Rhetoric and Communication Studies Faculty
Publications

Rhetoric and Communication Studies

2015

The Rhetorical Roots of Communication Centers

Linda B. Hobgood
University of Richmond, lhobgood@richmond.edu

Afterword

The Rhetorical Roots
of Communication Centers

Linda Bartlett Hobgood

INTRODUCTION: "GREETINGS FROM THE WORLD'S
FIRST SPEECH CENTER!"

The handwritten message on a postcard sent by an alumnus of our speech consultant staff aroused curiosity and drew my attention to the photograph on the reverse side, featuring the majestic Parthenon against a clear Athens sky. The former student's allusion to our center's ancestry prompted an appreciative smile.[1]

In a review of Michael Sproule's award-winning essay on the eclectic and complex origins of modern public speaking text, James Farrell praises Sproule's study of the twentieth-century revival of the field of speech communication. Sproule's contribution to an understanding of "the institutional, organizational, and reputational struggles of the discipline's founders," argues Farrell, should inspire context-based "research focused on the historical developments of rhetorical pedagogy."[2]

This chapter traces the rich rhetorical roots of the creation of the modern communication center, following the lead of Sproule and Farrell as well as the postcard author. Placing this contemporary learning enhancement in the context of that abundant history reminds us that the precepts associated with the discipline of rhetoric and shared in communication center consultations are as classic as they are classical, and the questions deliberated by scholars and practitioners of this ancient art are timeless. The postcard's photo of the venerated Athenian ruins offers both a symbolic and explicit link between the legacy of the *paideia* of antiquity and the efforts of communication center directors and their staffs.

Competing philosophies and pedagogical trends in undergraduate teaching, and exigencies sparked by events and resources that contributed to the emergence of communication centers provide a microcosm of the history of

the discipline of communication since its institutional rebirth in 1914. Across twenty-five centuries and rhetoric's changing stature among the liberal arts, through cultures oral and written, visual and mediated, scholars and pundits have argued the value and implications of "the calculated word."[3] Communication centers have taken a stand in that debate, asserting unequivocally both rhetoric's value as epistemology (see the discussion in the introduction to this volume) and the intellectual worth of preparation and practice in pursuit of excellence in public expression. Brought into existence by varying incentives—institutional accreditation requirements, calls for attention to communication competency, pressure brought by competing school offerings or burgeoning enrollments—nearly all communication centers have resisted becoming sites simply engaged in skills training, handling multimedia aids, or managing anxiety. They generally serve all undergraduates as well as additional audiences. Clients often include administrators, faculty, and staff, fortifying the position that speaking effectively is a lifelong endeavor. Centers may exist where rhetoric departments do not but they tend to fare even better at institutions with thriving communication studies curricula.

Recent arrivals to this twentieth-century movement in higher education, communication centers echo the stance taken by advocates of the older writing centers movement that peer mentoring and personal attention reinforce activity in the classroom. Communication centers have, for example, explored the pedagogical and persuasive dimensions of emerging technologies, sometimes before they are prevalent in other instructional uses.[4] Transformations in philosophies of education and communication have played out in communication center operations: from speech as product to speaking as process, from communication as delivery to rhetoric as invitation, from knowledge as given to knowledge as socially constructed, from top-down lectures to the unique potential of collaborative learning, the concept of *improving speeches* has been recalibrated to emphasize *educating speakers*.

Increases in their numbers and uses have rendered communication centers subject to the challenges faced by their professional forebears. Writing centers have sought to dispel criticism based on broadly differing conceptions of what constitutes quality, perceptions of remediation, and controversy over appropriate standards and means of measuring student work; those associated with communication centers have discovered a similar need to guard against being misunderstood and therefore undervalued while facing down a different assortment of entangling alliances. At times this has meant allowing that although they share certain aims, the work of writing centers and communication centers is hardly identical. On this point, communication centers enact some of the same tugs and pulls that led professors of oral rhetoric to finally separate from English departments and establish, or revive, a discipline of their own. While members of the two departments and both kinds of centers

might concede that what unites matters more than what divides, the differences make a difference to the fundamental teaching of each. Less obvious but often mistakenly assumed distinctions mentioned in earlier chapters, such as the difference between writing for the eye and speaking for the ear, deserve attention. The historical roots of such misunderstandings help to explain why the work of these respective types of centers needs to be regularly clarified. Audiences for the written and for the spoken have their own sets of expectations and requirements, so the pedagogy proves complementary but not synonymous.

