

PATTERSON, ANDREA R., Ph.D. Revisioning the Basic Communication Course in the Context of Globalization. (2011)
Directed by Dr. H. Svi Shapiro. 219 pp.

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine how to revision the basic undergraduate communication course in the context of globalization. This research establishes the significance of the spiral of silence theory in relation to the communication process and the college classroom. This dissertation also examines the culture of silence and discusses how critical pedagogy can help transform our society, students, and classrooms. The methodology in this research utilizes interpretive inquiry to examine 35 basic communication course syllabi from community colleges and universities across the country. The study reveals a performance and skills-based approach to this course does not adequately prepare students to become competent and engaged communicators in a global society. The conclusion introduces and explains how the model of intercultural praxis can be utilized for curriculum development to revise the basic communication course from a global perspective.

REVISIONING THE BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE
IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION

by

Andrea R. Patterson

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2011

Approved by

Committee Chair

© 2011 Andrea R. Patterson

To the memory of my grandmother,

Pearl White Patterson

For her love and spirit

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____
H. Svi Shapiro

Committee Members _____
Peter M. Kellett

Ulrich C. Reitzug

Omar Swartz

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It has been an honor to work with my committee chair Dr. H. Svi Shapiro, who motivated me to write about my passion. As dissertation chair and advisor, his critique and wisdom was priceless. A special heartfelt thank you goes to my doctoral committee. I thank Dr. Peter Kellett for his guidance during my master's and doctoral programs. I especially want to thank Dr. Omar Swartz for his commitment and belief in me as a communication scholar when I did not believe in myself. His generosity of time and feedback during this dissertation process has been immeasurable. And to Dr. Rick Reitzug—whose desire for democracy, equality, and support for all the students in our graduate program is steadfast and unwavering—your wisdom and presence is greatly appreciated. All the professors on my committee encouraged me to never give up on my vision of transformative communication education.

I am indebted to the Communication Studies department at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for providing me during my bachelor and master's degree programs with a solid foundation and a desire to explore the field of communication. I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in the Department of English and Foreign Languages at Winston Salem State University. I also want to thank my other university colleagues for their encouragement and support.

I especially want to thank my colleagues who read drafts of my dissertation, providing me with insightful feedback and encouragement.

I want to give thanks to my friends, family, and neighbors who helped me maintain my focus and faith when I wavered. A special thanks is extended to Freda Patterson, my mother, the person whose unconditional love and heartfelt support has sustained me. I want to also thank family members Sam Patterson and Charles Speight for their quiet wisdom and strength.

I am grateful to the Department of Educational Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for giving me the opportunity to teach as a graduate assistant and awarding me the Luther Winborne Self Fellowship through the UNCG graduate school. I especially want to thank my students. It is your voices, stories, and successes that continue to inspire me and confirm my belief in the transformative power of voices.

PREFACE

When we dare to speak in liberatory voice, we threaten even those who my initially claim to want our words. In the act of overcoming our fears of speech, of being seen as threatening, in the process of learning to speak as subjects, we participate in the global struggle to end domination. When we end our silence, when we speak in a liberated voice, our words connect us with anyone, anywhere who lives in silence. (hooks, 1994, p. 18)

The words express the culture of silence and oppression that many marginalized students experience in public schools, college and universities. I have experienced this culture of silence as an African American female student. I have also experienced a culture of freedom and critical engagement in classrooms where spaces of freedom were created and I was encouraged to speak in a liberated voice. The power of voice in a transformative classroom has inspired, encouraged, and challenged me. The forced silence of my voice in an oppressive educational environment has also weakened my spirit and damaged my belief in my abilities. “Those with a history of being misunderstood, ridiculed or punished by uttering the truth of their lives, silence may be more compelling than speech even when given the opportunity to speak” (Jenefsky, 1996, p. 345).

These affirming and negative acts I experienced and witnessed as a student are some of the reasons I chose to be a communication educator. I have a passion for helping students experience the transformative power of their voices in the classroom. I concur with Peter McLaren’s (2003) statement that a “critical and affirming pedagogy has to be constructed around the stories that people tell, the ways in which students and teacher’s

author meaning, and the possibilities that underlie the experiences that shape their voices” (p. 245).

Greene (1978) contends that the challenge is to engage as many young people as possible in the thought of freedom—in the mode that moved Septima Clark, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Martin Luther King Jr. It is when we develop a consciousness of thinking and develop the ability to critically interrogate the world around us that are we able to change it. A transformative education in the communication classroom is also accomplished when students can critically interrogate ideas, understand the relationship between freedom and speaking in the public sphere, and use their voices to advocate and defend social justice and peace in a global world. It is important that each new semester and with each class I strive to create a classroom where students can become empowered, liberated, and develop a critical consciousness and moral agency.

I am not the only one who wants to use the power of voice to make change in the world. There have been several of my students who have learned to use their personal narratives and voice to help change the world. My experience with a former student while teaching at a community college in Illinois exemplifies the value of an education that is transformative. A white female student enrolled in one of my introductory public speaking courses, she was initially very unmotivated and uninterested in the course. During the class, I challenged them to develop a persuasive speech that advocates for a social cause or issue that speaks to them. My assignment resonated with this student. She developed a speech advocating for the Illinois Gender Violence Act, a bill, which if enacted, would compensate victims of domestic violence. As a victim of domestic

violence, her personal testimony was powerful. At the beginning of the course, she was reluctant to speak in front of the class, but by the end of the semester, she volunteered to compete in the college speech competition. She won first place. One of the judges, a newspaper feature journalist, wrote a story about the pending legislation and my student. She was subsequently invited to speak at a battered women's shelter in town. While enrolled in this communication course, she learned how to use the power of her voice as an instrument of personal change and social transformation. Her story reminds me of why I teach. Her desire to learn transcended her initial hesitation regarding my race. She told me after the class she was reluctant to participate because she had never had an African American teacher. However, she was glad for the experience and in fact I was now her "new favorite teacher."

Her voice and the voices of other students who are marginalized and oppressed remind me of McLaren's (2003) belief that a "pedagogy of liberation must create a new place for narrative voices to emerge" (p. 260). It is her story and the experience of my other classroom students that moves me to write this dissertation.

The purpose of this study is to revision the basic communication course that constitutes a part of the general education and speech communication curriculum at the majority of community colleges and universities in the United States. More specifically, my purpose is to redefine the basic communication course by developing a pedagogy in which students become more effective communicators in a global society. I offer ten points that serve as a conceptual scheme to revision the basic communication course in the context of globalization. It is imperative for students to become culturally competent

communicators, practice fearless and bold speech, advocate for peace, and be critically engaged citizens in a democracy. I argue this vision can be realized by communication educators examining how we address issues of culture, silence our students with communicative behaviors and messages, and use strategic rhetoric of whiteness in the classroom.

My goal in this dissertation is to offer a conceptual scheme to revision the basic communication course in a way that can help with the evolution of this course in a world that is coping with the myriad faces of globalization. I offer a deconstruction of the basic course in ways that reflect and draw upon the critical paradigm and interpretive inquiry that demonstrate that “indeed, even though the world globalizes and our spaces and distances collapse, the introductory public speaking course remains fundamentally Western and European in orientation” (Chawla & Rodriguez, 2011, p. 77).

As we explore the basic communication course in the context of globalization, a dialogic and cultural approach offers strategies and tools for understanding, interrogating, and investigating the historical and political power structures within our society. I argue that increasing students’ global awareness and understanding will lead to a sense of critical consciousness and the development of a sense of moral agency and social justice.

This dissertation is symbolic of my personal transformation as a communication educator. I am reminded of bell hooks’s (1994) words that “professors who embrace the challenge of self-actualization will be better able to create pedagogical practices that engage students, providing them with ways of knowing that enhance their capacity to live fully and deeply” (p. 22).

Dissertation Outline

In Chapter I, I will critique the literature of globalization and describe how globalization has adversely influenced our society. I will discuss how the current wave of globalization is deeply rooted in European colonization and Western imperialism and that not all of the world's inhabitants benefit from this current wave of globalization. This chapter will also discuss the need for an examination of the basic speech course in the context of globalization. It addresses the need for a global perspective in the basic communication course.

The focus of Chapter II is to establish the significance of the spiral of silence theory in relation to the communication process and the college classroom. This chapter will investigate the relationship between silence, power, and the classroom. I will examine types of silencing methods, the negative impact of communicative behaviors and messages, and students' perception of silencing techniques in the classroom. I will also examine how muted groups can impose silence in the classroom and its impact on their scholastics.

In Chapter III, I will continue the examination on the culture of silence and discuss how critical pedagogy can help change our society, students, and classrooms. I will discuss the concept of critical pedagogy, its importance and relationship to transforming the culture of silence, review the literature of critical pedagogy and its application to a variety of academic fields—including the Communication discipline.

Chapter IV speaks to the failure of the basic communication course to address the issues of engaged communication in the context of globalization, as discussed in Chapter

I. This section provides a deconstruction of the general instruction and framework of the basic communication courses taught in most colleges and universities. It will examine how the traditional and skills-based approach to introductory level communications courses taught in many colleges and universities does not adequately prepare our students to become competent and engaged communicators in a global society.

Finally, Chapter V will offers strategies and suggestions to realize this vision of transformative communication education. It will examine how we can make changes within the profession and get communication faculty to rethink the curriculum in the basic communication course. These key points are useful in redescribing the basic communication course from a global perspective.

Svi Shapiro (2010) urges educators to participate in the task of “Tikkun Olam,” which means “the repairing of the world” (p. 185). He further adds that

to educate in this spirit requires encouraging students to see their lives in terms of the contribution each might make to healing the brokenness of our world, and to see how they may act to redress intolerance, indignity, and injustice—all the things that fragment and split apart our world. (p. 185)

Shapiro’s words encourage me as I envision a new curriculum for the basic undergraduate communication course, and direct and guide my path: “We must teach the young that while it is important to have a realistic appreciation of the limits of what may be possible, the only justifiable purpose of education in our time is that of bettering the world we have all been given. All the rest is mere commentary” (Shapiro, 2006, p. 204).

Shapiro gave me and other students this precious gift in his effort to practice Tikkun Olam in his classroom. It allowed me to experience what transformative education is, while being a student and a communication educator. It is now my turn to give this precious gift to another group of educators. This study is my attempt to practice the art of Tikkun Olam and to aid in the “healing and repairing of the world” as a communication educator.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	xvii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Globalization.....	6
Environmental Globalization.....	7
Social/Cultural Globalization.....	8
Military Globalization.....	9
Political Globalization	10
Economic Globalization.....	11
Power, Resistance, and Defiance	13
Power, Disneyization of Higher Education, and Globalization.....	16
The Need for a Global Perspective in the Basic Communication Course	22
Theoretical Framework—Critical Pedagogy	28
Examining My Theoretical and Methodological Assumptions	29
Critical Paradigm	33
Interpretative Inquiry	35
Dissertation Outline	38
Conclusion	39
II. SPIRAL OF SILENCE	41
The Spiral of Silence Theory	43
Spiral of Silence Theory in Communication Studies.....	48
The Spiral of Silence and Muted Groups.....	50
The Spiral of Silence and Education.....	52
Silence, Power, and Classroom Management.....	54
Methods of Silencing in the Classroom.....	58
Naming.....	58
Not naming.....	58
Smoothing over.....	59
Impact on Silenced Students.....	60
Students Impressions of Being Silenced.....	60
Muted Groups and Classroom Silence.....	61
The Significance of Silencing and Education.....	64

Conclusion	66
III. CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND TRANSFORMING THE CULTURE OF SILENCE.....	69
Critical Pedagogy.....	70
Critical Pedagogy and Imagining Freedom	71
Transforming Education	73
Critical Pedagogy to Praxis.....	73
Critical Pedagogy and Dialogue	76
The Applicability of Critical Pedagogy in Other Disciplines.....	82
English Composition and the Basic Communication Course.....	85
Critical Pedagogy and the Communication Discipline.....	87
Cultural Critique and Critical Social Issues.....	88
Conclusion	93
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE.....	96
Introduction.....	96
Speech Pedagogy Shifts Emphasis	97
Old Model of Speech Pedagogy	98
The New Model of Speech Pedagogy.....	99
Addressing the Current State of the Basic Communication Course	108
Role of the Researcher	109
Interpretative Analysis: The Syllabus as a Heuristic Tool.....	110
Participants and Instructional Context	112
Data Analysis	112
Culture.....	114
Anthropologic definition of culture	116
Cultural Studies definition: Culture as a site of contested meaning.....	118
Globalization definition of culture.....	123
Multiple and competing views of culture	125
Culture and the educational practice.....	126
Culture acknowledged—but not operationalized.....	128
Strategic Rhetoric.....	130
Dialogue as epistemology	133
Silence in the Basic Course.....	136
Democracy and Education	143

Citizenship education.....	149
Origins of parrhesia.....	149
Realizing citizenship education	151
Citizenship is a learned habit and practice.....	151
Civic engagement in the basic course.....	152
Engagement in citizenship education.....	153
Conclusion	156
V. REVISIONING THE BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE.....	161
Ten Points for a Redesigned Basic Communication Course	163
Recommendation #1: Include One Additional General Education Outcome in the Course	163
Recommendation#2: Develop a Critical Multicultural Education Perspective.....	165
Recommendation#3: Incorporate Critical Communication Pedagogy.....	167
Ten commitments of a critical communication pedagogy	168
Recommendation#4: Intercultural Praxis and Curriculum Development	170
Inquiry.....	171
Framing.....	171
Positioning	172
Dialogue.....	172
Reflection.....	172
Action.....	173
Recommendation #5: Prepare for Attempts to Remove the Oral Communication Course from the College’s General Education Curriculum.....	173
Recommendation #6: Teach Students the Art of Parrhesia	176
Recommendation #7: Teach Students <i>B’tsuelm Elohim</i> and to Communicate for Peace.....	178
Recommendation #8: Learn Lessons from English Colleagues.....	181
Recommendation #9: Strive for a Dialogic Form of Education in a Global Society.....	183
Recommendation#10: Critical Citizenship Education.....	184
Service learning and citizenship education.....	185
Conclusion	186
REFERENCES	188

APPENDIX A. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....213

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Educational Institutions Participating in Study.....	113

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The ideology of the free market is the reigning viewpoint of our time. Yet its control has not entirely thwarted growing moral repugnance to the kind of world it is spawning, with all of its grotesque social inequities, environmental irresponsibility, shallow manufactured meanings, and callous indifference to others' lives. Far from being an 'end to history,' it is hard to doubt that we are on the edge of major resistance to the distorted priorities and fixations of the global marketplace. Increasingly, questions are raised regarding the erosion of democratic accountability in the 'new world order' in which corporations wield so much power. (Shapiro, 2006, p. 201)

People have traveled around the globe exchanging cultural goods, practices, and ideas, and consequently been involved in intercultural communication for centuries.

Globalization, now with a new cosmopolitan name, is not new. In fact, for nearly 3,000 years, Europeans have traversed sand and seas to buy from and trade with the Far East for silk and satin. Many journalists, businesspeople, politicians, and scholars view globalism as inevitable—and willingly accept or embrace it.

In recent years, significant developments in governance, economics, politics, and educational institutions have combined with changes in communication technology and transportation to exponentially increase the interaction and relations of humans from different religious, ethnic, social, national, and international cultures around the world (Sorrells, 2008).

Yahoo's cofounder Jerry Yang, a proponent of globalization, contends that the democratization of information has had a profound impact on our society's consumers are much more efficient—they can find information, products, and services, faster [through search engines] than through traditional means. They are better informed about issues related to work, health, leisure, etc. Small towns are no longer disadvantaged relative to those with better access to information. And people have the ability to be better connected to things that interest them, to quickly and easily become experts in given subjects and to connect with others who share their interest (as cited in Friedman, 2007, p. 180).

Many people around the world, however, regard globalization with suspicion, apprehension, and trepidation. They worry about its impact on humanity. Some people view it as a threat to jobs, existence, and culture. It increasingly leads to inequality between countries, wealth for a few, and mounting poverty for many.

Sorrells and Nakagawa (2008) argue that the current wave of globalization, deeply rooted in European colonization and Western imperialism, have thrust people from different countries and cultures together into shared physical and virtual homes, workplaces, schools, and communities in unprecedented ways. Unfortunately, not all people benefit from globalization. The inequities in our society are evident in how communication technology is allocated in our world. Sorrells (2008) reports that while technological advances enable about 15% of the earth's inhabitants to connect to the world on wireless laptops at home or in our favorite coffee spots, more than 50% of the earth's population lives below the poverty line. These people start their day without the basic necessities of decent food, clean water, and safe shelter.

Sorrells (2008) notes that for many Americans, our imperialistic assumptions from colonial and Eurocentric society continue to influence how we understand and interpret our world and other cultures. She argues that:

these hidden assumptions mask historically inequitable relations of power that contribute to the maintenance of social, political, and economic injustice. A critical approach to culture, sense-making, processes, and everyday lived practices challenges these ethnocentric attitudes and nurtures the ability to understand cultures from within the cultures' frame of reference rather than interpreting and negatively evaluating other cultures from one's own cultural position. (p. 21)

This lack of cultural understanding, ethnocentrism, negative evaluation, and distrust was very apparent in the United States following the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center. The looming fear of terrorist attacks and imminent danger led to the creation of a culture of silence among the American people and their elected officials. The nation's leaders were very reluctant to publicly question the military decisions of President George W. Bush regarding Iraq. The tone and tenor of the country was one of fear and suspicion from Wall Street to Main Street. A dangerous silence was prevalent among our elected officials and citizens. Former Vice President Al Gore recalls the chilling effect this unsettling atmosphere had on our democracy. Gore (2007) wrote of this in his book "The Assault on Reason" when he recalled the events leading up to the invasion of Iraq:

the longest-serving senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia stood on the senate floor and said: "This chamber is, for the most part silent—ominously, dreadfully, silent. There is no debate, no discussion, no attempt to lay out for the nation the

pros and cons of this particular war. There is nothing. We stand passively mute in the United State Senate.” (p. 1)

Gore asks the reader, “Why was the senate silent? What has gone wrong in our country?” Gore contends that Byrd asked a version of a question that millions of Americans have been asking: “Why does reason, logic, and truth seem to play a sharply diminished role in the way America now makes important decisions?” (p. 1).

It is imperative that educators investigate our contribution to the “strangeness of public discourse” and examine how our educational system and curriculum contributed to this lack of rhetorical discourse and critical engagement among our elected leaders and citizens. Our students inevitably become our future lawmakers, senators, congressional representatives, police officers, engineers, nurses, teachers, and citizens in our society.

Some educators argue that the market and social forces of globalization have had an adverse impact on schools and colleges. Smith (2002) points out that many schools have become locations for branding and sites for policy-market solutions and corporate expansion. Smith further says, “The impact and pervasiveness of globalization also means that there should be a fundamental focus for education and learning—but there are powerful currents running against honest work in this area” (p. 2).

What alarms me and makes me passionate about this dissertation is that we, as communication educators, do not always acknowledge the role we play in endangering our democracy and our planet. It is imperative that we reevaluate the undergraduate basic communication course that fulfills the general education requirement for many colleges and universities through the lens of globalization. I argue that communication can be

employed to assist students in learning how to use cultural critique to question the existing power structures within our society that disempower and disenfranchise certain groups. Communication educators can help realize this vision by developing a pedagogy that encourages an appreciation and understanding of diverse and marginalized voices in our world and focus on how to use rhetoric to foster social justice, advocacy, and peace.

In this dissertation I examine the need to reevaluate and redescribe the basic communication course in the context of globalization. I argue that the standard method for teaching the basic communication course is limited in its approach to helping students communicate competently in a global society. Students must be able to critically examine the world around them and use communication to co-create a more peaceful and equitable world for all the earth's inhabitants.

The purpose of this study is to examine how to revision the basic undergraduate communication course. More specifically, my purpose is to redefine the basic communication course by developing a pedagogy in which students become more effective communicators in a global society. I argue that this vision can be realized through encouraging educators to engage in *Intercultural Praxis*, a process of “critical, reflective, engaged thinking and action” that enables them to help their students understand other cultures, find their voice, engage in critical dialogue, and become empowered to use communication to advocate for social justice. In this study I adapt Kathryn Sorrells's model that explains how intercultural praxis can be used as a curriculum development framework to teach the basic undergraduate communication course. Drawing from my examination of 35 basic communication course syllabi from

community colleges and universities, I highlight how the basic communication-course classroom can be a place of social change and provide a powerful environment for creating dialogue, emancipation, and empowerment. The next section of this chapter provides a closer examination of globalization: various definitions, descriptions, and its adverse impact on education.

Globalization

The faces of globalization continuously change. In Bangalore, Taiwan, or Hong Kong it may look like economic prosperity and opportunity, while in tribalistic countries such as Kuwait or Baghdad, it may look like capitalistic greed and opportunism. The face of globalization in Afghanistan or Iraq may look like occupation and “democratic” terrorism.

President Barack Obama, in his June 2009 speech in Cairo, Egypt, said the purpose of his visit was to forge a new relationship between the United States and Muslims worldwide. The American president addressed several key international issues, including economic development, opportunity, and globalization.

I know that for many, the face of globalization is contradictory. The Internet and television can bring knowledge and information, but also offensive sexuality and mindless violence. Trade can bring new wealth and opportunities, but also huge disruptions and changing communities. In all nations—including my own—this change can bring fear. Fear that because of modernity we will lose control over our economic choices, our politics, and most importantly our identities—those things we must cherish about our communities, our families, our traditions, and our faith. (AmericaNews.Com, 2009)

The competing and in some cases contradictory descriptions of globalization suggest it has deeply embedded historical and philosophical definitions arising from strikingly different views. Nye defines globalization as “the increase in worldwide networks of interdependence” (Nye, 2009, para. 3), whereas Thomas Palley, from the Economics for Democratic and Open Societies, defines globalization as the general concept incorporating the diffusion of ideas and cultures (as cited in Perkovich, 2006).

Although globalization is often viewed as the world economy and markets, it has, in fact, several dimensions—each impacting our lives. And while the term globalization became common in the 1990s, the various factors that constitute globalization have been in existence for thousands of years. In this section I examine the various dimensions of globalization: environmental, social/cultural, military, political, and economic.

Environmental Globalization

Environmental and climatological change, as well as the spread of disease, are the oldest forms of globalization. Examples include the first smallpox epidemic, which was recorded in Egypt in 1350 BCE.¹ The disease spread to China in AD 49 and then appeared in Europe after 700. The Americas were hit in 1520 and finally Australia in 1789. During the fourteenth century, the Black Death, also known as the bubonic plague, originated in Asia, but spread to Europe, killing a fourth to a third of its population (Nye, 2009).

¹ BCE stands for “Before the Common Era.” It is synonymous with BC (Before Christ) in that it refers to the year 1 before the Western calendar; however, it is a dating system from a Christian worldview. By evoking this phrase, I recognize that the historical significance of the Christian cosmology in impacting our dating system without reifying, thereby giving implied support to this type of cosmology.

Diseases spread from Europe to the Americas in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, decimating nearly 95% of the indigenous population. In recent years, one of the most devastating forms of environmental globalization in the past 30 years has been the AIDS epidemic. Since 1980, HIV/AIDS has killed nearly 20 million people and infected nearly 40 million people around the globe. The World's AIDS Day Organization predicts those statistics will nearly double by 2010 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009).

Global climate change is also another form of environmental globalization. Scientists from at least 100 countries have reported increasing evidence of rising global temperatures due to human behaviors and decisions. In the twenty-first century, the average global temperature is expected to rise between 2.5° F and 10° F (Nye, 2009). The devastating results include torrential storms, hurricanes, landslides, droughts, and floods, among other natural disasters.

Social/Cultural Globalization

The second type of globalization is social/cultural globalization, which includes the dissemination, infusion, or exchange of ideas, images, artifacts, customs, cultures, and people. As people travel across the world, whether for work, military service, tourism, family, economic survival, or opportunity, they take their culture with them. People make efforts to recreate a sense of the familiar or home. In addition, people returning home from their travels take artifacts or reminders of the places they have visited. While the complicated notion of culture cannot be reduced to an item packed in a suitcase, the

mementos we take or leave are important in representing our cultures, the languages we speak, the beliefs we hold, and the practices we carry out (Sorrells, 2008).

One specific example of social/cultural globalization is migration. During the nineteenth century, more than 80 million people crossed continents, oceans, and borders to new homes. In America, at the start of the twenty-first century, more than 11.5% of the population, or 32 million people residing in the United States, were born in another country (Nye, 2009). Consequently, the lives of people from various cultural backgrounds—ethnic/racial culture, religious cultures, class cultures, and national and regional cultures—are increasingly intertwined and interconnected (Sorrells, 2008).

Military Globalization

A third type of globalization is military, “consisting of networks of interdependence in which force, or the threat of force, is deployed” (Nye, 2009, para. 9). An example of military globalization is the “balance of terror” between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Military globalization terrorized Americans again during the tragic events of September 11, 2001. Geographical differences became even more pronounced when the U. S. government learned that the training camps Al Qaeda used for the attacks on New York and Washington were in the mountains of Afghanistan (Nye, 2002).

The U.S.-led invasion of Iraq is viewed by some skeptics as the hegemonic, militaristic side of globalization. Observers argue that military globalization can enable one country to use brute force against another country. U. S. military experts, however, contend that if a country allows itself to be a part of globalization, the better for America.

Tragically, Third World countries, rich with natural resources—including huge oil reserves, diamond mines, exotic fur animals, etc.—are particularly vulnerable.

Political Globalization

Sorrells (2008) argues there is also a growing trend toward political globalization. She cites an increased interconnectedness between nation-state politics, the development of bodies of global governance, and a global development of resistance in response to more and more inequities in political power. Following the toppling of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the fall of the former Soviet Union in 1990, there has been a growing assumption that capitalism and democracy together will bring about global prosperity and peace. Many observers suggest there has been a global trend toward democracy since World War II, and this move of “democratization” has been highly contested in different parts of the world (Fukuyama, 1992; Leys, 2001; Nsouli, 2008; Nye, 2009; Palley, 2006).

Barber (1992), however, argues there is another conflict—between tribalism and globalism—and there are two other possible political futures and neither advances democracy. In his article and book, both known as *Jihad vs. McWorld*, Barber characterizes tribalism and cultural terrorism as *Jihad* to describe approximately a hundred faiths that oppose “every kind of interdependence, every kind of artificial social cooperation and civic mutuality” (p. 53). In contrast, Barber characterizes capitalistic, corporate seduction with fast food, computers, technology, popular music, and television as *McWorld*.

These two clashes of culture and ideology create dialectic in which “The planet is falling precipitately apart AND coming reluctantly together at the very same moment”

(Barber, 1992, p. 53). He goes further to refer to this cultural clash “as the two axial principles of our age—tribalism (Jihad) and globalism (McWorld)—clash at every point except one: they both are threatening to democracy” (Barber, 1992, p. 53).

Some observers and skeptics of globalization conclude that the political agendas associated with “democratization” are closely related to the free-trade agreements of the World Trade Organization (WTO), World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Economic Globalization

And finally there is economic globalization: many economists, businesspeople, and journalists view it and the world economy as one (Nye, 2002). Friedman views it as the international system that replaced the one established by the Cold War. Friedman sees it at the integration of capital, technology, and information across national borders, and in a manner that is creating a single global market, or in essence a global village (Friedman, 2007).

In the next section I distinguish between “globalization” and “neo-liberalization” and examine three views on “neo-corporate” globalization. I conclude with a discussion of some of the criticisms and fears of “neo-corporation” from financial leaders to critical educators. Unfortunately, some financial leaders fear the playing field is not equal for the poorest countries. World Bank President Robert Zoellick, during a September 2009 meeting of the G20 in Pittsburgh, urged these leaders not to forget about the poorest countries as they make plans for global recovery, a New York Times article reported (Reuters, 2009).

And according to *The New York Times* (Reuters, 2009), a World Bank report, released in September 2009, indicates that more than 40 poor countries, including Kenya, Nigeria, Zambia, Moldova, and Cambodia, are still trying to recover from an economic downturn and are grappling with how to finance fundamental needs such as education and healthcare, despite the fact that there are signs of recovery in some of the more “industrialized and emerging” countries. “We’re entering a danger zone, not of freefall, but of complacency,” Zoellick said. “While some are moving towards the exits, many are still being left behind (in) the burning house” (Zoellick, as cited in Reuters, 2009).

But for some observers and skeptics, the ideology of globalization is deceptive and destructive. It represents imperialism, global capitalization, and inequity of power. This face of globalization also appears shrouded in economic greed, corporate gain, capitalist consumerism, and Western imperialism. The World Bank, in a report released in September 2009, states that poorer countries face a \$11.6 billion shortfall in key areas such as education, health, social protection, and infrastructure. The private-capital flows to the poorest countries are projected to plummet. This represents a decrease from \$21 billion in 2008 and \$30 billion in 2007 (World Bank, 2009).

The hard currency of capitalism, Western imperialism and colonization, wears the mask of globalization. It glitters and shimmers under the neon lights of consumerism.. In the next section, I discuss the global protest and resistance to globalization. My discussion closes with how the variations of globalization are interconnected.

Protest, Resistance, and Defiance

The debates over globalization are passionate and fierce. The resistance to globalization and its adverse effects are erupting around the globe. Protestors are angry about the inequities between rich and impoverished countries, the policies of the IMF and the World Bank, the lack of intervention from the United Nations, and the increasing militarization and domination of foreign countries in the name of “democracy” and “freedom.” In recent decades, anti-globalization protests have disrupted meetings around the world, including those of the IMF, World Bank, and WTO, among others. Demonstrations were held during the annual meetings of the IMF and the World Bank in 1988 in West Berlin, then a part of German Democratic Republic. Many view the protest as a foreshadowing of the anti-globalization movement.

Since then, protesters against globalization have marched faithfully during WTO, IMF, and World Bank meetings. The first mass anti-capitalist, anti-globalization protest took place on June 18, 1999, when thousands of militant protesters took to the streets in more than 40 cities around the world, including London and Eugene, Oregon, in a mass movement known as The Global Carnival against Capital, or J18.

The second major anti-globalization protest, N30, occurred some five months later on November 30, 1999, in Seattle. With an estimated 50,000 to 100,000 protesters in attendance, the massive gathering turned violent, more than 600 people were arrested, and opening ceremonies of the WTO meeting were cancelled. The protest, however, continued throughout the four-day meeting.

In September 2000, nine thousand protesters in Prague voiced their fury and frustration over economic globalization. The Seattle Times (“Prague protests,” 2000) reported at least 69 people were injured and 44 hospitalized. News reports called Prague a “smoky battle zone” (para. 4), filled with the chants of demonstrators yelling “London, Seattle, continue the battle” (para. 3) as they converged on Prague’s Wenceslas Square, where peace protesters had gathered more than 10 years earlier to speak out against communism.

A later protest against the WTO in Seattle in 2001 resulted in more than 1,300 trade organizations and social movements from more than 80 countries. Since 2001, additional protests held in Quebec, Geneva, and other places have become symbols of the festering and growing feelings of frustration and resentment about the unfair gap between rich and poor and the power inequities that exemplify globalization (Sorrells, 2008).

Meetings, rallies, and protests are being held around the world to develop programs, strategies, and oppositional forces to combat the various forms of globalization—environmental, military, economic, and others. The patchwork quilt of forces has formed a loosely woven blanket of resistance. “This decentralized, multi-headed swarm of a movement has succeeded in educating and radicalizing a generation of activists around the world” (Klein, 2002, p. 2).

The energy of activism was evident in Porto Alegre, Brazil, during the 2003 World Social Forum (WSF) where as many as 40,000 activists gathered to discuss the conference’s two main themes: global justice and life after capitalism. More than 15,000

attendees packed a local soccer stadium to hear the keynote address of Scholar Noam Chomsky. Harsh criticism of the United States dominated the conference.

In his speech “Confronting the Empire,” Chomsky (2003) said, “the most powerful state in history has proclaimed, loud and clear, that it intends to rule the world by force, the dimension in which it reigns supreme” (p. 1). During the course of the speech, Chomsky told the audience that many of them already knew how to combat the empire—through their “own lives and work. The way to ‘confront the empire’ is to create a different world, one that is not based on violence and subjugation, hate and fear. That is why we are here, and the WSF offers hopes that these are not idle dreams” (p. 2).

The local TV station reported that the fans cheered like “it was a rock concert” during Chomsky’s speech. Organizers said the heavy turnout during the conferences proved the anti-corporate globalization movement had regained some of the energy lost after September 11. On the final day of the conference, thousands of protestors marched and danced through the city carnival style, waving red flags and banners. This demonstration and the World Economic Forum in New York occurred simultaneously.

Although economists, scholars, world leaders, businesspeople, and others distinguish between the variations in globalization, critical theorist Peter McLaren contends that they are all interconnected.

What needs to be understood by the broader public in general, and by educators in particular, is that within the context of the globalization of capital, military, trade, and energy interests are so intertwined that they are often virtually indistinguishable from each other. (McLaren, 2003, p. 16)

The dimensions of globalization—economic, social, political, and environmental—have shaped conditions in our society. Activists are not alone in their opposition to globalization. Many critical educators are observing how the destructive forces of globalization are adversely impacting our educational system.

In the following section I examine the influences of globalization, power, consumerism, and its adverse impact on youth and higher education. I conclude with the question: How do we envision a new globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education in the undergraduate basic communication classroom?

Power, Disneyization of Higher Education, and Globalization

Essential to our understanding of the insidious grip of globalization on higher education is the consideration of the notions of power, consumerism, and the incorporation of higher education. Swartz, Campbell, and Pestana (2009) contend that:

Humans are beings of rich and vibrant potential. Through a self-conscious awareness and cultivation of power, people can identify, create, and seize opportunities to develop and realize its potential. At a societal level, power shapes, norms, transforms society, and reproduces the social, economic, and potential arrangements of the status quo. (Swartz et al., 2009, p. 109)

The term power can also be viewed as something that is imposed on or held over someone that other people do not have. In this sense power can be seen as coercion, control, or manipulation through language, thought, or action. In some cases, people are rendered helpless, defenseless, and unable to respond or escape physically or mentally.

In his writings, philosopher Michel Foucault challenges us to critically examine the relationship between power and the way it is understood, how it develops, its

intricacy, how it functions, and how it is formed (Swartz et al., 2009). Foucault notes that power is not something that is only hierarchical in nature, uniform or top down only in its approach; it is something that is pervasive, insidious, that grows, and manifests itself within society. Power not only rests on the elements of repression and ideology, but goes a step further:

Power is taken above all carrying the force of a prohibition. Now I believe that this is a wholly negative, narrow, skeleton conception of power, one which has been curiously widespread. If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? (Foucault, 1984, p. 61)

Foucault further argues that power can be understood in terms of discipline and the function of rule, norms, and regulations, reified through policies and procedures. It is through this normalization of power that it becomes a process, it is enforced, and the language becomes codified.

What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only outweigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression. (Foucault, 1984, p. 61)

An example is Barber's (1992) concept of *McWorld*, where he uses it to describe the capitalistic spell that mesmerizes consumers from fast food like McDonald's to MTV, fast computers, fast music, and glamorous makeup and clothes. Ritz also observed this

concept of “McDonaldization,” as cited in Swartz et al. (2009). This view also extends to mainstream America where “McMansions” are becoming more prevalent in the suburbs—a sign of progress and affluence. The McDonald’s mentality has become embedded in American culture. Bryman (1999) compares this idea to the policies, procedures, operations, and marketing of the Disney theme parks, whose practices are being adopted across America as well as around the globe. Disney’s amusement parks consist of fantasy worlds that transport the visitor to a different global location, and even to outer space.

