Public speaking as cultural ideal: Internationalizing the public speaking curriculum

David Boromisza-Habashi, Jessica M.F. Hughes & Jennifer A. Malkowski

Published online: 17 Dec 2015.

Submit your article to this journal ⬀

View related articles ⬀

View Crossmark data ⬀

Public speaking as cultural ideal: Internationalizing the public speaking curriculum

David Boromisza-Habashi[a] , Jessica M.F. Hughes[a] and Jennifer A. Malkowski[b]

[a]Department of Communication, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309, USA; [b]Department of Communication Arts & Sciences, California State University, Chico, CA 95929, USA

ABSTRACT

Institutes of higher education around the world respond to the challenge of globalization by internationalizing their curricula. We argue that adding an element of cultural reflection to curriculum design is an important step toward internationalization. We use ethnographic analysis to highlight the cultural gap between Anglo-American and non-Anglo interpretations of public speaking. We begin by reconstructing the Anglo cultural ideal of public speaking from a historical overview of the evolution of the public speaking textbook (Sproule, J.M. [2012]. Inventing public speaking: Rhetoric and the speech book, 1730–1930. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 15, 563–608.). Then, we review alternative cultural models of public speaking. Finally, we identify directions for future research and curriculum design.

Societies impacted by globalization often respond to the combined forces of international trade, politics, and cultural exchange by internationalizing their institutes of higher education. Internationalization, understood here as "the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution" (Knight, 1999, p. 16.), serves as an engine of the cross-border flow of knowledge generated and taught at institutes of higher education. One example of a body of knowledge routinely exported from the United States to the rest of the world is the basic college-level public speaking curriculum, in particular, the public speaking textbook. Such textbooks published in the United States are available for purchase and are used around the world. Their adoption in public speaking courses at non-U.S. institutes of higher education is an important advance toward internationalization. In this paper we argue that more could be done to internationalize the public speaking curriculum both within and beyond the borders of the United States.

In spite of its global presence, the context-bound communication practice labeled "public speaking" and taught to students in the public speaking curriculum is far from universal. As a culturally specific form of expression, and as a resource for public participation, Anglo-American public speaking as represented in U.S. public speaking textbooks may or may not resonate with the experiences of students socialized in non-Anglo speech communities. Kenyan university students, for example, who only had access to U.S. public

---

CONTACT David Boromisza-Habashi ✉ dbh@colorado.edu

speaking textbooks, and their instructors of Kenyan and Ugandan origin had little difficulty pointing out ways in which the representation of public speaking in their textbooks differed from local ways of understanding, and doing, public speaking (Miller, 2002). Students found doing research during the preparation process odd and somewhat pedantic. They noted that speaker credibility in Kenya is often determined by factors like wealth, social status, age, education, ethnicity, and marital status. Instructors emphasized that Kenyan public speaking mobilized a greater variety of supporting materials beyond, and often instead of, extensive research such as proverbs, personal stories, or songs. One instructor, Miller reported,

> that African speeches are often circular, perhaps resembling a bicycle wheel with spokes wandering out repeatedly to the rim [to] make a point or tell a story and then returning back to the center, the thesis. They are actually one-point speeches with a great deal of supporting material. Americans listening to such a speech might feel bewildered and even bored because they are unable to follow the logic that ties all the points together, whereas Kenyan listeners would be absorbed in the stories and delighted with their subtle convergence back into the central theme (p. 180).

Systematic reflection on locally relevant cultural differences could contribute significantly to the internationalization of the public speaking curriculum at Kenyan institutes of higher education and elsewhere.

Reflection on cultural differences between dominant and local interpretations of public speaking as a communicative practice can advance the internationalization of the public speaking curriculum in the U.S. as well. With Knight (1999), we hold that "internationalization is not only oriented to countries or nation states but also includes the different cultural/ethnic groups within a country." One need not look beyond the borders of the United States to experience gaps between the dominant cultural interpretation of public speaking in the U.S. American classroom and the local view. In a nuanced cultural analysis of public speaking as a genre of context-bound communicative action Carbaugh (2005) shared his struggles teaching public speaking to college students from the Blackfeet Indian Nation in Montana. Some of his students expressed their inability to give speeches in front of their peers, others opted for alternative forms of public expression:

> … a Blackfeet boy in my class on public communication […] gave what one fellow student called a "mesmerizing" 7-minute public presentation (i.e., a "public speech"). This consisted of actively and artfully maneuvering the martial art tool, *nunchakus*, for his "speech." The only verbal portion of his speech consisted of only three words "like an eagle," spoken once, about midway through his 7-minute presentation. (p. 86)

We propose that understanding and discussing the dominant Anglo-American cultural ideal would be a productive move toward the internationalization of the public speaking curriculum. One way to accomplish reconstruction is treating the representation of "public speaking" in contemporary textbooks as the articulation of that cultural ideal recognizable to, and circulated by, participants of the Anglo-American speech community. The extent to which the cultural ideal of public speaking informs the norms Anglo speakers apply to actual performances of public speaking is an empirical question we do not seek to answer in this paper. Instead, our aim is to describe the cultural ideal informing and animating contemporary public speaking pedagogy in U.S.-style textbooks. In our pursuit of public speaking as an ideal style of communication we follow Carbaugh's

(2005) approach to public speaking as not a universal but a culturally variable communication practice—a patterned, context-bound, locally meaningful communicative activity.