For both speech and writing initiatives, language is essential; it is also currency for mischaracterization. This is hardly new to scholars of rhetoric inhabiting the embodied realm of the ancient and medieval "lady" who in the Enlightenment became the "harlot" of the liberal arts. In a struggle that echoes Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Augustine, Erasmus, Campbell, Whately, Blair, and many others, rhetoricians have sought to define the discipline in the midst of being defined. Communication centers and their writing counterparts have tried to explain what it is they do as they resist being labeled pejoratively by metaphors of their own creation. Such terms as *lab* with its connotations of scientific experimentation, are simultaneously liberating and constraining, keeping staff and supporters ever mindful of the power of words and of audience for this learning enhancement as signified and signifier.[5] Needing to regularly explain what centers involve and what goes on in their studios has its advantages and is, after all, what practitioners of the art do—at times well and at other times less so. The need forces continuous critical self-evaluation to keep center staffs faithful to claims and seeking to improve what they represent and hope to achieve. It even helps to have to remind people in new and compelling ways that speaking effectively is *not* a genetic predisposition, communicating and talking are *not* the same, delivery is *not* the only aspect that matters, one practice session does *not* a speaker make, visuals alone are *not* enough, and silence *can* and *does* persuade. These are just a few of the reminders issued over and over again, hopefully improved with each utterance but also frustrating to those who feel perpetually misunderstood.

How to treat the art and help others take care of ideas is the story of rhetorical pedagogy over the past hundred years. The constituent parts that came together and formed the confluence we call communication centers parallel the multifaceted field that centers reflect in their work.

PREPARATION AND PRACTICE

Toward excellence in speaking, ancient instruction consisted of a series of imbricated exercises known as the *progymnasmata*. The design of each

lesson honed talents and techniques in the artistic control of Greek and Latin grammar and rhetoric, which were considered requisite for the eventual participant in public argument or representative government. Clark's *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* described in detail the sequence and difficulty of each step in the series, to help mid-twentieth-century rhetorical pedagogists understand "how much ancient educational methods in teaching the arts of language influenced Renaissance literary theory and practice."[6]

Areas of emphasis in the *progymnasmata* included discovering and evaluating arguments, marshalling material, and arranging prose lucidly. The exercises incorporated daily drills in *inculcation* of "accepted precepts of good writing and good speaking," *imitation* of the "methods of successful writers and speakers," and *repetition* through "writing and declaiming themes."[7] Clark recalls the ancients' view that "some natural aptitude was necessary for success in oratory," but also noted that "no one denied that nurture of some sort was needed to make the most of nature's gifts." A good portion of nurturing oratorical success included practice in the forms of trial-and-error attempts and imitative exercises.

Like the founding members of the contemporary discipline originally known as speech, Clark believed teaching and scholarship should hew to classical tenets. In part because they were dedicated to an understanding of classical theory as a starting point for any theory of rhetoric, the founders no doubt understood that proceeding in this manner lent integrity and a measure of pedagogical ethos in the academy. Even those who emphasized the interactive nature of public speeches over a focus on speeches as texts still knew that classical concepts from the renowned teachers and philosophers of Athens and Rome enriched discussions of theory and created a more welcome reception and clearer understanding among their colleagues.[8] By detailing how the great orators of antiquity had themselves been trained, Clark called for a reconsideration of modern methods and succeeded in placing the still young but growing speech discipline on a solid footing. Clark's case for thorough preparation and practice, so profoundly demonstrated by the ancients, went unchallenged but not embraced.

In the second half of the twentieth century, breadth took priority over depth; the scope of speech departments' concerns broadened considerably. The more traditional qualitative, humanities curriculum was joined by a growing list of data-based, analytic, and quantitative "social science" coursework. The artistic proofs and classical canons of rhetoric seemed less accommodating to the influences of relativism, behavioral studies, and the modern, let alone postmodern, post-structural, or deconstructionist pedagogies. Certain quarters interpreted the teaching of speech as a career-oriented, pragmatic distraction to a quality liberal arts program that ought to develop

the creative mind and the intellect. Even institutions that countenanced the value of practice often believed that the undergraduate experience allowed too little time to devote to rehearsal in the presence of an audience. Still others echoed the persistent mistrust for "the calculated word." Tarver summarizes the centuries-old presumption that any worthwhile speech should be impromptu, noting that speakers "find it necessary to keep the fact of 'verbal premeditation' out of sight, and when audiences notice such preparation it is considered courteous of them to ignore it."[9] Tarver thus addresses a classic disagreement initiated by Plato,

> who in most of his writings on rhetoric regarded eloquence as a mere "knack" or skill. Plato argued the study of rhetoric lacked the substance of his discipline, philosophy. To Plato the calculated word was either an illusion in the hands of the naïve or a sham in the service of the dishonest.
>
> Centuries of refutation against that position, starting with Aristotle, have attempted to establish that the substance of rhetoric consists in providing a systematic, calculating, teachable method of discovering arguments, structuring ideas, employing language and delivering messages.