The bigger-than-life theme is also evident in oversized malls such as the Mall of America in Bloomington, Minnesota. The casinos and hotels of Las Vegas, also often built around a theme, transport the visitor into another world. Hotel visitors can travel around the globe: Caesar’s Palace becomes Italy; New York, New York becomes a cosmopolitan city; Circus Circus becomes the ultimate children’s three-ring circus event. Visitors are constantly surrounded by merchandise, food courts, casinos, and amusement. Bryman, who refers to this as the “dedifferentiation of consumption,” argues that the “general trend of consumption associated with different institutional spheres become interlocked with each other and increasingly difficult to distinguish” (Bryman, 1999, p. 33). This is apparent in Las Vegas, where, he argues, guests may enter the hotel through a lobby filled with merchandise and a casino. Like Disney World, Las Vegas hotels offer themes and settings that carry the consumer into a make-believe universe. Bryman (1999) goes further to say that “In this process, conventional distinctions between casinos, hotels, restaurants, shopping, and theme parks collapse” (p. 36).

The interlocking elements of globalization have become weapons in what Giroux (2003b) characterizes as “the war against youth.” He argues that neoliberal capitalism has created weapons to destroy our youth: inadequate healthcare, food, education, unemployment, corporate downsizing, corporate deregulation, among other basic necessities.

Unfortunately for many youth, culture has become a product to purchase as a consumer and they are fluent in the language of capitalism. Lawrence Grossberg, as cited in Giroux (2003b), contends “the current rejection of childhood as the core of our social identity is, at the same time, a rejection of the future as an affective investment” (p. 145).

The economic and market forces of capitalism and consumerism have changed the language we use in how we present ourselves and how we assess the behavior of others (Fassett & Warren, 2007; Giroux, 2003b; Smith, 2002; Sorrells, 2008; Swartz, 2006; Swartz et al., 2009). Stars such as Michael Jordan, Beyonce, Martha Stewart, and Queen Latifah market themselves as a brand. We are conditioned through advertising and the media to consume the products being sold for self-gratification and to be accepted by society. Giroux (2003b) argues that “No longer defined as a form of self-development, individuality is reduced to the endless pursuit of mass-mediated interests and pleasures” (p. 154).

Giroux (2003) cites one such example of individuals marketing themselves as a brand. The case centers around two high school graduates who successfully received corporate sponsorships to finance their college education. The students, Chris Barrett and Luke McCabe, developed the website ChrisandLuke.com and said they “would put

corporate logos on their clothes, wear a company's sunglasses, use their golf clubs, eat their pizza, drink their soda, listen to their music, or drive their cars" (Giroux, 2003a, p. 154).

The students eventually received sponsorship from First USA, a prestigious bank that issues credit cards to students. The students became the first "corporate-sponsored" students and appeared for interviews in several national media outlets, including The New York Times.

Giroux made the following observation:

This tragic narrative suggests that the individual choices we make as consumers are becoming increasingly difficult to differentiate from the "collective choices we make as citizens." Under such circumstances, citizens lose their public voice as market liberties replace civic freedoms and society increasingly depends on "consumers to do the work of citizens." (2003a, p. 156)

Zygmunt Bauman warns us that "Globalization is on everybody's lips, a fad word fast turning into a shibboleth, a magic incarnation, a passkey meant to unlock the gates to all present and future mysteries. For some," he continues, "'globalization' is the cause of our unhappiness" (as cited in Ibrahim, 2007, p. 102).

Bauman's stance astutely characterizes the tensions that surround globalization. Advocates such as New York Times' journalist Thomas Friedman, Yahoo founder Jerry Yang, global corporate leaders, and world organizations such as the WTO view it as an avenue for possibilities, profit, opportunity, and expansion. However, skeptics of globalization and public intellectuals such as McLaren, Giroux, Shapiro, Sorrells, and

many others are angered by the devastation, destruction, and despair that globalization has caused our youth, society, democracy, and planet.

Giroux (2003a) poses a question that educators must ask themselves in the context of globalization:

Under this insufferable climate of increased repression and unabated exploitation, young people become the new casualties in an ongoing war against justice, freedom, citizenship, and democracy. What is happening to our children in America and what are its implications for addressing the future of higher education? (p. 145)

In the context of globalization, many critical educators continue to envision a different world and engage in a critical pedagogy that is transformative and helps students imagine that another world is possible. In the words of Paulo Freire, teachers and students become “critical co-investigators” and create projects of social justice, emancipation, peace, economic equity, global citizenship, cultural critique, dialogue, democracy, empowered voices, and those yet to be imagined.

Educator Awad Ibrahim (2007) poses this question:

In a post 9/11 world, where the politics of “us” versus “them” has reemerged under the umbrella of “terrorism,” especially in the United States, can we still envision an *education sans frontières*, a globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education in which there are no borders? If it is possible to conceive what would it look like? (p. 89)

This dissertation is my project to address Ibrahim’s question: How do we envision a new “globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education” in the undergraduate basic

communication course? I argue that the Greek concept of “fearless and bold speech” in the context of globalization is fading. The future of democracy, dissent, fearless and bold speech, and educating for critical consciousness are being threatened around the globe. It is critical for the discipline of communication to examine our pedagogical practices and explore multiple and competing ways of knowing and learning in the college communication classroom.

In the following section I provide justification for the development of a more global focus in the basic communication course. I describe the basic communication course and its role in general education and explore four reasons for reevaluating the course.

The Need for a Global Perspective in the Basic Communication Course

Deanna Sellnow and Jason Martin (2010) contend that one of the questions that “continually perplexes and basic communication course teachers-scholars is simultaneously simple and complex: Just what is the basic course in communication?” (p. 33). This question serves as a point of departure for this dissertation project and the various ways the course is operationalized in community colleges and colleges across the country. It will be explored further in Chapter IV. For a point of departure for this project, the basic communication course is defined as “that course required or recommended for a significant number of undergraduates or that course which the department has or would recommend as a requirement for . . . all or most undergraduates” (Morreale, Hanna, & Gibson, 1999, p. 3). Beyond this general definition, there are many opinions that surface regarding the content, how it should be taught, and whom should

teach this course. In regards to the content, should the course be taught mainly from public speaking format or a hybrid course which includes elements of public speaking, interpersonal, small group, or perhaps something else? One question that may be asked, should the course be focused more for skills for the workplace or to help student function as citizens in a democracy? In regards to whom should teach the course, should it be taught by graduate teaching assistants, instructors, or more experienced faculty?

In view of these issues, the basic communication course, is important to evaluate for several reasons: It meets a general education requirement in college, acknowledges the ideological shifts in rhetoric in light of globalization, helps students understand how people use messages to create meaning and communicate across various contexts, and assists students in becoming more culturally competent global communicators.

First, the basic communication course is included in the majority of two- and four-year colleges and universities and assists institutions in meeting its general education requirements. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) reports that 56% of the institutions surveyed showed that general education has become an increasing priority among their institutions, while only 3% say that it is diminishing in importance (Glenn, 2009). The survey also indicated that 89% reported their colleges were either re-evaluating or making modifications to their general education requirements. Carol Schneider, Association of American Colleges and Universities president, argued that a general education should produce graduates with “a deep and flexible set of skills” and hence not rely too heavily on a narrow, technical, pre-professional model of education (Glenn, 2009). Furthermore, Schneider, citing a 2006

survey conducted by employers, noted that businesses also wanted colleges to emphasize written and oral communication, cross-cultural team communication skills, and other skills not directly linked to a specialized field of study (Glenn, 2009).

Second, it is important to assess the ideological shifts in rhetoric in the context of globalization. In higher education before 1885, public speaking was a skill used to engage in academic discourse and for citizenship issues. And, although in the beginning public speaking was recognized as a skill to engage in critical issues, the course later developed into a focus on the basic skills of public address and elocution (Cohen, 1994). This shift from the perspective of public speaking as a social- and critical-performance class to a class focused on standard, universal delivery skills is an important shift that needs acknowledgement. Increased scholarship interest in areas such as feminist theory, intercultural communication, and critical theory has increased. The absence of these perspectives in the most basic communication course, however, signals a gap between vision and reality as it relates to helping our students become competent communicators in the global village.

Furthermore, understanding how people use messages to create meaning and communicate across various contexts, cultures, and media is of critical importance in a global society (Korn, 2000). Scholars outside the field of communication also attest to the centrality of communication education. McCloskey (1994), a professor of economics, presents three primary reasons to support her argument: “a nation of new minorities needs better communication skills; we are existing in a communication revolution with the same magnitude as the invention of printing; and many people earn their living

through the use of talk” (as cited in Morreale, Osborn, & Pearson, 2000, p. 225). Hence, McCloskey concludes that the field of communication studies is critical to interdisciplinary teaching and research.

A nationwide study conducted by Bollag (2005) concurs with this assertion: Results show there is a growing consensus among educators, business leaders, and accreditors on what skills are necessary for all undergraduates. These include good written and oral communication skills, critical-thinking skills, and the ability to work in teams. The data suggest, however, that many students finish college with serious deficiencies in these areas.

The fourth reason is that being a culturally competent communicator will help participants become responsible in the world, socially and culturally (Berry, 2005; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Gamble & Gamble, 2008; Jaffe, 2001; Jenefsky, 1996; Morreale et al., 2000; Scudder, 2004). There is a growing recognition among educators and business leaders that working, worshipping, and living among people of other cultures will be inevitable for many in our society. “Communication can be easy at play. It’s harder at work, especially when there are significant differences in cultures, goals, and perspectives” (Scudder, 2004, p. 559).

Scudder acknowledges that technological advances have made it easier to talk to one another but has not necessarily resulted in more effective communication. He argues too much communication is “me to me.” The method leads to failure. In this context there is much work to be done in the area of globalization. Consequently, in the twenty-first century, an increasing number of employees will be required to adjust their

communication skills to the competency level of their communication partners. Therefore, communication educators must teach their students to become culturally competent communicators in a global society.

American colleges and universities are increasingly seeing more non-native speakers of English in the college classroom. The US Census Bureau reported in 2007 that about 20% of the U. S. population speaks a language other than English; people born in a foreign country represent 55.4 million individuals, according to the American Community Survey. (Office, 2010)

Communication educator Nancy Burroughs (2008) argues, “I believe that communication courses, especially those that require mastery of skills and behaviors, should be embedded with a sensitivity to culture and communication apprehension” (p. 290). She further reports that these students experience a higher level of communication anxiety in the classroom. Her recommendations to address these issues include the development of a one-credit communication lab course; a one-credit communication course on Coping with Communication Anxiety, the development of a new, three-credit hour hybrid course for non-native speakers of English to include in the general education course options. Burroughs’s non-curricular strategies include the development of a communication across-the-curriculum program and training future faculty on cultural sensitivity with non-native speakers.

Although I agree with Burroughs’s recommendations, the reality is that many colleges are reluctant to add general education courses. Many colleges only require one basic communication course to fulfill the general education requirement for oral

communication. This course is in high demand and considered a service course. In addition, funding constraints limit hiring faculty who specialize in this area or to the development of a speaking-across-the-curriculum program.

In summary, the need to reevaluate the basic communication course in the context of globalization is warranted because it fulfills a general education requirement in most colleges and universities, recognizes the ideological shift in rhetoric, assists students in comprehending how we create and use messages across different contexts, and develops students into more culturally competent communicators. The economic, social, political, cultural, and environmental dimensions of globalization impacting our society today demand new intercultural ways of thinking, acting, and teaching. Communication educators must envision transformative models of curriculum development and pedagogy in communication studies. To contribute to this effort, the primary purpose of this dissertation is to explore new ways of redescribing the basic communication course in the context of globalization as a way to enhance understanding of our increasingly diverse world and develop more inclusive perspectives on communication in the new millennium.

In the next section, I introduce my theoretical framework of critical pedagogy, a pedagogical philosophy that can help educators make conscious choices to help students develop a critical consciousness. I also explain why critical pedagogy is my guiding foundational philosophy in the communication classroom.

Theoretical Framework—Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy evolved from the philosophy of Brazilian political activist Paulo Freire—a dialogic and humanizing approach to education. His problem-solving pedagogy is grounded in the belief of social justice through the liberation of oppression and that a raised critical consciousness and dialogue can culminate in the realization of social justice. Freire argued the necessity of a dialogic form of education comes from the realization that education is not neutral. “Education as the practice of freedom—as opposed to education as the practice of domination—denies that [people are] abstract, isolated, independent, unattached to the world; it also denies that the world exists as a reality apart from people” (Freire, 1970, p. 81).

Freire (1970) visualized the relationship between teacher and students as one of dialogue, characterized by love, faith, humility, trust, hope, and engaged critical thinking. He believed dialogue is both a “human phenomenon” and the “encounter in which the united reflection and action of dialoguers are addressed in the world which is transformed and humanized” (pp. 88-89).

His vision of education is realized in the works of critical educators such as bell hooks, Deanna Fassett, Henry Giroux, Cindy Jenefsky, Peter McLaren, H. Svi Shapiro, David Purpel, Kathryn Sorrells, Omar Swartz, and others. These critical educators influence my pedagogy and teaching philosophy. The richness of their scholarship informs how I view critical pedagogy and how it guides my teaching philosophy. I believe that critical pedagogy is a theory of practice and education that challenges injustice, a culture of silence, and educators to practice transformative education and

educate for peace. Perhaps this is why the language of critical pedagogy speaks to my heart. It is rich with metaphors of identity, voice, global understanding, freedom, and peace.

As I play the role of communication educator and student researcher, I contemplate Abram Ibrahim's question: How do we envision a new "globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education?" I believe critical pedagogy is one of the keys that will unlock the door to this question. To address this issue, I examine 35 basic communication course syllabi as research artifacts to also address this question.

The second key I use to unlock the door to this question *Intercultural Praxis* can be used as a curriculum development model to teach the basic undergraduate communication course. Drawing from examples from my basic communication course, the philosophical writings of scholars who practice critical pedagogy, and Sorrells's use of this model to teach intercultural communication, this study demonstrates how intercultural praxis can help students address their moral agency in society and communicate more effectively as global citizens. Having articulated the main goals of my study, in the next section I discuss meta-methodological and meta-theoretical assumptions informing this study.

Examining My Theoretical and Methodological Assumptions

In the last section I explored critical pedagogy. I begin this part of the chapter by engaging in a brief meta-methodological and meta-theoretical discussion of the assumptions and perspectives informing this project. The methodology used in this study refers to interpretive inquiry, a type of qualitative research, the goal of which is "to see

how respondents in interviews impose order on the flow of the experience to make sense of events and actions in their lives” (Riessman, 1993, p. 2). Interpretive inquiry focuses on individuals communicating their own story, “organized around a consequential events” (p. 3). The narratives serve as representations of the individual’s experiences, memories, or extraction of mental models. This type of research, known as “interpretive analysis,” recognizes that “interpretation is not an act in which a disembodied researcher is trying to determine the preestablished meaning of the culture or actor, the interpretator must also become aware of her or his own historicity” (Hultgren, 1994, p. 12).

I argue this approach to scholarship is appropriate because it is not a scientific, neutral, or objective study that discovers and presents facts absent of human experiences. “Objective” methodology can easily be conducted on marginalized individuals in our society. In our pursuit of “knowledge” researchers may totalize and objectify the “Other.”

One of the most chilling examples of how objectivity can cultivate hierarchy and objectification of the other is the Tuskegee Syphilis study (Lederer, 2003; Office of the Protection of Research Subjects, 2010).² In 1972, as the Vietnam War came to a close, America began learning of the horrors another marginalized group suffered from the hands of another government sanctioned research project; however, this project was in the continental United States. In 1932, the United States Public Health Service (PHS) initiated the longest non-therapeutic scientific research project in American history, The Tuskegee Syphilis Study (Lederer, 2003).

² See Gray (2002) for a more in-depth discussion of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project.

Initially designed to explore the racial differences in the natural history of syphilis, this 40-year longitudinal research study involved 600 African American males from low-income families, 400 of whom were infected with syphilis. The men were given free medical examinations, but were not told about their condition. In an effort to ensure the “success” of the no treatment study, scientists in the Venereal Disease Division at the Public Health Service purposely misinformed and misled the African American men about the nature of their participation in this study. The unsuspecting men were misled in numerous ways. For example, they were informed they had “bad blood” instead of syphilis, and were advised to receive lumbar puncture, a “special treatment for their illness.” However, this treatment was a purely diagnostic procedure involving removal of spinal fluid for testing (Lederer, 2003).

In the 1940’s, as penicillin became available to treat syphilis, the government scientists even took steps to make sure the men did not receive treatment from other medical doctors to make sure they did not receive this effective treatment. When the men went to other doctors to get help, being made aware of the study, they did not receive any penicillin. As a result, many subjects died of the disease. The research was only stopped after publicity from a journalist brought political humiliation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It was clear the racial tone and tenor of the United States was markedly changed from the 1930’s to 1972 when the projects were halted. President Bill Clinton issued a formal apology in 1992 to the study’s subjects and their families in reaction to growing public pressure (Office of the Protection of Research Subjects, 2010).

As Lederer (2003) notes,

There was, however, another prevailing sense: that this was a relatively isolated event, that it could be explained away as something sinister and racially motivated from a previous generation, and that although shameful, it was not indicative of a broader problem with the American medical research community. (p. 510)

Lederer (2003) explains the significance of this study in the African American community: “the study has become a powerful symbol of the exploitation of unsuspecting and vulnerable African-Americans at the hands of the white medical establishment” (p. 513).

As researchers, we must all be aware that all “objective” research is not useful and we must always be mindful and guard against the separation of science and humanity. As Frey (1983) explains:

Research is never a politically neutral act. The decision to study this group rather than some other, to frame the research question this way or another, and to report the findings to this group or in that journal rather than in some other form privileges certain values, institutions, and practices. (p. 114)

I emphasize I am not rejecting post-positivistic, post-scientific models of research that desires to establish causal relationships between variables. This methodology has led to paradigm-shifting scientific breakthroughs. I am also not opposing methods, as methods are only tools. I am arguing that for my research and for critical research overall, the critical paradigm offers scholars alternative methods that may be more appropriate for

the study, claims, and arguments I advance. I now turn my attention to the meta-methodology that informs my research, the critical paradigm.

Critical Paradigm

The critical paradigm is viewed as a form of scholarship that differentiates itself from “objective” scholarship that promotes a value exactness and truth. Schools of inquiry in the critical paradigm include Marxism, critical theory, critical pedagogy, feminist theory, critical race theory, rhetorical cultural criticism, cluster analysis, and critical discourse analysis. Two assumptions held by this tradition are that critical scholarship continues to advocate for social change and equity and objects to the separation of scientific research or criticism from ethical, moral, and social responsibility (Anderson, 1996; Swartz et al., 2009).

Essential to all forms of inquiry is the concept of praxis, defined as action or practice. Aristotle conceptualized a model of knowledge that includes *theoria* (theory), *praxis* (practice), and *technê* (art) in political affairs. The Roman orator Cicero stressed that praxis is situated in the area of oratory and includes both knowledge of the subject matter, knowledge of the human psyche, and a political awareness (Swartz, 1996b).

In recent times, praxis has been contextualized by Marx and Hegel to indicate an awareness of the historical mode. Hegel considered the process of praxis to be visionary and grounded in theory, whereas Marx viewed consciousness as substance and a revolutionary tool for changing material conditions. Therefore, praxis indicates accurate ideological behaviors of people struggling to obtain social justice within their certain conditions (Swartz, 1996b).

Freire (1974) believed we must have a praxis that is based on action and reflection. He observed that in this new process of self-examination and reflection people will see the possibility of acquiring new learning and praxis, and constructing new ways of knowing and being in the world.

Freire argued that people must courageously discuss problems in their context and intervene in them to create a new stance toward their problems. Hence, what lies at the center of Freire's worldview is the belief that individuals need to develop their consciousness and a more problem-posing and humanizing pedagogy. This constructivist epistemology requires critical consciousness. This level of engagement requires us to become more conscious and aware in the world. Therefore, a praxis-oriented scholarship emphasizes the importance of knowledge and stresses the dialectical relationship between thought and action. Consequently, critical scholarship strives to balance theory and action in the social realm (Swartz, 1996b).

The moral dimension of knowledge is the second assumption in the critical paradigm. It recognizes that critical scholars acknowledge and embrace the moral, political, and social implications of their scholarship and its consequences, despite its purpose (Swartz et al., 2009). When scholars situate our work in the critical paradigm, we stress that our work is not intended to put forth a new agenda for social change, but we advance the position for thinking about things differently due to our convictions as citizens, scholars, and human beings. Burke (1966) reminds us that humans are "the symbol-using, symbol-making, symbol-misusing animal, inventor of the negative (or moralized by the negative) separated from [natural] condition by instruments of [their]

own making” (p. 16). We are constantly reinterpreting our experiences and our world. Consequently, the critical paradigm in cultural studies lends itself to cultural, political, and social responsibilities in research. I close this chapter with discussion of interpretive inquiry, the approach that guides this study.

Interpretive Inquiry

I believe the critical paradigm and interpretive inquiry provides me with critical, ethical, and heuristic methodological tools for examining the basic communication course in relationship to globalization. In other words, the critical paradigm and interpretive inquiry provides me with the academic language to articulate how I understand the possibilities of education and ethical possibilities to conduct research to heal and repair our world.

Throughout my research, it was imperative that the assumptions and perspectives informing this project mirror my evolving philosophy of education as an African American female educator and doctoral candidate. I positioned my study within the Critical Paradigm framework because of my own experiences of being labeled as the “Other” by the dominant culture in the communication classroom. I am a southern, middle-aged, African American female doctoral candidate in a Predominately White Institution. I earned my Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts in a different department at this same university. I agree with David Stinson (2009), who explains that he does not equate his experience as a White gay man with other marginalized groups. However, he explains: “I do believe that when one has been ‘Othered’ one becomes better equipped to

see how dangerously pervasive the unjust hegemonic discourse of White, patriarchal ideology operates within U. S. social structures and discourse” (Stinson, 2009, p. 513).

I also acknowledge that my marginalized status is different from other minority groups. I realize I will never know what it is like to be a White, gay man, Jew, lesbian, a migrant Cuban worker, a Haitian earthquake refugee, or an Iraqi-born U.S. immigrant. However, I realize that we must also strive to build solidarity and explore our commonalities. I am further reminded of the words of Stinson:

But even as we grow to understand oneself and others, as having fragmented and subjected identities, but rather to get away from understanding ourselves and others in terms of identity. Through my fragmented identities, however I have become aware of the perverseness of U.S. hegemonic ideology. (Stinson, 2009, p. 513)

This recognition led me to an understanding of why the selection of THE methodology for my dissertation led to a great deal of indecisiveness and cognitive dissonance for me as an emerging critical scholar. In my quest for the Methodological approach for my dissertation, I finally realized and understood the importance of joining a community of scholars as a narrative researcher to advance my research. The essential element of interpretive inquiry is the effort to gain from the narratives or text how people make sense of their lives. The interpretation of these texts helps reveal how people create meaning. Narrative research embodies a variety of research practices and interdisciplinary inquiry. Casey (1993) states that narratives may have different names, (texts, personals, narratives, conflict stories, oral history) but they are essentially the same. Riessman (1993) states that “Narrative research is one approach, not a panacea,

suitable for some research situations but not others. It is a useful addition to the stockpot of social science methods, bring critical flavor to the fore that otherwise gets lost” (p. 70).

In my study, the research artifacts of 35 syllabi will be viewed as the communication instructor’s narrative. Each narrative is subjective, based on the narrative frame of reference or point of entry. There are interpretive communities: people with similar values, which equate to long term relationships with people with whom you have in common—the classroom. There are also interpretive traditions: an interpretive community moving through history, a shared vision. They are responding to those who came before and those who’ll come after them.

Kellett (2007) states

some researchers collect great speeches that capture the meaning of social and political conflicts and their resolution. Some researchers collect conversations—whether natural or simulated—in which you can see the to and fro of a conflict in the microscopic details of how people talk together in conflicted ways. Some researchers like to collect broader social discourse that captures the role of conflict in protest, social movements, struggles, and so on. (p. 14)

In this study, the collection of syllabi used to teach the basic communication course is very valuable for analyzing the conflict within our the speech discipline in relation to how communication educators across the country approach the basic communication course. Kellett (2007) explains that “for narrative researchers, stories are revealing historical objects, much like great fossils are to a paleontologists” (p. 14). The interpretation of syllabi and assignments are analogous to “petrified or preserved pieces of communication . . . They are, in this sense, objects that are richly packed with meaning

that open a window into interpreting and understanding the way of life in which that story represents a real conflict” (p. 14).

The syllabi collected from community colleges and universities across the country provide rich interpretive texts that can help reveal the manner in which the narrative is told in relation to the basic communication course. It will also provide rich data in terms of exploring and extracting the mental models that communication educators have constructed in relation to this course.

As a result, I argue the interpretive inquiry mode of scholarship is a heuristic methodological approach by which to examine the critical social problems that overwhelm human beings across the globe. This mode of scholarship allows researchers flexibility in envisioning alternatives to the present social inequities as opposed to a more “objective” methodology or approach of research that limits us from discovering all of the imaginative possibilities that can be created.

Dissertation Outline

Now that I have discussed my research focus and methodological approach, I will provide an outline of my dissertation. My study contains five chapters. In Chapter I, I critiqued the literature on globalization and described its adverse impact on society and, more specifically, higher education. I examined the need for the basic communication course to be reevaluated in the context of globalization. I explained my theoretical underpinning, research focus, and methodological approach.

In Chapter II, I examine the spiral of silence theory in relation to the communication process and the college classroom. This chapter will discuss the

relationship between silence, power, and the classroom. I will examine types of silencing methods, the negative impact of communicative behaviors and messages, and students' perception of silencing techniques in the classroom. I will also examine how muted groups can impose silence in the classroom and its impact on their scholastics.

In Chapter III, I discuss how critical pedagogy can transform the culture of silence and injustice that envelops our society and classrooms. In Chapter IV, I engage the question: How does the basic course fail to address the needs of the basic communication course in the context of globalization? I employ methods in the critical paradigm and interpretive inquiry to examine the research artifacts collected.

Finally, in Chapter V, I address the final question: How do we envision a new “globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education” in the basic communication course? This chapter offers strategies and recommendations to help realize this vision of transformative communication education. I discuss how we can make changes within the communication profession. I also introduce Kathryn Sorrell's model of intercultural praxis as a curricular approach to transforming the basic communication course.

Conclusion

Chapter I explores the concept of globalization and its various definitions and descriptions. I examine the influences of globalization, power, consumerism, and its adverse impact on youth with an emphasis on higher education. I pose my primary research question: How do we envision a new globalized critical praxis of citizenship education in the basic communication course? I provide justification for the development of a more global focus in the basic communication course. I introduce the remainder of

my research questions, theoretical framework—critical pedagogy, methodology—the critical paradigm, and finally interpretive inquiry.

The classroom is representative of our world; it can be a site of social change, self-reflection, and the development of our critical consciousness. The lessons learned in our schools can help us create a more peaceful society or lead to more destruction and demise. As I continue my endeavor to redesign the basic communication course I now focus on chapter II and introduce the spiral of silence theory to examine the relationship between power and silence and its impact on our communities and classrooms.

CHAPTER II

SPIRAL OF SILENCE

Education may well be, as of right, the instrument whereby every individual in a society like our own, can gain access to any kind of discourse. But we all know that in its distribution in what it permits and in what it prevents, it follows the well-trodden battle-lines of social conflict. Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or of modifying the appropriation of discourse with the knowledge and the powers it carries with it. (Foucault, 1972)

In Chapter I, I argued that the present wave of globalization, deeply entrenched in European colonization and Western imperialism, has catapulted people from different countries and cultures into shared and virtual homes, workplaces, and schools in unparalleled ways (Sorrells, 2008). I stated that although many people around the planet view globalization with optimism, opportunity, and hope, many world citizens view globalization with anxiety, wariness, and fear. It is viewed as a danger to their way of life—employment, existence, and culture. Unfortunately, for many Americans, our ethnocentric and imperialistic assumptions from colonial and western society shapes our perceptions and impacts how we make sense of, and interpret, our world and cultures (Sorrells, 2008).

As established in the previous chapter, this deficit of cultural understanding, ethnocentrism, and suspicion was apparent in the public discourse in the United States following the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center. The threat of

terrorism and danger contributed to the culture of silence that enveloped Americans and our governmental leaders.

I established in Chapter I that many educators argue that market and social forces of globalization have had a profound adverse impact on our society and educational system. I argued that as educators we must also critically examine how we contribute to this “strangeness of public discourse” and reflect upon how our educational system contributes to this diminished discourse among our citizens and elected officials. I stated how we as communication educators do not always acknowledge the role we play in endangering our democracy and our planet when “we all are complicit” in tolerating this silence. Chapter II continues this exploration of the peculiar public discourse in our society. This chapter explores the intersections of silence, society, and education. More specifically, this chapter will address the question: What is the communication process that contributes to our culture of silence in our society and classrooms? This chapter is essential and provides a foundation for our understanding of Chapter III. In this chapter, I answer how critical pedagogy can transform the culture of silence and injustice in our society and classrooms. In my review of the literature of critical pedagogy, I noted several studies, articles, and writings and their relationship to notions of public opinion, the public sphere, and this culture of silence that develops from a communication process standpoint.

This chapter will provide a critical connection to our understanding of this concept known as The Spiral of Silence Theory and how it provides a rationale about how minority and marginalized perspectives and voices vanish from public interest, and

invariably, awareness. It explains how people are silenced due to their anxiety of being viewed as strange, and therefore, isolated. It also explains how the media plays a critical role in informing and shaping what people view as acceptable, and therefore, normal (Infante, Rancer, & Avtgis, 2009).

The first section in Chapter II will explore the meaning of the spiral of silence theory, and describe this concept and its significance to societies and individuals, specifically muted groups. The second section will explore the research relating to The Spiral of Silence Theory and culture. The third section will explore the relationship of the Spiral of Silence to education, more specifically the university classroom. I will examine the role of the teacher and the student in creating a culture of silence in our university classrooms, the power of the instructor, the general consequence, and student impressions. It is critical that we break this spiral of silence in the basic communication classroom in order to best teach our students how to become effective communicators in the twenty-first century.

The Spiral of Silence Theory

The Spiral of Silence Theory, conceptualized in 1974 by German researcher Elisabeth Noelle-Neuman, has been applied in three major research areas: public opinion, mass media and communication, and the intrapersonal (individual) and interpersonal communication realm (Infante et al., 2009). This theory has been considered one of the “most developed theories in the field of public opinion” (as cited in McDonald, Glynn, Kim, & Ostman, 2001, p. 28; Infante et al., 2009). Other scholars have seen the

significance of addressing this theory “because it directly relates to the cornerstone of our democracy” (Liu, 2006, as cited in West & Turner, 2009, p. 411).

Noelle-Neumann contends that during the course of history the disposition of public opinion influences who speaks and who remains silent. She argues that

observations made in one context spread to another and encouraged people either to proclaim their views or to swallow them and keep quiet until, in a spiraling process, the one view dominated awareness as its adherents became mute. This is the process that can be called a “spiral of silence.” (p. 5)

Noelle-Neumann described it as “the threat of isolation, the fear of isolation, the continual observation of the climate of opinion and the assessment of the relative strength or weakness of different sides determine whether people will speak out or remain silent” (p. 219).

An engaged spiral of silence explains why people may speak out in some encounters, while remaining silent in others. Noelle-Neumann (1993) asserts that two main issues decide whether people voice their opinions or do not discuss their viewpoints: dread of isolation, and belief that silence is perceived as agreement.

The fear of isolation seems to be the force that sets the spiral of silence in motion. To run with the pack is a relatively happy state of affairs; but if you can’t, because you won’t share publicly in what seems to a universally acclaimed conviction, you can at least remain silent, as a second choice, so that others can put up with you. (Noelle-Neumann, 1993, p. 6)

Therefore, based upon this supposition, the spiral of silence hypothesizes that

groups who see themselves in a minority or as losing ground are less vocal and less willing to express their opinions in public. This in turn will influence the

visibility of majority and minority groups, and the minority will appear weaker and weaker over time, simply because its members will be more and more reluctant to express their opinions in public. Ultimately, the reluctance of members of the perceived minority to express their opinions will establish the majority opinion as the predominant view or the social norm. (Scheufele, 2008, p. 176)

Noelle-Neumann (1993) contends that people could correctly examine, assess, and explain their social environment surroundings. Noelle-Neumann and the Allensbach Research Institute conducted a study to assess people's competency in correctly reporting events unfolding and occurring in the public sphere. The research findings from surveys administered between 1971 and 1979 "confirmed that the actual changes in opinion were reflected reliably in the people's perception of the climate" (p. 14) (the findings led Noelle-Neumann and the Allensbach Research Institute to examine two other hypotheses in relation to the spiral of silence). The tests, known as the "Spanking Scenario Test" and "Train Test" explored the willingness to express your opinions or beliefs about an issue depending upon whether you feel your opinion is shared by others (Noelle-Neumann, 1993, p. 14). The findings supported the conclusion that people may be open to sharing their viewpoints within their foremost circle or social circle; however, they refuse to give their opinion with unfamiliar people in a public setting, despite the fact they may indeed have the same opinion as the majority. Noelle-Neuman refers to this as the silent majority.

Consequently, there are five assumptions based on the spiral of silence:

- (1) Society threatens deviant individuals with isolation;
- (2) Individuals experience fear of isolation continuously;
- (3) Because of the fear of isolation, individuals are constantly trying to assess the climate of opinion;
- (4) The results of this estimate

affect behavior in public, particularly the open expression or concealment of opinions; (5) The above assumptions are connected and thus provides an explanation for the formation, maintenance and alteration of public opinion. (p. 202)

In addition to these five basic assumptions, Noelle-Neumann (1993) also sees a relationship between the spiral of silence and the media. She argues that the mass media plays a pivotal role in manufacturing the spiral of silence. She refers to it as the Articulation Function: “The media provide people with the words and phrases they can use to defend a point of view. If people find no current, frequently repeated expression for their point of view, they lapse into silence; they become effectively mute” (p. 14).

Gore (2007) argues the increase usage of mass media and the decreased use of the printed word (newspaper, magazines, books, and pamphlets) contributes to this dilemma. Our reliance on “electronic images” can evoke emotional responses, but often without the need for engaged thought or reflection.

Like the boarded-up business district of a small town by-passed by an interstate highway, the marketplace of ideas in the form of printed words has emptied out. Video-rentals and fast-food restaurants have replaced the hardware stores and groceries. It is the emptying out of the marketplace of ideas as we have known it in the past that accounts for the “strangeness” that now haunts our efforts to reason together about the choices we make as a nation. The mental muscles of democracy have begun to atrophy. (Gore, 2007, p. 11)

In essence, there are two concepts of public opinion to compare, based on the function of public opinion. Habermas (as cited in Noelle-Neumann) describes public opinion as a rational process, emphasizing that all citizens in the democracy should participate and exchange opinions relating to the public’s interest with the expectation

that their voices will be considered by their government. The notion of public opinion formed by rationality is founded on the concept that a well-informed public is able to accurately observe, evaluate, and interpret ideas in the public sphere, competently articulate rational and logical arguments, and effectively make sound decisions. Gore (2007) contends that America's founding fathers knew that a "well-informed citizenry" could self-govern. "Whether it is called a public forum or a public sphere or a marketplace of ideas, the reality of open and free discussion and debate was central to the operation of our democracy in America's earliest decades" (Gore, 2007, p. 12).