Following our discussion of the Anglo-American cultural ideal of public speaking we illustrate other ways of speaking in public with non-Anglo examples. We end this paper by highlighting some areas of pedagogical innovation and communication research that reflection on the cultural ideal brings into relief.

Reconstructing the cultural ideal of public speaking

From a cultural perspective, public speaking textbooks can be regarded as texts written to socialize students into culturally competent public speakers. From that perspective, the cultural ideal of public speaking circulated via textbooks can be regarded as a pedagogical resource used to that end. In order to reconstruct that ideal we read Sproule's (2012) analysis of the evolution of the public speaking textbook in the United States from 1730 to 1930 as a cultural text. Sproule's content analysis of over 200 textbooks offered a unique and rich record of the language textbook authors had been using to present the ideal form of public speaking across time.

We drew on Sproule's text to accomplish the reconstruction of the dominant cultural ideal of public speaking in five moves. First, we identified two contrasting clusters of symbolic terms in Sproule's text organized around the metacommunicative terms "expression" and "communication," terms Sproule used to characterize the contrast between old-style and contemporary forms of public speaking. Terms that form these clusters are presented between quotes in this section. Second, we identified 14 passages in Sproule's text that highlighted these symbolic clusters. Then, third, we used Hymes's (1972) SPEAKING analytic framework to trace the outlines of public speaking as a patterned, context-bound activity in these passages. Taken together, elements of SPEAKING (setting, participants, ends, acts and act sequences, key, instruments, norms, and genre) provide the analyst a sense of how particular types of communicative acts are expected to be performed and evaluated in a given speech community. Our analysis yielded a set of constraints (Bitzer, 1968) that, according to the cultural ideal, are immanent in rhetorical situations in which public speaking occurs. Fourth, we drew on Carbaugh's (2005) cultural discourse theory and analysis to explicate relevant cultural discourses (basic cultural assumptions, beliefs, and values) immanent in the Anglo ideal of public speaking. We used Hymes's analytic framework to highlight the communicative pattern implied in the cultural ideal, and Carbaugh's to highlight cultural premises that rendered the pattern meaningful. Finally, fifth, we contrasted the pattern and cultural meanings of public speaking implied in the ideal style with patterns and meanings of public speaking in some other speech communities. In what follows, we present our findings in the same order.

Anglo-American "public speaking" as patterned, context-bound activity

There are two warrants for treating Sproule's (2012) text as a rich source of cultural information. First, his analysis remains close to the language of the textbooks he uses to trace the historical trajectory of public speaking education. From our perspective, the preservation of language means the preservation of the cultural logic informing these textbooks. Second, the cultural study of communication thrives on the contrast between systems of

communicative pattern and meaning (Boromisza-Habashi & Martínez-Guillem, 2012). The contrast Sproule draws between the beginning and the end of public speaking's historical trajectory can be read as a contrast between two ways of doing and interpreting public speaking.

Sproule traces the evolution of "public speaking" in the United States from what we call a code of "expression" to a code of "communication." In the early stages of public speaking education, textbooks focused on training students in the "expression of ideas." Such "expression" required nearly exclusive focus on "eloquence," "technique," and "delivery." "Expression" was imagined as a unidirectional process, proceeding from speaker to audience. Its effect on the audience was thought to be predictable: as long as the speaker deployed the correct technique she or he was expected to elicit the desired audience response. Contemporary textbooks are organized according to the code of "communication." This code suggests that "conversation" should be the ideal of public speaking. In our attempt to extract the dominant ideal of public speaking from Sproule's analysis we concentrated on passages where he developed the contrast between "expression"- and "communication"-oriented pedagogies. As it will become apparent, "communication" means more than delivery. Next, we use Dell Hymes's (1972) SPEAKING framework to represent this latter, contemporary, "communication"-oriented view of "public speaking."

The most immediately relevant physical *setting* of public speaking is, of course, the "high school" or "college" classroom, but textbooks treat the classroom as a stand-in for a wide range of contexts. The representation of public speaking in contemporary public speaking textbooks has extended the range of physical settings in which public speaking may occur. By discussing a "a wider array of rhetorical situations" and "a broader canvass of rhetorical contexts" than their predecessors, modern public speaking textbooks consider any physical setting relevant to public speaking in which speakers are involved in speech events (Hymes, 1972) associated with "civic affairs," "business," "special occasions" or "celebratory" events.

Public speaking highlights two types of *participants*, a "speaker" and an "audience." Sproule points out that modern textbooks imagine the relationship between the two as an "I-speaking-to-you" association, a relationship that is "intimate," "direct," and "personal." The speaker chooses a purpose, designs the speech specifically for an intended audience, and speaks in an "audience-adapted" or "audience-sensitive" manner. The relationship between audience and speaker is best described as "democratic": The two sides are portrayed as having equal social status. Unlike speakers portrayed in older textbooks, not only is the speaker sensitive to the perspective and interests of the audience, but she or he sees an audience as an agent of a "response" that is not determined by the structure, contents, or delivery of the speech. In the dominant ideal, the audience is seen as the speaker's conversational partner whose agency becomes visible in the "response" and the "oral discussion" following the speech.