Tarver offers a rebuttal from genus, specifically rhetoric as art, by defining it as "a body of technique that helps you create a message designed to affect an audience." Yet he acknowledges the force of popular opinion: "Aristotle's position has failed to overcome the recurring criticism that Plato began."[10]

Tarver suggests two reasons why Plato's criticism too often prevails: the tendency of intellectuals to disdain the practical or useful, and the discipline's reputation for attracting "far too many charlatans, reprobates, scoundrels and hacks." This denigration should concern communication centers at least as much as it does academic departments of communication, if not more so. Communication centers tend to operate on the "front lines" of the academy, serving more than majors and minors in the discipline. Their staff, including the student consultants, may become the symbol of the field for those who visit the center but never enroll in a rhetoric or communication class. Communication centers thus must balance the intellectual and practical attributes of the process.

Despite Plato's dismissal of eloquence as a "mere 'knack,'" research demonstrates that preparation time and practice correlate to higher grades on classroom speeches.[11] Student experiences bear out the results of these studies when a class speaking assignment included one visit or more to the communication center. Student consultants base their feedback, including asking questions and presenting alternatives, on relevant theory. Student clients can then consider their advice intellectually *and* practically as they strategize according to their own goals and particular audiences. Attaining balance between

theoretical constructions and practical application influences every aspect of the work of communication centers that expect to thrive.

PEER MENTORING

Tarver's second reason for the denigration of rhetoric presents a more significant challenge to communication centers: that it attracts glib talkers who lack substance.[12] That perception may be exacerbated by the notion of inviting undergraduates to represent the field of rhetoric through the work of the speech center.

Initially, enlisting students as tutors was likely an invention of necessity. As Winslow Homer depicted in his painting of the one-room *Country School*, younger pupils received assistance from both peers and older classmates under the watchful eye of the teacher. This portrayal of frontier learning in nineteenth-century America showed that the scarcity of instructors called for a pedagogical method to meet the needs of many children, at varying ages and stages of learning. While such peer-assisted education generated numerous benefits from the nineteenth century to present day, Tarver points to the risks entailed by the perception of peers as less qualified instructors.

A concentration on mathematics and hard sciences in higher education in the aftermath of World War II and the Cold War era prompted observations in Britain and America that attention to reading and writing in the classroom suffered from neglect. The "Why Can't Johnny Read?" movement was followed by "Why Can't Johnny Write?" inquiries that led to initiatives in writing across the curriculum and writing centers at the college level. Both were designed to address perceived deficiencies and to underscore the standard that composition competency applied to students majoring in *all* disciplines, not English alone. As these programs grew they became multifaceted; many writing center and across-the-curriculum directors became advocates for a departure from traditional composition methods, as earlier chapters note. The precursor to programs in speaking across the curriculum, writing programs also began experimenting with an innovation known as peer learning.

Mentoring as pedagogical method gained momentum given the success of efforts to enlist the assistance of students at the graduate level to prepare undergraduates. Across all undergraduate disciplines, the lecture model that had been popularized in late-nineteenth-century German academies made it possible to teach hundreds simultaneously. Electronic voice amplification only enhanced the popularity of the lecture format. These unwieldy teacher-student ratios created less concern for some disciplines than others. Cornell University psychology professor James Maas is among those credited in the

mid-twentieth century with pioneering the idea of dividing his large lecture class—which could reach enrollments of 1600—into weekly small group sessions.[13] There, students could discuss topics raised in the course lectures, guided by undergraduate students who had studied with and been trained by the course professor.

