sophisticated approach to public speaking. Little is said, however, about the use of narratives or self-disclosure to form messages for an audience conditioned to expect them. Though Beebe and Beebe advocate the use of visuals as an "integral part of a presentation rather than an afterthought," they claim that visuals are more heavily relied upon only in speeches within the workplace, not in "traditional speeches" (p. A-14), thus missing Jamieson's point. A glimmer of hope rests, however, in their section on "Crafting Memorable Word Structures," "A Second Look at Memorable Word Structures," "Creating Arresting Images," and "Tips for Using Language
Effectively” (pp. 264–9). Here, they note the importance of soundbyte-like structures, such as those used by the President and other modern orators, that “create the unique drama and cadences needed to make a speech memorable” (p. 264). They suggest a few rhetorical techniques that may help create such a soundbyte design: omission, inversion, suspension, parallelism, antithesis, alliteration, and other tropes such as metaphor, simile, and personification. Thus, we see evidence of an attempt to represent a more accurate view of the modern rhetorical situation.

Grice and Skinner’s (1998) Mastering Public Speaking also move toward the mated form of eloquence. Like Beebe and Beebe’s text, they address the importance of using words to empower speech; yet instead of talking of soundbytes, they speak of ways to use words to recreate visual and other sensual feelings in your audience—a move that Lucas and others fail to suggest. But while they too discuss narration simply as a form of supporting visual material (p. 165), they do address, however slightly, the impact of television on our conception of communication and public environments. This illustration of the modern situation, however, is given insignificant attention. It exists, in one instance, as a picture of President Clinton debating Bob Dole and a caption explaining how television promotes “vague and noncommittal language” (p. 15). Once these types of discussions get into the text itself, in adequate sizes, then we might have a text that is positioned to prepare students in the way that Jamieson believes is important.

Some non-mainstream textbooks, therefore, do suggest alternative forms of instruction closely articulating Jamieson’s ideas, yet these are still cautionary moves, and thus the mated eloquence to which Jamieson speaks is not properly addressed. Even so, texts that are closely aligned with Jamieson’s thinking are not getting the attention they deserve. The texts that are being employed by large institutions are those that follow traditional and outdated themes. We ought to create such a synthesis in our texts and consider employing these in our classrooms, but this is a difficult task since it involves moving outside of the boxes in which some of us have been trained—predominantly classical rhetorical thought and, with that, a certain performative conservativeness. But it is not impossible. Indeed, our training is the best place to begin since even Jamieson would have us privilege the “old” and only adapt it to the “new.” This synthesis, though, requires significant revision of current texts and authors who are bold enough to provide these radical alternatives.

If we were to construct this new book, it would follow a traditional theme with the following major changes. First, this new book must start by defining what modern eloquence is, based upon Jamieson’s contention that television has cultivated in the typical audience different expectations of eloquence. The textbooks I have examined in this paper miss important opportunities when, for example, in chapters on audience analysis, authors opt to focus upon analyzing particular audiences only, missing the sweeping changes that have occurred in the larger scene. Second, instead of privileging examples, statistics, and testimony, a proper synthesis would contrast, for instance, narrative with other forms of argument and structure, visual with verbal, self-disclosure with reservation, and emotion with logic. By contrasting, we ought not devalue one in favor of another, but explain the importance of each in creating different forms of eloquence—new and old. The author might meet these counterpoints with effective and ineffective examples and reasons for their success or failure. Third, these changes must be supported by recent scholarly research, such as that by Jamieson and others who have addressed the ways in which various media
have altered our expectations and our ways of seeing. This research should not be
found only in bibliographies where students are less likely to go, but in the text itself.
Fourth, the book might employ radical or protest rhetoric, as well as other forms of
rejected speech, as alternative models of eloquence, since ignoring such an area
would suggest that there is nothing of value in the study, that it is not desired, and
that such forms of speech cannot be effective nor productive. Thus, instead of
providing students with speeches that conform to the “old” style, the synthesis
would consist of both traditional and alternative forms of public address. Students
constantly challenge instructors in asking why John F. Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther
King, Jr., and Malcom X—all great speakers—do not maintain an introduction, three
points, and a conclusion. Such difficulties need to be addressed by our texts and not
ignored because these styles do not easily fit with current models of effective
speaking. A fifth change would be a greater emphasis on mediated communication.
Instead of discussing technology as a speech aid, this book should address the
medium of exchange as a vital part, if not the most important part of a message.

These issues must be addressed if we are to construct a textbook that is based upon
current research and theory and one that accurately represents the modern rhetori-
cal situation. It is not enough for textbook authors simply to pay tribute to current
research and theory in the text’s bibliography; they must integrate it into the text as a
whole. Such a textbook would, as its implication, better prepare students for the
many rich and diverse opportunities in public speaking by presenting a view of the
world that is realistic. Yet, some may resist using such a textbook by making a couple
of arguments: (1) It should be up to the instructor to make the transition to the new or
mated eloquence known, and (2) As a first text, Lucas’s (or whoever’s) is adequate.
In response to the former concern, the majority of those that teach the basic course,
especially at large universities, are graduate teaching assistants who may not
acknowledge Jamieson’s nuanced argument. By writing a textbook that considers
her observations, the text becomes a constant in the classroom and gives teachers a
basis from which to address students’ concerns. This would meet Leff’s (1992)
concern over a lacking “disciplinary consciousness” (p. 120). On the latter concern,
effectively because it is students’ first encounter with public speaking, each text should
represent current theory and research to the best of its ability. While it is obvious that
Lucas and other mainstream textbook authors do very well in publication sales,
economics does not necessarily signify that textbooks are better or not in need of
revision. It might suggest, on the other hand, that these authors grasp and represent
the best of traditional instruction. We now need to move to the next level and
present students with a more accurate view of the rhetorical environment, mating
both old and new forms of eloquence into a textbook that demonstrates the best of
our knowledge.

Notes

1The only apparent reference to Lucas’s success in print is noted in Gibson, et al. (1985, p. 288). Lucas’s text ranked
second among those textbooks used in the basic course; first was Ehninger, Gronbeck, & Monroe’s 9th edition Principles
of Speech Communication, which is now in its 13th edition. These rankings should now be taken as dated.
2Lucas has a new 6th edition text, but McGraw-Hill claims to have added only better or revised ancillary materials
Internet as a research tool and additional speeches, among other changes. The problems inherent to the 5th edition
remain, however, and do not alter the relevance of this critique.
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