Besides the physical setting of Anglo-American public speaking its *ends and outcomes* have also become more diverse in contemporary textbooks. Sproule's analysis mentions five immediate ends (or goals) speakers are thought to pursue in their speeches: "seeing (making things clear)," "feeling (making things impressive)," "accepting (inducing belief)," "enjoying (by entertaining)," and "doing (inducing action)." Beyond the context of the immediate speech, long-term goals of public speaking include institutional and personal success. Successful public speakers effectively engage in "civic affairs" or

"civic-celebratory" events and "enhance societal conditions." They can also achieve "business success" and "upward mobility." As to personal success, textbooks promise public speakers the ability to "make a good impression" and attain "advancement," "self-confidence," "self-improvement," "individual efficiency," and "leadership." In general, public speaking opens the door to "advancing one's reputation and perceived business acumen."

Modern public speaking textbooks tightly regiment the *act sequence* of public speaking. Public speaking must be "grounded on research and evidence," and therefore begins with "analyzing the topic," "testing and analyzing the pros and cons of an issue," and "identifying purposive audience outcomes." Next come "library research," the development of "notecards" and the development of an "outline" which involves "adapting the material to the audience." On the day of giving the speech, the speaker performs "original extemporaneous speaking" aided by "brief notes that are, ideally, held in reserve." She or he begins with a "conversational opening," provides a "modest body of major points" (each with "strong illustration") and arrives at a "prompt and decisive conclusion." The speaker's linguistic choices are marked by "audience-based standards of pronunciation and usage." Individual statements are "plain," "common sense," "pointed," and "original." Textbooks suggest that the speaker use "common sense in gesture" and achieve the "integration of content and delivery." Finally, the speech—if it is intended to "set up a fair context for debate"—is followed by "oral discussion."

The *key* or emotional tone of public speaking arises from holding public speakers to the ideal of speaking in a "conversational-communicative manner." Ideal public speaking is "eloquent" but "democratic," "low-key" and "sincere," "calm" but delivered with "energy," "clear" and "focused" but "spontaneous" and marked by "ease of manner." Public speakers should aim to perform an "informative speech" that fosters "intimate audience contact."

The *instruments* used to accomplish public speaking include face-to-face or mediated interaction between speaker and audience, an "outline" and "notecards."

Sproule's analysis points to four *norms* audiences apply to particular performances of public speaking: the norms of "richness," "originality," "adaptation," and "intimacy." The norm of richness suggests that the public speaker should offer her or his audience content that is well supported by careful research and strikes the audience as interesting and practical. The norm of originality extends to content and presentation. Both should be original artifacts crafted for the specific audience listening to the speech. The textbooks suggest that the speaker's every act of preparation, performance, and audience engagement should be adapted to the audience's interests and desires. The norm of intimacy calls on the speaker to seek a relationship of intimacy with her or his audience. We suggest a single norm to tie the other four together, the norm of authenticity, which prompts the speaker not only to *speak* in an authentic manner but also to *be* the type of authentic person to whom the audience can easily relate.

Finally, the overarching speech *genres* to which modern public speaking textbooks expect public speaking to conform are "communication" and "conversation." "Communication," as a genre, often stands in opposition to "expressing ideas." Whereas "communication" implies a "conversational manner" seen to "spring chiefly from ideas and audience," "expression" entails a "dominant emphasis upon techniques of artistic presentation." Certainly, public speaking marked by a "conversational-communicative manner"

can feed into the secondary genres of (classroom) "speeches," "oratorical contests," "discussion," "reports," "lectures," "parliamentary procedure," "special-occasion speaking." Some textbooks go as far as to claim that public speaking skills can inform "interpersonal conversation" as well.

Cultural discourses of Anglo-American "public speaking"

Carbaugh (2005) argued that Anglo public speaking was not simply a pattern of communication unfamiliar to his Blackfeet students. The differences ran deeper than observable pattern. In what follows we summarize Carbaugh's cultural discourse analysis of Anglo public speaking, the only empirical study focusing on the cultural meanings animating Anglo public speaking of which we are aware, note the extent to which our study of Sproule's text diverges from Carbaugh's account, and reflect on other studies of Anglo "communication" from the perspective of our cultural approach to public speaking.

Cultural discourse theory (Carbaugh, 2005) suggests that the cultural meaningfulness of observable communicative conduct can be captured in the form of cultural discourses, or premises for interpreting and performing such conduct. These premises are the analyst's formulation of fundamental cultural assumptions about the nature of personhood (being), communication (acting), social relations (relating), emotions (feeling), and living in the world (dwelling). Premises answer the question: What do members of this speech community have to believe in order to communicate that way? Such premises are immanent in the ways members of speech communities communicate with one another, and communicative conduct fosters the sharing of premises among communal members. Reflection on Blackfeet and Anglo cultural premises immanent in acts of speaking in public can aid us not only in making sense of Blackfeet students' reluctance or inability to enact Anglo-style public speaking in the college classroom, but also the cultural meanings that render the Anglo style coherent and valuable.