In *Peer Teaching: To Teach Is to Learn Twice,* Neil Whitman asserted that peer mentoring aided both students and instructors by reinforcing areas of knowledge—especially for the tutors. Whitman noted that the concept of peer teaching had ancient roots in "Aristotle's *archons* or student leaders," and he advocated a return to the practice.[14] Maas and those who quickly followed were among the "college educators [who] had recognized that peer influence among students is a powerful, but wasted resource."[15]

In a penetrating critique of culture in decline as evidenced by deteriorating public expression, Tom Shachtman commended the efforts of such schools as Radford University where speaking well not only had been deemed a priority of the undergraduate experience but was also actively supported. Working with undergraduate counterparts enrolled in speaking-intensive courses, graduate students helped with preparation and practice sessions, which were video-recorded and replayed with critique. Other schools, Central College in Iowa and Alverno College in Michigan, had been experimenting with videotaped practice sessions. With the development of video portfolios at Alverno, individual collections of speeches presented by each student during the undergraduate years enabled students and faculty to track progress and target areas in need of improvement. At DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana, Professor Robert Weiss pursued an initiative designating select courses across the curriculum as speaking-intensive. Students in these "S" courses received individual assistance at DePauw's Speaking Center, under the capable direction of Ann Weiss and the students she personally trained. The success of this initiative was shared in a "Speech Across the Curriculum" newsletter that became known as "SAC." Distinguished by its bright golden paper, the newsletter chronicled initiatives nationwide, connecting its recipients to innovations, methods, and colleagues pursuing similar aims.

A significant breakthrough for training in speech in higher education came in the form of federal funding awarded to Sherwyn Morreale and her team of researchers for the purpose of studying communication competence at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. Her team developed a sixteen-point assessment instrument of "The Competent Speaker" that could be applied across disciplines and institutions to assess communication competence. Morreale and her colleagues subsequently shared research into its efficacy and developed an amended version of the measure.

Feasible and well-intended as a means of satisfying increased demand for coursework in public speaking and communication subjects generally, graduate teaching assistance and peer tutoring did not guarantee excellence in teaching. To combat the perception of rhetoric as a lowly skill, the thorough training and education counters mightily.

PEDAGOGY AND MOTIVATING INFLUENCES

Early in the twentieth century, scholars of pedagogy began refocusing their attention, moving from inquiries about how teachers teach to investigating how learners learn. Such efforts resulted in such initiatives as John Dewey's scientific method and declarations of knowledge as situated, and proponents of William James's philosophy of pragmatism. Mortimer Adler's increasingly renowned "Paideia Group" team of scholars provided one response, publishing results of research investigating how learning optimally occurs according to the type of learning.[16] Their famous three-column diagram identified the criteria by which subject knowledge was best acquired: first, "didactic instruction, lectures and responses textbook and other aids"; second, "coaching, exercises, and supervised practice"; and third, "maieutic or Socratic questioning and active participation." The art of rhetoric tellingly appeared in all three columns.

Adler contended that contemporary education relied almost exclusively on the traditional didactic approach to teaching—telling, demonstrating, and lecturing. By means of Socratic discussion and most especially knowledgeable coaching, however, Adler argued that the joy of learning might be revived. Students could then truly gain linguistic competence as well as competence in communication, in the handling of symbolic devices, and in critical thinking. Skills training and practice, which Adler referred to as "the backbone of learning," were best developed by means of coaching, involving "a different teacher-pupil relationship and a different pupil-teacher ratio than does instruction by telling and by the use of textbooks."[17] Effective communication centers concentrate on tutoring clients by first training the tutors in how not to lecture but to coach—thoroughly and well. Coaching, in addition to seminars and didacticism, would benefit all students.

A member of the Paideia Group, Ernest Boyer subsequently published seminal studies of higher education that endorsed participatory pedagogy to engage students in their own learning.[18] Later treatises emphasizing student accountability for learning and collaborative learning in preparation for the civic sphere across the curriculum and peer mentoring initiatives gained impressive endorsement.[19] These studies emphasized moral citizenship through service learning, community-based learning and philanthropy, which

required attention to the "public" character of public speaking as taught and exercised before public audiences.