In contrast, public opinion as social control demands a high level of compliance. Noelle-Neumann (1993) argues in this instance that the power of public opinion is so great that it cannot be unrecognized by the government or the public. "This power stems from the threat of isolation that society directs at individuals and governments, and from the fear of isolation, which results from man's social nature" (p. 229).

West and Turner (2009) assert that the spiral of silence theory contends that people dread social isolation because they do not want to appear different from the majority. This fear of social isolation is especially relevant to adolescents "who are especially sensitive to 'fitting' in with the majority regarding the clothes they wear and the expressions they communicate" (p. 358). In fact, Glynn and McLeod (1984) report that most people would rather remain silent than to appear different from the majority. Noelle-Neumann argues that the continual communication of one dominant viewpoint greatly reduces the likelihood that the minority viewpoint will continue to be expressed.

However, some individuals identified as “hardcores” do not acquiesce to the spiral of silence, according to McDonald et al. (2001). These individuals do not “feel the same constraints of social pressure or fear of social isolation attached to expressing minority viewpoints. Hardcores have an unusually high amount of interest in the issue; but their position remain(s) relatively unchanged” (West & Turner, 2009, p. 358).

Spiral of Silence Theory in Communication Studies

Scholars in the field of communication studies have researched the role of spiral of silence in a variety of issues and perspectives employing different methodological approaches to help crystallize and engage in theory-building by extension (Glynn & McLeod, 1984; Gozenbach, King, & Jablonski, 1999; Infante et al., 2009; West & Turner, 2009).

One study conducted by Gozenbach et al. (1999) tested the spiral of silence theory assertion that decisions about majority opinion are made because of “direct observation”; more specifically, from watching television. Researchers evaluated both their awareness level to media by participants in their nationwide sample, and their belief of what they felt was the most favored issue regarding whether gay and lesbian should be allowed to serve in the United States military. The results indicated that participants with greater media awareness perceived that their views were supported more than with the public who had less media exposure. In fact, these individuals with less media exposure believed there was minimum support for their opinion on that topic.

The spiral of silence theory has also been utilized to gauge public opinion on another contestable issue—declaration of English as the official language of the United

States. Lin and Salwen (1997) studied whether a person's likelihood to voice their opinion on a controversial issue is contingent upon their perception of local and national opinion.

Participants were randomly surveyed in Miami, Florida and Carbondale, Illinois by telephone. They were asked whether they would or would not articulate their opinion about this topic in public with another individual who held a different opinion about the issue about making English the official language of the United States. Lin and Salwen (1997) report that their overall findings confirmed the spiral of silence theory.

Participants in both towns expressed a greater willingness to discuss the issue in public when the news coverage of this issue was overall affirmative and favorable. In addition, research shows that younger persons with a higher educational level were more likely to increase their willingness to articulate their opinion as the news coverage became more positive.

Scholars have also speculated and studied whether or not the "spiral of silence effect" can be seen or examined among other cultures besides Germany (Huang, 2005; Ikeda, 1989; Katz & Baldassare, 1994; Salmon & Moh, 1992; Scheufele, 2008; Scheufele & Moy, 2000; Willnat, Lee, & Detenber, 2002). These questions have led to the development of new research on the spiral of silence theory from a cross-cultural perspective (Scheufele, 2008). Scheufele and Moy (2000) questioned whether the variance with different cross-cultural studies examining the spiral of silence may be related to intercultural differences, norms, ways to express opinions, and how conflict styles may be perceived and exhibited.

Willnat et al. (2002) researched the spiral of silence theory in Singapore involving two controversial issues in Japanese society: homosexual equal rights and interracial marriages. The researchers tested the respondents' reactions to levels of fear and isolation and to opinion climate. The study also examined their willingness to speak out. Researchers looked at several independent variables in order to help explain cultural-specific differences relating to their willingness to speak out. The variables included communication apprehension, social interdependence, and fear of isolation, among others. The research did indicate some support in relation to the spiral of silence model, and the findings did support that cross-cultural differences did account for people's willingness to speak out. The study also concluded that more research relating to the spiral of silence theory among cultural variations should be explored among other cultures.

Most research (Katz & Baldassare, 1994) did indicate that despite the cross-cultural differences among societies, the factors of public opinion, fear of isolation, and the notion of the silent majority were exhibited across cultures, whether they are individualistic (United States) or collectivistic (Japan) (Huang, 2005; Ikeda, 1989).

The Spiral of Silence and Muted Groups

Anthropologist researchers Shirley Ardener and Edwin Ardner (as cited in Orbe, 1998) contend that in every society there is a social hierarchy that privileges certain groups above others. These elite groups operate at the top of the social echelon and greatly influence the communication patterns of the less dominant groups.

The voices of marginalized group members are muted, or, in the least, distorted within a communication system that excludes their lived experiences as legitimate. In addition to the effects of in articulation, the language system also encourages dominant group members to establish evaluative criteria for the communication of them and others . . . A muted-group framework exist within any society that includes asymmetrical power relationships. (Orbe, 1998, p. 9)

Wood (1981) argues that Muted Group Theory focuses on the power to articulate experiences. Turner and West (2009) assert that many minority groups are muted because their native tongue does not have the same words to represent the feelings, emotions, or events that they are experiencing. Theorists analyzing muted groups critique dominant groups and “argue that hegemonic ideas often silence the ideas of others. The concept of the dominant culture and societies muting or silencing the voices of less powerful groups has been studied by various researchers: study of women (Gilligan, 1982; Kramarae, 1981; Lakoff, 1990, 1995; Wood, 1992); study of African American males (Orbe, 1994, 1996); study of people of color (Gong, 1994; Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Ribeau, & Sedano, 1990; Nakayama, 1994); study of persons of disabilities (Braithwaite, 1990, 1991; Janowski, 1991); and study of gay/lesbian persons (Chesebro, 1981; Wood, 1993).

The spiral of silence is the antithesis of a democratic society. Noelle-Neumann’s research determines that the majority of people would rather remain silent than be viewed as troublemakers, outsiders, lepers, or a loose cannon. I contend that members of muted groups are particularly vulnerable to the elements of the spiral of silence—fear of isolation, being influenced by public opinion, and a significant silent majority. Kramarae (1981) argues that

people assigned to these subordinate groups may have a lot to say, but they tend to have relatively little power to say it without getting into a lot of trouble. Their speech is disrespected by those in dominant positions; their knowledge is not considered sufficient for public decision-making or policy making processes of that culture; their experiences are interpreted for them by others; and they are encouraged to see themselves as represented in the dominant discourse . . . an important way that a group maintains its dominance is by stifling and belittling the speech and ideas of those they label as outside the privileged circle. (p. 55)

As a former newspaper journalist, I see the relationship between the mass media's influence on public opinion and perception. I recall during the first Desert Storm, while conducting "man on the street" interviews where journalists would randomly ask people on the street whether we should have invaded Iraq, many supported the First President George Bush's decision "on the record," but off the record expressed much less enthusiasm, expressing their objection. This spiral of silence enveloped the public during both Iraqi Wars. I wonder, when did Americans become so diminished in their capacity to exercise "parrhesia," the Greek term for fearless and bold speech? This spirit of engaged democracy was evident during the Vietnam War era and helped contribute to the American government's decision to end the war. In order to understand how this type of spirit is diminished in our society, we must acknowledge and try to understand the significance of the spiral of silence in our university classrooms, particularly in relation to the basic communication course.

The Spiral of Silence and Education

In my review of the literature, I located very little research directly linking the spiral of silence and education (Eckstein, 1999; Eckstein & Turman, 2002). In West and Turner's (2009) introduction to a communication theory textbook, they reference the

Eckstein and Turman (2002) article. This is an area that helps us to understand the culture of silence in society and in our university classrooms. This topic needs further exploration by other researchers.

It is to the relationship of the spiral of silence in education to which I now turn my attention. In understanding the relationship of the spiral of silence in society, individuals, and education, we must also consider how to break the culture of silence in our society and university classrooms.

The spiral of silence impacts not only co-cultural groups within our society, but students in the communication classroom. Kramarae (1981) suggests that “an important way that a group maintains its dominance is by stifling and belittling the speech and ideas of those they label as outside the privileged circle” (p. 55). In Kramarae’s work she has analyzed how muted group theory has drawn attention to silencing of women’s voice.

hooks (2003) argues that this censorship silenced our educational system following the 9/11 travesty.

In our nations, schools, and colleges, free speech gave way to censorship. Individuals lost their jobs or lost promotions because they dared to express the right to dissent that is a civil core right in a democratic society. All over our nation, citizens were stating that they were willing to give up civil rights to ensure that this nation would win the war against terrorism. In a matter of months many citizens ceased to believe in the value of living in diverse communities, anti-racist work, of seeking peace. They surrendered their belief in the healing power of justice. (p. 11)

In a post-9/11 society, the spiral of silence remains a powerful force in our nation. Individuals who dared to dissent to exercise their constitutional right to practice free speech were painted with the broad brush and named “liberals.” The television shows are

filled with images of violence, ethnocentric hysteria, and xenophobia. More recently, The Arizona Immigration debate has sparked controversy and tension. The rhetoric is filled with suspicion and a fear of losing white privilege. As I listened to several talk radio shows, I was shocked to hear the voices dripping with hatred towards our nation's first African American president. The visual rhetoric is even illustrated on the editorial pages of The New York Post. The silent majority of conservatism is becoming more vocal, visual, and violent (Sewell & Peters, 2009).

Are we teaching our students to become critically-engaged thinkers, or are we teaching them that it is important to follow instructions, do not challenge, only speak when addressed, follow protocol, support American values, and don't speak out against the status quo? Weis, Fine, and Lareau (1992) contend that

the questions of who says what, how, under what circumstances, to whose benefit, must all be addressed in our post-modern world. In education, we look at who is marginalized and excluded, who is centered and privileged, and how, through academic discourse, silences are created, sustained, and legitimated. (p. 1)

The “politics of silencing and voice—what gets said and left unsaid” (Weis et al., 1992, p. 1) in our university classrooms must be critically explored. In order to provide further understanding of the culture of silence in the university classroom, it is important to look at the relationship between silence, power, and classroom management.

Silence, Power, and Classroom Management

The concept of power and its use has been studied in a variety of disciplines in the social sciences and the humanities including education and communication. It has been of particular interest in the fields of critical pedagogy and communication (Bartholomae,

1985; Chory & Goodboy, 2010; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Foucault, 1984, 1997; Freire, 1971, 1992; French & Raven, 1959; Kearney, 1985; McCroskey & Richmond, 1982, 2006; Richmond, 1990). Analyzing an instructor's intentional or unintentional use of power in the classroom is critical to our understanding of the effects of the use of silence in the classroom.

The work of French and Raven (1959) has been extremely influential in communication. The authors' conceptualization of the bases of power has been foundational in the field of communication education (Chory & Goodboy, 2010; McCroskey & Richmond, 2006; Vangelist, 1999). Numerous theories have been explored and studies conducted focusing on power in the classroom. McCroskey and Richmond (1982) assert that the goal of their research agenda was to "determine how teacher power affects student learning and how teachers may modify their communication behavior and use of power to enhance learning in the classroom" (p. 178).

In earlier "Power in the Classroom Studies" (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1985, 1986; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984; Richmond, 1990), the use of power has been studied in relation to managing the classroom. The studies focused on how instructors use compliance-gaining strategies known as behavior alteration techniques (BATS). Examples of these techniques are known as behavioral alteration messages (BAMS). The use of BATS/BAMS have been viewed as "prosocial (reward-oriented) or antisocial (punishment) compliance gaining techniques" (Chory & Goodboy, 2010, p. 185). In essence, these techniques are used by teachers to trigger certain behaviors from students and discourage other behaviors.

McCroskey and Richmond (2006) reports that instructors using the influencing technique of compliance generally use the primary model of “just do it.” This type of compliance involves completing the desired behavior while the teacher is present (e.g. not chewing gum in class). Compliance often leads students to obey the rules whether the teacher is there or not, making it even easier for the teacher (McCroskey & Richmond, 2006) to employ compliance gaining techniques and Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATS) (Kearney et al., 1985, 1986).

The behavioral altering techniques, known as (BATS) and the message they referred to known as behavioral altering messages (BAMS) indicate that “power and communication are intertwined” (McCroskey & Richmond, 2006, p. 93). BATS fall into the categories of reward, punishment, relational, legitimate, moral responsibility, referent, and expert.

In the BATS category of punishment, it includes “not only punishment which may be imposed by the teacher, but also punishments that come from the behavior itself, from people other than the teacher, and from the students internal guilt” (McCroskey & Richmond, 2006, p. 96). These punishment behavior techniques include: punishment from behavior, punishment from the teacher; punishment from others; and guilt. The use of silencing may be viewed as a punishment oriented technique.

Silencing and classroom facilitation is connected to censorship in that it can happen when an instructor decides what topic or material will be covered in the classroom (Rand, 1996). These topics typically are those meeting the standard course requirements and inside the comfort zone of the instructor and students (McCallister,

1994, as cited in Eckstein & Turman, 2002; Rand, 1996). Controlling classroom topics and discussion is typically accomplished by instructor's feedback and responses to students (McCallister, 1994, as cited in Eckstein & Turman, 2002). The language instructors use to silence students include sarcastic remarks, embarrassment, competitiveness, and ultimately if students do not conform to the desired behavior, the student is shut out of the classroom dialogue. In essence, instructors can use silence to facilitate and regulate classroom discussion (Eckstein & Turman, 2002).

Deemed permissible in the classroom are those messages and behaviors that are inside the comfort zone of teachers and students, comply with the curriculum, and reinforce ideas from the dominant culture. In a university environment, this type of discourse encourages silence to legitimize certain topics, conversations, and students. Silencing can also be used as a Behavioral Alteration Technique to punish, discourage, marginalize, exclude, and privilege certain students. Eckstein and Turman (2002) report that allowing and encouraging students to communicate their opinions helps them to construct, maintain, and validate their worldview and identity. Denying schools the opportunity to be "democratic public spheres" silences students (Weis et al., 1992, p. 9).³

Silencing is encouraged when safe topics and ideologies are only explored in the classroom public sphere. Silencing represents a fear to exchange or discuss ideas in a certain encounter. Silencing also happens when students' values, ideas, beliefs, culture, and world views are made inconsequential, or marginalized, conflicting evidence, ideologies, are ignored, masked, or illegitimized (Fine, 1987). Three methods of silencing

³ <http://www.scribd.com/doc/10263212/Foucault-The-Discourse-on-Language-Critical-Theory-Since-1965>.

used in the classroom include naming, not-naming, and smoothing over (Fine, 1987). In the next section a brief description of these methods will be discussed.

Methods of Silencing in the Classroom

Naming. Naming often exposes a person's world view, religion, moral views, economic viewpoint, or social status or belief. When teachers and students are allowed to name critical conversations about the above-mentioned topics, the fear of this topic does not persist. Naming often reveals a person's belief system (Eckstein & Turman, 2002). One example in a classroom would be a teacher stating "those of you who say you are born again Christians . . ." This technique would probably result in silencing students and causing them to feel that they are unable to voice their opinion or discuss their religious viewpoint. This topic would consequently be eliminated or avoided based on the teacher's use of naming (Eckstein & Turman, 2002). In order to break this culture of silence, students must be able "to openly express potential controversial views, the students need to feel the support from the teacher—not necessarily their ideas—but for the right to express it" (Eckstein & Turman, 2002, p. 177).

Not naming. The second silencing behavior technique is referred to as not-naming (Eckstein & Turman, 2002). This is regularly achieved by placing different labels on topics such as "Mother-God" vs. "Father-God." The concept "Mother-God" may be less offensive to the large percentage of students in a feminist classroom; however, those students who may believe in the "Father-God" concept may feel compelled to "go along" with the rest of the students.

Not naming, discussing, or examining the “Father-God” concept is an example of silencing students. “To not name is to avoid problematizing the fact there are different belief systems in play. To not name race, ethnicity, or religious problems eliminated the discussion of those divisive topics in the classroom—silencing” (Eckstein & Turman, 2002, p. 177).

Smoothing over. The final method of silencing is smoothing over. This technique involves glossing or passing over to another subject or to another student very swiftly. The method essentially minimizes the students’ credibility and concern. This technique subtly trains students not to raise certain issues or to voice certain opinions; consequently, good students learn not to raise controversial or divisive questions or topics in order to be considered a top-performing student. “The price of success is muting one’s voice” (Fine, 1987, p. 164). In a study, Fine (1994) identified that in the school system she researched, students often encountered “two-voiced tension”—deciding when to talk, choosing which dialect to talk in, selecting which words to use, and the topics to discuss. This two-voiced system essentially removed talking about their real world experiences and their social and moral viewpoints. The atmosphere of selecting the appropriate subject and exhibiting good or bad behavior essentially created space between students who spoke and performed appropriately, and those who struggled. They were smart or stupid; obedient or disobedient. These techniques lead to the silencing of students (Fine, 1994; McCallister, 1994).

Impact on Silenced Students

In their studies to determine the effects on students whom are silenced, Fine (1994) and Weis et al. (1992) report that some students shut down, withdrew, or were perceived as being good students because they did not misbehave in the classroom.

Unfortunately, some responded to the silencing dilemma by withdrawing from school and finding other avenues through which to express their viewpoints and beliefs. Many of these dropouts were intelligent and articulate young people who refused to comply with the silenced behavior. The students who do remain in school but resist these techniques are viewed as behavioral problems for teachers or were known as deviant. However, in reality they were dismayed for not being allowed to express their viewpoints. Teachers using silencing often asked close-ended questions, and controlled what was said and the length of the conversation. In short, compliance-gaining and BATs were employed in silencing students.

Student Impressions of Being Silenced

In one study, Eckstein (1999) researched whether students believed their religious values, attitudes, and beliefs were silenced in the college classroom environment. Results indicated that the religious and the non-religious groups believed silencing behaviors were taking place in the classroom setting. Participants throughout the university were requested to reflect upon a variety of their classroom experiences since attending college. Students were then asked whether they perceived the silencing of religious viewpoints happened in the classroom. Upon asking if they could recall a specific time when they knew of a specific student who did not speak up, 64% of the students responded they did

in fact know of an instance. In the same study, 69% indicated they believed students felt uncomfortable articulating their religious viewpoints in a classroom environment. This study also revealed that the silencing of their religious viewpoints were a result of behavior by both the students and the teachers.

In another study, Eckstein and Turman (2002) supported the argument that silencing occurs through the use of naming, not-naming, and smoothing over. Results indicated that silencing, as a form of BAT, and compliance gaining behaviors is “effective in preventing students from expressing their religious viewpoints” (p. 177). The implications of these studies not only support Eckstein and Turman’s arguments that silencing behavior occurs in relation to religious behavior, it also leads us to wonder if silencing behavior occurs in other classroom settings regarding other topics—including the field of communication.

Muted Groups and Classroom Silence

Tragically in our public schools, many students mute their own voices. They are conditioned by the oppressive structures of power, race, class, society, and in some cases, our educational system. Researchers characterize the experiences of First Generation College students similar to entering an “alien culture” (as cited in Chafee, 1992; Orbe & Groscurth, 2004; Rose, 1989).

Bartholomae (1985) contends that students must

learn to speak our language, to speak as we do, to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community, since it is in the liberal arts education that a student, after the first year or two, must learn to try on a variety of voices and interpretive schemes. (p. 403)

In the context of globalization, many of our students enter our university classrooms as first generation college students. And for these students, they may impose silence upon themselves in an attempt to navigate the cultural terrain.

Researchers report that many first generation college students have described their experiences of attending a university as entering into a foreign land (Orbe, 1998).

According to Orbe (2005),

co-cultural group members strategically enact communicative practices in contexts where a person's membership in one or more social groups enact communicative practices (e.g., censoring self, utilizing liaisons, mirroring, confronting) that reflect larger co-cultural communication orientations (e.g., assertive accommodation). (p. 66)

Orbe prefers to use the word “co-culture”—denoting a “co-existence of multiple groups within a predetermined social hierarchy” (2005, p. 65). He argues that the phrase “muted groups” seems to imply a “static positionality.”

In another research project, Orbe and Groscurth (2004) reported that first generation college students communicate in different and intricate ways at college than at home. Research revealed specific themes when relating to their communication experiences. In focus groups and interviews with 79 campus students, Orbe and Groscurth explored the questions: “What co-cultural communication orientations and practices do FGC students enact in their interactions with others?” The second question inquired what, if any differences exist in how they communicate in and between different contexts (e.g., campus and home). The research showed that First Generation College Students communicate differently at home and on campus. Studies revealed the students

communicated differently and their experiences, analyzed through a co-cultural lens, centered around three orientations and were compatible with assimilation and accommodation outcomes (Orbe & Groscurth, 2004). The finding showed that these students reported using co-cultural practices related to the outcomes of nonassertive assimilation, assertive assimilation, and nonassertive assimilation. First generation college students within a non-assertive assimilation orientation reported they would participate in two different communication practices including attempting to establish common ground with those students who had family members who attended college. The other technique employed was censoring self in order to minimize emphasizing differences compared to their peers. These students indicated they perceived themselves as “a stranger in a strange land,” and they as students worked hard to fit in with the “college crowd.”

In comparison, some first generation college students utilized noticeable communication strategies in relation to others. In response, these students believed they must “overcompensate” in certain aspects of their college careers. These students self-reported they were “overachievers” in their classes and campus activities and worked to support themselves. The researchers also reported some students practicing assertive accommodation strategies actively sought others who had similar experiences including advisors, mentors, professors, and other college students. These students reported this strategy proved quite helpful.

Many first generation college students (Gordon, 2000; Orbe & Groscurth, 2004) and African American college students face tremendous barriers and challenges when

attempting to achieve academic success. Many are seeking validation in and outside the classroom at a university, thus making them more susceptible to failure in higher education. “This vulnerability may be exacerbated when educators fail to recognize the relationship between the life experiences of African American students, their academic performance and college success” (Gordon, 2000, p. 458). African American students are challenged further as they attempt to successfully adjust to an academic environment which does not acknowledge or validate them (Gordon, 2000). First generation college students, especially those students for whom English is not their parent’s native language, face these challenges even more so.

Jenefsky (1996) contends that students come to the classroom with “differing capacities for speaking, and not just because of technical skill (innate or learned) but also because of the complicated histories with the act of speaking in our lives” (p. 345). I contend it is for these students that critical pedagogy can assist in breaking the spiral of silence and help them “come to voice” in the basic communication course classroom.

The Significance of Silencing and Education

As educators we must realize that many of our student feel silenced in university classrooms. More importantly, we must ask ourselves the question, “Do students feel silenced in my classroom?” How do we as educators position ourselves in a pedagogical framework that helps students break the spiral of silence in our society, voice their opinions, and reduce fear of isolation if they practice the Greek art of “fearless and bold speech”? Barrie Thorne (1989) poses a question that all educators must ask themselves

How can one empower students, especially those whose silence may be the accumulation of years of feeling invisible, marginalized, afraid, unable or unwilling to become involved? How can one enhance their sense of presence and of freedom to participate in the classroom? And turning to the more privilege how can one reveal and challenge assumptions of entitlement? (p. 316)

In the next chapter, I will discuss how the application of critical pedagogy can help generate alternatives and help our communication students experience transformative education.

In *Pedagogy of Freedom* (1998), Paulo Freire argues we must also apply the question of critical consciousness as it applies to media literacy. He argues that we must be aware of the role ideology plays in the distorting, masking, and disguising of communication.

We cannot hand ourselves over to the television ready to accept whatever comes. The more we sit in front of it (barring exceptions like holidays when we just want to switch off), the more we risk being confused by the real nature of the facts. We cannot leave behind critical consciousness. It must always be at hand, especially at the critical moments. The power that rules the world has yet another advantage over us. It requires of us that we be permanently alert, with a kind of epistemological consciousness. (p. 124)

Freire's warning to be wary of messages from the media is significant in relation to the spiral of silence. Our opinions of topics, events, and local and world affairs are greatly influenced by the media. Our exposure to media helped mold us into who we are today (West & Turner, 2009).

Samir Amin (2001) argues that

Neither modernity nor democracy has reached the end of its potential development. That is why I prefer the term "democratization," which stressed the

dynamic aspect of a still-unfinished process, to the term “democracy,” which reinforces the illusion that we can give a definitive formula for it. (p. 12)

As citizens in a democracy, is imperative that we critically interrogate the images and messages we receive from the media. In a post-9/11 society, it is essential that we do as McLaren urges, and teach students how to question the prevailing values, attitudes, and social practices of the dominant society. It is even more imperative that we view democracy in the words of Henry Giroux as “an unfinished project.”

Conclusion

hooks (1992b) argues that “awareness of the need to speak to give voice the varied dimensions of our lives is one way women of color begin the process of education for critical consciousness” (p. 13). As an African American communication educator, I recall the sense of accomplishment and confidence that I experienced as a undergraduate in my basic communication course at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. My instructor’s encouragement and interest in hearing my voice in the classroom helped instill a critical aspect of self-affirmation that my “coming to voice” was important and to not feel ashamed of my voice. It helped motivate me to select communication as my undergraduate major.

Reflecting upon my experience reminds me of hooks’s comments on that “coming to voice” and that moving from silence to speech is a revolutionary gesture” (p. 12). I believe that this realization of the desire to “speak to give voices to the varied dimensions of our lives” (p. 12) is essential for all university students in our effort of educating for critical consciousness.

As a communication educator, I reflect upon hooks's question: Do we encourage and listen closely to the voices of classroom students that dwell on the margins? (hooks, 1992b). She argues that

the struggle to end domination, the individual struggle to resist colonization, to move from object to subject, is expressed in the effort to establish the liberatory voice—that way of speaking that is no longer determined by one's status as object—as oppressed being. That way of speaking is characterized by opposition, by resistance. It demands a paradigm shift—that we learn to talk—to listen—to hear in a new way. (p. 15)

Therefore, as hooks invites us to move dialogue from the margins to the center, we must listen and hear the voices of: immigrants and African American students because they struggle with diminishing their dialect and code-switching; first-generation college students who struggle to make sense of the university environment; students across ethnic, class, religious, and immigrant lines, that are grappling with their new identity.

It is my intent that this dissertation will spark interest in other communication educators to reflect upon the interlocking spheres of power, language, and speech, and the spiral of silence in the university classroom. This chapter has provided a foundation for others in the Communication discipline to find strategies to pierce this culture of silence. In this chapter we have explored how we as educators participate in perpetuating the continuation and reification of oppressive educational structures and norms.

In Chapter III, I will explore how critical pedagogy offers insight for educators in how to help all students find one's voice and genuinely listen to the speech of others, recognizing that all people on this planet have something significant to say. In the

following chapter I will discuss how critical pedagogy can help transform the culture of silence and injustice. I will explore what critical pedagogy is, the consequences of using critical pedagogy, its application to different academic disciplines, how it is being used in communication studies, and the basic communication classroom.

CHAPTER III

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND TRANSFORMING THE CULTURE OF SILENCE

Our teaching must, in the global age, help to breach the walls of insularity and indifference to the lives of others. Our strong communities of meaning, while nurturing a secure and confident self, must also be vehicles for enhancing our sense of responsibility and concern for those who live across the economic, social, cultural, and linguistic and religious borders, which traverse both our nation state and our global community. (Shapiro, 2007, p. 27)

In Chapter II, we explored The Spiral of Silence Theory to help us understand the communication process that can silence our students. We investigated the relationship between silence, power, and the classroom. We examined types of silencing methods, the consequences of this type of classroom management, and students' impressions of silencing methods used in the classroom. We finally explored how muted groups can self-impose silence in the classroom, the reasons, and its impact on their academic performance.

We will continue our discussion on the culture of silence and address how critical pedagogy can help transform our society, students, and university classrooms. In this chapter, we will discuss the concept of critical pedagogy, its significance and relationship to transforming the culture of silence, and review the literature of critical pedagogy and its application to a variety of academic disciplines—including the Communication Discipline. We will conclude this chapter exploring the literature of critical pedagogy and the basic communication course—with an emphasis in the context of globalization.

Critical pedagogy offers us a theoretical framework to allow communication educators to develop new ideas to break the culture of silence in our society. In the following section, I will examine the role of critical pedagogy and its importance in diminishing the culture of silence in our classrooms.

Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy is a theory of voice and empowerment. The language that defines critical pedagogy is inspirational for considering ways to diminish the silence in our classrooms. Henry Giroux (1993) views critical pedagogy as an

educational practice that expands capacities in order to enable people to intervene in the formation of their own subjectivities and to be able to exercise power in the interest of transforming the ideological and material conditions domination into social practices that promote social empowerment and demonstrate possibilities. (p. 189)

McLaren (2003) asserts the objective of critical pedagogy is “to empower the powerless and transform existing social inequalities and injustices” (p. 186). It is essential that educators discover how they can create a classroom environment in which students can experience liberation and empowerment, and develop a critical consciousness and a moral compass.

In the Freirean sense, critical consciousness involves understanding your identity, your world, and obtaining the necessary skills to change your situation. Freire (1971) used the term *conscientizaco* to describe this situation, which he described, “as the deepening of the attitude of awareness characteristic of all awareness” (p. 192).

Critical theory provides us with a theoretical framework for helping us understand the political, social, and economic issues that influence our schools and society. Critical pedagogy can teach our students how to navigate the cultural terrain of their lives. It can teach students how to critically interrogate the world, develop empathy for another human being, and use dialogue to explore ways to end injustice and create a culture of peace. This practice of teaching can help us imagine a world where the sound of each voice is welcome and heard. Once we can hear our own voice, then we can use our voice to challenge the injustice we see.

Critical Pedagogy and Imagining Freedom

Brookfield (2005) claims that

critical theory aims to help bring about a society of freedom and justice, a set of beautiful consequences, as pragmatists might say. Consequently, we can assess critical theory's usefulness by judging how well it offers guidance on the very practical matters of naming and fighting those enemies that are opposed to those consequences. (p. 8)

In order for our students to challenge injustice, we as educators must be able to envision freedom. And like Maxine Greene (1988), we must be aware of the “. . . ambivalences with respect to equality and with respect to justice as well” (p. 23).

However, we as educators must continually fight to move past that ambivalence. Greene further states that

We may have reached a moment in our history when teaching and learning, if they are to happen meaningfully, must happen on the verge. Confront a void, creating a nothingness, we may be able to empower the young to create and re-create a common world—and, in cherishing it, in renewing it, discovers what is signifies to be free. (p. 23)

It is essential that educators create more democratic and culturally sensitive classroom environments where students and lifelong learners can experience an education that is liberating, empowering, and inspiring.

Critical pedagogy has the potential to create a classroom environment which can raise students' critical consciousness and creates, in the words of Maxine Greene (1988), a "wide awakesness" (p. 2). Greene argues that the passivity and the disinterest in our schools prevent discoveries in our classrooms. It is not just a lack of disinterest or motivation, it relates to the lack of freedom in our classrooms. McLaren (2003) believes that as educators "we must create spaces of freedom in our classroom and invite students to become agents of transformation and hope" (p. 184). "This can only be achieved if educators become critical educators who are dedicated to the emancipatory imperatives of self-empowerment and social transformation" (p. 198).

Freire (1971) suggests that it is only when we as educators can envision freedom, can we as educators help our students realize this precious gift. He further stressed his conviction that a critical, multicultural democracy should be the driving force of the struggle for freedom. He argued that the concepts of critical consciousness, dialogue, a sense of history, and praxis are essential in this struggle.

In an interview with Leistyna (2004), Freire states that such a level of consciousness requires that people situate themselves in history, with the assumption that we are never without the influence of the historical and social forces that surround us. We inherit beliefs, values, and consequently the ideologies that need to be understood, and if necessary, transformed. Freire argues that this process of transformation must include

dialogue and praxis. He contends that we as active subjects must continually engage in the process of action and reflection. Dialogue is essential to the pursuit of academic rigor and the responsibilities of teachers to teach, participate as learners and to genuinely participate in and express themselves in classroom dialogue.

Transformative Education

Practicing transformative education is one way to begin the process of transforming the world of so much hurt, anger, and pain. Shapiro (personal communication, October 21, 2005) believes that engaging in transformative education is a task that educators in the fight for social justice and freedom must undertake. We must inspire our students to reflect, question, and problematize about what we can do to allow the diverse voices in our society be heard and to educate for democracy.

Critical Pedagogy to Praxis

Paulo Freire contends the elements of critical pedagogy include problem-posing, critical consciousness, and dialogue. Education that involves problem-posing permits teachers and students to become “critical co-investigators” in their pursuit of knowledge, or what Freire refers to as the concept of “generative themes.” The elements of power prohibit us from seeing our world clearly. Beileke (2008) suggests that “by problematizing the world, however, students are given a critical lens through which to view the world—a lens unblurred by class, race, or gender constructs. Community engagement creates the opportunity in which problem-solving can occur” (p. 98).

For example, during the spring of 2010, a native of Haiti was enrolled in my on-line basic communication course. The student visited her homeland during the Spring

2010 semester following the recent earthquake, accompanying a small medical team that provided relief through a mission organization there. The student was filled with anxiety and misgivings about returning to America instead of staying in Haiti to continue to provide medical relief. One of her concerns was how she could continue to help her fellow Haitians while still in America. Upon her return, a local television station and newspaper had tried to contact her for an interview. She avoided calls from our university's media relations department and from the news outlets. A senior nursing major, she was overwhelmed. Her frantic emails to me around 3:30 a.m. indicated she was bewildered. She explained the reason she enrolled in the online introduction to communication course was because of bad experiences with speaking in public in the past and her stage fright was overwhelming. The student and I participated in problem-posing dialogue through email, phone conversation, and a meeting to help her decide how she could engage the community and to view her media interviews as an opportunity to help her fellow Haitians. The student and I developed her informative and persuasive speech assignments in a manner that she could share with the audience her personal experiences and views about the devastation in Haiti and to persuade them to assist in the relief effort. Instead of videotaping her informative speech, I invited her to speak to my intercultural communication class before she conducted her media interviews, as it would allow her an opportunity to share her ideas in an inviting format and receive feedback on the content of her speech and her performance.

This student welcomed the opportunity to speak with my intercultural communication class. The time requirement for her informative speech was 5-7 minutes.

I told her that if she felt comfortable, after delivering her informative speech she could continue and transition to her persuasive speech. The time requirement for this speech was 7-10 minutes. She became motivated and constructed her informative and persuasive speeches. We worked together via email to connect the two speeches so they would transition smoothly from one speech to the next for the audience. She initially spoke with hesitation, but after seeing how moved her audience was with personal testimony and pictures, her delivery improved. During her 45 minutes, she spoke with passion and conviction. Her speech was well-received. Consequently, it increased her confidence level and she agreed to be interviewed by the *Winston Journal* (O'Donnell, 2010) and WXII television station. Her paradigm shifted and she began viewing public speaking as an opportunity to engage in problem posing and using her voice to advocate for those less fortunate. As a result of her story appearing in the newspaper and on television, several area churches tried to reach her to help coordinate a relief effort. Members of my intercultural communication class mobilized and helped with the university's efforts to donate items to a Haiti relief fund organized on our campus.