The Anglo practice of public speaking in Carbaugh's analysis suggests that typical public speakers should be seen as citizens who possess and exercise their voices. Anglos regard verbal expression as the most valuable form of communication, and hold that all individual public speakers can and should excel at the art of public speaking. From this purview, all public speakers are to be considered equal, and as in possession of a voice, and therefore everyone should respect everyone else's right to speak in public. All elements and aspects of our world can be the subject of public speaking, and although novice public speakers are likely to experience anxiety they are thought to be capable of developing a feeling of confidence. By contrast, the Blackfeet hold that the typical public speaker is the elder male whose experience and wisdom give him the right to speak in public. The most valuable form of communication, according to the Blackfeet is attentive listening to others (especially the elders) and to one's natural surroundings. Because public speakers hold a high position in society they deserve community members' respect. Young, inexperienced Blackfeet should feel too embarrassed to speak in public, and elders who are expected to speak should appreciate that the community depends on their guidance. Finally, the Blackfeet hold that the world around them should be listened to rather than talked about. It is not difficult to see why a young person, male or female, socialized on the Blackfeet reservation would see standing up and speaking in public as a violation of deeply held beliefs.

Our reading of Sproule expands Carbaugh's findings about Anglo cultural discourses of public speaking on three accounts. First, contemporary public speaking textbooks offer readers an image of the public speaker not only as a citizen, as Carbaugh finds, but also as an authentic, potentially successful, upwardly mobile entrepreneur. Second, our analysis confirms the existence of the belief that everyone should respect everyone else's right to speak in public. However, it also confirms a complementary belief: Everyone should respect others' right to act as a discerning audience member who may or may not be critical of a given speech. Finally, speaker confidence matters, as Carbaugh notes, but "intimate audience contact" is assigned an equal amount of importance.

Public speaking in other cultural contexts

The patterns and cultural discourses highlighted above constitute the cultural ideal of public speaking circulated via U.S.-style public speaking textbooks. Our reconstruction of the ideal is likely to ring quite familiar to readers socialized in the Anglo public speaking classroom. In this section, our goal is to help such readers develop a sense of just how exotic this ideal may seem to readers who lack familiarity with it. Ethnographic accounts of speaking in public in other cultural contexts point to very different expectations about public speaking in non-Anglo speech communities.

Drawing on a review of 50 ethnographic studies of public speaking in non-Anglo speech communities, next we offer a sample of alternative patterns of speaking in public. Our survey here is not meant to give a systematic discussion of all of the speech communities reviewed. Neither can we offer an in-depth comparative analysis of the cultural meanings of communicative patterns we review. Rather, this overview is meant to call attention to the existence of communicative patterns that are both similar to and different from those evident in the Anglo cultural ideal, and thereby place that ideal into the context of other time-honored cultural practices of public speaking.

Much like modern public speaking textbooks, non-Anglo speech communities associate public speaking with a wide variety of physical *settings*. The choice of setting is closely related to the type of speech event to be staged. Public speakers in village legislative meetings in Western Samoa (Duranti, 1988) and newly installed chiefs in Southern Ghana (Yankah, 1991), for example, attend to "civic affairs" in spaces recognized as "public." Speeches given during "special occasions" like Tongan funerals (Philips, 2010), Merina circumcision ceremonies (Bloch, 1974), ritual quarreling in Burundi (Albert, 1964), Urapmin public prayer (Robbins, 2001), or during "celebratory" events like feasts in Pohnpei, Micronesia (Keating, 2000) and wedding ceremonies in Central Sulawesi (Schrauwers, 2000) were also understood as having a public dimension owing to the spaces in which they occur. However, among the articles reviewed, public expression often took place in settings that, from the perspective of the Anglo cultural ideal, might be recognized as more "private" than "public," such as the homes of village leaders (e.g., Duranti, 1983; Yankah, 1991). Women's ritual wailing (*sana*) in homes, village processions, and public spaces during funerary proceedings in Warao villages (Briggs, 1992) blurred the boundary between what, from the Anglo perspective, might be understood as "private" and "public" settings.

While the Anglo ideal highlights the role of two types of *participants*, "speakers" and "audiences," who are on relatively equal footing in terms of social status, public speaking

practices in non-Anglo speech communities generally involve a more stratified set of participants with differently defined social roles and privileges. In many of the speech communities investigated, speaking in public is an activity performed by men who are elders or chiefs (see Bloch, 1974; Brenneis, 1978; Comaroff, 1974; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1997; Duranti, 1988; Fowler, 1978; Graham, 1993; Murphy, 1990; Myers, 1986; Philips, 2010; Pratt & Wieder, 1993), appointed speakers (Milner, 1961; Yankah, 1991), and other high status social actors (see Blé, 2011; Donzelli, 2007; Schieffelin, 1995; Singer, 1955). While participants in the Anglo ideal are generally assumed to be human actors, it is not uncommon for participants in non-Anglo public speaking contexts to include both human and non-human, and present and non-present actors. For instance, in public meetings in the village of Sang Ton, the village itself is seen as a participant, one who, like human participants, can lose face (Bilmes, 1975). In Madagascar, Merina orators act as conduits for the words of deceased ancestors (Bloch, 1974). Such instances of "possession" (Bloch, 1974, p. 59) offer interesting contrasts to Anglo public speaking models in which speakers are treated as autonomous individual agents fully accountable for what they say.