As Antczak has noted, however, there is a long-standing antagonism inherent in democracy and intellectual enterprise. He recalls Plato's two sorts of rhetoric, one that indulged and the other that ennobled, and the dangers Plato envisioned in appealing to democratic audiences. As he observes, "even Plato admitted possibilities for a rhetoric that could be more interestingly 'successful,' a rhetoric that would improve the audience's thought had to involve their character—and in some sense the character of the speaker himself."[20] With special attention to the civic discourse of three acclaimed speakers of nineteenth-century America—Ralph Waldo Emerson, Mark Twain, and William James, because they "genuinely tried to reconstitute their audiences intellectually"—Antczak believes that

> their rhetorical success consisted precisely in making it welcome, making it—in all its rigor and discipline—popular. I choose the word *popularization* for this level of rhetorical approach cognizant of its supposedly pejorative connotations; indeed I am in a way invoking them. For what distinguished this rhetoric was its popular success: it *worked* for the democratic audience, worked in two senses. It managed to respect the integrity of the intellectual discipline, but it also found rhetorical resources for presenting the discipline in a way that engaged the thought and character of the audience.[21]

Antczak's observation also responds, at least in part, to the challenges of teaching rhetoric identified by Tarver. Even without years of research and study toward advanced degrees, the well-trained student consultants at a communication center convey earnestness for rhetorical precepts that function as a kind of healthful contagion. Relying on the advantage that being a peer presents, the student consultants "popularize" the acquisition of knowledge in the pursuit of excellence in public expression. So long as student consultants do not pretend to expertise they have not attained, they can "create a message designed to affect an audience" of peers who as clients are likely to become intrigued by a glimpse of the art and persuaded to learn more. The students are not scholars in the most accomplished sense, but they "respect the intellectual integrity of the discipline" and have "found resources for presenting the discipline" that appear to *work*.

In the final decade of the twentieth century, regional accrediting agencies explicitly added requirements for oral proficiency and/or communication competence to their assessments of member institutions to compel institutions to attend to oral communication. Typically they read that member institutions "shall demonstrate proficiency in writing and composition, in math and computational skills and in speaking and communication."[22] More

recently, perhaps because their earlier standards had indeed evoked change, their approach has become more covert—asking schools to outline and argue for objectives appropriate for their type of mission on the assumption that few schools would omit oral communication competency. In pushing schools to recognize the importance of oral communication, the accrediting agencies have echoed the rich rhetorical roots on which the communication centers movement is based.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

More than any other characteristic inherited by communication centers in sharing the lessons of rhetoric (or speech, or communication studies, as the discipline has been variously known) is the satisfaction derived from preparing students to serve as mentors. As we share those lessons with new and continuing tutors and mentors, we pass along learning in the process of training, apprehending the deeper significance of precepts through communal discussion, and coming once more to a realization of their value to human interaction, to the civic sphere, to the quality of thought, to needed argument and the discoveries that emerge from such. What happens to the students who are training to become peer tutors, the "midwives" as Plato referred to those who convey the rhetorical art, brings pedagogy to life in ways that reinvigorate and inspire. Student consultants, especially as undergraduates, relish the chance to try to be the coaches they somehow missed playing for or the encouragers they sought to become by listening to the uncertain student colleague and saying knowledgeably "you can do this!" To observe each day the practice and effects of mentoring in the form of communication consulting is to marvel that the earnest enthusiasm of student consultants never dims. And the consulting experience extends as fond recollection beyond the undergraduate experience.

Thirteen years following his graduation, in his keynote address to the tenth annual gathering of communication center directors and student consultants, my former student—the one who sent the postcard—recalled appreciatively Cicero's example:

> In *De Oratore*, the character Antonius says that when he walks in the sun, although he doesn't do so to get a tan, for that would be ridiculous, nevertheless it changes his complexion.
>
> We don't study speech to change our lives, but our lives are changed nonetheless. Like me, not many students come to college for a Speech Center, but the lucky ones, who end up in a Speech Center, as consultant or client, are rarely sorry that they did. And you can be proud, that, however briefly, be it one hour or four years, you let them stand in the sun.[23]

NOTES

1. In an address to the National Association of Communication Centers 2011 annual gathering, the author of the postcard corrected his handwritten message to cite Sicily, because of the famous dispute between Corax and Tisias, as the authentic birthplace of rhetoric. He offered another amendment to his claim:

> That postcard was wrong in another way: although rhetoric flowered there, Athens was not a Speech Center as we know it. The students had to make do with sitting at the feet of the masters like Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle. But in a Speech Center, students not only learn to speak, but also use that knowledge to train others. It is an arrangement that enriches the lives of both clients and consultants. At least it enriched mine. And to think I almost missed it.

See Michael P. Geiser. "I Say Enthymeme Till They Scream," *Vital Speeches of the Day* 77, no. 6 (June 2011): 216–19.

2. James Farrell, "Dignity for the Freaks," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17 no.1, (Spring 2014), 152. See J. Michael Sproule, "Inventing Public Speaking: Rhetoric and the Speech Book, 1730–1930," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 16 (2013): 563–608.