This application of problem-posing allowed this student to view the world from a different lens; rather than viewing the media as intrusive, she began to see it as a way to solve a problem and involve the community in her efforts. In her own way, she pierced the spiral of silence and voiced her opinion.

It also allowed my other students to reflect upon their moral agency. Each week I posed a question to my students to consider as it relates to our world. Through the use of Blackboard Academic Suite, an e-educational web-based platform and teaching tool, the

classroom dialogue can be expanded, and thereby problems are posed. Students are able to critically interrogate ideas, discuss the personal meaning of the communication theories, and examine how it relates to our world. Before my student's presentation, our class engaged in a discussion about our responsibility as global citizens. During our discussion, one student commented that the United States should focus our monetary aid to helping people in our own country instead of donating money to Haiti and other disasters globally. We then discussed the history of Haiti and the legacy of slavery, colonialism, international debt, and poverty. We then discussed the impact of colonialism on culture. However, when we discussed our guest speaker's presentation the following class period, the student acknowledged that her thinking was too focused on being an American citizen and not a global citizen. She concluded it is our responsibility for America and individual Americans to help others.

My student's realization reinforced for me the importance of educators helping our students address their diversity as moral agents in society and then help them develop a critical consciousness. Freire reminds us that to be uncritical is to be unaware of historical processes and the significance of knowledge, and critical thinking is true dialogue. It is always said in a context in history. Freire contends that critical thinking, along with love, humility, faith, trust and hope characterizes an effective dialogic relationship between teacher and student.

Critical Pedagogy and Dialogue

Freire argues that the necessity of a dialogic form of education comes from the realization that education is not neutral. It can never be neutral because it is always an

action to domesticate or to liberate people. Freire argues that dialogue is both a “human phenomenon and the encounter in which the united reflection of action and dialoguers are addressed in the world which is to be transformed and humanized” (pp. 88-89). Dialogue involves a mutual respect between the teacher and the students. This, in turn, fosters an environment where people work with each other. Hence, “this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person’s ‘depositing ideas in another’” (p. 89). This model, referred to as the banking model of education, is in sharp contrast to the problem-posing model of education. Freire (1971) argues that education becomes an

act of depositing in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the “banking” concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filling, and storing the deposits. (p. 72)

The banking model isolates the learner from the content and process of education. The banking model presents knowledge as a gift bestowed upon the students. It assumes the teacher knows everything and the student knows nothing. The teacher narrates, prescribes, and deposits information; the student meekly obeys. The teacher is the subject; the students are mere objects.

In contrast, Freire advocates for the “problem-posing model of education.” This model is based on a democratic relationship between the teacher and the students. The banking concept oppresses people; in contrast the problem-posing concept liberates people. “Education as the practice of freedom—as opposed to education as the practice of domination—denies that man is abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the

world; it also denies that the world exists as a reality apart from people” (p. 81). The acts of cognition and comprehension are only possible with dialogue.

Freire asserts that dialogue is essential to the resolution of the teacher-student contradiction. Through dialogue, a new term emerges: “teacher-student with student-teachers” (p. 80). The teacher is no longer the only one who teaches. They become jointly responsible for their own education. It is through this process that learning is no longer based on authority, but on the side of freedom, social justice, and peace—not against it.

Thus it is through dialogue and communication that students assume responsibility for their own learning. “In this way, the problem-posing educator constantly re-forms his reflection in the reflection of the students. The students—no longer docile listeners—are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher” (pp. 80-81). Freire (1971) further argues that dialogue is essential to the process of conscientization (being awake, conscious, becoming intentional and deliberate). He believed in the great potential of dialogue and the powers of language to foster liberation. “The world—no longer something to be described with deceptive words—becomes the object of that transforming action by men and women which results in their humanization” (p. 86).

Dialogue is essential to the pursuit of academic rigor and the responsibilities of teachers to teach, participate as learners, and to genuinely participate in and express themselves in classroom dialogue. The increasing need for multicultural awareness in our society and schools has placed a new emphasis on dialogue in all disciplines. Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin’s and Freire’s dialogic theories are central to the ideas of

scholars in many areas as they intersect their philosophical approach to dialogue to their respective disciplines. Bakhtin's concept of utterances and multiple voices of the self are central to the concept of talk. Bakhtin viewed dialogue as "the single adequate for verbally expressing authentic human life is the open-ended dialogue. Life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to participate in dialogue" (as cited in Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 293).

Freire (1970) contends it is through the process of dialogue that we achieve importance and meaning as human beings. Dialogue enables us to name and thus transform our universe. "Dialogue is thus an existential necessity" (p. 88). It is through the process of dialogue that students and teachers can become critical co-investigators in this pursuit of critical knowledge. Dialogue exists when those participating engage in critical thinking. And for the critic, "the important thing is the continuing transformation of reality, in behalf of the continuing humanization of men" (Freire, 1970, p. 92). It is dialogue which "requires critical thinking, it is also capable of generating critical thinking" (p. 92).

Dialogue can create authentic, truthful, and meaningful discussion among students over issues such as immigration, affirmative action, legislation before congress, and global issues. Thus the elements of critical pedagogy, dialogue, problem-posing, conscientization, and praxis are elements that can help transform the culture of silence and injustice that envelopes our world.

I believe many critical educators struggle to develop a classroom community where students may experience, in the words of Shapiro, a "transformative education" or

Freire's "education as a practice of freedom." I know from experience that this task can be daunting while teaching the basic communication course under the mandate of a standard department syllabus. McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005) pose a question with which many critical educators grapple:

How do we organize teachers and students against domestic trends such as these [class inequities, racism, social inequality, unfair labor issues, unjust immigration practices, gender inequalities] and also enable them to link these trends to global capitalism and the new imperialism? What pedagogical discourses and approaches can we use? (p. 9)

According to Brandt (1991), McLaren offers five undergirding principles to a radical and revised approach to critical pedagogy that parallels the five foundations of popular education:

First, critical pedagogy must be a *collective* process that involves utilizing a dialogical (i.e. Freirean learning approach. Second, critical pedagogy has to be *critical*; that is it must locate the underlying causes of class exploitation and economic oppression within the social, political, and economic arrangements of capitalistic social relations of production. Third, critical pedagogy must be profoundly systemic in the sense that it is guided by Marx's dialectical method of inquiry, which begins with the real concrete circumstances of the oppressed masses and moves towards classification, conceptualization, analysis, and breaking down of the concrete social world into units of abstractions in order to reach the essence of social phenomena under investigation. Next it reconstructs and makes the social world intelligible by transforming and translating theory into concrete social and political activity. Fourth, critical pedagogy should be participatory. It involves building coalitions among community members, grassroots movements, church organizations, and labor unions. Finally, critical pedagogy needs to be a *creative process* by integrating elements of popular culture (i.e., drama, music, oral history, narratives, as educational tools that can successfully raise the political consciousness of students and teachers. In our view critical pedagogy must be animated by a passionate and open-minded optimism. (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005, p. 9)

Consequently, critical pedagogy helps students and teachers raise their critical consciousness. The critical educator utilizes a dialogical approach. The teacher realizes and acknowledges that the dilemmas of society and the individual are intertwined. Thus the critical educator becomes with his/her students critical co-investigators in searching for the larger political, economic, and social problems that plague us (McLaren, 2003).

Shapiro (2009) reminds us that

School is nothing if it is not a vehicle for the transmission of hierarchical distinctions of respect, worth, ability, and economic expectations. It is the seeding ground for a society in which we accept astonishing inequalities in the circumstances of our lives—access to health care, decent housing, availability of food, opportunities for rest and recreation, security of employment, and dignity and respect in the community and on the job. Of course, such hierarchical ordering stands in sharp contrast to our vision and desire for a community that is something more than the clichés of a Hallmark card. The classroom itself, as we already noted, is a place in which the ethic of mutual caring and support is undone by the relentless process of competitive individualism in which students are urged to “get ahead” of one another. And talk of a national community is mocked by the extraordinary differences in children’s lives consequent upon differences of race, wealth, and gender. (p. 9)

Supporters of critical pedagogy (Beileke, 2008; Cooks, 2010; Fine, 1994; Giroux, 2001; Greene, 1978; hooks, 1994; Howard, 2004; Jenefsky, 1996; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005; Shapiro, 2009; Sorrells & Nakagawa, 2008; Swartz, 1997a) contend that (a) students must be critically engaged, involved, and responsible for their education; and (b) this process is jeopardized by intersecting cultural, political, economic, and national boundaries.

Inherent in the critical paradigm is the belief that education should encourage, motivate, challenge, and empower students to think critically, evaluate social problems

and conditions, and analyze information, especially connected to representation, social justice, inequality, and power. Howard argues that

to establish this kind of critical pedagogy educators must create an educational culture that empowers students by leveling the teacher-student hierarchy and reflects a re-imagining of the academy's hegemonic communication patterns, institutional structures, and disciplinary "turf-guarding" (Howard, 1999, pp. 8-9)

The Applicability of Critical Pedagogy in Other Disciplines

In the previous section I discussed the power and potential of critical pedagogy to transform the culture of silence and injustice that envelopes our classrooms and society.

My attention now turns towards examining the contributions of other academic disciplines in employing critical pedagogy into the curriculum including education, business education, English, Women Studies, and community organizations.

Critical pedagogy has been used in different academic disciplines. The field of education has been at the forefront of implementing critical pedagogy into the classroom including early childhood education (Lee, 1998). Lee argues that critical pedagogy is an excellent approach to apply to early childhood education programs. In his research, Lee conducted interviews with teachers who used critical pedagogy methods and exercises in their classrooms. Teachers kept a journal documenting how students responded to class reading and exercises. The instructor employed Paulo Freire's philosophy of student and teacher being "critical co-investigators"; however, in this instance, they were co-learners in this environment. Consequently, this collaborative and empowering environment encouraged liberatory pedagogy.

The field of children's literature has also utilized the principles of critical pedagogy to empower marginalized communities. Keis (2006) researched the use of critical pedagogy employed in the Libros y Familias Program, a family literacy program for Spanish Speaking Families in Independence, Oregon. His research indicated how children's literature and critical pedagogy can be used to empower communities through critically transformative pedagogy.

In another research study, critical pedagogy has been incorporated in an early community-based program for children. Beileke (2008) reported that the tenets of critical pedagogy was incorporated in an ongoing partnership with a secondary education program at Ball State University and the Muncie Boys and Girls Club in Muncie, Indiana. The university students participated in after school activities with the children. The college students developed student reflective journals to document their experiences and further develop their understanding of "critical multicultural consciousness and the potential for praxis (change)" (Beileke, 2008, p. 28).

In another article, Machado-Casas (2008) explored how Critical theory and the vision of Paulo Freire can be incorporated into the fourth-grade classroom using the arts. Students chose three biographies: Anne Frank in Spanish, Frida Kahlo in English, and Biddy Mason in Spanish. After reading their selected text, students incorporated the arts to communicate their feelings about the work. Students could incorporate singing, acting, drawing, or developing their own "mini-book." The classroom experiences culminated with "community meetings" involving the parents and the community. In this instance,

students and parents were liberated and empowered through the integration of critical pedagogy and the arts in an elementary level classroom.

The discipline of business communication has also applied critical pedagogy in their classroom teaching. In a research project, Munshi and McKie (2007) developed a course which addressed western biases in textbooks and approaches to intercultural communication. Researchers chose from mainstream and alternative articles that allowed students to make connections among the field of businesses' colonial and imperialistic legacy, and to reflect upon the ethics and practices found in today's business world. This critical method was reinforced by student presentations of their own cultural experiences, thus breaking away from the traditional method of relying upon intercultural simulation models.

The discipline of Feminist and Women's studies have also embraced critical pedagogy in the classroom. The explicit intent to facilitate social change and empower women and help them critique and dismantle existing power structures is inherent in critical pedagogy. Kathleen Weiler (1988) notes in an analysis of feminist critical pedagogy that

What [feminist] teachers need to do is to be very clear about the specific meanings of class, race, and gender for people in differing relationships of control and power in a society dominated by capitalism racism, and patriarchy. We need to locate ourselves in these complex webs of intricate relationships and then attempt to act at whatever sites we find ourselves, in ways that will encourage both resistance to oppression and the building of a counter-hegemony through critical understanding. (pp. 54-55)

This view of the teacher's role is very much aligned to the goal of critical pedagogy to bring social change through the process of educators helping their students examine and critique historical and current social structures and conditions and dismantle power structures and hegemonic forces.

The English field has had a history of integrating critical pedagogy in English classes, in particular composition courses. In many instances it can be considered leading the way in integrating critical pedagogy into courses outside the field of education (Carter, 2005; Swartz, 1997a; Thorne, 1989).

One innovative research project involved an instructor assigning Paulo Freire's chapter on "The Banking Concept of Education" to his English 101 Composition class at La Guardia Community College in New York City. Gallagher (2010) reports that teaching Freire has allowed her classes to open up and talk about their personal experiences involving education and the key concepts relating to Freire's ideas of liberatory education. Students spent a great deal of time engaging in problem-posing exercises. The activity empowered students and allowed them to become more critical thinkers and writers and to use their voice to advocate for change in their education.

English Composition and the Basic Communication Course

Basic communication course educators can make a connection between the works of English composition and the basic communication course. In fact, James Berlin notes that "in teaching writing [or communication] we are providing students with guidance in seeing and structuring their experience, with a set of tacit rules about distinguishing from falsity, reality from illusion" (as cited in Swartz, 1997a, p. 148).

In short, courses in composition often foster an epistemology that assists students in becoming critical thinkers and examining their life experiences. The role of cultural critique becomes relevant and significant. It also helps students shatter the spiral of silence in their academic and personal lives.

Swartz (2005) observes that there are significant similarities between public speaking instruction and English composition instruction. He cites the historical similarities between the roots relating (a) communication and English in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, (b) strong conceptual linkages between classical rhetorical tradition in Western society; (c) both the basic communication course and freshmen composition constantly battle with outside forces in justifying their relevancy and significance to today's curriculum; (d) both courses are viewed in academia as "service" courses and are continually being analyzed to find alternative strategies of delivering its content in other curriculum course; (e) both courses produce critical full time enrollment figures and monies, which are critical to their department's survival; and (f) both courses are constantly devalued, feminized, and marginalized by other communication and English faculty within their own departments.

The skills of persuasion, argumentation, and debate cultivated in English composition and the basic communication course have enormous potential in breaking the spiral of silence ingrained in our students from education and society. The philosophy embraced in critical pedagogy offers us tremendous opportunities for teaching our students the significance of cultural critique, arguing for social justice and advocating for a more peaceful world.

However, within the field of Communication there is limited scholarship that explores the benefits of critical pedagogy for students in the context of globalization. In the next section of this chapter, I will explore the literature in Communication that strives to address the use of critical pedagogy in the Communication discipline.

Critical Pedagogy and the Communication Discipline

In order to redescribe the basic communication course, it is first important to understand how critical pedagogy has been used in the Communication discipline. This section will explore the scholarship within the area of communication that incorporates a critical social or political focus.

Jenefsky (1996) contends that “critical pedagogy provides a theoretical foundation for generating new ideas about the ways we teach communication courses” (p. 343). She further adds that critical pedagogy is “directed toward both a critique of existing conditions and the development of alternative power configurations” (p. 344). She asserts that critical pedagogy for public speaking empowerment is

grounded in a concept of education dedicated to providing student’s knowledge and a context within which they can (a) learn to critique themselves and the world around them, (b) learn to critique knowledge itself, and (c) develop ideas, skills, and strategies to better the world within which they live. (p. 344)

As mentioned in Chapter I, two- and four-year institutions of higher education may choose different communication courses to meet the general education requirement in relation to oral communication. Most recent surveys indicate that the majority of two- and four-year schools of higher learning offer their students a public speaking course or the introductory course—also known as the hybrid—that incorporates a combination of

public speaking and interpersonal and team work skills (Morreale, Hugenberg, & Worley, 2006).

Many communication educators articulate that utilizing critical pedagogy is a liberating and empowering classroom concept; however, in the classroom it may be more complex to implement from a practical perspective on a daily basis (Carter, 2005; Cooks, 2010). However, those who do engage their students in the “analysis and critique of power, identity, culture, and schooling toward social justice and social change” (Cooks, 2010, p. 296) find it to be transformative. Giroux (1994) argues that critical pedagogy connects the intricate relationship among structures, identities, and pedagogies. Giroux states that critical

pedagogy . . . signals how questions of audience, voice, power, and evaluation actively work to construct particular relations between teachers and students, institutions, and society, and classroom and communities . . . Pedagogy in the critical sense illuminates the relationship among knowledge, authority, and power. (p. 297)

Cultural Critique and Critical Social Issues

The communication discipline has a rich history in relation to teaching public speaking and rhetoric. While public speaking was originally acknowledged and cultivated as a skill to engage in critical citizenship issues, it has throughout the years developed into a course that has focused more on the mechanics of organization, elocution, and public address. Cohen (1994) asserts this shift from viewing public speaking as a critical performance class to one more focused on emphasizing mainstream delivery skills is critical in our understanding of the importance of critical pedagogy. While scholars have

reviewed the literature of teaching oratory and rhetoric from Ancient Greece and Christian periods (Carter, 2005; Mendelson, 2002; Murphey & Katula, 1994; Shome, 1996; Timmerman, 1996), our discussion of rhetoric in this section starts with the move to integrate more a cultural critique and critical issues into the study of speech and rhetoric. A more comprehensive discussion of the history of the speech communication discipline will follow in Chapter IV.

Shome (1996) argues that “in recent times, the discipline of rhetorical studies—a discipline that for years has celebrated the public voices of White men in power and has derived most of its theories from such foci—is being challenged in a variety of ways” (p. 40). He further notes that the discipline of speech communication is being questioned to recognize and incorporate the voices and perspectives of different ethnicities and sexual orientation in addition to a more critical multicultural perspective of communication.

Supporting this notion, Carter (2005) contends that

rhetorical studies are becoming more critical. If rhetorical scholars are to reexamine the discipline in relation to issues such as imperialism and culture, then they need to also investigate typical pedagogical approaches to teaching rhetoric and unlearn some of the traditional teaching practices in order to uncover a more emancipatory agenda. (p. 21)

Howard (2004) contends that one way of making the transition from theory to praxis is the use of interactive performance. Howard applied the work of Augusto Boal’s book *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979) to create a learning community that explored issues of body image and social pressures. As a result, students learned the use of cultural critique and to explore “cultural norms and expectations and developed a richer

understanding of the performance process” (p. 217). The author further noted that critical performative pedagogy can be used as a tool for “student empowerment” (p. 228).

In one case, Klopf (1983) discussed the need to develop an introductory speech class based on student and community needs. The department of Speech at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu developed a public speaking class designed to increase communication skills for those in a variety of occupations. Researchers gathered data to assess the communication skills for nearly every occupational group in Hawaii. An identical study was conducted in Japan. Findings were then analyzed in relation to the guidelines for minimum listening and speaking competencies for American high school graduates. Research indicated students needed to develop competencies in the following areas: interpersonal skills, discussion skills, public speaking skills, and conflict resolution skills.

In another instance, Brammer and Wolter (2008) theorized the need to develop an introductory public speaking course to develop critical thinking skills and civic engagement in students. Gustavus Adolphus College developed a foundational course in Public Discourse in the Communication Studies area. Questionnaires were distributed in the Public Speaking and Public Discourse sections for assessment purposes. Results showed those students in the Public Discourse class reported growth in argument skills; increased awareness, knowledge, and interest in civic issues; and a heightened desire for civic participation. Japanese educators found this study to be of particular interest to help prepare their students desiring to obtain careers in international business or education. Although this study did not emphasize more of a practical approach to public speaking, it

did reinforce the need to adapt the course learning objectives and outcomes based on the cultural background of the students and the need to become competent communicators in a global society.

While the field has made inroads into integrating critical pedagogy into the discipline, there has not been as great an emphasis on culture, critique, particularly in the context of globalization. Although the communication discipline has developed pedagogy more critical to engage and develop effective citizens, over time it has become more focused on organization, structure, logic, and elocution. The dominant and traditional structures reinforced that organization, structure, and elocution is the primary emphasis (Carter, 2005; Fassett & Warren, 2004, 2007; Jenefsky, 1996; Osborne, 2007; Swartz, 1997a).

As a result, the basic course deemphasized cultural critique and the significance of culture and the voices of muted groups and other marginalized populations. The traditional approach to teaching the basic course remains prevalent. However, some innovative and inspiring educators have made strides in developing a more critical approach to teaching the basic communication course. While in the past decade there has been more of an emphasis to include more critical and feminist perspectives in teaching, the basic communication course (Chesebro, 1981; Haynes & Chavez, 2001; Wood, 2009), most contemporary teaching of the basic communication course follows the traditional, linear, rhetorical structure. As observed by Swartz (1997b),

A critical pedagogy in the basic Communication course stems from our commitment to both research to a widening popular involvement in the public sphere. Specifically, a critical pedagogy approaches education as a “dialogue” and

as “rhetoric.” A critical pedagogy in short, is a *strategic* cultural intervention by scholars, one empowering students to disseminate the results of a critical education throughout the wider non-academic community. (p. 137)

Jenefsky (1996) asserts that the basic communication course should strive to “empower students to be critical thinkers and agents of social change” (p. 344). Jenefsky (1996) positioned her vision for the basic public speaking course in a pedagogical approach that is informed by a feminist critical pedagogy, her visionary university is

grounded in a concept of education dedicated to providing students knowledge and a context within which they can (a) learn to critique themselves and the world around them, (b) learn to critique knowledge itself, and (c) develop ideas, skills, and strategies to better the world within they live. (p. 344)

Her vision of the introduction to public speaking course emphasizes the function of communication, focusing on the above-mentioned process. Jenefsky (1996) uses a model in her Women studies classes adapted from a model by Lynn Weber Cannon (1990). This model focuses on cultivating an (a) “authorial voice”; (b) promoting discussion “across differences”—such as race, class, and gender—and (c) the inherent belief that communication could be used as a “tool for healing and empowerment and for changing material conditions of one’s life and community” (Jenefsky, 1996, p. 346). These principles were integrated within the curriculum through course and syllabus design and the pedagogical methods she employed.

More than 10 years later, critical communication educators still argue that there still needs to be more of an emphasis on a feminist pedagogy perspective in the introductory public speaking course. Weber (2007) argues that the introductory public

speaking class still should contain more of a critical pedagogy that employs more of a feminist-based approach to teaching communication.

Conclusion

McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005) write that “Teachers can help students develop a ‘language of critique’ to guide them in investigating how such concepts are ‘selectively’ employed by the ruling class to represent existing relations of power among dominant and subordinate groups in society” (p. 256). After reviewing the literature relating to critical pedagogy and the basic course, it is my assessment that the introductory communication course presents an excellent opportunity to use this perspective to liberate student voices. I argue that the basic communication course can be used as a tool to help students develop a language of hope, possibility, and peace through engaging in critical pedagogy.

We must envisage the basic communication course as a corner stone of citizenship education. Shapiro (2009) reminds us that “citizenship education today must be one that is concerned with our plural identities and the social cohesion stemming from our common concerns as human beings” (p. 8). This entails learning to communicate across differences and shattering the culture of silence in our classrooms and communities. As critical communication educators we must engage in transformative education—one where the basic communication course supports and encourages our students to critique and evaluate the powers that impose upon their lives. Critical pedagogy can help transform the culture of silence and injustice in our society and schools. The basic communication course has the potential to help students learn to

communicate more effectively in the global community. Oral communication can be an effective strategy to allow our students to experience transformative education.

In this chapter we explored how critical pedagogy can shatter and change the culture of silence and injustice in our classrooms. We reviewed the literature of critical pedagogy as it relates to a variety of academic disciplines including education, business, and English. We also explored how educators are making the connection to the community. In addition, we explored the literature of critical pedagogy as it applies to the Communication Discipline. We finally explored the literature of critical pedagogy and looked at its significance and application in various academic disciplines, and specifically in the basic communication course. Based upon my review of the literature, I realize it is even more critical that we explore new and innovative ways to teach our students to communicate in a global society.

In the following chapter, I will address the question: How does the basic course fail to address the needs of our students in today's world? I will utilize the methods in the critical paradigm and the interpretive inquiry approach to examine the research artifacts collected of 35 syllabi from community colleges and universities across the United States.

As I conclude this chapter, I am reminded by the words of Shapiro (2009):

This is a time of crisis, but also of renewed possibility—one that offers us the opportunity to reconsider radically what is the meaning of education for a generation that will bear the brunt of grappling with these extraordinary challenges and dangers. What will it mean to be an educated human being in the 21st century, compelled to confront and address so much that threatens the very basis of a decent and hopeful human existence? (p. 2)

I am hopeful this dissertation project will not only benefit my students, but also encourage other communication educators to grapple with the deficiencies in the basic communication course and create their own alternative vision to help our learners use their communication skills to transform the culture of silence and injustice in our world.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE

Introduction

In the previous chapter I discussed how critical pedagogy can transform the culture of silence that envelopes our classrooms. I reviewed the literature of critical pedagogy and examined its application to different disciplines including business, education, and English composition. I examined how educators are also employing critical pedagogy to change our communities. The chapter explored the application of critical pedagogy in the Communication discipline and more specifically the basic communication course. My examination of the literature reveals there needs to be a greater emphasis and application of critical pedagogy in the basic course. Based upon my review of the literature, I realize it is even more imperative that critical communication education be utilized to teach our students how to employ cultural critique, and to question the existing power structures within our society that disempower and disenfranchise certain groups.

In this chapter I examine the question: How does the basic course fail to address the needs of the basic communication course in the context of globalization? I discuss the shift in speech pedagogy in U.S. higher education, the basic course and general education, and discuss my findings in an interpretive study analyzing 35 syllabi collected from two year and four year colleges and universities across the country. The themes

explored are culture, the use of strategic rhetoric, silence in the classroom, and citizenship education. In the next section, I will provide a brief overview of the shift from the old model of speech pedagogy to the new model in higher education, and the basic communication course. As mentioned in chapter one, the basic course is defined as “that course required or recommended for a significant number of undergraduates or that course which the department has or would recommend as a requirement for . . . all or most undergraduates” (Morreale et al., 1999).

The purpose of the next section is to trace some of the historical changes that have taken place in the Communication Studies discipline in higher education and the basic communication course. The significance of this inquiry is articulated by Gibson, Hanna, and Huddleston (1985): “What is occurring in the basic courses appears to be a reflection of the thinking, generally, of teachers and scholars in . . . our discipline. So, to trace the history of course orientations is, to some extent, to trace the history of thought in our discipline” (p. 283).

Speech Pedagogy Shifts Emphasis

Jesse Delia (1987), in *Communication Research: A History*, states that speech instruction in United States colleges dates back to the colonial period. William Keith (2007) in *Democracy and Discussion* also discusses the cultivation and development of speech departments in college and universities and the shift from a civic approach to a more performance platform based approach. Keith contends that many of the main departments of the “modern” university developed from 1885 to 1920. In many universities, departments consisted of faculty with similar scholarship and teaching

interests, and speech was among them. In fact, by the end of nineteenth century, a style of speaking instruction and speaking, elocution, had developed. Conditions were optimal for change. Speech teachers, for numerous reasons, were moving towards departmental rank.

Keith further adds that when the field of speech pedagogy underwent a variation during the 1800s and 1900s. Keith argued there was a change from the “old model” to the “new model” of speech pedagogy. He further depicts the “Old Model” *as the embodiment* of civic discussion.

Old Model of Speech Pedagogy

In his book, *The History of Speech Communication: The Emergence of a Discipline, 1914-1945*, Herman Cohen (1994) documents the position of early speech teachers who believed that “students who took speech courses needed to learn how to become responsible and active citizens who understood the power of language” (p. 135). Cohen’s research shows how public speaking moved from a focus on civic responsibilities to elocution and stylistic emphasis. His analysis recognized the relationship between public speaking to democracy and education.

Keith (2007) notes that during the eighteenth century “rhetoric” was not a subject in and of itself as an area of communication skills. Instead, the “classical vision of rhetoric was still intact, in that the teaching of communication skills was integrated into the curriculum” (p. 22).

During the 1700s students spoke about what they were learning—philosophy, literature, science, etc. Faculty wisely recognized the significance of elocution and

delivery during collegiate debates and “forensicks” [sic] allowed students to enroll in an elocution course, but the main emphasis was on their discipline. Keith contends that

the purpose of a college education at this point was to produce a virtuous, decent person, capable of speaking both in civic duties and in the professions (law and ministry). Learning to think and speak in a morally appropriate manner were not separate activities; but just as Cicero and Isocrates, two sides of the same coin. (Keith, 2007, p. 23)

The contributions of Cicero, Quintilian and Aristotle focused greatly on developing civic leadership skills and critical thinking (Bertlesen & Goodboy, 2009). Students could enroll in courses in elocution, but the main emphasis was on teaching students to become responsible citizens. Therefore communication skills were integrated into the curriculum and not seen as a separate skills set.

The New Model of Speech Pedagogy

In the nineteenth century, universities and colleges changed content and direction in relation to the concept of rhetoric. The deviations with speech pedagogy were attributed to five areas: “the rise of aestheticism, perceived decline in the speaking ability of college graduates and the elocutionist response, the growing need for political orators, the growth of a politically empowered middle class, and the disengagement of rhetoric instruction from its contexts of application” (Keith, 2007, p. 24). The new speech model, focusing on style and delivery, had lost touch with its liberal tradition of utilizing rhetoric for civic responsibilities.

Cohen (1994) states that the increase of the study of Elocution resulted in work in Europe, especially in Britain and France. The Elocution movement developed from

scientific goals of eighteenth century explorations. Notable contributors during this period included Thomas Sheridan, an Irish voice and action teacher and Francoise Delsarte, a French actor, who developed a complex oratory system which embodied the characteristics of philosophy and science. The Delsarte System of Oratory provided the foundation for American Elocution. The argument that Elocution was based on a set of scientific laws and principles impressed American elocution teachers greatly. The elocutionists in academia placed heavy emphasis on the Delsarte Scientific Mysticism. His approach is exemplified in the preface to *The Delsarte System*.

Orators, you are called to the ministry of speech. You have fixed your choice upon the pulpit, the bar, the tribune or the stage. . . . I applaud your design. You will enter the noblest and most glorious of vocations. Eloquence holds the first rank among the arts . . . What, in fact, is oratorical art? It is the means of expressing the phenomena of the soul by the play of the organs. It is the sum total of rules and laws resulting from the reciprocal action of mind and body . . . And thus having become an orator, man of principle, who knows how to speak well, he will aid in the triumph of religion, justice and virtue. (1887, pp. xxiii-xxix, as cited in Cohen, 1994, p. 3)

Chawla and Rodriguez (2011) argue that during this time period the basic need of oratory moved from civic engagement to skill development, irrespective of use. “A skills orientation to speech encouraged students to emphasize those skills regarded as valuable or marketable at a given point, thereby ensuring that the discipline would follow convention rather than challenge it” (p. 82). Public speaking was reduced to preparing students for the trio of “pulpit, platform, and courtroom” (p. 82).

Keith argued that there was a decline of how organization, content, and delivery worked together.

One was left with a different sort of platform skills. The student must figure out *how to apply* them. They were portable, which is admirable, but the hidden cost was the possibility they might end up as just entertainment, or pale and lifeless reflections of civic action. This constellation of affairs left oral skills instruction in a kind of limbo, important yet meaningless. (Keith, 2007, p. 33)

The Delsarte System provided charts, diagrams, and illustrations depicting the theory, on how to position parts of the body, the right eyebrow arch, the wrist movement, and torso movement. In the early 1900s, performance courses, many with a foundation in the Elocutionary period, flourished (Bertlesen & Goodboy, 2009). The Delsarte System was known as a scientific system.

Cohen argues that it is important to note Delsarte,

not because he is relevant to the present field of Speech Communication, but because he so influenced the teaching of elocution in American schools and colleges. Even the American home and everyday life were affected, sometimes indirectly, by the teachings of Françoise Delsarte. An examination of some of the most popular elocution texts will serve to demonstrate not only the influence of Delsarte, but also some of the character of the materials being taught to students in American colleges. S. S. Hamill, late professor of Rhetoric, English Literature and Elocution at Illinois Wesleyan University and the State University of Missouri, published his *The Science of Elocution* in 1882. (Cohen, 1994, p. 4)

It is important to note the great influence of Elocution not only to American colleges and universities, but also the elementary texts used in schools. The texts were classified as narratives, dramatic readings, forensic, etc. In fact, Elocution became entrenched in the culture. Many homes contained Elocution books with readings. Orators including Mark Twain traveled the lecture circuit and drew many crowds in towns. A less cost prohibitive but more exhaustive set of oratory readings was edited by William Jennings Bryan in 1906. *The World's Famous Orations* reprinted by Bryan contained

great speeches from ancient Greek and Roman times until the present day. Bryan, one of the most eloquent orators of his time, wrote the introduction which depicted a view of oratory that was more in line with the view of the classical writers than the elocutionist:

The age of oratory has not passed, nor will it pass. The press, instead of displacing the orator, has given him a larger audience and enabled him to do a more extended work. As long as there are human rights to be defended; as long as there are great interests to be guarded; as long as the welfare of nations is a matter for discussion, so long will public speaking have its place. (pp. x-xi, as cited in Cohen, 1994, p. 4)

This shift also ushered in the emergence of a new type of speech teacher who would eventually differentiate and gradually separate from Rhetoric in English departments and later become its own discipline—Speech Communication. While the intent of this dissertation is not to give an historical account of the speech pedagogy, it is important to note the philosophical shifts. Delia (1987) notes that Speech departments began to emerge from their homes in English departments near the beginning of the century.

James Berlin (1987) in *Rhetoric and Reality Writing Instruction in American College, 1900-1985* notes that one of the “most significant curricular developments in American colleges between 1940 and 1960 was the mushrooming of the general education movement” (p. 92). This initiative arose after World War I in an effort to offer a set of classes that would counter- balance the specialized course work with the curricular effort to offer more training for the professional workforce. Berlin, speaking of this new movement in higher education, insisted that all students should enroll in classes

that “provided a sense of cultural inheritance and citizenship. . . . such as the humanities courses offered at Reed, Chicago, and Columbia” (p. 92).

Cohen contends that John Dewey’s (1938) democratic philosophy and vision guided the development of required general education curricula during the 1940’s. I argue that the current basic communication course has moved further away from using rhetoric to empower citizens in a democracy. Sellnow and Martin (2010) note that this curricula eventually subsided during the 1950s when the notion of a compulsory type of education “came . . . under suspicion as being un-American” (Rudolph, 1977, as cited in Sellnow & Martin, 2010, p. 34).

Debate over the basic course has continued throughout the evolution of the speech discipline. The concern about the basic course has persisted throughout the evolution of the speech discipline. White, Minnick, Van Dusen, and Lewis (1954) note that discussion of the objectives and goals of the first course students take in speech communication “antedates the formation in November, 1914, of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking, and since that time has been a perennial subject for articles in our journals and papers at regional and national meetings” (White et al., 1954, p. 163).