Examples from our corpus also position participants in interactional roles that fall outside of those typical to the Anglo cultural ideal. While typical interactional roles for participants in U.S. public speaking contexts cast speakers as solitary disseminators of speech to audiences of listeners, non-Anglo contexts often cast participants in more complex and interrelated interactional roles. Prophets in the Masowe church are "filled" by the Holy Spirit, who speaks through them (Engelke, 2004). Prophets then deliver the words of the Holy Spirit softly or whisper them directly to *mumiriri wemweya*, "interpreters of the spirit," who repeat what prophets say, shouting at the top of their lungs so that everyone in the assembled congregation can hear. Audience members also often take more active roles in non-Anglo events marked by public speaking. For example, Brenneis (1978) describes the role of audience members in song challenges in the Fiji village of Bhatgaon. In these competitions between dueling religious groups who take turns attacking and shaming their opponents, spectators sit between the two groups, encouraging skilled insults, jeering when insults appear to hit their mark, and, importantly, preventing insults from leading to physical violence. This example highlights a difference between the roles of primary audience members (those to whom speech is directed) and secondary audience members (present onlookers and overhearers), a distinction that is not addressed in the dominant Anglo-American ideal, but that is evident in several other exemplars surveyed (see Fisher, 1976; Schrauwers, 2000).

All five immediate *ends and outcomes* posed by Sproule (2012) are apparent in non-Anglo public speaking contexts. Like public speakers in contemporary textbooks, many members of non-Anglo speech communities use speaking in public for "seeing (making things clear)," "feeling (making things impressive)," "accepting (inducing belief)," "enjoying (by entertaining)," and "doing (inducing action)." However, the particular ends non-Anglo speakers seek often contrast with the dominant cultural ideal. In the Bhatgaon song challenges described above, for example, each group's goal is "to make [the opposing group] so mad they cry" (Brenneis, 1978, p. 162), a challenge that entertains onlookers and ultimately induces a group to call outsiders to end the competition and stop them from taking revenge. Interestingly, this example exhibits parallels to non-dominant ways of speaking in the U.S. such as playing "the dozens," a public exchange common in African-American communities in which two competitors take turns volleying witty

insults in front of onlookers (Kochman, 1972). Beyond the context of the immediate speech, long-term goals of public speaking in non-Anglo speech communities also include additional goals, such as: maintaining or subverting social hierarchies (see Albert, 1964; Bauman, 1975; Bloch, 1974; Briggs, 1992), speaking for the entire tribe in times of communal strife (Carbaugh, 2005), and preserving cultural knowledge, like lessons about the origin of the universe and practical farming techniques (Blé, 2011). While institutional and personal successes are desired outcomes within the Anglo cultural ideal, these ends are not prominent in the non-Anglo speech communities surveyed. Though some non-Anglo speakers valued being perceived as competent or skilled (see, e.g., Albert, 1964; Bauman, 1975), public speaking aims of "upward mobility" and "self-improvement" seem uncommon in non-Anglo public speaking contexts. This may be linked to the fact that many of these contexts exist in stratified social hierarchies in which upward mobility is less attainable, or is recognized as a cultural desirable (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004) to a lesser extent. This difference may also be connected to the focus on public speaking as a collective, rather than individual, endeavor in non-Anglo contexts, a value we highlight in more detail below.

Ethnographic accounts of public speaking in non-Anglo contexts present *act sequences* that often link multiple acts of speaking in public. For instance, Bloch (1974) described the traditional structure of public speaking in Merina circumcision rituals. These ceremonies begin in the afternoon and continue until early the following morning, and consist of numerous ritual speeches, speeches accompanied by dancing, speeches given by ancestors channeled through village elders, repeating chants, shouts and interjections from the audience, intoned prayers, and singing. This and other examples highlight ways in which non-Anglo speech act sequences often develop through collaboration between multiple speakers. Western Desert Aboriginal communities in central Australia offer another context in which multiple participants work to build speech sequences (Liberman, 1990). Here, collective decision-making is achieved through public discourse in which multiple speakers offer continual, repeating, and overlapping summary accounts, rapid and "vociferous vocal participation of all present parties" (p. 177) that signifies the value of the communal voice over the voice of the individual.

The *key* or emotional tone of public speaking in non-Anglo speech communities studied by anthropologists is generally more "formal" than "conversational." Many of the studies surveyed describe speech that is "deferential" yet "authoritative." Ideal public speaking in non-Anglo contexts is often "well said" or "eloquent." Several of the "traditional" registers described in our survey employ poetic formalities, archaic vocabulary, and even code-switching (see Bloch, 1974; Donzelli, 2007; Engelke, 2004). These patterns are seen to convey mysterious emotional tones in which speech is "endowed with meanings not fully accessible to human beings" (Engelke, 2004, p. 14) or to all audience members (Donzelli, 2007). Some non-Anglo public speech is characterized by emotional tones that would be seen as unacceptable in other speech contexts. For example, Tibetan monks in Sera Mey engage in public reprimand to expose "derelict monks" to public scrutiny, employing harsh tones and expletives that would normally constitute gross violations of etiquette, but that are seen as virtuous and even kind in the context of these public admonishments (Lempert, 2006). Speakers in non-Anglo cultural contexts tend not to aim for the same kind of "intimate audience contact" and "personal" tone called for in the Anglo cultural ideal, less a couple of interesting exceptions. In studies that address

the influence of "modern" Western politics and neoliberal discourses in African contexts, Jackson (2009) and Blommaert (1990) described how more "democratic," "transparent," and "personal" rhetoric existed alongside more "formal" registers in Madagascar and Tanzania, respectively.

As in the Anglo ideal, the *instruments* used to accomplish public speaking in non-Anglo speech communities include face-to-face interactions between speakers and audiences. However, Pratt and Wieder (1993) noted the use of a peculiar instrument among the Osage in Oklahoma. Osage public speakers are required to avoid making eye contact with particular audience members. Some speakers avoid violating this cultural norm by wearing sunglasses during their performances.