3. Among the finest discussions of this ongoing debate may appear in the text of Professor Jerry Tarver's keynote speech to the students and faculty of Hampden-Sydney College, March 24, 2003, "The Calculated Word: The Prejudice Against It," reprinted in *Vital Speeches of the Day* 69, no. 13 (April, 2003): 409–14.

4. Communication center directors closely followed methods of recording, playback, and preservation of sessions, as well as the technology used for presentations. From PowerPoint to Prezi, iMovie to NetFiles, directors and tutors must be aware of both the technical requirements and the rhetorical implications of various mediated forms.

5. See Peter Carino, "What Do We Talk About When We Talk About Our Metaphors: A Cultural Critique of Clinic, Lab, and Center," in *Landmark Essays on Writing Centers*, ed. Christina Murphy and Joe Law (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1995): 37–46.

6. Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957): vii.

7. Ibid., viii–ix.

8. See, for example, William Keith, "On the Origins of Speech as a Discipline: James A. Winans and Public Speaking as Practical Democracy," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (July 2008): 239–58.

9. Tarver, "The Calculated Word," 410. Tarver is first obliged to correct a common mistake, the use of the term extemporaneous in claims that "for centuries there has existed the presumption that a speech should be extemporaneous." Tarver notes: "By 'extemporaneous,' he means something close to what public speaking textbooks would call 'impromptu.'"

10. Ibid. In the 2003 Hampden-Sydney speech, Tarver continues: "along with its sisters logic and grammar, rhetoric was part of the trivium, the very foundation of

liberal education. Where do you find colleges today who seriously charge their facul-
ties with the task of teaching students 'to speak,' 'to write,' and 'to think' as disciplines
standing first among the liberal arts?"

11. Judy C. Pearson, Jeffrey T. Child, and David H. Kahl, "Preparation Meeting
Opportunity: How Do College Students Prepare for Public Speeches?" *Communica-
tion Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (August 2006): 351–66. See also Joe Ayres, "Speech Prepa-
ration Processes and Speech Apprehension," *Communication Education* 45 (1995):
228–35; and Kent E. Menzel and Lori J. Carrell, "The Relationship Between
Preparation and Performance in Public Speaking," *Communication Education* 43
(January 1994): 17–26.

12. James Farrell's "Dignity for the Freaks" essay quotes giants in the discipline's
founding, James Winans, James O'Neill, and Everett Lee Hunt among them, despair-
ing that less than qualified instructors of elocution and oratory of the late-nineteenth
century had contributed to low regard for the revived discipline by others in the
academy as lacking theory and being unscholarly in its practices. That low regard
dogged the revitalized curriculum of speech. Thirty years after the discipline's found-
ing members, Richard Weaver began with similar discouragement in his landmark
essay based on his 1963 "Language is Sermonic" lecture. See Patricia Bizzell and
Bruce Herzberg, eds., *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to
the Present*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001), 1351. See also Richard L.
Johannsen, Rennard Strickland, and Ralph T. Eubanks, eds., *Language is Sermonic:
Richard M. Weaver on the Nature of Rhetoric* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univer-
sity Press, 1970). Weaver's essays "To Write the Truth," 187–98, and "Language is
Sermonic," 201–25, bear significantly on the relationship between rhetoric and teach-
ing, or what Weaver prefers to call "defining."

13. Neal A. Whitman, *Peer Teaching: To Teach Is to Learn Twice* (Washington,
DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1988), 48–49.

14. Whitman, 3–4.

15. Theodore Newcomb, "Student Peer Group Influence," in *The New American
College*, ed. Nevitt Sanford (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962) as cited by
Whitman, p. 3.

16. Mortimer J. Adler, *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*
(New York: Collier Books, 1982).

17. Ibid., 26–27.

18. Ernest L. Boyer, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*
(New York: Harper & Row, 1987); and Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered:
Priorities for the Professoriate* (Menlo Park, CA. The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

19. Anne Colby, Thomas Ehrlich, Elizabeth Beaumont, and Jason Stephens,
*Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and
Civic Responsibility*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
(San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003), 266.

20. Frederick J. Antczak, *Thought and Character: The Rhetoric of Democratic
Education* (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1985), 8.

21. Ibid., 9.

22. For an earlier version of the requirements, see "Special Section: The SACS Oral Communication Requirement," *Carolinas Speech Communication Annual* 7 (1991): 4.

23. Geiser, 219.