In 1954, Eugene White edited a symposium with three Speech Communication educators, Thomas Lewis, Wayne Minnick, and Raymond Van Dusen. The educators discussed their perspective on the content focused on in the basic communication course. White reported that “all three claim two basic premises in common: the first speech course that students take is likely to be the only speech they ever take and therefore the

first speech course should aim at the basic needs of students. This, however, is where the agreement ended” (p. 4).

Lewis took the perspective of a broad approach to “the communications course.” He stated this “pressing need” should encompass a diverse approach. Lewis emphasized four areas in his approach:

(1) the students will be given many opportunities to practice, (2) the emphasis will be upon content rather than form, upon clarity rather than artistry, (3) training will be given in listening as well as in speaking and reading, and (4) training will be offered in several of the types of oral communication. (p. 168)

However, Minnick protested against teaching the basic course from such a broad perspective. He stated:

Some educators have high hopes for the first speech course. They expect it to do many things—teach students to listen critically, to act naturally and purposefully, to speak with culture, animated voices, to read aloud with a strong sense of communicativeness, to discover and evaluate evidence, to reason correctly, to organize speech materials with unity, coherence, and, not content with these, they expect to attain a number of additional goals which I have no space to enumerate. All of these are laudable aims, without doubt, and if they were attained, we should have no need for other courses in the speech curriculum. But I am afraid that in our efforts to do much we often succeed merely in doing little. (p. 164)

Minnick argued the “pressing need” guided him toward a distinct course structure: the public speaking approach. He stated that too many times, “we forget that the foremost requirement for effective participation in a democratic society is persuasive speaking in public” (p. 165). He further added this translates to this belief that the first speech class “is dedicated to the purpose of training young people to speak the truth honestly and to speak it well” (p. 165). Minnick’s philosophy echoed more of the older

speech pedagogy emphasizing the importance of oral communication skills in a democratic society.

In contrast, Van Dusen advocated for the third design: the voice and diction approach. Van Dusen argued: “Because of the large numbers of persons whose voice and/or diction required improvement each year, I have come to believe that these two factors should receive attention before the student enters upon subjects which stress platform appearances” (p. 166).

Van Dusen referred to the increasing number of students pursuing careers in drama and radio-television. He believed this approach ultimately helped all students to become more confident and poised. He further added overall, “it seems advisable that such help should be offered early so as to give students the basis for good speech in all situations” (p. 164).

The second factor that influenced the basic communication course in 1954 was economic pressures. In reference to the college level, White viewed our education programs that “[were a] somewhat untidy medley of packed lecture halls, I.B.M.—corrected examinations, capsule curricula, and of emphasis upon rote rather than upon thinking” (p. 254).

Both White and Van Dusen agreed that many of the problems White mentioned above were due to financial constraints. From our perspective, more than 57 years later, economic constraints, classes taught in lecture halls, graduate assistants’ staffing courses, clickers, and scan tron sheets assist with course management, and cutbacks in higher education overall seem “normal,” or what we have become accustomed to live with;

however, it is interesting to observe that these problems have been plaguing higher education for more than four decades.

By the onset of the early 1970's, the general education reform initiative began to dissipate. As a result, the revival of the general education program that grounds our programs today can be connected to the late 1970s and early 1980s. By the late 1980's, the majority of universities and colleges had created a general education program that included a course in oral communication. This curricular initiative was a solution to Boyer's (1987) declaration that "to succeed in college, undergraduates should be able to write and speak with clarity, and to read and listen with comprehension" (p. 73). Since communication skills consistently remain as one of the top skills that employers desire in college graduates, the basic communication course continues to exist as part of the general education curriculum in the majority of today's universities and colleges. Consequently, the basic course is "the first opportunity to introduce students to communication skills and theories" (Morreale et al., 2006, p. 416).

The contemporary approach to skills orientation is encapsulated by the National Communication Association's synthesis of "Speaking and Listening Competencies for College Students" originally published in 1998. As documented by the Association's website, "Speaking and Listening" competency primarily consists of speech delivery, organization, and effective listening skills. Apparently, nowhere in their extensive list of competencies did the Association consider that a competent communicator should demonstrate proficiency in the areas of cultural diversity, the strategic use of rhetoric, or civic engagement.

Although there have been discussions and attempts to integrate these vital dimensions into the discipline, the format has essentially remained constant. The course generally is offered in either a public speaking or a hybrid format (which includes interpersonal, group, and public speaking (Morreale et al., 2006). Colleges that offer this course as a general education requirement expect the basic communication course to help their students become competent communicators.

Several scholars have reflected on the history of the Speech Communication discipline in order to assess what should be taught in the basic communication course. Communication educators Chesebro and McCroskey (2002) contend that communication and public speaking are critical for several reasons. The first rationale is that oral communication is the most widely used form of communication. The second reason is oral communication is one of the most vital skills college graduates will need when they begin a career.

In *Communication for Teachers*, Chesebro and McCroskey (2002) stress to pre-service teachers the importance of teaching students the basic skills essential for developing an excellent speech. This practical application of public speaking takes precedence over personal development. Therefore students focus on organization, structure, and developing logical substantive outlines. Students should also be poised, confident, and articulate with minimum verbal fillers.

Addressing the Current State of the Basic Communication Course

The economic, social, political, cultural, and environmental dimensions of globalization impacting our society today demand new intercultural ways of thinking, acting, and teaching the introductory communications course.

In light of these dramatic changes, schools and businesses realize that Americans need a different way of learning from our colleges and universities. In response, The National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) recommended learning outcomes that can be accomplished utilizing different programs of study. The report published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) noted that

in recent years, the ground has shifted for Americans in virtually every important sphere of life—economic, global, cross-cultural, environmental and civic. The world is being dramatically reshaped by scientific and technological innovations, global interdependence, cross-cultural encounters, and changes in the balance of economic and political power. These waves of dislocating change will only intensify. The context in which today's students will make choices and compose lives is one of disruption rather than certainty and of interdependence rather than insularity” This volatility also applies to careers. Studies show that American already change jobs ten times in two decades after they turn eighteen, with such change even more frequent for younger workers. (AACU, 2007 p. 2)

The Council recommended that schools prepare students for the twenty-first century by gaining the following essential learning outcomes: knowledge of human culture and the physical natural world, intellectual and practical skills, and acceptance of personal and social responsibilities.

I argue that in today's society that it is important, we not only teach students to be competent oral communicators but culturally competent communicators who can use

dialogue to advocate for peace and social change. Skills sets should not be taught in taught in isolation but from a holistic perspective. Merging theory and practice in this manner leads to a more substantive and meaningful praxis.

I have been teaching the Basic Communication Course since 1997. I have taught each of the various formats of this course including: Public speaking, Interpersonal, and the most recent format, the Fundamentals of Speech Communication—which surveys different areas of communication including interpersonal, group, and public speaking. I have taught these courses in at least five institutions of higher learning. Based upon my research and experiences as a communication educator and former student, I concur with Engleberg’s perspective that the current structure of the introductory communication course does not meet the twenty-first century needs of our students—especially in the context of globalization. In the following chapter, I will address the question: How does the basic course fail to address the needs of our students in today’s world? The 35 syllabi I have collected will in essence serve as narratives lending themselves to an interpretive inquiry of what they reveal about the state of the basic communication course and the intent and meaning of those who created the various syllabi in relation to globalization, cultural diversity and citizenship education. The following section will include the role of the researcher and a deconstruction of the basic communication course from a critical perspective.

Role of the Researcher

Peshkin (1998) argues that subjectivity is inevitable and happens throughout the research process. The slightest awareness of the researcher’s subjectivity may shape the

inquiry and its outcomes. A researcher can never fully remove his or her subjectivity; hence it is important for the researcher to take off her mask of objectivity. Researchers have individual preferences and different cultural frameworks of meaning; hence a systematic audit of the self can benefit both investigator and the subject. An awareness of this subjectivity can help the researcher be more sensitive and responsive to the differences that she uncovers. Although the researcher cannot eliminate subjectivity, perhaps she can manage it with intellectual honesty and disclosure.

Interpretive Analysis: The Syllabus as a Heuristic Tool

In this interpretive study, the syllabi represent an extraction of the professor's mental models. Thus the syllabus can be considered narrative texts. On the first day of classes at any college, students come to class and typically look to receive a syllabus outlining their course objectives, the grading scale, assignments, the weight of the assignments, and requirements for *the* course. As Thompson (2007) correctly points out, "as a written text, the syllabus communicates a great deal" (p. 54). Research focusing on the syllabus reveals that "teachers face several challenges when presenting and constructing syllabi" (Thompson, 2007, p. 55). The first communication challenge is that *of establishing* the appropriate balance between communicating *that* they are open, caring, and approachable *while simultaneously* being goal-focused, objective oriented, and assessment driven (Becker & Calhoon, 1999; Smith & Razzouk, 1993; Thompson, 2007).

The second *issue* teachers must address is the fact that the syllabus often serves multiple functions. The syllabus may offer information about the teacher (Becker &

Calhoon, 1999; Smith & Razzouk, 1993; Thompson, 2007). The document may include information about the *instructor's* teaching philosophy (Becker & Calhoon, 1999; Thompson, 2007). The syllabus *may reveal the teacher's* self-identity and teaching style (Thompson, 2007). This document also functions as a critical means of communicating textbook information, course assignments, and due dates. The syllabus also conveys content information regarding the course (Thompson, 2007). In more recent years, the syllabus functions as a “complex contractual document” (Singham, 2005). The syllabus inevitably instructs the students regarding the rules and regulations for the course. “As instructors add more rules over the years, the syllabus eventuates into a document that constrains, alienates, and dehumanizes students” (Singham, 2005, p. 5). The language can attempt to demand compliance and obedience, for example ‘you must attend class and participate to pass this course.’ While the syllabus can communicate power it can also impart warmth, caring, trust, respect, and belief in the infinite potential of students.

An additional problem is the fact that students often give the syllabus only a cursory, fleeting glance or totally disregard it altogether. “Most students fail to read the syllabus, refer to it sparingly, and are unable to recall basic information contained in the syllabus” (Smith & Razzouk, 1993). Becker (1999) recommends that instructors go over the syllabus thoroughly, highlighting important issues. In light of the multiple communicative messages, functions, challenges, and importance of the course syllabus, this study examines these research artifacts. Therefore, the following research question was asked: “Does the basic communication course taught in two-year and four-year colleges and universities meet the needs of today’s students in the context of

globalization?” This critical study employed an interpretive approach in order to ascertain whether the basic communication course fails to meet the objectives of helping students become competent communicators in the context of globalization.

Participants and Instructional Context

I collected syllabi from at least 35 two-year colleges and universities in the United States. A message distributed by the National Communication Association List-Serve (CRTNT) and the Basic Communication Course Director’s List-Serve solicited instructors for participation. The requests were made during Spring 2009, Spring 2010, and Fall 2010. I also made an oral request for syllabi at The Hope Conference, a week-long training seminar for communication faculty, sponsored by the National Communication Association. I asked basic communication instructors and directors to submit syllabi and assignments used in their basic communication courses that met their college’s general education requirement for oral communication (intellectual and practical skills). I received 36 syllabi. There were 35 syllabi that met the requirements of my study. I employed an interpretive approach to analyze the texts. For a detailed description of the research methodology, please refer to the Appendix.

Data Analysis

Course syllabi and assignments were analyzed to capture an understanding of how instructors teach the basic communication course. Table 1 shows the institutions that participated in this study; to maintain anonymity, the order they are presented in the table does not reflect the institution number by which they are referred to in the text.

Table 1. *Educational Institutions Participating in Study*

Institution	Communication Class Type
American River College	Public Speaking
Ball State University	Public Speaking
Bradley University	Public Speaking
Cal State LA	Public Speaking
Casper College	Public Speaking/Service Learning
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Mass Communication
Emerson College	Public Speaking
Gannon University	Public Speaking
Gaylord College	Public Speaking
George Washington University	Hybrid
Gonzaga University	Public Speaking
Hillsborough Community College	Public Speaking
Illinois State University (Perry)	Mass Communication
Illinois State University (Simonds)	Public Speaking/Portfolio
Kutztown University	Public Speaking
Middle Tennessee University	Public Speaking
Morton College	Public Speaking
North Carolina A&T State University	Hybrid
Oakland University	Public Speaking
Ohio University	Hybrid
Oklahoma State University	Hybrid
Passaic Community College	Public Speaking
Penn State Lehigh Valley	First Year Experience Course
Pulaski Technical College	Hybrid
Salt Lake Community College (2)	Hybrid
UNC Wilmington (McKinney)	Hybrid
UNC Wilmington (Olsen)	Hybrid
University of Alaska Anchorage	Hybrid
University of Kentucky	PS/service learning
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Public Speaking
University of South Dakota	Public Speaking
Washington, Seattle, WA	Public Speaking
Wayne State College	Hybrid
Wayne State University	Public Speaking
Winston Salem State University	Hybrid

Note: UNC Wilmington has two courses; instructors McKinney and Olsen teach the courses very differently. Illinois State University has two courses instructors; Simonds and Perry teach the courses differently. Order presented here does not reflect institution number by which they are referred in the text.

It is important to note that this interpretive analysis was not designed to measure whether or not these courses met the general education outcomes of oral communication; rather, the major criteria for selection of the data set *was* that the course was used to fulfill the general education outcome requirement of oral communication. The intent of this study was to assess the instructional effectiveness of a sample of the colleges and universities in terms of a critical approach.

I will explore four themes that should inform our pedagogy of the basic course that emerged from my deconstruction of the basic course. Communication educators must deal with issues of culture, strategic rhetoric, silence, and citizenship education in the context of globalization in the basic public speaking course. How we address these issues may affect how future citizens engage in discourse in the public sphere and help minimize the “strange public discourse” and the culture of silence that has enveloped our society in the context of globalization.

Based on my research, four problems were identified: the absence of culture, a pervasive strategic rhetoric of whiteness, too many silencing messages and techniques, and limited citizenship education. The first theme I will introduce is culture. In the following section I will analyze how the concept of culture is operationalized in the basic communication course.

Culture

Chawla and Rodriguez (2011) argue that it is imperative that concepts relating to diversity and power be addressed in the basic communication course.

In our view this mainstream model depoliticizes communication by reducing communication to a process of speaking where success merely requires the acquisition and execution of various skills, techniques and strategies. There is an assumption that power resides in the speaker commanding the floor. For the speaker, the ultimate goal is to persuade or impose one's worldview upon others. (p. 84)

Therefore, to speak is to determine your position and standpoint. Thus, it is important to establish how one views culture.

The concept of culture is critically integral to the way we see, interpret, sense, and experience the world in which we live. Consequently our definitions of culture are influenced by the political, social and historical era in which we live. In fact, historically the term "culture" was closely related in its use and meaning to the process of colonization (Sorrells, 2008). During the nineteenth century European anthropologists wrote depictions of the life of "others," and their descriptions mainly described non-European cultures as uncivilized, and lacking "culture." This viewpoint of "culture" provided grounds for colonization. By the beginning of World War I, European powers had colonized approximately nine-tenths of the world. Young (2001) argues that this legacy of imperialism and colonization influences the field of intercultural communication even today.

The distinction of being "cultured" or not, was based on European societal interpretations of "high" culture and "low" culture. Therefore, those in the ruling class who held power and money, were educated at esteemed schools and viewed as patrons of the arts (literature, ballet, opera, etc.) were considered to possess "high culture." Conversely, those in the lower or working classes that liked activities such as folk art,

popular theatre and later television and popular movies were considered “low culture.” In today’s world, this may be referred to as popular culture. Sorrells (2008) contends that we see the influences of these symbols of high and low culture in film, advertising, television, and commercials to represent not only cultural differences in class but also to reify cultural hierarchy. The increasing desire and consumption of American culture across the globe may partly be influenced by those individuals and societies in general that desire to be perceived as ‘being cultured’ (Sorrells, 2008).

Anthropologic definition of culture. The field of communication studies and the area of intercultural communication have been influenced by a variety of disciplines including, psychology, sociology, and English. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) states that culture “denotes an historically transmitted pattern of meaning embodied in symbols, a system of inherited concepts and expressions in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about attitudes towards life” (p. 89).

The core of this definition is the concept of symbols and symbol systems. Symbols stand for arbitrary, abstract representations of phenomena. Ideas, objects, actions, and people can all be symbols to represent other things.

Cultural anthropologist Goodenough (1981) reserved the term culture for “what is learned, for the things one needs to know in order to meet the standards of others” (p. 50). He expressed a view that places culture in the minds and hearts of men. He states:

for if culture is in the mind of men and if culture is also something shared by or common to the members of society, then it becomes apparently necessary to postulate the existence of a collective mind and to see culture as consisting of

what French sociologists have called “collective representations,” or we must apparently assume that others are capable of some kind of mystical mental communication in which we, as observers, are unable to participate. Certainly it is unsound to attribute generally to others mental processes that individually none of us have been able to discover in himself. (p. 52)

He viewed culture as a product of human learning and summarized its content as: the way people organize their experiences, their past efforts, and how they make sense of those experiences. The author’s model of culture consists of standards for deciding one’s feelings, actions, and how to proceed.

Hecht, Collier, and Ribeau (1993) assert that Goodenough’s concept of culture is an interpretive process that includes the central elements of (code) interacting with others, (conversation) and aligning groups of people (community). These central elements of code, conversation, and community are thus connected with a sense of identity. The authors further argue that this “process of identification is one of adopting the code, learning to do the conversation, and associating within the community literally and symbolically. Identity means orienting one’s self toward a particular ethno-cultural framework” (p. 36).

Consequently, Goodenough’s definition of culture corresponds to Freire’s (1974) assertion that men create their own sense of culture: “As men relate to the world by responding to the challenges of the environment, they begin to dynamize, to master, and to humanize reality. They add to it something of their own making, by giving it temporal meaning to geographic space, by creating culture” (p. 4).

Therefore, culture from a traditional anthropological perspective is a system of shared meanings that are transmitted from generation to generation through symbols that

allow us to communicate and sustain how we see our life. In essence, culture allows us to engage in sense making, and expression. In the syllabi examined, four addressed culture from this anthropological perspective (Institutions 1, 15, 18, and 19).

In one syllabus, one four-year school (Institution 18) emphasized the relationship between culture and communication and stated that its goal was to help students view culture as it relates to identity and intercultural relationships. This communication course with a hybrid approach, stated in their course description this course provides students with an

historical and intellectual development of Communication as an academic discipline. Students will survey the origins of contemporary communication theory; learn about fundamental concepts, models, investigative tools, and contexts of communication; and explore a variety of professional opportunities awaiting communication graduates. (p. 1)

This course viewed culture from an anthropological perspective and helped students to “understand, apply, and evaluate theoretical concepts within a variety of communication contexts (interpersonal, group, organizational, public, media, and intercultural)” (p. 1).

The course devoted one day on the course calendar to a chapter on intercultural communication and also stressed the importance of social diversity.

Cultural Studies definition: Culture as a site of contested meaning. In contrast, while traditional anthropologists view culture as a system of shared meaning, the cultural studies perspective informed by Marxist theories of class, struggle, and exploitation see “culture as a site of contestation” where meanings are always negotiated (Grossberg, Nelson, & Treichler, 1992). Simon During (2001) contends that as England’s

working class became more dispersed and affluent during the 1950s, and mass produced culture started to loom over more local and community cultures, the old concept of culture as a shared way of meaning and life became less applicable.

Hall (1997) argues that culture is the “actual grounded terrain” of our everyday lives from the clothes we buy, the food we eat, the movies we watch, and music we hear, and the news that we select to inform of us about our world—are all grounds where meaning can be challenged.

The concept of culture from an idea of shared meaning and lives shifts

to a view of culture as an apparatus of power within a larger system of domination. A cultural perspective reveals how culture operates as a form of hegemony, or domination through consent. . . . From a cultural studies perspective, meanings are not necessarily shared, stable, or determined; rather meanings are constantly produced, challenged, and negotiated. (Sorrells, 2008, p. 11)

This concept takes the view of culture being challenged and negotiated, appeals to individuals who view themselves as marginalized, or disenfranchised from the center of power. In contrast, viewing culture as system of shared meaning from the dominant culture’s perspective is more aligned with the anthropological view of culture. From a cultural studies perspective, culture is a subject of analysis—something that needs to be critiqued, reviewed, but it is also a site of intervention—that we can use to work toward making the world more equitable and just. This perspective is evident in five syllabi across the country (Institutions 1, 14, 21, 29, and 32).

Textbook author Julia Wood, whose textbook is used by 9.68% of the syllabi surveyed, including two mentioned above (Institutions 1 and 32) states in one of her introductory communication textbooks *Communication Mosaics* that

Social diversity is a defining aspect of the present era. The United States and the world include people at different ages, sexual orientations, races, and ethnicities, sexes, abilities, spiritual commitments, and economic circumstances. These differences directly affect communication. Thus the idea of universal communication goals and principles must be replaced with understandings of how goals and principles are used differently by diverse people and how communication is adapted to contexts, especially cultural contexts. (Wood, 2008, p. 4)

This recognition of the significance of social diversity is evident in 30.33% of the introductory communication courses. In fact one four-year university (Institution 29) makes this evident in their departmental mission statement that culture and diversity are valued in the department. It is articulated in a section of their department mission statement:

Our faculty value a multidisciplinary framework and within each classroom, incorporate a number of divergent perspectives from several fields in the humanities and social sciences. We are dedicated to promoting respect for diverse cultures. We stress collaborative problem-solving and seek to create a community of thoughtful learners, aware and respectful of students' unique experiences, talents, and backgrounds. (p. 2)

The recognition of social diversity is also evident in one of their major assignments. In the persuasive speech (Institution 29), students are asked to "Select a topic from a culture other than your own that addresses a question which contains an ethical question or dilemma. You may select your persuasive topic from experiences you

may have had on an overseas/international trip, from your political involvement, or from a speaker representing a culture other than your own” (p. 3).

This basic communication course syllabus cites their textbook author Griffin , (2010) who points out that “culture” may include “nationality, race, ethnicity, religion, work environment, peer group, or even gender” (p. 4).

In this study, four out of 32 colleges or 12.5% (Institutions 14, 21, 29, and 32) stress the significance of culture and communication in their course description, rationale, and learning objectives. These institutions developed assignments that allowed students to make the connection between citizenship, the public sphere, and cultural and social issues.

In one syllabus from a four-year university (Institution 14) noted the significance of culture and the centrality of communication in fostering the outcome of helping students “become a responsible citizen in the world, both socially, and culturally” (p. 3). This stance is reiterated in their instructional goals that states this course should enable students to “understand how cultural differences can improve intercultural communication” and to “learn the functions and channels of nonverbal communication and the role culture plays in the interpretation of nonverbal messages” (Institution 14, p. 3). This university, in its course objectives, states that one of its instructional goals is to “understand how cultural differences can improve intercultural communication” (p. 3).

This same university (Institution 14) cites as the rationale for one of its assignments to raise students’ awareness and make the connection between the

complexity of “social and cultural issues in their communities, their country, and their world” (p. 5).

The value of social diversity is also communicated in one college’s basic public speaking course (Institution 3). Quotes from various cultural figures are placed on 29 of 34 pages of the syllabus and accompanying course assignments. These quotes include various cultural figures including Margaret Mead, Eleanor Roosevelt, Martin Luther King Jr., and Reverend Neimoller.

The quotes inspire belief in social justice, change, and the power of public speaking. “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only one thing that ever has” (Margaret Mead, as cited in Institution 3 syllabus, p. 12). For example, students are able to make the connection between powerful language and advocacy in the “Let them Eat Cake” persuasive speech assignment.

In one syllabus (Institution 11), culture is highlighted in the course description and objectives acknowledges the significance of culture, gender, class, race, geographic location, and other markers of culture as they influence the ways in which humans express, exchange, and interpret meanings. Culture is viewed in relation to identity construction. One assignment, Participatory Photography as Identity Construction, helps students draw connections between identity and culture. In this course, the professor spends a day discussing the significance of communicating in a global world and links the concept to group activities relating to social justice.

One four-year school (Institution 18) emphasizes the relationship between culture and communication and states that its goal is to help students view culture as it relates to identity and intercultural relationships. This course with a hybrid approach states in their course description that this course provides students with an

historical and intellectual development of Communication as an academic discipline. Students will survey the origins of contemporary communication theory; learn about fundamental concepts, models, investigative tools, and contexts of communication; and explore a variety of professional opportunities awaiting communication graduates.

This course views culture and helps students to “understand, apply, and evaluate theoretical concepts within a variety of communication contexts (interpersonal, group, organizational, public, media, and intercultural).” This course devotes one day on the course calendar to a chapter on intercultural communication and also stresses the importance of social diversity, which is indicated by use of the *Wood Communication in our Lives* textbook.

Globalization definition of culture. Guided by cultural studies, George Yudice (2003) contends that culture, in the context of globalization, should be understood as a resource. It plays an even larger role based upon how it is linked to community, local, national, and transnational economies and politics. Sorrells (2008) argues that “as we enter the twenty-first century, culture is now seen as a source for economic and political exploitation, agency and power and as a resource to be utilized or instrumentalized for a wide range of purposes and ends” (p. 15). In the context of globalization, culture is being

exploited, commodified, and appropriated; for example, white rappers such as Eminem in the hip-hop industry. In this sense, culture is being used as a resource.

Culture is also being used in some areas as a resource for empowerment and resistance. Consider how the Black youth in the favelas—poverty-ridden areas of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil—use funk music to protest against racial discrimination and as a platform for advocacy while they access funding from organizations that support cultural empowerment. Yudice (2003) stresses that today, in the context of globalization, “the understanding and practice of culture is quite complex, located at the intersection of economic and social justice agendas” (p. 17).

In this survey, two syllabi did acknowledge the relationship between culture and globalization (Institutions 11 and 21).

One school (Institution 21), which uses a customized edition of the Hamilton Gregory (2010) book, incorporates a chapter from the Gamble and Gamble (2008) textbook that makes the connection between globalization, diversity, and glocalization.

Gamble states that

In the age of globalization, the likelihood of working and living with people from all over the world increases daily. Globalization is the increasing economic, political, and cultural integration and interdependence of diverse cultures—the worldwide integration of humanity (p. 324).

Gamble, in this context, connects globalization and diversity by viewing the acknowledgement of differences including age, ethnicity, gender, etc. He further looks at the concept of glocalization to describe how “globalization affects and merges with local interests and environments” (p. 324). In this way it acknowledges that all three elements

impact communication. Preceding the discussion of culture in the context of globalization, students examine the concept of culture from an anthropological and a cultural studies perspective. This approach allows students to realize there are multiple and competing views of culture.

In another syllabus, the course description states “Emphasis is on the basic principles of thought, content, organization, style, delivery, and the interaction of communication and culture” (Institution 25, p. 1). The course goals further emphasize the importance of students understanding the relationship between culture and communication and states in its course goals its recognition of culture in a global world: “To integrate issues of ethics, diversity, and technology, in ways that are consistent with our concern for developing knowledge, self-awareness, critical thinking, and practical communication skills in our diverse and changing world” (p. 1).

Multiple and competing views of culture. It is evident that in 30% of the syllabi surveyed there are multiple and competing definitions of culture being operationalized. The concept of culture itself has been contested and challenged. There is no one agreed upon definition of culture, and there are many different meanings to the word culture. Anthropologists Clyde Kluckhohn and Arthur Kroeber (1952) identified more than 150 definitions of culture in the 1950s. In this section, culture has been defined as (a) a system of shared meaning; (b) a site of contested meaning; and (c) culture as a resource. All three of these definitions affect our experiences in our personal, professional, and educational lives.

Culture and the educational practice. Freire contends that it is imperative that we consider a learner's cultural identity and its relationship to the educational practice. This perspective is critical to a 'humanizing pedagogy.' According to Freire (1970),

A humanizing education is the path through which men and women can become conscious about their presence in the world. The way they act and think when they develop all of their capacities, taking into consideration their needs, but also the needs and aspirations of others. (p. 38)

One university syllabus (Institution 29) fosters a "humanizing education" in their basic course in their persuasive speech assignment. Students are instructed to "select a topic from a "culture" other than your own that addresses a question which contains an ethical question or dilemma. You may select your persuasive speech topic from experiences you may have had on an overseas/international trip, from your political involvement, or from a speaker representing a culture other than your own" (p. 4). In fact one four-year university (Institution 29) makes this evident in their departmental mission statement that culture and diversity are valued in the department. It is articulated in a section of their department mission statement:

Our faculty value a multidisciplinary framework and within each classroom, incorporate a number of divergent perspectives from several fields in the humanities and social sciences. We are dedicated to promoting respect for diverse cultures. We stress collaborative problem-solving and seek to create a community of thoughtful learners, aware and respectful of students' unique experiences, talents, and backgrounds. (p. 2)

In *Teachers as Cultural Workers*, Freire (1998b) states that helping students understand that culture is one of the critical elements of social transformation.

It is true that education is not the ultimate lever for social transformation, but without it transformation cannot occur. No nation can assert itself through a wild passion for knowledge without venturing emotionally into constantly reinventing itself and creating taking risks. No society can assert itself without developing its culture, science, research, technology and teaching. (p. 38)

Consequently, Freire believed that one's "cultural inheritance" plays a significant role in shaping our lives and worldview. He argued that developing an understanding of the significance of culture is a fundamental element in bringing about change. One university (Institution 11) acknowledges that the significance that cultural inheritance plays in helping students understand how to construct their personal identity.

Two group activities involve students involved in an exercise, "Participatory Photography as Identity Construction" and the creation of social justice groups. These activities allow students to look at the concept of culture through multiple lenses. The participatory photography activity helps student recognize how their identity shapes who they are in context to world the around them.

It is imperative that we as educators must never become victims of what Freire (1998b) calls "historical amnesia," in which one loses the ideas of "tomorrow as a possible project" (p. 72). In doing so, we lose the potential site for conscientizing pedagogy and identity liberation. His words to teachers in his Eighth Letter are applicable to diversity education:

to know the concrete world in which their student's live, the culture in which their students' language, syntax, semantics, and accent are found in action, in which certain habits, likes, beliefs, fears, desires are formed that are not necessarily easily accepted in teachers' own worlds . . . Educators need to know what happens in the world of their children with whom they work. They need to know the universe of their dreams, the language which they skillfully defend themselves

from the aggressiveness of their world, what they know independently of the school, and how they know. (p. 72)

Hence, it is critical that we as educators try to acknowledge, understand, respect, and value the student's culture and ethnic identity if we are to help them reach their full potential. This can be achieved if we, in the words of Freire, become critical co-investigators with our students and use a dialogic form of education that is grounded in trust, respect, optimism, and love.

Culture acknowledged—but not operationalized. However, five (14.28%) of the syllabi (Institutions 9, 15, 19, 23, and 24) acknowledge the importance of culture, but there is no other mention of the term in the syllabi in either lectures or assignments. One example (Institution 9) states:

COMM 210 is a University Core Curriculum requirement that focuses on communication concepts and skills with the goals of helping you to understand basic communication principles, providing you with the opportunity to improve your oral communication skills, and enhancing your awareness of the role of communication in culture. (p. 1)

This is also evident in another community college (Institution 23) that mentions the importance of diversity or culture in their division mission objectives. However, there is no evidence of this in their basic communication course. It states on the syllabus that the division

upholds and promotes the general education objectives stated in the catalog by requiring students taking classes in the Fine Arts and Humanities division to: think critically; act with integrity; write across the curriculum; demonstrate computer literacy; demonstrate information literacy; demonstrate cultural literacy

and sensitivity; and understand the importance of civic/community involvement. (p. 2).

In another section of the syllabi, it states that

this course focuses specifically on three (Institution 23) general education objectives: increases ability to communicate in writing, speaking, and reading; develops a basic understanding of people, cultures, and society in general; and develop teamwork and workplace skills necessary for success in the world of work. This course also introduces students to speech communication as an academic discipline. (p. 2)

However, there is no mention of culture or intercultural communication within the course calendar, assignments, or activities. It is very difficult to fulfill general education requirements to increase students' ability to "communicate through speaking" and

develop a basic understanding of people, cultures, and society's in general; and develop teamwork and workplace skills necessary for success in the world of work without helping students understand the importance and relationship of language and culture and how to be a competent speaker within a global society. (p. 1)

In the 35 syllabi surveyed, 70% do not identify culture as a topic or unit to address. While several syllabi mentioned it as important, there is no evidence that culture is in the syllabi or addressed in the curriculum.

The absence of culture as a critical framework in the majority of the basic courses surveyed perpetuates and fosters the notion of strategic rhetoric and whiteness which acts to sustain and perpetuate "the spread of a hegemonic orientation to public speaking" (Chawla & Rodriguez, 2011, p. 77).

Strategic Rhetoric

Strategic rhetoric is viewed as the persuasive discourse articulated in a hegemonic fashion to perpetuate and solidify structures and institutions of power. Historically, rhetoric has been used as a mode to obtain and maintain power (Carter, 2005; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Fine, 1987; Foucault, 1984; French & Raven, 1959; Swartz, 1997a).

Ferguson (1990) contends that

the place from which power is exercised is often a hidden place. When we try to pin it down, the center always seems to be somewhere else. Yet we know that this phantom center, elusive as it is, exerts a real, undeniable power over the entire framework of our culture, and over the ways we think about it. (p. 19)

In relation to whiteness, this persuasive discourse operates in a hegemonic manner to obtain and maintain the institutional power structures and hence the status quo. The history of the communication field has originated from an emphasis on the center. Plato and Aristotle, both from the elite and privileged class, had no interest in developing the use of rhetoric in a manner that empowered or amplified the voices of slaves, women, or any other marginalized human beings. In fact, rhetoric was also a skill that was used to maintain and defend the center or the status quo. Spelman (1988) argues that “both Plato and Aristotle have a normative view of notion of humaneness that is inseparable from a notion of masculinity (which is of course normative)” (p. 54). Spelman’s argument provides evidence for ways that race and gender were merged into one voice to reify and maintain the focus of the center for white male citizens. While the use of rhetoric has shifted through the course of history from Ancient Greece to North America and westernized capitalistic societies, the position of whiteness as the center is still firmly

entrenched and considered the norm (Fassett & Warren, 2004, 2007; Ferguson, 1990; Gong, 1994; hooks, 1994; Jeneffsky, 1996; Nakayama, 1994; Orbe & Groscurth, 2004; Sorrells & Nakagawa, 2008; Wood, 1981).

An example of this is shown in one syllabus (Institution 2):

By becoming a student of public speaking, you join a long history of rhetorical study dating back to ancient Greece. This course thus advances the mission of the Department of Communication to nurture socially responsible, literate citizens who can interpret and evaluate messages they create and receive. (p. 1)

Is it important to consider whose language we want our students to articulate?

What platonic values do we want them to embody? Do we want them to use stylistic language, to use political correctness to disenfranchise people?

Foucault's notion of power is critical in providing an analysis of the insidious nature of the strategic rhetoric of whiteness. Foucault maintains that power relations are not visible at any given time. The invisibility of power is central to Foucault's reading of its impact and enduring nature. In his conceptualization of discursive formation, Foucault emphasizes that the acknowledgement of the contradictory nature within discursive formation.