The relevance of the four *norms* that ought to guide public speakers according to the Anglo cultural ideal is not evident in non-Anglo contexts. Rather than seeking authenticity by attending to norms of richness, originality, adaptation, and intimacy, many non-Anglo speakers seem to be guided by norms of eloquence, tradition, authority, and community. As mentioned, registers employed in non-Anglo speech communities tend to be marked by particular, formal ways of speaking, including archaic dialects, ritualized metaphors, poetry, and singing. Speakers in many non-Anglo contexts are expected to follow particular scripts rather than engage in creative speech. For instance, Toraja ritual speech in Sulawesi is marked by memorized metaphors, allusions, and preexisting formulae that are "unintelligible" to some members of the audience (Donzelli, 2007); these "elite" and "well-spoken" forms constitute eloquent speech and traditional ways of speaking that have been passed down.

Speaking appropriately in many non-Anglo contexts establishes social authority for the speaker and often works to maintain social hierarchies within speech communities. While Anglo textbooks place a large emphasis on the role of the speaker as an individual, many non-Anglo ways of speaking in public emphasize community over individuality by placing value on speakers' abilities to speak on behalf of the group as a whole (see Carbaugh, 2005), or to represent subgroups within the larger community (Liberman, 1990). Ways of speaking in these contexts helps sustain group identities, as in Pintupi Australian Aboriginal communities where village council discourse is not meant to move toward decision-making, but rather works to build shared identity, compassion for others, and sympathy for kin (Myers, 1986).

Finally, speech *genres* discussed in ethnographies of non-Anglo speech communities are often of ritual or political nature, and are subject to transformation under the influence of globalization. Ritual genres are employed in ceremonial events like weddings, feasts, namings, sermons, and funeral laments. Political genres are used in governance practices like village meetings, electoral campaigns, and public disputes. These genres are often patterned according to act sequences that constitute performances in ways that deviate from the Anglo-American cultural ideal. For instance, Malagasy political oratory is marked by winding argument structures that are meant to mirror a speaker's internal thought processes and lead audience members to come to conclusions on their own (Jackson, 2009). In communities where "modern" Western politics and global market influences have begun to shape "traditional" ways of speaking, genres that conform to Anglo-American ideal of "communication" and "conversation" are also beginning to appear. These genres sometimes offer competing models that lead to a devaluation of traditional forms. The influence of Western-style economic and education projects in Malagasy,

for example, has led to a value for "absolute transparency" and logical directness over and against meandering traditional genres (Jackson, 2009). In other non-Anglo contexts, on the other hand, "modern" genres are often combined with more "traditional" genres, resulting in hybrid forms that mix new and old generic forms and norms of speaking (e.g., Blommaert, 1990).

The above representation of public speaking practices should help our readers understand and appreciate similarities, differences, and connections between Anglo and non-Anglo styles of public speaking. Although we highlight cultural variability we do not call into question the increasing influence of the Anglo cultural ideal around the world and the fact that in some cases non-Anglo speakers are willing, or are forced, to use Anglo patterns instead of locally recognized ones in speech situations dominated by Anglo norms of public speaking (Miller, 2002). Our discussion is meant simply to highlight the broad range of cultural patterns evident in public speaking practices. We do so to show that the cultural ideal of public speaking immanent in Sproule's (2012) discussion is only one style among many alternate styles of public expression in a global context. Comparing the dominant ideal of public speaking evident in U.S. classrooms to other cultural contexts can be useful for teaching, learning, and doing public speaking. In the next section we consider specific avenues of conducting and using research to further internationalize the Anglo-American public speaking curriculum.

Internationalizing the public speaking curriculum: future directions

Our discussion of the Anglo-American cultural ideal of public speaking and our review of public speaking practices in other contexts highlight the potential of communication research to contribute to the internationalization of the public speaking curriculum. Further research can lead to a fuller understanding of the cultural foundations of Anglo-American public speaking as a resource for participating in the public life of cultural communities. One particular line of inquiry worth pursuing stems from the observation that the Anglo cultural ideal of public speaking may be closer to the cultural ideal of "communication" than the discourse analyst and cultural critic Deborah Cameron (2000) would lead us to believe. Anglo "communication culture," Cameron wrote, is

> a culture that is particularly self-conscious and reflexive about communication, and that generates large quantities of metadiscourse about it. For the members of such cultures it is axiomatically "good to talk"—but at the same time it is natural to make judgments about which kinds of talk are good and which are less good. People aspire, or think they ought to aspire, to communicate "better"; and they are highly receptive to expert advice. (viii)

Communication training manuals, Cameron argued, are robust expressions of "communication culture." These manuals are designed to teach individuals to communicate better in interpersonal interaction, and thus become better persons. People living in contemporary Anglo societies are motivated to read and write such manuals within the framework of what Cameron discussed as the reflexive project of late modernity, a permanent quest for authentic, integrated, and presentable selves. According to this logic, the self becomes an enterprise, and communication the means of entrepreneurial success. Cameron contrasted communication training with public speaking training on the

grounds that while the former teaches "interpersonal skills" the latter teaches "rhetorical skills." Hence, public speaking training prepares students to deliver speeches to large crowds or to engage in debate, but not to "communicate" with others.

The stark contrast Cameron drew between "communication" and "public speaking" does not hold up in the light of our discussion so far. Contemporary public speaking textbooks' vision of speaking in public is closely modeled on the "vision of communication as authentic dialogue, as the mutual communion of souls" (Katriel, 2004, p. 1). Anglo public speaking textbooks tell a similar cultural story to Katriel and Philipsen (1981) who were the first to explicate the dominant U.S. American cultural ideal of interpersonal "communication." "Communication," according to U.S. speakers, is a form of interpersonal interaction marked by closeness, supportiveness, and flexibility. It also involves partners committed to "working" on and improving their "core selves" in the process of thoughtful and intimate "communication." In ideal acts of public speaking, this unique, core self is revealed to the audience as the speaker relaxes and "shed[s] unnecessary impediments to the experience" (p. 305). Although Cameron is certainly correct in suggesting that public speaking usually involves less interaction between speaker and audience than interpersonal communication, we claim that the Anglo-American curriculum, including the textbooks Sproule (2012) surveyed, is rooted in the cultural logic of "communication." Empirical research may further substantiate this claim and investigate how this type of cultural orientation shapes the teaching, learning, and practice of public speaking in non-Anglo cultural contexts.

Another, complementary line of inquiry could pursue answers to the question: If public speaking is indeed a cultural ideal, with deep intellectual roots descending into the Anglo-American cultural terrain, how do we explain the global influence of that ideal? We surmise that research designed to answer this question will include an investigation of the currents of globalization that have carried the Anglo public speaking curriculum beyond the borders of the United States. Such an investigation would help us understand why, for example, Kenyan university students believe that studying Western-style public speaking may be a somewhat quaint exercise but "in an age of globalization it is necessary" (Miller, 2002, p. 176).

The cultural reflections presented here can be directly useful for educators interested in internationalizing the public speaking curriculum. In particular, the cultural ideal of public speaking can be used as a starting point for critical reflection on divergent cultural patterns of communication in the public speaking classroom. Educators may pursue questions such as what range of speech events count as "public," and what types of expression count as "speaking," for members of particular cultural groups. We recognize that the basic public speaking course curriculum leaves little room for such culturally oriented critical reflection, and that the advanced public speaking course may serve as a better forum for the exploration of relevant cultural patterns.

Godley (2012) identified three types of relevant, and potentially divergent, communication patterns: the teacher's patterns, shaped by his or her out-of-school and peer community; students' patterns, shaped by their out-of-school and peer communities; and the educational institution's patterns, imbued with normative status sustained by institutional authority. To this list we add the textbook's patterns that, at least in the case of textbooks designed to teach particular forms of communication or communication skills, capture, and lend authority to, cultural ideals relevant to the material at hand. As we could see

in the first section of this article, in the Blackfeet case the textbook patterns were aligned with the instructor's but not the students' familiar patterns. Following Godley, we suggest that instructors faced with cultural diversity in their classrooms explore one or more of four possible avenues of internationalization. First, if they find it advantageous to do so, instructors can turn their classrooms into hybrid discourse communities where Anglo-American ideals and practices of public speaking are combined with the ideals and practices of the non-Anglo communities of instructors and/or students. Second, instructors can use the cultural ideal to make the communication norms of the Anglo public speaking curriculum explicit for non-Anglo students. Kramsch (2006) recommends that instructors share with students their own struggles and culture shocks regarding norms of speaking, and thereby model the acquisition of those speaking norms. Third, students can utilize the cultural ideal in activities designed to raise their awareness about culturally variable communication norms relevant to speaking in public and learning to speak in public. This exercise can benefit not only non-Anglo but also Anglo students as they reflect on public speaking practices in the Anglo speech community that do not, or only partially, conform to the cultural ideal. Finally, fourth, the cultural ideal can be used in the professional development of instructors teaching culturally diverse public speaking classes.

Additionally, the cultural ideal can inspire a different type of critical reflection that centers on the questions: Can the Anglo-American ideal of public speaking, an ideal shaped by the emergence of various forms of participatory democracy in the United States, benefit non-Anglo speech communities? Can this ideal serve as a cultural resource for public participation in communities of non-Anglo speakers? For example, can it become a resource for accomplishing *parrhesia*, the often hazardous act of speaking back to power in moments when human rights are compromised (see Hauser, 2012)? We believe in the value of carefully investigating whether cultural reflection in and beyond the classroom might pave the way toward the promotion of public speaking as an emancipatory practice used to articulate, advance, and defend human rights and responsibilities across the globe.

Acknowledgments

ORCID

David Boromisza-Habashi 🔘 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3235-5813

References

Albert, E. (1964). "Rhetoric," "logic," and "poetics" in Burundi: Culture patterning of speech behavior. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), 35–54.

Bauman, R. (1975). Verbal art as performance. *American Anthropologist*, 77(2), 290–311.

Bilmes, J. (1975). Rules and rhetoric: Negotiating social order in a Thai village. *Journal of Anthropology Research*, 31, 44–57.

Bitzer, L.F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1, 1–14.

Blé, R. (2011). Communication and collective memory: The plight of oral traditions in Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal of African Media Studies*, 3, 89–108. doi:10.1386/jams.3.1.89_1

Bloch, M. (1974). Symbols, song, dance and features of articulation: Is religion an extreme form of traditional authority? *European Journal of Sociology*, 15, 54–81.