A discursive formation is not, therefore, an ideal continuous, smooth text that runs beneath the multiplicity of contradictions, and resolves them in the calm unity of coherent thought; nor is it the surface in which, in a thousand different aspects, a contradiction is reflected that is always in retreat, but everywhere dominant. It is rather a space of multiple dimensions; a set of different oppositions whose levels and roles must be described. Archeological analysis, then erects the primacy of a contradiction that has its model in the simultaneous affirmation and negation of a single proposition. (Foucault, 1972, p. 155)

Thus, the central contradiction regarding whiteness is critical. In its discursive formation, its invisibility is omnipotent, and without critical interrogation and deconstruction, remains pervasive. Consequently, by structuring and studying rhetoric from a particular vantage point, students' attempts to question and challenge the dominate paradigm is minimized. This assumption of the omnipotence of whiteness is evident by the fact that 70% of the syllabi sampled do not address issues of culture in their description and assignments. One university (Institution 15) offers a first-year experience course which has a section on presentation skills. The goal of this course is to help students acclimate, explore, and learn the campus' resources, policies, and understand the hidden curriculum of higher education—how to behave and speak in a manner which ensures their academic success. This course meets the oral general education requirement as students deliver presentations. In its description, it states that

This course is designed to:

- 1) Help students understand the college experience and university study while growing as a public communicator
- 2) Introduce students to the procedures and resources of the university and help students become proficient in using them
- 3) Acquaint students with learning tools and resources available at (school name)
- 4) Provide students with a supportive community of peers who will assist them in the transition to college
- 5) Help students appreciate and understand diversity. (p. 3)

However, there is no mention of discussion or activities on topics of diversity or culture. This is an area of concern because it is in the Freshmen Seminar courses that students receive assistance in decoding the “hidden curriculum.” Students are learning during the first year in college. This example is a haunting reminder of what Foucault

(1977) believes we are teaching students, to i.e. inhabit “docile bodies” (p. 135), where students raise their hands to speak, sit in orderly rows, learn to speak appropriately, and maintain the academic and society’s power structures.

Dialogue as epistemology. Although we are familiar with the word “dialogue” and we assume that we participate in it regularly, it is helpful to consider the origin of the word as we examine how dialogue is used in the basic communication course. The word dialogue is derived from the Greek word “dialogos.” The term “dia” means through, “between,” or across and “logos” refers “word” or “the meaning of the word” as well as “speech” or “thought” Philosopher and physicist David Bohm (1996) contends that:

The picture or the image that this derivation suggests is a stream of meaning among and through us and between us. This will make possible a flow of meaning in the whole group, out of which may emerge a new understanding. It’s something new, which may not have been in the starting point at all. It’s something creative. (p. 6)

In developing a transformative curriculum for the basic communication course in the context of globalization, it is important one must consider what process, pedagogical methods, and teaching strategies we can use to liberate ourselves from oppressive thoughts, actions, and political systems. Freire (1970) states that “constant dialogue and awareness must be self guarded to avoid the relationship of the oppressor-oppressed and it is an existential necessity” (p. 87). Hence, by allowing a dialogic form of education we allow the masses (students and the perspective of diverse populations) to metaphorically speak by reading and listening to their own voice. As dialogue is used more and more in the classroom for authentic conversations about issues of culture, race, disabilities, war,

and peace, educators need to help students develop a sense of critical consciousness and their authentic voice. Their identity is thus formed in relation to the self and other individuals. In this sense, dialogue can be viewed as a way of knowing.

In essence, it is through dialogue that we begin to know and understand the other. The process of learning about the other culture, their lifestyle, their stories of family, struggles, how they define themselves and their world is critical to the process of becoming more competent speakers and culturally competent global citizens.

While many syllabi state the instructor has an open door policy, one syllabus (Institution 9) encouraged students to discuss difficult issues with the instructor. This syllabus contained messages to different student populations which facilitates a more inclusive and dialogic classroom atmosphere. One message was addressed to English as Second Language (ESL) students:

We encourage you to consult with your instructor as you take this class. You may be asked to do things which do not make to you or which seem difficult. As you come to understand the cultural basis of communication, these difficulties will be alleviated. So please, keep communicating with your instructors and classmates. (Institution 9, p. 7)

This invitation to an open door policy specifically aimed for students of other cultures encourages them to spend time with their professors and share difficult issues that may be impeding their academic progress that we as Americans may be unintentionally aware of, but perhaps feeling comfortable enough to disclose these issues with their professors, these students may have a better educational experience.

In many college classrooms, the instructional method of lecturing is pervasive. It threatens to infect us with what Freire terms “narration sickness.” However, many college professors believe they facilitate or use a seminar approach to teaching their classes. In many cases, their efforts result in what Bakhtin refers to as monologism.

Russian philosopher Bakhtin was concerned about what he considered as the oppressive character of monologue, the monopolization of meaning, and the ruling out and suppressing of all competing voices. The philosopher’s hatred of monologue became the driving force for the development of his concept of dialogue. He viewed life as an ongoing, never-ending dialogue taking place at every moment of our existence.

Dialogism is Bakhtin’s attempt to counteract pervasive monologism. Clark and Holquist (1984) describe Bakhtin’s perspective on dialogue:

Dialogism is Bakhtin’s attempt to think his way out of such pervasive monologism. Dialogism is not intended to be merely another theory of language or even another philosophy of language, but an account of relations between people and between persons and things that cuts across religious, political and aesthetic boundaries. Despite the enormous range of topics to which it is relevant, dialogism is not the usual abstract system of thought. Unlike other systems that claim comprehensiveness, Bakhtin’s system never loses sight of the nitty-gritty of everyday life, with all the awkwardness, confusion, and pain peculiar to the “hic et nunc,” but also the joy that only the immediacy of the here and now can bring . . . Bakhtin’s philosophy never undercuts the dignity of persons. (p. 348)

One syllabus (Institution 26) demonstrates Bakhtin’s philosophy:

It is important that our classroom is a supportive environment for all students to learn public speaking, presentations, and listening skills. When listening to another person speak, be attentive and encouraging. Practice cultural humility and treat others with respect at all time. Positive interaction and feedback are important.

In contrast, monologism not only undercuts the dignity of the person, it prevents cultural spaces from opening in the classroom. Students are unable to articulate their attitudes, knowledge, and thus may not develop their skills sets as effectively. It also hinders the very goal of infusing different cultural perspectives in the classrooms. It limits the possibility of students and teachers becoming critical co-investigators in knowledge.

In the syllabi examined, four courses (11%) do not require students to deliver oral presentations, yet the courses fulfill their college's general education requirements for oral communication (Institutions 1, 4, 12, and 18). The students do participate in classroom discussion, submit written assignments, and take exams. One syllabus states: "One of the learning outcomes for this course is 'to demonstrate an increased awareness of the importance of communication skills'" (Institution 18, p. 1).

Students, while they are exposed to communication theories and informed on how to deliver a presentation, are still limited in developing their own voice through the construction and delivery of individual oral presentations. This type of environment has the potential to be dominated by the professor's lecture and be viewed as monologism. This can also lead to silencing our students.

Silence in the Basic Course

In Chapter II, I discussed the relationship between silence, society, and education. I argued that the communication process the Spiral of Silence contributes to our culture of silence in our society and classrooms. I also emphasized in Chapter II how an instructor's intentional or unintentional use of power contributes to silencing in our

classrooms. Instructors use compliance-gaining strategies known as Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATS) and Behavior Alteration Messages (BAMS) as reward-oriented or punishment compliance gaining techniques (Chory & Goodboy, 2010). In this section I will examine how instructors who teach the basic communication course may unknowingly contribute to this culture of silence in our university classrooms.

In the syllabi reviewed, nearly all communicated Behavior Alteration Messages (BAMS) for punishment-compliance regarding attendance and participation. One syllabus (Institution 17) illustrates this point:

An unexcused absence on the day you are scheduled to speak or take a quiz or exam will result in an automatic “O” for that particular assignment. *Additionally, any unexcused absence on a speech day—when you are supposed to be an audience member—will result in the lowering of your grade for that particular assignment.* [Italics in the original text] (p. 2).

This message of punishment compliance negatively communicates that the role of the audience member is a dreaded experience and that forced compliance is necessary.

In one syllabus (Institution 3), students are required to sign a contract and submit the signed copy to their instructor and keep a copy for their records. One line of a contract states that “I understand that once signed, this contract may not be changed except under mutually agreeable conditions between the above and the instructor (Instructor Name).”

In another syllabus (Institution 27), students must read and agree to the following statement: “I understand my obligation and expectations as a student in this particular course. I agree with and will comply with the items, terms, and statements as listed within

this syllabus and referenced by the (School Name) catalogue and student code of conduct” (p. 8).

In the examples above, the use of these behavior-altering messages intertwines power and instructional communication in the classroom. The signing of the contract seals the deal between instructor and students. The student has signed on the dotted line and signed away her power and agency.

Another Behavior Alteration Message (BAM) is the use of sarcasm on course documents and in the classroom. While some educators may perceive their sarcasm as witty and clever comments, this type of message may make some students apprehensive, withdrawn, and reluctant to voice their thoughts and ideas. The use of sarcasm was noted on at least two syllabi (Institutions 1 and 19). One instructor used a sarcastic message when communicating his policy on cell phones:

Cell phones are an amazing technology which I must admit I despise. I refer to them as ‘electronic nipples’ because it seems (school name) students cannot go longer than 10 minutes without obsessively checking to see who called or texted them. Why anyone would want to walk around clutching their cell phone all hours of the day is beyond me. Accordingly, make SURE you turn off your cell phone before class. *If you cannot last the fifty minutes of class without your cell phone, drop the course (2).* [Highlights indicated on the original text] (Institution 1 Syllabus, p. 2)

The above statement precedes the Communication Studies Department policy on electronic devices. The reinforcement of this policy in a sarcastic tone—is meant to gain compliance. Sarcasm is also used to gain compliance for the dress code. One syllabus’s ninth expectation uses this approach: “Baseball caps are not worn during class, regardless of activity. They are collector items” (Institution 19, p. 1).

Silencing and classroom facilitation is also related when instructors censor student's speech topics. In one syllabus, the instructor uses censorship for topic selection (Institution 3). "Issues such as 'abortion' or 'gun rights' are so emotionally charged that so called efforts at 'informing' are often doctrinaire persuasive efforts in disguise. Try to avoid issues that are so heavily charged that 'honest' informing is not possible" (p. 15).

In this class, students are silenced by controlling topics selected for speeches. Students learn to refrain from discussing "controversial subjects" or speaking out about a controversial subject instead of being invited to seek assistance in developing their presentation so they can learn how to publicly address difficult topics. In this sense, we are contributing to developing a culture of silence in the university classroom teaching students to silence their voices on difficult issues and join the 'silent majority.' Such silencing practically guarantees that students will not become agents engaged in social action.

In addition to behavior altering messages, instructors use a variety of behavior altering techniques (BATS) in the communication classroom. Many of the BAMS on the syllabi support the instructor's attempt to reinforce the Behavior Alteration Message. One behavior altering technique used in college classrooms are student response systems, (SRS), audience response systems (ARS), or personal response systems (PRS) also known as "clickers" A more recent technology, clickers are considered one method of employing active learning in the classroom. When students use clickers, they use an input device, similar to a game remote device that allows them to answer a question or express their views anonymously. The cumulative view of the class is seen on the screen.

However, each device is numbered so that the instructors can download answers for record keeping following class (Martyn, 2007). The clickers provide a tool for students to participate anonymously and it incorporates a gaming approach into the traditional classroom discussion. The tool has also been considered an active learning approach (Caldwell, 2007; Martyn, 2007).

Three universities employed clickers in their large lecture classes (Institutions 1, 11, and 12). Instructors utilize these mechanisms to monitor attendance, take quizzes, and elicit audience responses on questions posed by the instructor.

Proponents of this approach argue that it provides a way for students to participate more in classroom discussions in large lecture settings, increase engagement, participate anonymously, and record their quiz scores and attendance. However, critics argue instructional time is limited due to technical difficulties, and cost is prohibitive. While the use of clickers have been used in a variety of courses including math (d'Iverno, Davis, & White, 2003); nursing (Halloran, 1995); and engineering (van Dijk, van Den Berg, & van Keulen, 2001), there have also been concerns with this learning approach.

Students complain that the clicker reminds them of big brother watching them and requiring them to attend class.(Wampler & Clark, 2006). One complaint from a student includes “stop messing around with technology and get back to good basic teaching” (d'Iverno et al., 2003, p. 163).

While the use of clickers is considered an “active learning approach” in a large lecture classroom, it is the antithesis of authoring voice. In a class that is designed to meet the general education requirement for oral communication, one must ask if sitting in a

large lecture hall mutely clicking an electronic device helps students become competent oral communicators.

Educational journals, workshop facilitators, and educational gurus proclaim that with the integration of technology in the classroom, we usher in a new era of innovative learning for our students. However, McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005) warn us that

by creating a façade of information-era utopianism through carnival-like hucksterism that accompanies the corporate invasion of our classrooms, calls for educators to be converted into McTeachers, and the growth of a computer technology millenarianism that assures salvation through Internet (and computer) consciousness, potential criticism can be siphoned away from the fact that we live in a monstrous era. (p. 130)

In an oral communication classroom, are we cultivating students to use discourse as informed citizens by requiring them to register their presence through the click of a button?

Educator bell hooks (1994) reminds us that one central issue to transformative pedagogy is the issue of voice—who listens? Who speaks? And why? She contends that

one way to build community in the classroom is to recognize the value of each individual voice . . . To hear each other (the sound of different voices is an exercise in recognition. It also insures that no one student remains invisible in the classroom. Some students resent having to make a verbal contribution in the classroom, and so I have had to make it clear from the outset that this is a requirement in my classes. Even if there is a student present whose voice cannot be heard in spoken words, by signing (even if we cannot read the signs they make their presence felt. (p. 41)

In the communication classroom do we cultivate a sense of pseudo -techno empowerment by the use of clickers? As communication educators we must ask

ourselves is it more empowering to sit in our chairs “with docile bodies” or to speak up in a room of a 100 people and learn how to voice our opinion, argue our position, and debate in the public sphere?

Shapiro (2010) warns of the danger of educational policies and practices that restrict our thoughts, actions, and voices. He argues that:

The current regime in education is all about conformity of thought—finding somebody else’s idea of the one right answer. This conformity is reinforced, not just through the medium of standardized forms of assessment, but also through the sterility of what constitutes the learning space. This space mostly excludes the very things that are most salient to the direction and quality of young people’s lives: sexuality, spiritual and religious faith, the impact of the media and the content of popular culture, war and violence, race and cultural difference, politics. Remove these things and we are left with a classroom that offers no possibility of the kind of passionate engagement that stirs us to find our voices and speak our truth to others who share our world. (pp. 186-187)

This “conformity of thought” is reified in many university classrooms when we do not allow students to critically interrogate issues that are relevant to their world.

Communication becomes a behavior alteration technique to silence our students’ voices in the classroom in order for them to conform to speech topics and discussions that we deem “appropriate.” In essence, if educators censor the topics discussed and do not acknowledge, discuss, and challenge the multiple and competing ways of viewing culture and valuing differences including race, age, sexual orientation, nationality, and disabilities, we are using communication as a means to limit and silence our students’ voices. In turn, we can also teach our students to silence others who are marginalized, less powerful, if we abuse our authority in the classroom.

Communication educators must develop a classroom culture where students feel supported and protected to help them develop a sense of critical consciousness and citizenship. In the next section I will discuss the concepts of critical consciousness, Socratic questioning, and Lerner's (2000) engagement in parrhesia.

Democracy and Education

Purpel (1989) contends that it has been said that “public schools are the only major public institutions specifically charged with the responsibility for nourishing and sustaining democracy” (p. 49). Purpel and other scholars (Chawla & Rodriguez, 2011; Keith, 2007; Stone, 2002) assert that John Dewey's work represents and synthesizes the work of political, educational, and social leaders to integrate democracy and education.

Purpel (1989) notes that “It is this tradition that underlies programs in student government, civics, citizenship education and various projects in community awareness and involvement” (p. 49). Purpel states that there were certain times during our history when issues of “social studies and citizenship education” were an important part of public debate and controversy” (p. 49).

Purpel further states it is the schools' responsibility to nourish and develop democracy. He argues that we as citizens have stopped worrying about voter apathy, and are much less concerned about how well versed our students are about social and political matters. Purpel's admonition is reflected in four of the syllabi that overemphasize skills for the workplace and are market-oriented (Institutions 4, 24, 35, and 36). In four of these courses, the main focus was to help students develop better communication skills for the workforce. One course (Institution 35) states the following goals for the course: “(1)

Students will create and define goals for academic and professional growth; (2) Students will align goals to current and future opportunities; (3) students will assess goal progress; (4) Students will demonstrate proof of progress toward goals initiating a portfolio” (p. 1).

One major assignment is the academic portfolio that is

a collection of documents and artifacts that demonstrate the skills and abilities you claim in your resume or vitae. It will represent your insights, observations, and reflections throughout your undergraduate studies. You will begin your portfolio in this course and will continue to add to it over the next few years. During this course you will create the following sections/documents for your portfolio: initial organization scheme, cover letter, table of contents, resume. (Institution 35 Syllabus, p. 2)

In addition to the academic portfolio, students also complete a “career options project” that consists of students reflecting upon their career goals. The course, designed for students who are majoring in mass media and journalism, requires the students to read a chapter on civic and political engagement in journalism careers for one class period.

One community college course syllabus (Institution 24) contains the following objectives:

(1) a general knowledge of the basic theories of human communication in rhetorical, group, and interpersonal settings; (2) a basic understanding of the principles and techniques of effective communication in interpersonal, group, and public speaking contexts; (3) ability to successfully apply the knowledge in actual small group, interviewing, business, public speaking, and interpersonal situations; (4) the ability to write well-worded and persuasive resumes and other business communication. Finally, students must demonstrate the ability to write a valid and well-supported analysis of communication problems encountered in real-world situations. (p. 1)

The main projects for the course include conducting an interview with a prospective employer, a group project focusing on communication and decision-making skills, one informative or persuasive individual presentation, an interpersonal theme paper, and a reflection paper to include in their general education eportfolio.

One course (Institution 36) provides students with a two-page handout with seven presentation tips from Steve Jobs of Apple Corporation, written by Carmine Gallo (2010), author of *The Presentation Secrets of Steve Jobs: How to Be Insanely Great in Front of Any Audience*:

(1) Plan in analog. Steve Jobs may have made a name for himself in the digital world, but he prepares presentations in the old world of pen and paper . . . **(2) Create Twitter-friendly headlines.** **(3) Introduce the antagonist.** In every classic story, the hero fights the villain. The same hold true for a Steve Jobs presentation. In 1984, the villain was IBM, “Big Blue.” . . . **(4) Stick to the rule of three.** The human brain can only absorb three or four “chunks” of information at any one time. Neuroscientists are finding that if you give your listeners too many pieces of information to retain, they won’t remember a thing. **(5) Strive for simplicity.** For example, there are forty words on the average PowerPoint slide. It’s difficult to find ten words in one dozen Apple slides. **(6) Reveal a “Holy Smokes” moment.** People will forget what you, said, what you did, but they will never forget how you made them feel . . . **(7) Sell dreams, not products.** Great leaders cultivate a sense of mission among their employees. Steve Job’s mission is to change the world, to put a “dent in the universe” . . . True evangelists are driven by a messianic zeal to create new experiences . . . Where most people see the iPod as a music player, Jobs sees it as a tool to enrich people’s lives. It’s important to have great products, of course, but passion, enthusiasm, and emotion will set you apart. (p. 2).

In the first and for some college students only communication course, what message are they receiving about communication? Are we teaching them to be critical consumers of messages and images? Gallo’s presentation tips may be perceived as a post-modern guide for the modern rhetorical situation of capitalism. In our quest for

excellence in the competitive race to maintain dominance and superiority, we have neglected to teach students the value and the art of Socratic reasoning?

The concept of rigor according to Purpel (1989) is within the Socratic tradition which begins with the “commitment to precise, rigorous thinking and a simultaneous skepticism and humility about our capacity to do so” (p. 130). Purpel refers to judgment as the “application of moral and ethical criteria to propositions, policies, events, and other phenomena” (p. 131). Purpel contends criticism is the means to react, respond, and make relationships, hence, criticism can be viewed as building relationships.

Freire (1970) eloquently writes on the centrality of this concept. He asserts that critical consciousness is “learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against those oppressive elements of reality” (p. 74). His concept of conscientious was designed to deliver people from illiteracy. Thus, he defines literacy not as the ability to read and write, but as the ability to read and write critically.

Teaching students information literacy skills was evident in six syllabi (17%) examined (Institutions 6, 13, 15, 16, 23, and 26). One community college (Institution 26) listed in its syllabus that students must acquire

Conversational Currency: Be informed, read newspapers, news magazines, and watch news shows (CNN, Nightly News, 60 minutes, Dateline, NBC, 20/20, 48 hours, etc.) to keep up-to-date on current events. Students are expected to pay attention to current and classical events and news items about the topics of communication and special interest and should be able to discuss them at the beginning of class. This is part of your class participation grade and it’s also conversational speaking. (p. 3)

One syllabus for a freshmen first-year course (Institution 15) that meets the oral communication general education requirement states: “You are required to read The New York Times each day and to integrate material from the newspaper into your speeches” (p. 1).

Two community colleges stated a strong commitment by the institution that students gain competence in information literacy. One syllabus (Institution 23) states:

The college name is committed to the Information Literacy Competency Standard for Higher Education as established by the Association of College and Research Libraries and endorsed by the National Forum on Information Literacy.

Therefore, all courses will incorporate an information literacy component so that, by graduation, all students will be able to recognize the need for information, then locate, evaluate, synthesize, and communicate information in an ethical manner. Information literacy encompasses critical thinking, research, media, technology, health, business, and visual literacy skills to produce lifelong learners who can make informed decisions in the workplace and in their personal lives. (p. 8)

The class schedule designates one instructional day for a case study and review of websites and a second day at the library for an information literacy research session.

Students complete two assignments.

Jaffe (2001) argues that

critical thinkers can analyze information and sort through persuasive appeals. They can discriminate between faulty arguments and valid reasoning, follow ideas to their logical conclusion, and appreciate a diversity of opinion and presentation styles. Studying the principles of public speaking can only increase your critical thinking competencies. (p. 7)

In six of the syllabi examined (14, 16, 20, 29, 13, and 35), a strong emphasis was demonstrated in developing critical thinking skills.

In one course (Institution 20), it is stated that one of the goals of their group communication project is to “employ aspects of critical thinking to solve problems within a task-oriented group” (p. 3). In another syllabus (Institution 16), critical thinking is emphasized in the course description. “Introduction to speech is part of (College Name) ‘Thought and Expression’ block, a series of courses designed to develop skills in critical thinking and thoughtful verbal and written expression” (p. 1). The same syllabus states as the first course objective: “Upon successful completion of this class, students will: develop critical thinking skills.” Another course objective is to “become familiar with research materials” and to “apply concepts of reasoning and evidence to present ideas more clearly” (p. 1).

One of the most extensive courses (Institution 35) focusing on developing students’ critical thinking skills is entitled “Communication as Critical Inquiry.” The book and the supplementary materials packet are entitled “Communication as Critical Inquiry.” In fact, critical thinking skills are emphasized in the first three course goals:

- (1) Students will become more competent communicators (using knowledge, skills, motivation, and judgment),
 - (2) Students will become more critical consumers and producers of ideas and information (using analytical reasoning skills in the reception, collection, and presentation of ideas), and
 - (3) Students will conduct background research necessary to develop well-informed presentations.
- (p. 2)

Students develop a portfolio as one of their major assignments. Students include in their portfolio “a final communication analysis paper” and also a “pre and post Critical Thinking Self Assessment” (p. 2).

Citizenship education. Lerner (2000) contends that effective citizenship education should challenge students to think critically. He argues that pedagogy itself must change.

It must be directed at engaging the student in asking critical questions and learning to see the possibilities in every given actuality. Even the deepest spiritual truths are of little value as a new catechism. Unless students are awakened to do their own thinking and exploring, much of the rest of what we are teaching is going to be useless, no matter how wonderful the content. (p. 261)

West (2004), citing Socrates, states that

The Socratic love of wisdom holds not only that the unexamined life is not worth living (Apology 38a), but also that to be human and a democratic citizen requires that one must have the courage to think critically for oneself. Socratic questioning yields intellectual integrity, philosophic humility, and personal sincerity—all the essential elements of our democratic armor for the fight against corrupt elite power. (pp. 208-209)

West contends that Socratic questioning is the “enactment of parrhesia—and frank and fearless speech is the lifeblood of any democracy” (p. 209).

Origins of parrhesia. In 1983 at the University of California at Berkeley, Foucault delivered six lectures in a seminar entitled “Discourse and Truth.” In this seminar, he discussed the Greek concept of parrhesia or “frankness in speaking the truth” (Foucault, 2001, p. 7).

Foucault (2001) contends that parrhesia appears in the first instance in Euripides (c. 484-407). It is subsequently used in the Greek world until approximately the close of the fifth century B.C.E. Consequently the word has been used in English as “free speech” and parrhesiates, the individual who uses parrhesia, is the person who speaks the truth.

Foucault depicted it as “verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his personal relationship to the truth, and risks his life because he recognized truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people as well as himself” (p. 19).

Peters (2003) notes that Foucault viewed parrhesiastes as a moral and ethical virtue connected with truth. One syllabus (Institution 27) directly addressed the fact that controversial topics may be addressed in the classroom and consequently provides students with a 10-line position on controversial statements:

If the instructor plans to use an example, video, or other item which may be deemed particularly controversial, he will attempt to warn individuals of such content. However, it is difficult to determine what an individual or group may perceive as controversial. Therefore, please accept this statement as your notice of such events and remember we are all mature adults and learn from others, especially when encountering differences or something new. (p. 2)

This college encourages what Foucault refers to as one of the characteristics of parrhesia—frank discussion. Foucault contends that frank discussion indicates a special relationship between the audience and the speaker and that the speaker engages in forthright discussion.

At least one syllabus (Institution 2) encouraged students to express their comments free of suppression:

The classroom must remain a tolerant space where we reason through opposing arguments. No doubt, you will hear many opinions this quarter that are not your own (this is essential to the design of this course), but you must engage those opposing views in a respectful manner. I will not tolerate oppressive comments in the classroom that make it difficult for anyone to have fair and equal access to education. (p. 3)

Realizing citizenship education. Effective citizenship education should make Americans think more globally realizing that our actions, language, and deeds impact not only America, but the globe. Scott Ritter, the former US Marine and United Nations arms inspector who traveled the globe to try to stop a US attack on Iraq, said something all Americans should critically interrogate. Van Gelder, who cites his words in *Yes!* (2003), states that these words are a reminder that democracy is an unfinished project:

There has been a disturbing tendency among certain nations, Iraq included, to try and make a distinction between the people of the United States and the government of the United States. This is wrong. Ultimately, there is no difference, and indeed there can be no difference between the people and the United States and the government of the United States, because thanks to our constitution, we the people of the United States of America are the government. In America today, we take very seriously the concept of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This represents the very foundation of the democratic way of life we love and cherish. (p. 1)

In the following section I will examine how instructors of the basic course promote the concept of citizenship education in connection with public speaking.

Citizenship is a learned habit and practice. Aristotle (1941) contends that citizenship is a habit and practice that must be learned. The first proponent of participatory citizenship, Aristotle argues that citizens must be involved in their government and be motivated to deliberate debate and be involved in decisions that impact their lives. Aristotle's interpretation of participatory democracy advocates for all citizens to share the well-being of their government. Citizens in a democracy need to learn the habit of citizenship in order to contribute to the state. They must also cultivate the skills to critique and change it.

Aristotle's emphasis on individual involvement and desire are critical traits in his model of citizenship education. Aristotle stresses that citizens must be engaged in order to sustain a healthy democracy. His belief in individual engagement and drive are critical aspects in his citizenship model that can serve as a foundation for redesigning the basic communication course in the twenty-first century.

Civic engagement in the basic course. In the courses surveyed, 18 syllabi (51%) did not address the relationship between public speaking and civic engagement. Three courses do not mention concepts relating to citizenship at all; the emphasis is on "platform skills" or performance. The course description at one university (Institution 17) states: "This course will explore the procedures of preparing and delivering a public platform speech with emphasis on personal credibility, physical technique, and effective vocal principles" (p. 2).

Dewey stated there is a clear relationship between democracy and education, experienced based, purposeful learning, experimentation and other elements of "progressive education." And for Dewey, the process of developing discipline understanding, the process of bringing order to events, understanding experiences and events, and developing more powerful explanations of phenomena and events is discipline understanding. This process of developing discipline understanding is evident in the syllabus (Institution 31). In this basic communication course, students engage in a speech assignment that involved problem based learning.

The first assignment is called the problem based inspirational speech. "In this in-class presentation, students will identify the problem area they will be focusing on and

provide a personal justification for the selection.” The third speaking assignment is the problem analysis informative speech. “In this in-class presentation, students identify the problem, the significance/harms/causes of the problem, who (causal agents, those harmed, researchers, agencies, action groups, agent of change) is involved, whether or not action has been taken, and by whom, when and with what result.” The final speech is the advocacy persuasive speech. “This speech is an in-class persuasive speech geared towards an appropriate specified audience advocating a solution to the issue focus” (Institution 31 Syllabus, p. 1).

Engagement in citizenship education. However, 17 syllabi (48%) in the survey did exhibit some elements in teaching students to engage in citizenship education. In the syllabus for Institution 31, it states in the course overview that a

semester-long, student selected civic engagement project will provide the framework for this course. Each student will choose an issue in the community that they are personally concerned about and through linked, systematic assignments, will research the issue fully, investigate possible ways to address the issue, develop a plan and take direct action in the community to advocate for the change. **ALL STUDENTS ARE REQUIRED TO KEEP A CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PORTFOLIO OF ALL THEIR WORK FOR THE ENTIRE SEMESTER.** (p. 1)

It states further in the syllabus that students are also required to attend a

“MANDATORY CLASS FIELD TRIP – TBA TO CHEYENNE, WYO FOR CITIZEN LOBBYIST TRAINING” [bold in original document] (p. 2).

This type of activity exemplifies what Shapiro (2010) refers to as “civic literacy.” Shapiro describes civic literacy as persuasive speaking or rhetoric, and one of the most important subjects in the curriculum. Many of the elements of successful speaking

identified by the Greeks and Romans, such as the canons of rhetoric, were integral to, in the words of Quintilian, helping the “good man to speak well.”

In *Educating Youth for a World beyond Violence: A Pedagogy for Peace*, Shapiro (2010) explores the concept of civic literacy and education. He stresses the significance of helping students critically interrogate their world. He contends that

civic literacy means teaching young people the importance of engaging with the events, issues, and concerns that are shaping their world. It means that education must place at the center of its agenda the goal of individuals who see the connection between the quality of their own lives to the decisions and policies that shape their national and global communities. (p. 160)

In another syllabus (Institution 14), the rationale for an assignment

informed citizens are the lifeblood of a democratic society. This assignment will heighten students’ awareness of the complexity of social and cultural issues in their communities, their country, and their world, and will help them make them become more critical consumers. (p. 5)

Another approach that colleges and universities are incorporating into their curricula is to teach civic engagement is service learning. The communication discipline has also incorporated this innovative approach in a variety of programs (Bertlesen & Goodboy, 2009; Morreale & Backlund, 2002; Oster-Aaland, Sellnow, Nelson, & Pearson, 2004; Sellnow & Martin, 2010; Swartz, 1997a; Warren & Sellnow, 2010).

Rhodes and Davis (2001) define service learning as a pedagogical approach where students participate in volunteer work, which accentuates their comprehension of course concepts, and provides them the opportunity to serve the community. In addition, Eyler and Giles (1999) contend that a quality and successful service learning opportunity

should meet four criteria: (a) interpersonal and personal development, (b) comprehension and application of knowledge taught in class, (c) a transformative opportunity, and (d) citizenship development. Communication educators argue that all four of these goals can be met in a variety of communication courses from interpersonal communication to public speaking (Oster-Aaland et al., 2004).

Service learning is situated in larger context of experiential learning. Dewey (1938) is mainly attributed with being the first to discuss experiential learning. In *Experience and Education*, Dewey argued that traditional education does not equip students with the proper skill set to handle every possible situation that may arise. Dewey further believed that “every experience must prepare the learner for a future experience” (p. 46).

The application of service learning in the basic communication course offers the realization of this possibility. In this study, Institution 7 and Institution 31 incorporated service learning into their basic courses. Students enrolled in the communication class at Institution 31 developed a “Community Service Agency Informative Speech”:

Students will develop a 3-5 minute informative speech developed from research and interviews designed to familiarize students with a selected community service agency and begin to identify the kinds of and the nature of the communication skills used in that agency. (p. 3)

Students also developed a Service-Learning Speech of Inspiration. “In this speech she will develop a 3-5 minute persuasive speech designed to inspire involvement or donation to a student selected community service agency” (p. 3).

Students at Institution 7 are required to

complete the 10 hours of service; failing to complete the hours results in an incomplete in the course. Students are then required to complete a 4-5 minute informative speech of description, explanation, or demonstration that focuses their experience at the service location. Students in groups of four develop a group presentation.

In the second speech, the “actuation persuasive symposium speech, students will finally deliver the same actuation speech to their service learning organization agency” (p. 4). In these instances, students learn the value of civic learning in a democracy. The integration of service learning into the basic course crystallizes Dewey’s vision of the transformation role that education can play in a democratic society.

Conclusion

The introduction of this chapter explored the history of speech pedagogy in United States higher education institutions and its relationship to the basic course. The most important conclusions that emerged from my deconstruction of the basic course was communication educators must deal with issues of culture, strategic rhetoric of whiteness, silencing of students, empowering students through civic literacy and education in the basic course. How we address these issues may affect how future citizens engage in discourse in the public sphere and help minimize the “strange public discourse” and the culture of silence that has enveloped our society in the context of globalization.

It is disconcerting that approximately 70% of the syllabi surveyed did not address issues of culture. There is a disconnect between the post 9/11 rhetorical paradigm and our pedagogy because we fail to teach our students the tools of cultural critique. It is important we consider in the words of Sproule (2002) that by “gleaning from the

historical and cultural legacy of rhetoric, we can offer our students a useful range of approaches to meet whatever is their particular need” (p. 1).

In relation to strategic rhetoric, it was alarming that several of the syllabi did not address issues of culture. This lack of attention to culture, except from a very surface and politically correct standpoint does not allow students to critically interrogate the multiple and competing definitions of culture and how it is contextualized from their standpoint and positionality. While our scholarly journals, books, anthologies, and conference presentations reflect contemporary issues of culture, race, class, marginality, recognition and interrogation of these issues are not reflected in the majority of the syllabi utilized in the basic course. It is imperative to remember that our theory and pedagogy in the basic course are reflexive. We must also reflect upon how we can redescribe the basic course as the teaching of cultural critique. It is important to note that our rich rhetorical traditions and history are interconnected with English departments. However, it is also essential that we critically examine and deconstruct the model employed in a particular English department as well. We as communication educators can learn much from Berlin’s application of critical pedagogy in English composition courses. James Berlin (1987) argued that “in teaching writing [or communication] we are providing students with guidance in seeing and structuring their experience, with a set of tacit rules about distinguishing falsity, reality, from illusion” (p. 7).

In teaching students about how to use language and contextualizing it with culture, we are teaching students how to make sense of their world. When we do not acknowledge the perspectives and views of other positionalities, we assume that

whiteness is the normative position. More importantly, we communicate this view to our students.

This study also examined the use of silence in the classroom and how communication educators may unknowingly use behavior altering message and behavior altering techniques to gain compliance and reify notions of hegemonic discourse and behavior. In our attempt to use sarcastic humor to gain compliance, educators must ask ourselves are we using our syllabus as contractual documents to reinforce power. In the syllabi examined, while the sarcasm was memorable and perhaps makes a student take note, it could also be construed as using discourse to command an authoritarian classroom environment rather than one that instills discipline that is connected to democracy, civic engagement, and citizenship education. I found it quite surprising that 11% of the syllabi examined did not require students to deliver oral presentations. However, they did receive instruction in how to construct and deliver informative, persuasive, and special occasion speeches. It is quite ironic that clickers substituted for the sound of students voices to register their presence, their opinion, and gain compliance. This is the antithesis of helping students author their voice. Henry Giroux (2007) notes that “as a performative practice, pedagogy should provide the conditions for students to be able to reflectively frame their own relationship to the ongoing project of an unfinished democracy” (p. 181).

The basic communication course should be taught from a critical perspective. Teaching students the use of strategic rhetoric, incorporating the multiple and competing

definitions of culture, teaching them the vital skills of critical citizenship education is a responsibility that we as communication educators must embrace and own.

Giroux (2007) states that

Pedagogy must be understood as central to any discourse about academic freedom, but more important, it must be understood as the most crucial referent we have for understanding politics and defending the university as one of the very few remaining democratic spheres in the United States today. (p. 210)

We must remember in the words of Giroux (2007) that

higher education is one of the few spaces left where young people can think critically about the knowledge they gain, learn values that refuse to reduce the obligations of citizenship to either consumerism or the dictates of the national security state, and develop the language and skills necessary to defend those institutions and social relations that are vital to a substantive democracy. (p. 210)

Based on the findings of this study, the need for deconstruction of the basic course and the infusion of critical pedagogy in the context of globalization is warranted.

We as communication educators must continually reflect upon how we can help create, in the words of Shapiro, a “Pedagogy of Peace” in a democratic society. We have a moral and professional responsibility to teach our students the basic communication skills that are needed to critique, challenge, and address. In the words of Zygmunt Bauman (2000), “the kind of social order responsible for unhappiness, human suffering, and the [duty] to help those in danger” (p. 215).

In the next chapter I will discuss my vision for a critical approach to the basic course that enables students to experience a more transformative communication experience in the classroom. I will offer ten key points other basic communication course

educators may want to consider when revisioning their basic course. The key points will provide a summary of the elements discussed in this study and introduce Intercultural Praxis, as a curriculum development model for the basic course.

CHAPTER V

REVISIONING THE BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE

Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education. (Freire, 1970, p. 93)

In the previous chapter, I described ways in which the basic communication course fails to address the needs of college students in the context of globalization. I explained that understanding the pedagogical shifts in speech instruction in American colleges and universities from the colonial period to the present gives insight into the thought processes of the scholars in the Communication Studies discipline. I highlighted how the discipline shifted pedagogical emphasis during the 1800s and 1900s. I discussed the movement from the “Old Model” of using oratory for civic engagement and responsibility to the “New Model,” which emphasized platform skills and performance. I discussed how the general education program today can be traced from the late 1970s and 1980s. The majority of colleges and universities by the late 1980s had created a general education program that included oral communication as a requirement. I noted that in 2007, the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) recommended learning outcomes that fulfilled a variety of program areas. The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) recommended that institutions can prepare students for the twenty-first century by helping them master four essential learning outcomes: (a) knowledge of human culture and the physical natural

world; (b) intellectual and practical skills (which includes oral communication); (c) acceptance of personal and social responsibilities (which includes civic knowledge and engagement—local and global), and (d) integrative and applied learning.

I also shared findings from an interpretive study analyzing 35 syllabi from community colleges and universities across America. The most significant findings that emerged from my interpretive analysis were that educators must address issues of culture, be cognizant of the strategic rhetoric of whiteness, refrain from communication behavior which silences our students, and introduce critical citizenship education in the basic course.

In this chapter, I explain my vision for a critical approach to the basic course that allows our students to learn from a more transformative communication experience, compared to what I discussed in Chapter I as a restricting and hegemonic notion of education that is influenced by the myriad faces of globalization. This dissertation project is a call for reformation of the basic course. In the words of Peter McLaren and Ramin Farahmandpur (2005), “The idea here is not to adapt students to globalization but to make them critically maladaptive so that that they can become change agents in anti-capitalistic struggles” (p. 276). Communication educators must envision transformative models of engaging, teaching, and developing curriculum in the basic course.

In the following pages I want to describe briefly a few ideas that I contend are essential elements in developing a new vision of the basic course in the context of globalization. These ten key points offer other basic course educators an opportunity to problematize and situate their courses on their college campuses. It is my intent that these

key points will provide a concise summary of some of the essential elements I discussed in this dissertation and offer pedagogical and administrative recommendations based on my interpretive analysis of 35 basic communication course syllabi.

Ten Points for a Redesigned Basic Communication Course

In this section I will discuss ten points to consider for a new vision of the basic course in the context of globalization. These recommendations are what I advise based upon my research. These points are: (a) redesign the basic course to include one additional general education course outcome; (b) develop a critical multicultural education perspective; (c) utilize critical communication pedagogy as a framework to teach the basic course; (d) reflect upon the model of Intercultural Praxis as a theoretical framework for curriculum development; (e) prepare for attempts to remove the basic course from the college's general education curriculum; (f) learn lessons from English faculty who teach basic writing; (g) teach students the art of parrhesia and to value their own voice; (h) practice and teach students the value of *B'tsleum Elohim*; (i) strive for a dialogue form of education in a global society, and (j) engage in critical citizenship education.

Recommendation #1: Include One Additional General Education Outcome in the Course

The basic course should be redesigned to include at least one additional general education outcome. The basic course provides an excellent context for the application of each of the essential learning outcomes including (a) knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; (b) intellectual and practical skills; (c) personal and social

responsibility; and (d) integrative applied learning (Engleberg, Emanuel, Van Horn, & Bodary, 2008).

Engleberg (2010) argues that the basic course can be taught to meet all the general education outcomes recommended by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU). Eisenberg contends that “the only discipline that cuts across all four learning outcomes is communication” (p. 1). Teaching students to become competent communicators should be taught from a holistic perspective. One institution that has effectively used this approach in the basic course is Illinois State University which integrates critical thinking (Mazer, Hunt, & Kuznekoff, 2007).

In my basic course I include the general education outcome of acceptance of personal and social responsibilities (which includes civic knowledge and engagement – local and global). I introduce students to intercultural communication and explore multiple and competing ways of viewing culture. This knowledge serves as a foundation for developing their informative and persuasive speeches. Students interview an immigrant and develop an informative speech based on a topic discovered while conducting research. Informative speech topics range from the Arizona Immigration Act, the conditions of the diamond mines in Sierre Leone, to the mandatory voting process in Brazil. Persuasive speech topics range from boycotting a company because of their low pay and sweat shop conditions in a foreign country to persuading the audience to volunteer with a community agency. These types of assignments in addition to teaching the fundamental public speaking skills, provide a context to learn and apply these new skills.

The intellectual and practical skills outcome could be met by teaching students information literacy which includes evaluating documents, analyzing research, and conducting scholarly research. The outcome of personal and social responsibility may be achieved through delivering oral presentations that benefit their peers and the organization. The selection of the second general education outcome could be based upon the college's initiatives or educational perspective. Subsequently the development of a critical multicultural education perspective may shape outcomes, teaching philosophy, and methodology.

Recommendation #2: Develop a Critical Multicultural Education Perspective

Critical Multicultural Education seeks the development of critical consciousness (*conscientizacao*). The elements of critical consciousness involve dialogue, trust, respect, hope, optimism, and critical interrogation of themes such as race, class, sex, and gender (Beileke, 2008; Giroux, 2003b; McLaren, 2003). The conceptual framework of critical theory evolved from the works of Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, and Peter McLaren.

McLaren (2003) says that Freire's philosophy offers a critical reading of reality with the "potential to transform society, with the learner functioning as an active subject committed to self and social transformation" (p. 192). In the Freirean sense, critical consciousness "involves understanding yourself (your identity) and the world around you, acquiring the necessary intellectual and physical tools to effect change in your situation, and fully becoming aware of your history, achievements, and capabilities" (Abdi, 2001, p. 191). Consequently, critical theorists believe we live in "a world rife with contradictions and asymmetries of power and privilege" (McLaren, 2003, p. 193). The

world is constructed by and acted upon by people who are controlled by issues, of class, privilege, economics, power, and gender. We struggle with shackles of hegemony, ideology, capitalism, greed, and cultural reproduction. There is a continual struggle between the individual and society for emancipation, freedom, justice, and equity.

The critical multicultural educator desires to employ a dialectical approach. They realize societal problems are interconnected. These educators acknowledge their place as actor, creators, and acted upon, within the larger society (Beileke, 2008). They critically interrogate their worlds to examine the larger social, economic, political, cultural, class, economic, gender, and implications that threaten our society (McLaren, 2003). McLaren (2003) defines critical multiculturalism as a perspective in which “representations of race, gender, and class are understood as the result of larger struggles over signs and meanings” (p. 221).

Beileke (2008) explains that the use of words such as “power signs,” “ghetto queen,” “hip hop,” “welfare mother,” and “public transportation” are all symbols that evoke strong images of black women and/or men. “People who are viewed in this category are viewed monolithically. They serve as reference points upon which social and school policies are predicated. Persons are so objectified and marginalized by society and by the dominant culture” (p. 98).

An example of this marginalization is the racializing of standardized test scores with an effort to connect ethnicity to intelligence. It is also evidenced in the choice of language to describe a group of people. In April 2011, real estate mogul Donald Trump was embroiled in a controversy regarding word choice when he used the term “THE

BLACKS” to describe persons of color from African descent. As a member of this ethnic group, it is offensive because the phrase objectifies and totalizes a group of people.

McLaren (2003) states that the application of critical multiculturalism raises this central question: “How do we develop an understanding of difference that avoids an essentializing of Otherness?” (p. 286). Beileke and other educators contend that unintentional denigration is common with pre-service education majors. Beileke (2008) discusses how many pre-service teachers say they want to enter the profession because they want to “make a difference.” She cautions there is a danger in this way of thinking: “In its most benign form, the charity impulse translates into ‘good deeds.’ At its worst, it perpetuates white, middle class status, and Christianity as the status quo and what should be strive towards.” These essential questions are critical for each communication educator to reflect upon when considering the strategic rhetoric of whiteness. In the next section, I will explore the notion of developing a critical multicultural perspective in the basic course through critical communication pedagogy.

Recommendation #3: Incorporate Critical Communication Pedagogy

As communication educators continually answer the charge to teach students to become competent speakers in an increasingly complex global society, it is imperative that we strive to incorporate the concept of difference in our teaching (Allen, 2010). This goal can be achieved through the application of critical communication pedagogy, which intersects with a variety of disciplines including communication, education, critical pedagogy, and cultural studies (Cooks, 2010).

In this section, I briefly discuss the theoretical and philosophical foundation that grounds critical communication pedagogy, highlight the 10 commitments to critical communication pedagogy, and discuss strategies for teaching the basic communication course and the concept of difference.

Cooks (2010) contends that critical communication is critical pedagogy “in and of communication” (p. 304). Fassett and Warren (2007) ground their discussion of critical communication pedagogy in the work of Freire. The authors of the book *Critical Communication Pedagogy* augmented the Freirean paradigm with theories of Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, Michel de Certeau, Jo Sprague, and others. Cumulatively, these scholars posit that “doing critical communication pedagogy is about holding ourselves accountable for the ways we exist within the institutions that shaped us” (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 128). The application of critical communication pedagogy can help our students understand their concrete lived experiences. Students begin to use communication to problematize their world in order to become change agents.

Fassett and Warren (2007) articulate 10 commitments that ground critical communication pedagogy. In the next section I will briefly list these ten commitments as articulated by Fassett and Warren.

Ten commitments of critical communication pedagogy

- (1) in critical communication pedagogy, identity is constituted for communication;
- (2) critical communication pedagogy educators understand power as fluid and complex;
- (3) culture is central to communication pedagogy, not additive;
- (4) critical communication educators embrace a focus on concrete, mundane communication practices as constitutive of larger social systems;

- (5) critical communication educators embrace social, structural critique as it places concrete, mundane communication practices in a meaningful context;
- (6) language and(analysis of language as constitute of social phenomena) is central to critical communication pedagogy;
- (7) reflexivity is an essential condition for critical communication pedagogy;
- (8) critical communication educators embrace pedagogy and research as praxis
- (9) critical communication educators embrace in their classrooms and in their writing, within their communities and with their students, research participants, and co-investigators—a nuanced understanding of human subjectivity and agency;
- (10) critical communication educators engage in dialogue as both metaphor and method for our relationship with others. (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 54)

Critical communication pedagogy can be used as a tool in the college classroom to help students culturally critique the messages they receive and deliver to empower them to use their voices to be agents of social justice and peace. Fassett and Warren (2007) remind us that we don't forget the ideological lessons we learn in school, and if we presume that, in the classroom, we cannot build a more just society, then we have already abdicated our agency; we have lost ourselves to a series of false worlds by never knowing how to make them real.

Communication helps us to name, define, and change our world. Critical communication pedagogy informs and reminds educators how power and identity is constructed in our classroom. Critical communication pedagogy reminds us how language can be used to silence students in the form of sarcasm, competition, criticism, and oppressive rules communicated through the language on our syllabi and in our communication with our students.

Communication educators who engage in this practice may encourage students to develop topics that impact and affect their world. For example, a student in my basic

class commented that the neighborhood where she spent her early years has been “fixed up” and people who lived there cannot afford the property. As an educator engaging in critical communication pedagogy, I encouraged her to research the topic of gentrification. She developed her informative presentation on this topic. She subsequently developed her persuasive speech to protest against the displacement of neighborhoods and communities through gentrification. This type of engagement encourages students to make sense of their own lives and begin the path to critical consciousness in order to change their conditions and others through communication. We must also envision transformative models of curriculum development and pedagogy in the basic course. One curriculum development framework to critically transform this course is the model of *Intercultural Praxis*.

Recommendation #4: Intercultural Praxis and Curriculum Development

One innovative approach for curriculum development in the basic course is the theoretical framework of *Intercultural Praxis*, developed by Sorrells (2008). It was initially developed for understanding intercultural communication in the context of globalization, which provides strategies and methods for interrogating power. I argue this model can be extended for curriculum development in the basic course.

The integration of *Intercultural Praxis* as a pedagogical framework is grounded in critical pedagogy, the philosophy of Paulo Freire, and a combination of intercultural theories. This framework can help critical communication educators redefine the basic course by developing a pedagogy in which students are more effective communicators in a global society. Sorrells (2008) describes *Intercultural Praxis*, a process of “critical,

reflective, engaged thinking and action” that enables them to “understand other cultures, find their voice, engage in critical dialogue, and become empowered to use communication to advocate for social justice” (Sorrells, 2008, p. 206).

In this section I will briefly explain the model and how it can be used as a pedagogical framework for curriculum development in the basic course. The six entry ports of inquiry, framing, positioning, dialogue, reflection, and action can be applied to course content design and pedagogical practices.

Inquiry. Inquiry as a place of entry for Intercultural Praxis, means a wish and willingness to know, ask, find out, and learn. Exploratory inquiry about those who are unlike leads us to engaging with others. We are willing to take risks and be open to other perspectives. In relation to curriculum, inquiry, is viewed an invitation to question. It is used as a space for interrogation. Questions are asked such as whose knowledge is presented? What ideologies are reinforced? (Sorrells, 2010).

Inquiry in the basic course may encourage your students to develop a persuasive speech on a national or global issue such as the Arizona Immigration Act. Helping students to develop more sophisticated inquiry skills would require them to interview someone such as a Hispanic immigrant.

Framing. The term and action of framing suggests our perspectives, our views of ourselves, others, and the world around us are ultimately limited by frames. Framing as a port of entry in Intercultural Praxis means that we are able to zoom in and to focus on the particular and very situated details of a specific exchange or interaction. Engaging in framing allows us to become more audience centered in the basic course. In developing a

speech assignment, the educator may consider requiring the student to develop a persuasive presentation from the perspective of an immigrant group in our society.

Positioning. Sorrells contends that positioning refers to curriculum as a politics of location. It is critical to be able to locate “knowing” in one’s body/experience. It makes one mindful of the material, intellectual and practical consequences of curriculum. Moreover, it allows the educator to look at other ways of helping students develop a way of knowing—other than the textbook. Once students are able to make connections between reality and their experiences, we can move our students to engaging in meaningful dialogue.

Dialogue. The entry port of dialogue invites the educator to view curriculum as a site of “dynamic meaning-making.” In the basic course, we may consider effective dialogue as being able to deliver an effective presentation; but dialogue moves a step further and engages the audience. Does the audience ask questions? Do students engage in meaningful dialogue with others as they gather source information? With these questions considered, the educator is challenged to try different approaches to meaningful classroom dialogue. Once the conversation, lesson unit, or that day’s class has ended, it is essential that educators engage in reflection.

Reflection. Reflection allows the educator to review their pedagogy, what was effective that day, what was not effective. It allows us to consider our pedagogy for areas of synergy and growth. In participating in reflection as an educator, we are better able to help our students step back and reflect upon their assignments and readings beyond the current class and make connections. As an educator, reflection may mean keeping an

instructional journal or developing a pedagogy circle with other instructors. Once we have informed our pedagogy and engaged in reflection, we can then help our students use their newly developed communication tools for action.

Action. Intercultural Praxis challenges us to move beyond curious inquiry, framing, positioning, and reflecting, but to also take action. In curriculum, action is a site for engagement (Sorrells, 2010). It allows us to look at what is the connection, what is my involvement and responsibility in the learning process. Curriculum planning involving action looks at how can we encourage and engage our students to make a difference in society. In engaging in *Intercultural Praxis*, educators are able to push beyond the boundaries of the textbook and the standard syllabus. Once we develop our new transformative vision of education, we must be prepared to rhetorically and politically defend it.

Recommendation #5: Prepare for Attempts to Remove the Oral Communication Course from the College's General Education Curriculum

Shapiro (2010) reminds us “there is much talk about a crisis in education. Yet what is pointed to as the cause of this crisis is confusing at best and misleading at worst” (p. 179). This crisis is exemplified by comments made by Adam Earnhardt of Youngstown State University, on the Basic Communication Director list serve on April 20, 2011.

These fights aren't going away anytime soon (if ever). So long as we have administrators who want to turn us into for-profit, commercial tech schools, this war will rage on. (Earnhardt, 2011)

The basic communication course director's list serve has been active during the 2011 spring semester with accounts of communication department chairs attending university-wide faculty senate meetings and being "ambushed" with motions to remove the basic communication course from the general education curriculum. In fact, one Speech faculty member discussed an attempt during the April 2011 Youngstown University faculty senate meeting. The proposal, made from the College of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math, called for the elimination of six hours of general education courses for their students. Earnhardt reported that following an hour debate, "a political science professor rose to offer a *friendly* amendment. That amendment? Remove the communications foundations course from the general education core (which by the way also consists of two writing courses and math)" (Earnhardt, 2011).

Immediately, Communication department chairperson Cary Horvath stood and delivered an eloquent and skilled defense on the faculty senate floor. The motion was denied. Earnhardt (2011) recounted to the list-serve:

We survived this battle—thanks in part to a well-informed department chair (and representatives on the academic senate) and support from colleagues across campus. The amendment went down in flames—receiving only a handful of votes (3 or 4). In fact, a later report suggested most senators rolled their eyes and showed little patience for the amendment. Maybe they were tired, but we won.

Unfortunately, not all attempts to preserve the basic course as a general education requirement was successful. Bill Coleman, of the University of Mount Union, discussed on the list-serve the attempt to remove the basic course.

Our issue came to a faculty vote last night at the April faculty meeting. To summarize, our general education task force presented a new eight course general education curriculum. A key part of the proposal called for the elimination of the basic speech and college writing courses (that have been required of all students for years) and in their place infuse/integrate oral and written skills into the new general ed curriculum. Bottom line is that professors not trained in communication/rhetoric/English will be teaching our students how to write and speak besides teaching the particular content of the class. Our position was that of the NCA's: infusion without a foundational course will not work. What made our position difficult was that the English department was fine with infusion only. They were good with the elimination of college writing. But, we stood our ground. And lost. By 4 votes. (Coleman, 2011)

In the words of Earnhardt (2011), the University of Mount Union was “ambushed.” Shapiro (2010) cautions us about the plight of education and the fallacies in reasoning that renders these arguments false from many factions including politicians, political pundits, school administrators, and many others.

It is essential that communication educators become familiar with their regional accreditation body's requirements for faculty credentials. For instance, in the Southern Association for Colleges and Universities (SACS) regional accreditation requires that faculty credentials must be able to demonstrate their competency to teach in their subject area. Communication educators should investigate their regional accrediting body guidelines to determine the faculty credentials required for teaching. Speech faculty should inquire whether new forms of courses such as a first -year seminar that includes an oral component, taught by faculty with no graduate hours in Speech Communication is considered qualified to teach this course based upon their credentials. Speech faculty should differentiate between a speaking intensive course taught by a faculty member in another discipline, i.e. business, and the basic course that currently meets the general

education requirement. In addition to remaining vigilant, speech faculty must also reflect upon and practice the art of parrhesia to keep our transformative model for communication vibrant and active on our college campuses.

Recommendation #6: Teach Students the Art of Parrhesia

The term parrhesia, deriving from Greek and Roman culture, consists of five main characteristics. Foucault outlines the following characteristics in his first lecture entitled: “The Meaning of the Word” (Foucault, 2001, p. 1). Foucault analyzes the distinction between parrhesia and rhetoric, which is evident in the Socratic and Platonic traditions. In the political world, parrhesia was also not only an ethical virtue of the good citizen, but also a criterion for democracy. The Athenian constitution guaranteed citizens (men only) equal rights of speech, participation, and power. Consequently, power and parrhesia were fundamental for citizens as individuals and as a collective body. Novak (2006) notes that parrhesia happens at the intersection of these five components:

frankness, danger, truth, criticism, and duty. While the elements of parrhesia, as Foucault delineated them, remain constant, they are fluid and malleable in the sense that each is context-specific given the particular political, social, and economic conditions of the moment. Currently, parrhesia is a theoretical tool that has been ignored by communication scholars despite the use of Foucault’s other theoretical frameworks for communication scholarship. (p. 26)

In addition to teaching our students, we as educators may be called upon to use the voice of parrhesia to maintain the basic course as part of our college campuses general education requirements. Bill Coleman, whose college lost the faculty senate vote to remove the basic course from their curriculum, offers in retrospect these words:

My advice to others who might have to face this issue in some way is to be preemptive. Probably we failed because we have not done a good job over the years of communicating to other faculty the value of what we do and teach in our foundation classes. Had we done a good job at our own PR, we would have had a ready-made support group and allies going into this battle. So, please tell others not to be complacent, but rather be aggressive in spreading the word. That alone will go a long way toward winning friends and eventually votes in the faculty should their basic course come under scrutiny by their colleagues. (Coleman, 2011)

Mount Union University's struggles remind us that we must engage in frank discussion on our college campuses about the centrality of communication, we must embody the characteristic of truth in the concept of moral virtue, remembering to always be ethical and credible in our communication. In displaying the third characteristic of danger, the parrhesiates show courage to state the truth despite the danger and risk. It is often times very politically dangerous to state the truth or oppose more tenured faculty and high ranking administrators. In engaging in such risk, the parrhesiatic may engage in a type of criticism, aimed at one self or someone else. In this sense we as a Speech discipline must engage in this type of criticism to ensure the vitality and relevancy of our basic course. We must also embody the final characteristic of parrhessia which is duty. We have a clear and moral obligation to the Speech discipline to engage in self-examination of the basic course.

While practicing the art of parrhesia may seem like a difficult skill to impart to our students, we must be mindful that each student must apply the five characteristics from their own worldview and circumstance. We as educators need to help our students define and claim their cultural space. We have a responsibility to teach them to critically

interrogate the world, participate in public discourse, influence policy, and use communication for advocacy.

I had the opportunity to cultivate this art with international exchange students enrolled in my classes a participant of the grant “Legacies of the African Diaspora in Brazil and the United States: Persistent Inequalities.” The grant was in collaboration with two United States universities and three universities in Brazil. My role in the grant was to redesign the basic course and the intercultural communication classes with an emphasis on a global perspective grounded in the dialogic philosophy of Paulo Freire.

One of the female exchange students, who was shy and hesitant because of her accent, delivered for her final speech a parrhesiastic speech by challenging the American students to participate more in campus, state, and national elections. Her presentation sparked discussion and debate on what does freedom mean in our society and is the role of citizens in the voting process. Following her presentation, many classmates enthusiastically congratulated her on such a bold speech with comments such as “You go girl!” The exchange student blushed and beamed. In this cultural space we became teacher-students and student-teachers in the spirit of Paulo Freire. I learned that I must strive harder to instill this type of parrhesiastic enthusiasm in each student if I want them to become passionate about using their public speaking skills to also communicate for advocacy and peace.

Recommendation #7: Teach Students *B’tsulem Elohim* and to Communicate for Peace

In educating for a more peaceful world, it is critical that educators rise to the challenge. This is the moment that Shapiro (2010) says, “for educators this is a time to

question and challenge the tired preoccupations of our profession and demand a radically different purpose and vision for our work—a vision that seeks to connect what we do to the ancient quest for a world of peace, love, and justice” (p. 204). In educating for a more peaceful world, it is critical that students understand the position of the “other.” The Chinese character for listening includes symbols for the ears, eyes, and heart. This symbol is excellent for describing how we must listen to people from different ethnicities, countries, ideologies, religions, or political affiliations.

Once students have learned to listen mindfully and take the other person’s words to heart, they must then develop empathy and a strong understanding of social justice issues. We must also be mindful that for many people around the world, the United States symbolizes capitalism, greed, military dominance, and cultural theft. It is even more important to learn the skills of communicating perceived understanding, which is the communicator’s assessment of success or failure of being understood or misunderstood when attempting to communicate with another person (Cahn, 1983). This frame of reference is extremely important in viewing democracy as an unfinished project.

Once students have developed an awareness of the importance of someone feeling understood or misunderstood in a situation, it is then important to look at the threatened self. Shapiro asserts that the violent and tragic events in our schools, such as Columbine High School, has forced us to look at the way “school violence is linked to a competitive culture and the deep sense of invalidation felt by so many” (Shapiro, 2010, p. 62).

It is imperative to remember that many of these same students enter our community colleges and universities. When these students enter our college classrooms,

the spiral of silence that has enveloped them in high school, sadly has become a cultural norm. Communication is integral in forming our self concepts. Once students begin to understand the importance of self concept in developing a culture of peace, teachers can also help students understand the infinite value of each individual. Shapiro (2010) say the Hebrew bible teaches us about the concept *B'tselm Elhim*—“the belief that humans are made in the image of God. If one is uncomfortable with this religious formulation, then other secular or naturalistic perspectives are available that arrive, broadly about the same inherent belief about the inherent worth of each life” (Shapiro, 2010, p. 195).

Every student must understand that life is precious and develop an attitude towards life and respect for the body. It also means that students become aware of how racism, sexism, nationalism, ethnocentrism, and homophobia can demoralize a person and negatively impact their identity and silence their voices.

Shapiro states that

our work as teachers, as well as parents, must be to emphasize our shared humility and the preciousness of every life while honestly and forthrightly pointing to the ways we think and act that contradicts and conflict with this conviction. The institution of school itself provides a powerful space for highlighting such conflict with its pervasive hierarchical ranking, competitive individualism, tracking and the differentiation of individual worth, social cliques and social status, bullying, and demeaning of those who might not fit the cultural or gender norms. What would it mean, we may ask, for us to act in ways that ensure that the worth and dignity of every individual person in our school is recognized and respected? What would it mean for us to do that with every life on earth? (2010, p. 196)

It is important they have a language to articulate the new vision of hope and peace. Students must be able to imagine the possibilities of communicating their desires and plans for a better world. Students must be taught they can make a difference in our

world and nurture their desire to learn about social injustice, issues of peace, and human dignity. However, before we can teach our students how to articulate hope. Shapiro (2010) states that each educator must ask themselves:

The question for us is can hope be taught? Can the feeling of possibility be nurtured and encouraged? My answer is tentatively yes. My personal experience, observation of change in the world, and my work as a teacher of social change encourages me to believe that there is a pedagogy of hope. (p. 199)

In order for basic communication educators to develop a pedagogy of hope, we must also be humble and learn from other disciplines.

Recommendation #8: Learn Lessons from English Colleagues

Pat Schneider, author and English educator, reinforced my belief in the power of oral and written communication for students when she stated during a 2006 Winston Salem Writer's workshop:

Writing is speaking onto paper, and speaking is writing on the air. And all of us sometimes achieve greatness in it. Not all the time, but sometimes. The problem is by and large, we have been taught to disbelieve our own voices, even in our own memories, imaginings and dreams. (Pat Schneider, personal communication, April 6, 2006)

Speech communication educators who teach the basic course can draw many comparisons and lessons from the basic composition writing course to be more effective in the classroom. One lesson the Speech discipline can learn from the English discipline is that junior and senior faculty both teach the basic composition course. In many departments, tenured English faculties are required to teach at least one composition course. This practice is extremely beneficial in advancing the curriculum. Tenured

faculties have more experience and ability to shape the curriculum. In contrast, in many Speech departments the basic course is taught by graduate teaching assistants, part-time faculty, or instructors. While this approach is cost-efficient and provides training for future faculty, there are fewer opportunities for course redesign. Tenured Northwestern University faculty member Michael Leff (1992) discovered:

last year, after an absence of almost twenty years from the basic course, I became the director of the fundamentals public speaking course at Northwestern. My first step, obviously, was to find out what the instructors were doing and to catch up. To my surprise, however, it did not seem that I needed to catch up. The syllabi for the course looked very much as it 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. (p. 116)

Leff asks a fundamental question that all Speech educators must address if we want the basic course to survive and thrive on college campuses:

During the past two decades, the academic study of rhetoric has passed through profound and revolutionary changes, and both theory and criticism now appear much different than they once were. In fact, graduate students in rhetoric are now taught at the top of the curriculum bears only a generic resemblance to what I was taught as a graduate student. Yet, they still teach public speaking very much as I taught it. Why? (p. 116)

Speech educators Leff (1992) and Engleberg (2010) argue that many in the discipline, as they focus on research and publishing, lose a connection between theory and practice because our scholarship does not inform teaching of the basic course. Engleberg (2010) stated during a daily keynote speech at the Hope Conference, sponsored by the National Communication Association during July 2010 that the “integrity and validity of our fundamentals course has been compromised and that only

those with both well-founded knowledge and political courage can reverse this trend” (p. 2). As we develop a new vision for the basic course, we must remember that a dialogic form of education is key in a global society.

Recommendation #9: Strive for a Dialogic Form of Education in a Global Society

Regardless of the student’s discipline or field of study, a dialogic form of education is essential in helping students problematize and understand their world. The increasing interest in communication across the globe and crossing cultural boundaries, has placed a new emphasis on dialogue in all disciplines.

As dialogue is used more in classrooms for authentic conversations about race, culture, disabilities, war, and peace it is imperative that as communication educators we help students develop their authentic voice. We must encourage our students to read, listen, and strive to understand the voices of other cultures. It is through dialogue that educators can create more democratic classrooms environments. It is important that as educators we reinvent our classroom and create spaces of freedom. Students begin to inquire about global issues. One of my students attended a protest rally for six African American teenagers convicted of beating a white student at Jena High School in Louisiana. The student traveled with other campus students. He developed a persuasive speech as a result of his experience. He told the class one of the reasons he attended because he was beginning to realize that social justice issues still exist in our society. He thought it had been conquered with Martin Luther King’s generation.

The act of cognition and the comprehension of reality are only possible with dialogue. Freire asserts that dialogue is essential to the resolution of the student-teacher

contradiction. The teacher is no longer the only one who teaches. In our classroom the students become jointly responsible for their education. In this cultural space, arguments are no longer based on authority, but on the side of freedom—not against it. The challenge for basic communication educators engaged in work for social justice and change, it is critical we envision ways that dialogue can foreshadow concepts of independence, and the significance of desired behavior is warranted. Communication educators must “be aware of the danger of the voices lost in the crowd—those who fall into the cracks of ‘the system’” (Cooks, 2010, p. 300). It is essential to remember that the tensions between dialogue and engaged citizenry in a democracy must be critically interrogated for transformative education to occur in the basic course. As I develop a new vision for the basic course, I contemplate Abram Ibrahim’s question posed in Chapter I, “how do we envision a new ‘globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education?’” One of the keys that will unlock the door to a new vision is integrating critical citizenship education into the basic course.

Recommendation #10: Critical Citizenship Education

In developing a transformative model for the basic course, students must engage in critical citizenship education. The idea of free speech is written in America’s Bill of Rights. And while it may not “always be realized, it holds out the possibility for silenced individuals to find their voices. Public speaking classrooms can be safe places for previous “speechless people to find their voices” (Jaffe, 2001, p. 13). In order to realize this vision in a democracy, students must engage in critical citizenship education.

Chawla and Rodriguez (2011) argue that

to view democracy in terms of Aristotelian notions of oration and persuasion is to downplay the consciousness that is vital to creating and sustaining a vibrant democracy, and moreover, to miss the epistemological practices that are vital for cultivating this consciousness. (p. 85)

However, increasingly there have been initiatives to integrate more civic engagement and global citizenship in public speaking and other courses. This vision must be realized if we are to transform the basic course. One way to teach the significance of civic engagement is through the involvement of service learning.

Service learning and citizenship education. Warren and Sellnow (2010) define service learning as a pedagogical approach in which students participate in volunteer work that increases their understanding of class theories and enable them to make contributions to society. Eyler and Giles (1999) state that service learning should meet four criteria for success: (a) personal and interpersonal growth; (b) comprehension and application of concepts learned in the course; (c) potential transformation; and (d) an enriched sense of citizenship. Communication educators contend these goals can be achieved in different areas of study ranging from interpersonal communication to public speaking (Oster-Aaland et al., 2004).

The concept of service learning is situated within the larger context of experiential learning. Dewey (1938) is mainly credited as the first to discuss “experiential education.” Research suggests that service learning has the potential to increase student’s level of civic engagement (Prentice, 2007; Simons & Cleary, 2006; Warren & Sellnow, 2010). Service learning can offer great benefits for students to learn critical citizenship education. Educating our students to be critically engaged citizens goes beyond teaching

them to robotically recite the pledge of allegiance in front of the classroom or at ballgames. It involves teaching them that civic literacy is critical for a democratic society. In the age of media talking heads, whose voices can be heard 24 hours a day in various media outlets, it is even more imperative that students be able to discern for themselves what it means to be critical consumers of information. We have a responsibility to not only teach public speaking skills, but to help our students understand the valuation of voice in a global world. In exploring the valuation of voice we must also teach students to critically interrogate about issues of reach, cultural equivalency and democratic participation in the public sphere.

Conclusion

In the first chapter, I posed the question “In a post 9/11 world, where the politics of ‘us versus them’ has reemerged under the ‘umbrella of terrorism,’ especially in the United States, can we still envision an *education sans frontiers*: a globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education in which there are no borders? If it is possible to conceive it, what might it look like?” (Ibrahim, 2007, p. 89).