Blommaert, J. (1990). Modern African political style: Strategies and genre in Swahili political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 1, 115–131. doi:10.1177/0957926590001002001

Boromisza-Habashi, D., & Martínez-Guillem, S. (2012). Comparing language and social interaction. In F. Esser & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of comparative communication research* (pp. 134–147). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brenneis, D. (1978). The matter of talk: Political performances in Bhatgaon. *Language in Society*, 7, 159–170.

Briggs, C.L. (1992). "Since I am a woman, I will chastise my relatives:" Gender, reported speech, and the (re)production of social relations in Warao ritual wailing. *American Ethnologist*, 19, 337–361.

Cameron, D. (2000). *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture*. London, UK: Sage.

Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Comaroff, J.L. (1974). Chiefship in a South African homeland: A case study of the Tshidi chiefdom of Bophuthatswana. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 1(1), 36–51.

Comaroff, J.L., & Comaroff, J. (1997). Postcolonial politics and discourses of democracy in Southern Africa: An anthropological reflection on African political modernities. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 53(2), 123–46.

Donzelli, A. (2007). Words on the lips and meanings in the stomach: Ideologies of unintelligibility and theories of metaphor in Toraja ritual speech. *Text & Talk—An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 27, 533–557. doi:10.1515/TEXT.2007.023

Duranti, A. (1983). Samoan speechmaking across social events: One genre in and out of a fono. *Language in Society*, 12, 1–22.

Duranti, A. (1988). Intention, language, and social action in a Samoan political event. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 13–33.

Engelke, M. (2004). Text and performance in an African church: The book, "live and direct". *American Ethnologist*, 31, 76–91.

Fisher, L.E. (1976). Dropping remarks and the Barbadian audience. *American Ethnologist*, 3, 227–242.

Fowler, L. (1978). Wind River Reservation political process: An analysis of the symbols of consensus. *American Ethnologist*, 5, 748–769. doi:10.1525/ae.1978.5.4.02a00070

Godley, A.J. (2012). Intercultural discourse and communication in education. In C.B. Paulston, S.F. Kiesling, & E.S. Rangel (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication* (pp. 449–481). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Graham, L. (1993). A public sphere in Amazonia? The depersonalized collaborative construction of discourse in Xavante. *American Ethnologist*, 20, 717–741.

Hauser, G.A. (2012). *Prisoners of conscience: Moral vernaculars of political agency*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jackson, J.L. (2009). To tell it directly or not: Coding transparency and corruption in Malagasy political oratory. *Language in Society*, 38, 47–69.

Katriel, T. (2004). *Dialogic moments: From soul talks to talk radio in Israeli culture*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communications Monographs*, 48, 301–317. doi:10.1080/03637758109376064

Keating, E. (2000). Moments of hierarchy: Constructing social stratification by means of language, food, space, and the body in Pohnpei, Micronesia. *American Anthropologist*, 102, 303–320.

Knight, J. (1999). Internationalization of higher education. In I. Knight (Ed.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13–28). Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Kochman, T. (Ed.). (1972). *Rappin' and stylin' out: Communication in urban Black America*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kramsch, C. (2006). Language, thought, and culture. In A. Davis & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 235–261). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B.B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Lempert, M. (2006). Disciplinary theatrics: Public reprimand and the textual performance of affect at Sera Monastery, India. *Language & Communication*, 26, 15–33. doi:10.1016/j.langcom.2005.09.001

Liberman, K. (1990). Intercultural communication in Central Australia. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact* (pp. 177–183). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Miller, A.N. (2002). An exploration of Kenyan public speaking patterns with implications for the American introductory public speaking course. *Communication Education*, 51, 168–182. doi:10.1080/03634520216505

Milner, G.B. (1961). The Samoan vocabulary of respect. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 91(2), 296–317. doi:10.2307/2844417

Murphy, W.P. (1990). Creating the appearance of consensus in Mende political discourse. *American Anthropologist*, 92, 24–41.

Myers, F.R. (1986). Reflections on a meeting: Structure, language, and the polity in a small-scale society. *American Ethnologist*, 13, 430–447.

Philips, S.U. (2010). Semantic and interactional indirectness in Tongan lexical honorification. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 317–336.

Pratt, S., & Wieder, D.L. (1993). The case of *saying a few words* and *talking for another* among the Osage people: 'Public speaking' as an object of ethnography". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 353–408. doi:10.1207/s15327973rlsi2604_1

Robbins, J. (2001). Ritual communication and linguistic ideology: A reading and partial reformulation of Rappaport's theory of ritual. *Current Anthropology*, 42(5), 591–614. doi:10.1086/322557

Schieffelin, B.B. (1995). Creating evidence: Making sense of written words in Bosavi. Creating evidence: Making sense of written words in Bosavi. *Pragmatics*, 5(2), 225–243.

Schrauwers, A. (2000). Three weddings and a performance: Marriage, households, and development in the highlands of Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. *American Ethnologist*, 27, 855–876.

Singer, M. (1955). The cultural patterns of Indian civilization: A preliminary report of a methodological field study. *Far Eastern Quarterly*, 15(1), 23–26.

Sproule, J.M. (2012). Inventing public speaking: Rhetoric and the speech book, 1730–1930. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 15, 563–608.

Yankah, K. (1991). Oratory in Akan society. *Discourse & Society*, 2, 47–64. doi:10.1177/0957926591002001003