This dissertation is my project to address Ibrahim’s question: How do we envision a new “globalized and critical praxis of citizenship education” in the basic communication course? The Greek concept of “fearless and bold speech” in the context of globalization is fading in the United States. It is critical for the Speech discipline to examine our pedagogical practices and explore multiple and competing ways of teaching our students the foundations of oral communication in our college classrooms. In this dissertation I also examined how to redefine the basic course by redesigning my

curriculum where my students learn communication skills to become global citizens and participate more effectively in democratic society. Aristotle believed that communication, especially persuasion, enabled people to discover what was good for society at a particular time and place. The concepts of voice, silence, culture, civic literacy, and dialogue are intricately linked in the basic course. It is important that our students realize the importance of living in a democracy, creating a shared vision of peace, and articulating a language of hope, learning about other cultures. We must reflect upon the words of Cornell West—

All systems set up to enact democracy are subject to corrupt manipulations, and that is why public commitment to democratic involvement is vital. Genuine robust democracy must be brought to life through democratic individuality, democratic community, and democratic society. (West, 2004)

We can connect our students and classrooms to issues that impact our local community, nation, and world. I challenge each educator to accept this project as my effort to practice Tikkum Olam and work towards healing and repairing our world through communication. We must give our students the rhetorical tools of discourse, fearless and bold speech, and critical citizenship education and then pass on the gift of Tikkum Olam and help future generations of educators heal and repair our world.

END

REFERENCES

- Abdi, A. A. (2001). Identity in the philosophies of John Dewey and Paulo Freire. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 35(2), 181–200.
- Allen, B. (2010). Critical communication pedagogy as a framework for teaching difference. In D. Mumby (Ed.), *Organizing difference: Pedagogy, research, and practice* (pp. 103–126). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Liberal education and America's promise*. Washington, DC: Author.
- AmericaNews.Com. (2009, June 4). *Text of President Obama's speech in Cairo*. Retrieved December 2, 2009, from Voice of AmericaNews.Com:
<http://1.voanews.com/english/news/a-13-2009-06-04-voa7-68693602.html>
- Amin, S. (2001). Imperialism and globalization. *Monthly Review*, 53(2), 6–24.
- Anderson, J. (1996). *Communication theory: Epistemological foundations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Barber, B. (1992). Jihad vs. McWorld. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 269(3), 53–65.
- Barber, B. (1996). *Jihad vs. McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world*. New York: Time Books.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Student's writer's block and other composing problems* (pp. 134–165). New York: Guilford.

- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. London: Polity Press.
- Becker, A. H., & Calhoun, S. K. (1999). What introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. *Teaching of Psychology, 26*(1), 6–11.
- Beileke, J. (2008). Whose world is this? In F. Shultz, *Annual edition: Multicultural education* (pp. 96–100). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Berlin, J. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality in writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Berry, L. (2005, March 14-20). What's so important about communication? Plenty! *Mississippi Business Journal, 27*(11), 30–31.
- Bertlesen, D., & Goodboy, A. (2009). Curriculum planning: Trends in communication studies, workplace competencies, and current programs at 4-year colleges and universities. *Communication Education, 58*(2), 262–275.
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the oppressed*. New York: Theatre Communications Group.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. New York: Routledge.
- Bollag, B. (2005, November 18). Consensus grows on basic skills that colleges should teach, but gauges off those abilities are poor. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(7), 13–16.
- Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Braithwaite, D. (1990). From majority to minority: An analysis of cultural change from able-bodied to disabled. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 465–483.

- Braithwaite, D. (1991). Just how much did that wheel chair cost?: Management of privacy boundaries by persons with disabilities. *Western Journal of Communication, 55*, 254–274.
- Brammer, L., & Wolter, S. (2008). *Assessing student response to public discourse, an introductory course in speaking, argument, and civic engagement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NCA 94th Annual Convention, TBA, San Diego, CA.
- Brandt, D. (1991). *To change this house: Popular education under the Sandinistas*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Brookfield, S. (2005). *The power of critical theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bryman, A. (1999). The Disneyization of society. *The Editorial Board of The Sociological Review, 25–41*. Available: <http://www.canyons.edu/Faculty/haugent/Disneyization%20of%20Society%20Article.pdf>
- Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burroughs, N. (2008). Raising the Question #10 – non-native speakers of English: What more can we do? *Communication Education, 57*(2), 289–295.
- Cahn, D. (1983). Relative importance of perceived understanding in initial interaction and development of interpersonal relationships. *Psychological Reports, 52*, 923–929.
- Caldwell, J. (2007). Clickers in the large classroom: Current research and best-practice tips. *CBE Life Sciences Education, 6*, 9–20.

- Cannon, L. W. (1990). Fostering positive race, class, and gender dynamics in the classroom. *Women Studies Quarterly*, 1 & 2, 126–134.
- Carter, N. (2005). *Reclaiming emancipatory speech: An argument for developing critical pedagogy methods into the design of the basic communication course*. Washington: Howard University.
- Casey, K. (1993). The new narrative research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 21, 211–254.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009, November 11). *National Center for Environmental Health Office of Global Health*. [Online]. Retrieved November 11, 2009, from <http://www.cdc.gov/NCEH/globalhealth/goals.htm>
- Chafee, J. (1992). Transforming educational dreams into educational reality. In L. S. Zwerling & H. B. London (Eds.), *First-generation students: Confronting the cultural issues* (pp. 81–88). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chawla, D., & Rodriguez, A. (2011). Postcoloniality and the speaking body: Revisioning the English oral competency curriculum. *Cultural Studies: Critical Methodologies*, 11(1), 76–91.
- Chesebro, J. (1981). *Gayspeak: Gay male and lesbian communication*. New York: Pilgrim Press.
- Chesebro, J., & McCroskey, J. (2002). *Communication for teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Chomsky, N. (2003, February 5). *Confronting the empire—Noam Chomsky speech*. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from Scoop New Stories: <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories>

- Chory, R., & Goodboy, A. (2010). Power, compliance, and resistance in the classroom. In D. Fassett (Ed.), *Communication and instruction* (pp. 181–210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, H. (1994). *The history of speech communication: The emergence of a discipline, 1914-1945*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Coleman, B. (2011, April 20). *Lessons from Mount Union...and YSU???* [Electronic mailing list message]. Retrieved from Basic Communication Course Director's List Serve: basicc@lists.udayton.edu
- Cooks, L. (2010). The (critical) pedagogy of communication. In D. Fassett & J. T. Warren (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of communication and instruction* (pp. 293–315). Washington: Sage.
- D'Iverno, R., Davis, H., & White, S. (2003). Using a personal response system for promoting student interaction. *Teaching Mathematics Applications*, 22(4), 163–169.
- Delia, J. (1987). Communication research: A history. In C. Berger & S. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 20–99). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- During, S. (2001). *The cultural studies reader* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

- Earnhardt, A. (2011, April 20). *Lessons from Mount Union...and YSU???* [Electronic mailing list message]. Retrieved from Basic Communication Course Director's List Serve: basicc@lists.udayton.edu
- Eckstein, N. (1999). *Silence in the classroom*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Nebraska Lincoln.
- Eckstein, N., & Turman, P. (2002). 'Children are to be seen and not heard': Silencing students' religious voices in the university classroom. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 25, 166–192.
- Engleberg, I., Emanuel, R., Van Horn, T., & Bodary, D. (2008). The status of communication education in U.S. community colleges. *Communication Education*, 57(2), 241–265.
- Engleberg, I. (2010). *Why speech communication should be a general education requirement*. Unpublished manuscript. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Hope Conference (pp. 1–5).
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fassett, D., & Warren, J. (2004). "You get pushed back:" The strategic rhetoric of educational success and failure in higher education. *Communication Education*, 53(1), 21–39.
- Fassett, D., & Warren, J. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Ferguson, R. (1990). Introduction: Invisible center. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures* (pp. 9–14). New York and Cambridge: New Museum of Contemporary Art and MIT Press.
- Fine, M. (1994). *Chartering urban school reform: Reflections on public high school in the midst of change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fine, M. (1987). Silencing in public schools. *Language Arts*, 64, 157–174.
- Foucault, M. (1972). The discourse on language. In A. T. Sheridan Smith, *The Archeology of knowledge* (pp. 215–237). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punishment: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 51–75). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (1997). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984 (Vol. 1)* (pp. 253–280). New York: New York Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Educating for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

- Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970).
- Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum. (Originally published in 1970.)
- Freire, P. (1998a). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Freire, P. (1998b). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Frey, M. (1983). *The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.
- Friedman, T. (2007). *The world is flat*. New York: Picador.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last of man*. New York: Avon Books.
- Gallagher, K. (2010, March). Teaching Freire and CUNY open admissions. *Radical Teacher*, 55–67.
- Gallo, C. (2010). *The presentation secrets of Steve Jobs: How to be insanely great in front of any audience*. McGraw Hill.
- Gamble, T., & Gamble, M. (2008). *Communication works*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of culture: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

- Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M., & Huddleston, B. (1985). The basic speech course at U.S. colleges and universities. *Communication Education, 34*(4), 281–291.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and woman's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1993). *Border crossings*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1994). *Disturbing pleasures*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education*. WestPort, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. A. (2003a). *The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear*. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Giroux, H. A. (2003b). Youth, higher education, and the crisis of public time: Educated hope and the possibility of a democratic future. *Social Identities, 9*(2), 141–168.
- Giroux, H. A. (2007). *The University in chains: Confronting the military-industrial-academic complex*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Glenn, D. (2009). College seeks new ways to give students a general education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A8.
- Glynn, C., & McLeod, J. (1984). Implications of the spiral of silence theory theory for communication and public opinion research. In K. Sanders, L. Kaid, & D. Nimmo (Eds.), *Political communication yearbook* (pp. 43–65). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Gong, G. (1994). *When Mississippi Chinese talk*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

- Goodenough, W. (1981). *Culture, language, and society*. New York: Benjamin/Cummings.
- Gordon, S. (2000). *The academic achievement of minority students: Perspectives, practices, and prescriptions*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Gore, A. (2007). *The assault on reason*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Gozenbach, W., King, C., & Jablonski, P. (1999). Homosexuals and the military: An analysis of the spiral of silence. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 4, 281–296.
- Gray, F. (2002). *The Tuskegee Syphilis study*. Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gregory, H. (2010). *Public speaking for college and career*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Griffin, C. (2010). *Invitational speaking*.
- Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., & Treichler, P. (1992). *Cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 13–74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Halloran, L. (1995). A comparison of two methods of teaching: Computer managed instruction and keypad questions versus traditional classroom lecture. *Computing Nursing*, 13(6), 285–288.

- Haynes, J., & Chavez, R. (2001). Storied lives, dialog → retro-reflections: Melding critical multicultural education and critical race theory for pedagogical transformation. *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, 1(4), 1–20.
- Hecht, M. L., Collier, M. J., & Ribeau, S. A. (1993). *African American communication: Ethnic identity and cultural interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hecht, M., Ribeau, S., & Sedano, M. (1990). A Mexican American perspective on interethnic communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 31–55.
- hooks, b. (1992a). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1992b). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as a practice of freedom*. London: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Howard, L. A. (1999). Primitives, progress, politics, and pedagogy. *World Communication*, 28, 3–13.
- Howard, L. A. (2004). Speaking theatre/doing pedagogy: Re-visiting theatre of the oppressed. *Communication Education*, 53(3), 217–233.
- Huang, H. (2005). A cross-cultural test of the spiral of silence. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 17, 324–345.
- Hultgren, F. H. (1994). Interpretive inquiry as a hermeneutics of practice. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 12(1), 11–25.

- Ibrahim, A. (2007). Linking Marxism, globalization, and citizenship education: toward a comparative and critical pedagogy post 9/11. *Educational Theory*, 57(1), 89–104.
- Ikeda, K. (1989). “Spiral of Silence” hypothesis and voting intention: A test in the 1986 Japanese national election. *Keio Communication Review*, 10, 51–62.
- Infante, D., Rancer, A., & Avtgis, T. (2009). *Contemporary communication theory*. Dubaque: Kendall Hunt.
- Jaffe, C. (2001). *Culture introduction to public speaking and culture in public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society*. New York: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Janowski, K. (1991). On communicating with deaf people. In L. Samovar & R. Porter, *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 142–149). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Jenefsky, C. (1996). Public speaking as empowerment. *Communication Education*, 45(4), 343–354.
- Katz, C., & Baldassare, M. (1994). Popularity in a free-fall: Measuring a spiral of silence theory at the end of the Bush presidency. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 6, 1–12.
- Kearney, P. P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). *Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kearney, P. P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1986). Power in the classroom IV: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy, and affective learning. *Communication Education*, 33, 43–55.

- Keis, R. (2006). From principle to practice: Using children's literature to promote dialogue and facilitate the "coming to voice" in a rural Latino community. *Multicultural Perspective*, 13–19.
- Keith, W. (2007). *Democracy as discussion: Civic education and the American forum movement*. Latham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Kellett, P. M. (2007). *Conflict dialogue: Working with layers of meaning for productive relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Klein, N. (2002). *Fences and windows: Dispatches from the front lines of the globalization debate*. Toronto: Vintage Canada Edition.
- Klopf, D. (1983). Developing an introductory speech course based on student and community needs. *Communication*, 12(1), 26–39.
- Kluckhohn, C., & Kroeber, A. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology Papers.
- Korn, C. M. (2000). Defining the field: Revisiting the ACA 1995 definition of communication studies. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 29(1), 40–52.
- Kramarae, C. (1981). *Women and men speaking: Frameworks for analysis*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lakoff, R. (1995). Cries and whispers: The shattering of silence. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self* (pp. 25–50). New York: Routledge.

- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lederer, S. (2003). The Cold War and beyond: Covert and deceptive American medical experimentation. In *U.S. Office of The Surgeon General Department of the Army, Textbooks of Military Medicine* (pp. 507–533). Washington: Office of the Surgeon General Department of the Army, United States of America.
- Lee, C. (1998). Culturally responsive pedagogy and performance-based assessment. *Journal of Negro Education, 67*, 269–279.
- Leff, M. (1992). Teaching public speaking as composition. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 4*, 116–122.
- Lerner, M. (2000). *Spirit matters*. Charlottesville, VA: Hampton Roads Publishing Company Inc.
- Leys, C. (2001). *Market-driven politics: Neoliberal democracy and the public interest*. London: Verso Books.
- Leistyna, P. (2004). Presence of mind in the process of learning and knowing: A dialogue with Paulo Freire. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 17–29.
- Lin, C. A., & Salwen, M. (1997). Predicting the spiral of silence theory on a controversial public issue. *The Howard Journal of Communication, 8*, 129–141.
- Machado-Casas, M. (2008). Arts in the classroom. In F. Shultz (Ed.), *Multicultural education* (pp. 137–143). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Martyn, M. (2007). Clickers in the classroom: An active learning approach. *Educause Quarterly, 30*(2), 71–74.

- Mazer, J., Hunt, S., & Kuznekoff, J. (2007). Revising general education: Assessing a critical thinking instructional model in the basic communication course. *The Journal of General Education*, 56(3&4), 173–199.
- McCallister, C. (1994). *The language of classroom democracy*. Paper Presented at the Annual Study Conference Association of Childhood Education International.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1982). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education*, 34, 214–216.
- McCroskey, J. R., & Richmond, V. P. (2006). *An introduction to communication in the classroom: The role of communication in teaching and training*. New York: Pearson Education.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1985). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training and learning. *Communication Education*, 34, 214–226.
- McDonald, D. G., Glynn, C. C., Kim, S.-H., & Ostman, R. E. (2001). The spiral of silence in the 1948 presidential election. *Communication Research*, 28(2), 139–155.
- McLaren, P. L. (2003). *Life in schools*. New York: Pearson Education.
- McLaren, P. L. (1995). White terror and oppositional agency: Towards a critical multiculturalism. In C. E. Sleeter & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy and the politics of difference* (pp. 33–70). Albany: State University of New York Press.

- McLaren, P. L., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mendelson, M. (2002). *Many sides: A protogorean approach to the theory, practice and pedagogy of argument*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Morreale, S. P., & Backlund, P. (2002). Communication curricula: History, recommendations, resources. *Communication Education*, 2–18.
- Morreale, S. P., Hanna, M.S., B. R., & Gibson, J. (1999). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities: Study VI. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 11, 1–36.
- Morreale, S. P., Hugenberg, L. W., & Worley, D. W. (2006). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities in the 21st Century: Study VII. *Communication Education*, 55, 415–437.
- Morreale, S. P., Osborn, M. M., & Pearson, J. C. (2000). Why communication is important: A rationale for the centrality of the study of communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 29, 1–25.
- Munshi, D., & McKie, D. (2007). Toward a new cartography of intercultural communication: Mapping bias, business, and diversity. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 64(3), 9–22.
- Murphey, J., & Katula, R. (1994). *A synoptic history of classical rhetoric*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Nakayama, T. (1994). Dis/Orienting identities: Asian Americans, history, and intercultural communication. In A. H. Gonzalez (Ed.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (pp. 133–139). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The spiral of silence: Public opinion—Our social skin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Novak, D. (2006). Engaging parrhesia in a democracy: Malcolm X as a Truth-teller.’ *Southern Communication Journal*, 71(1), 25–43.
- Nsouli, S. (2008). *Ensuring a sustainable and inclusive globalization*. Speech delivered at Universal Postal Union Congress (pp. 1–4). Geneva: International Monetary Fund.
- Nye, J. (2002, April 15). *Globalism vs. globalization*. [Online]. Retrieved November 13, 2009, from <http://www.theglobalist.com>
- Nye, J. (2009, April 12). *Which globalization will survive?* [Online]. Retrieved September 27, 2009, from http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2009/04/nye_globalization_will_survive.html
- O’Donnell, L. (2010, February 05). Intimate view: On a personal trip to Haiti, nurse in the midst of quake survivors’ ordeal. *Winston Salem Journal*. Retrieved April 26, 2010, from: <http://www.2journalnow.com/content/2010/feb/05/intimative-view/living>
- Office of the Protection of Research Subjects. (2010, February 9). *History of research ethics*. Retrieved February 9, 2010, from <http://research.unlv.edu/OPRS/history-ethics.htm>

- Orbe, M. (1994). "Remember it's always whites' ball." Descriptions of African American male communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 42(3) 287–300.
- Orbe, M. (1998). *Constructing co-cultural theory: an explication of culture, power, and communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Orbe, M. (2005, Fall). Continuing the legacy of theorizing from the margins: Conceptualizations of co-cultural theory. *Women and Language*, 28(2), 65–66.
- Orbe, M. (1996). Laying the foundation for co-cultural communication theory: An inductive approach to studying the non-dominant communication strategies and the factors that influence them. *Communication Studies*, 47, 157–176.
- Orbe, M., & Groscurth, C. (2004). A co-cultural theoretical analysis of communicating on campus and home: Exploring the negotiation strategies of First Generation College (FGC) students. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 5, 41–47.
- Osborne, J. (2007). *Syndication: A vision for the basic course*. Washington: National Communication Association.
- Oster-Aaland, L., Sellnow, T., Nelson, P., & Pearson, J. (2004). The status of service learning in communication departments: A follow-up study. *Communication Education*, 53, 348–356.
- Oster-Aaland, L., Sellnow, T., Nelson, P., & Pearson, J. (2004). The status of service learning in departments of communication: A follow-up study. *Communication Education*, 53(4), 348–356.

- Palley, T. (2006, April 13). *Could globalization fail?* Retrieved September 21, 2009, from <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu>
- Perkovich, G. H. (2006). *Is globalization headed for the rocks? Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (pp. 1–6). Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Peshkin, A. (1998). In search of subjectivity—One’s own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7), 17–21.
- Peters, M. (2003). Truth-Telling as an Educational Practice of the Self: Foucault, parrhesia and the Ethics of Subjectivity. *Oxford Review of Education*, 29(2), 207–233.
- Prague protests renew ‘Battle of Seattle.’ (2000, September 27). *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved November 30, 2009 from <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/archive/?date=20000927&slug=4044799>
- Prentice, M. (2007). Service learning and civic engagement. *Academic Questions*, 57, 113–125.
- Purpel, D. (1989). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education*. New York: Begin and Garvy.
- Rand, E. (1996). Teach me today: Finding the censors in your head and in your classroom. *Art Journal*, 55, 28–34.
- Reuters. (2009, September 16). Don’t leave poor behind, World Bank chief tells G20. *New York Times*, pp. 1–2.

- Rhodes, N., & Davis, J. (2001). Using service learning to get positive reactions in the library. *Computers in Libraries*, 21(1), 32–35.
- Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education*, 39(3), 181–195.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom II: Power and learning. *Communication Education*, 33(2), 125–136.
- Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rose, M. (1989). *Lives on the boundary: The struggles and achievements of America's underprepared*. New York: The Free Press.
- Salmon, C., & Moh, C. (1992). Spiral of silence: Communication and the public opinion as social control. In J. Kennamer, *Public opinion, the press, and public policy* (pp. 145–161). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Scheufele, D. (2008). Spiral of Silence Theory. In W. Donsbach & M. Traugott, *The Sage handbook of public opinion research* (pp. 175–183). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Scheufele, D., & Moy, P. (2000). Twenty-five years of the spiral of silence: A conceptual review and empirical outlook. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 12, 3–28.
- Scudder, V. (2004, July 1). The importance of communication in a global world. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 70(18), 559–662.
- Sellnow, D. D., & Martin, J. M. (2010). The basic course in communication: Where do we go from here? In D. L. Fassett & J. T. Warren (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of communication and instruction* (pp. 33–53). Washington, DC: Sage.

- Sewell, C., & Peters, J. (2009, February 18). Chimp stimulus cartoon raises racism concerns. *New York Times* (City Room). Retrieved October 24, 2010, from <http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/02/18/chimp-stimulus-cartoon-raises-racism-concerns/>
- Shapiro, H. S. (2006). *Losing heart: The moral and spiritual miseducation of America's children*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shapiro, H. S. (2007). Communities of meaning and hope: Education in a time of global fragmentation. *Education and Society*, 5–26.
- Shapiro, H. S. (2009). *Education and hope in troubled times: vision of change for our children's world*. New York: Routledge.
- Shapiro, H. S. (2010). *Educating youth for a world beyond violence: A pedagogy for peace*. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Shome, I. (1996). Postcolonial interventions in the rhetorical canon: An “other” view. *Communication Theory*, 48(3), 373–403.
- Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching*, 54, 304–319.
- Singham, M. (2005). Moving away from the authoritarian classroom. *Change*, May/June, 1–7.
- Smith, M. (2002). *Globalization and the incorporation of education*. [Online]. Retrieved September 18, 2009, from http://www.infed.org/biblio/globalization_and_education.htm

- Smith, M., & Razzouk, N. (1993). Improving classroom communication. *Journal of Education for Business*, 215–221.
- Sorrells, K. A. (2008). *Linking social justice and intercultural communication in the global context*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Sorrells, K. A. (2010). *Towards a politics of locations: Relationships and ruptures in the multicultural curriculum and classroom*. Northridge: Unpublished Manuscript.
- Sorrells, K. A., & Nakagawa, G. (2008). Intercultural communication praxis and the struggle for social responsibility and social justice. In O. Swartz (Ed.), *Transformative communication studies: Culture, hierarchy, and the human condition* (pp. 23–61). Leicester, UK: Troubador.
- Spelman, E. (1988). *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*. Boston: Beacon.
- Sproule, J. M. (2002, Winter). Rhetorical culture and the basic course. *American Communication Journal*, 5(2). Available: <http://www1.appstate.edu/orgs/acjournal/holdings/vol5/iss2/special/sproule.pdf>
- Stinson, D. (2009, September). The proliferation of theoretical paradigm quandry: How one novice researcher used eclecticism as a solution. *Qualitative Report*, 14(3), 498–524.
- Stone, L. (2002). Dewey's contribution to an American hubris: Philosophy of democracy, education, and war. *Philosophy of Education*, 274–281.
- Swartz, O. (1996a). On Power: A discussion of Richard Rorty and Michel Foucault. *World Communication*, 25, 13–20.

- Swartz, O. (1996b). Praxis. In T. Enos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age* (p. 533). New York: Garland.
- Swartz, O. (1997a). *Conducting socially responsible research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Swartz, O. (1997b). Toward critical education in the communication classroom. *The New Jersey Journal of Communication*, 5(1), 21–29.
- Swartz, O. (Ed). (2006). *Social justice and communication scholarship*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swartz, O., Campbell, K., & Pestana, C. (2009). *Neo-pragmatism, communication, and the culture of creative democracy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54–71.
- Thorne, B. (1989). Rethinking the ways we teach. In C. S. Pearson, D. I. Shavlik, & J. G. Touchton (Eds.), *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education* (pp. 311–325). New York: American Council on Education and MacMillian Publishing.
- Timmerman, D. (1996). Epideictic Oratory. In T. Enos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age* (pp. 228–231). New York: Garland.
- van Dijk, L., van Den Berg, G. C., & van Keulen, H. (2001). Interactive lectures in engineering. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(1), 15–18.

- Van Gelder, S. (2003). What democracy would look like? *Yes Magazine*.
- Vangelist, A. J. (1999). *Teaching communication theory, research, and methods*.
Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wampler, P., & Clark, K. (2006). *Clickers in the classroom—Rewards and regrets of using students response systems in a large enrollment geology course*.
Philadelphia: Geological Society of America.
- Warren, J., & Sellnow, T. (2010). Learning through service: The contribution of service learning in the communication discipline. In D. Fassett & J. Warren (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of communication and instruction* (p. 129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weber, J. (2007). *Feminist pedagogy in the “traditional” public speaking classroom: working within the confines*. Washington: National Communication Association.
- Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change*. New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- Weis, L., Fine, M., & Lareau, A. (1992). *Schooling and the silenced “others”: Race and class in schools*. Buffalo, NY: Graduate School of Educational Publishing.
- West, C. (2004). *Democracy matters*. New York: Penguin Press.
- West, R., & Turner, L. (2009). *Introducing communication theory*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- White, E., Minnick, W., Van Dusen, R., & Lewis, T. (1954). Three interpretations of the first course in speech: A symposium. *The Southern Speech Journal*, 20, 163–170.

- Willnat, L., Lee, W. P., & Detenber, B. (2002). Individual-level predictors of public opinion outspokenness: A test of the Spiral of Silence Theory in Singapore. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 14*, 391–412.
- Wood, J. (1981). Feminist Standpoint Theory and Muted Group Theory: Commonalities and divergences. *Women and Language, 28*(2), 61.
- Wood, J. (1992). Gender and moral voice. Moving from Woman's Nature to Standpoint Epistemology, *15*(1), 1–24.
- Wood, J. (1993). *The corporate closet: The professional lives of gay men in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Wood, J. (2008). *Communication mosaics*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Wood, J. (2009). *Communication in our lives*. New York: Wadsworth.
- World Bank. (2009, September 22). *World Bank*. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from <http://www.worldbank.org/financialcrisis/bankinitiatives.htm>
- Young, R. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Yudice, G. (2003). *The expediency of culture: Uses of culture in the global era*. Durham, NC: Duke University.

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In researching the state of the basic communication course is in the context of globalization, a qualitative method was utilized. The methodology in this research utilizes interpretive inquiry to examine thirty five basic communication course syllabi from community colleges and universities across the United States. The critical paradigm and interpretive inquiry provides me with critical, ethical, and heuristic methodological tools for examining the basic communication course.

Quantitative research assumes that reality occurs independent of other measures and influences and researchers can discern this reality. In contrast, qualitative research is grounded in the belief that reality does exist but there is no objective way to determine truth independently. Truth is grounded in a person's reality and is subject to multiple interpretations of meaning. Interpretive inquiry is a type of qualitative research in which the essential element is the effort to gain from the narratives or text how people make sense of their lives. The interpretation of these texts helps reveal how people create meaning. Narrative research embodies a variety of research practices and interdisciplinary inquiry.

In this study, the research artifacts of thirty five syllabi will be viewed as the communication instructor's narrative. Each narrative is subjective, based on the narrative frame of reference or point of entry. The syllabi collected provide rich interpretive texts that can help reveal the manner in which the narrative is told in relation to the basic

communication course. The research artifacts will also provide rich data in terms of exploring and extracting the mental models that communication educators have constructed in relation to the basic communication course. These texts provide critical ways to analyze the basic communication course in the context of globalization. The interpretive inquiry mode of scholarship is a heuristic methodological approach for examining the critical social problems that overwhelm human beings across the globe.

Challenges and Benefits for the Narrative and Interpretive Researcher

Kellett (2007) contends there are various obstacles and opportunities for those engaged in analyzing narratives and texts. These challenges also extend to the interpretive researcher. In relation to challenges, it is imperative to remember (a) meaning is a complicated concept to capture and explain and thus resides within the person and within their language; (b) meaning can be interpreted in various ways for various people; (c) meaning reflects the layers of relationship between the layers must be interpreted; (d) meaning can be quite elusive, challenging, and political; and (e) avoiding appropriating someone else's voice to support your own worldviews and theoretical standpoints.

In addition to providing challenges, working with narratives has various benefits as well for the researcher: (a) becoming more "in tune with how actions connect to their effects in networks, cycles, and patterns of relationship" . . . known as "telesmatic" (p. 21); (b) being able to see conflicts, narratives, or texts from a myriad of perspectives; (c) developing open-mindedness as a researcher and practitioner; (d) viewing and comprehending themes; and (e) linking comprehension to enlightenment and learning.

Role of the Researcher

Peshkin (1998) argues that subjectivity is inevitable and happens throughout the research process. The slightest awareness of the researcher's subjectivity may shape the inquiry and its outcomes. A researcher can never fully remove his or her subjectivity; hence it is important for the researcher to take off his or her mask of objectivity. Researchers have individual preferences and different cultural frameworks of meaning; hence a systematic audit of the self can benefit both investigator and the subject. An awareness of this subjectivity can help the researcher be more sensitive and responsive to the differences that she uncovers. Although the researcher cannot eliminate subjectivity, perhaps she can manage it with intellectual honesty and disclosure.

Reissman (1993) cites five areas where she contends the researcher introduces interpretation into the research process. In "attending," the researcher focuses especially on those dimensions that introduce choice in the interaction with the text or participant. As the researcher engages in telling the text or story to others, the "telling" is eventually unavoidable, thus it is essential that the researcher realizes that her or she may introduce their own subjectivity. "Transcribing" is the interpretive activity of describing the content and context of the text. The meaning and methods of deconstruction and the theory selected adds selectivity to the process. "Analyzing" is subject to interpretation and the researcher selects what is important in terms of the discourse. In making these evaluations, the researcher interprets the texts written by the original author. The "reading" of the texts augments the engagement and interpretation of the researcher and ultimately becomes more than the relaying the text for the researcher's sole purpose. It

consists of attending, telling, transcribing, analyzing, and reading the texts being examined.

Interpretive Analysis: the Syllabus as a Heuristic Tool

In this interpretive study, the syllabi represent an extraction of the professor's mental models. Thus the syllabus can be considered narrative texts. This study examines these research artifacts. Therefore the following research question was asked: "Does the basic communication course taught in two-year and four-year colleges and universities meet the needs of today's students in the context of globalization?" This critical study employed an interpretive approach in order to ascertain whether the basic communication course fails to meet the objectives of helping students become competent communicators in the context of globalization.

Participants and Instructional Context

A message distributed by the National Communication Association List-Serve (CRTNT) and the Basic Communication Course Director's List-Serve solicited instructors for participation. The requests were made during Spring 2009, Spring 2010, and Fall 2010. I also made an oral request for syllabi at The Hope Conference, a week-long training seminar for communication faculty, sponsored by the National Communication Association. I asked basic communication instructors and directors to submit syllabi and assignments used in their basic communication courses that met their college's general education requirement for oral communication (intellectual and practical skills). I received 36 syllabi. There were 35 syllabi that met the requirements of my study.

Data Analysis

Course syllabi and assignments were analyzed to capture an understanding of how instructors teach the basic communication course. It is important to note that this interpretive analysis was not designed to measure whether or not these courses met the general education outcomes of oral communication; rather, the major criteria for selection of the data set *was* that the course was used to fulfill the general education outcome requirement of oral communication. The intent of this study was to assess the instructional effectiveness of a sample of the colleges and universities in terms of a critical approach.

Curriculum Analysis Model: Intercultural Praxis

In this study I utilized a curriculum development model to deconstruct the collected data. The theoretical framework of *Intercultural Praxis*, developed by Kathryn Sorrells (2008), was initially developed for understanding intercultural communication in the context of globalization, which provides strategies and methods for interrogating power. I argue this model can be extended for curriculum development in the basic course. The integration of *Intercultural Praxis* as a pedagogical framework is grounded in critical pedagogy, the philosophy of Paulo Freire, and a combination of intercultural theories. Sorrells (2008) describes *Intercultural Praxis* as a process of “critical, reflective, engaged thinking and action” that enables them to “understand other cultures, find their voice, engage in critical dialogue, and become empowered to use communication to advocate for social justice” (p. 206).

In this section I will briefly explain the model and how it can be used as a pedagogical framework for curriculum development in the basic course. The six entry ports of inquiry, framing, positioning, dialogue, reflection, and action were used as concepts to deconstruct the basic communication course in the context of globalization.

Inquiry. Inquiry as a place of entry for *Intercultural Praxis* means a wish and willingness to know, ask, find out, and learn. Exploratory inquiry about those who are unlike us leads us to engaging with others. We are willing to take risks and be open to other perspectives. In relation to curriculum, inquiry is viewed an invitation to question. It is used as a space for interrogation. Questions are asked such as: “Whose knowledge is presented?”, and “What ideologies are reinforced?” (Sorrells, 2010).

Framing. The term and action of framing suggests our perspectives, our views of ourselves, others, and the world around us are ultimately limited by frames. Framing as a port of entry in *Intercultural Praxis* means that we are able to zoom in and to focus on the particular and very situated details of a specific exchange or interaction.

Positioning. Sorrells contends that positioning refers to curriculum as a politics of location. It is critical to be able to locate “knowing” in one’s body/experience. It makes one mindful of the material, intellectual, and practical consequences of curriculum. Moreover, it allows the educator to explore other ways of helping students develop a way of knowing—other than the textbook.

Dialogue. The entry port of dialogue invites the educator to view curriculum as a site of “dynamic meaning-making.” In the basic course, we may consider effective

dialogue as being able to deliver an effective presentation; but challenges us to meaningfully engage the audience.

Reflection. Educators reflect upon their pedagogy and examine ways for growth and synergy. Once we have informed our pedagogy and engaged in reflection, we can help our students use their newly-developed communication tools for action.

Action. *Intercultural Praxis* challenges us to move beyond curious inquiry, framing, positioning, and reflecting, but to also take action. In curriculum, action is a site for engagement (Sorrells, 2010). Taking action allows educators to explore their involvement, connections, and responsibilities in the learning process.

In this interpretive process, themes will be examined that emerge from analyzing these particular concepts. I will explore four themes that should inform our pedagogy of the basic course that emerged from my deconstruction of the basic course.

Communication educators must deal with issues of culture, strategic rhetoric, silence, and citizenship education in the context of globalization in the basic public speaking course.

Based on my research, four problems were identified: the absence of culture, a pervasive strategic rhetoric of whiteness, too many silencing messages and techniques, and limited citizenship education. These themes are explored further in Chapter IV.