Raimonda Mikašauskienė – humanitarinių mokslų daktarė, Klaipėdos universiteto Socialinių ir humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto Filologijos katedros lektorė
Moksliniai interesai: diskurso analizė, lyginamoji kalbotyra
El. paštas: raisaryte@gmail.com

Raimonda Mikašauskienė – PhD in Philology, lecturer of Department of Philology of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Klaipėda University
Research interests: Discourse analysis, Comparative linguistics
E-mail: raisaryte@gmail.com

Margarita Čiročkina – Klaipėdos universiteto Socialinių ir humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto Filologijos katedros asistentė
Moksliniai interesai: diskurso analizė, vertimas
El. paštas: m.cirockina@yandex.ru

Margarita Čiročkina – assistant of Department of Philology of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Klaipėda University
Research interests: Discourse analysis, Translation
E-mail: m.cirockina@yandex.ru

Raimonda Mikašauskienė
Margarita Čiročkina
Klaipėda University

THE STRUCTURAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SPEECHES OF AMERICAN BUSINESS LEADERS

Anotacija

Straipsnyje analizuojama Amerikos verslo lyderių sakytinių kalbų retorinė dispozicija (struktūrinė kompozicija), padedanti sukurti įtaigumo efektą. Tyrimo tikslas – išanalizuoti dispozicinę kalbų topiką: nustatyti ir apibendrinti pagrindinius retorinės kompozicijos komponentus. Tyrimui pasirinkta 50 žymiausių Amerikos verslo lyderių kalbų, pristatytų įvairiomis progomis 1981–2019 m. Šiuo tyrimu siekiama išsiaiškinti, ar šiuolaikiniai oratoriai laikosi klasikinės retorikos postuluojamų struktūrinės kompozicijos principų ir kaip kinta dispozicinė topika sakytinių kalbų atžvilgiu.
PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: retorika, dispozicija, įtaigumas, verslo diskursas, lyderystė.

Abstract

The article explores the rhetorical disposition (structural composition) of the speeches delivered by the most renowned American business leaders, which is approached from the perspective of persuasion. The aim of the research is to analyse the dispositional topic of the speeches in question:

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

271

to determine and generalise the most common elements of rhetorical composition. Fifty speeches by American business leaders, delivered on various occasions in the period 1981 to 2019, have been chosen and analysed in this article. The research is intended to answer the question whether contemporary orators still follow the principles of structural composition proposed by Classical rhetorical theory, and to observe how dispositional topics are changing with regard to orally delivered speeches.
KEY WORDS: rhetoric, disposition, persuasion, business discourse, leadership.

Preliminary remarks

The ability to tell a story persuasively enough to have a strong influence on the audience requires an elaborate set of skills with regard to both effective rhetoric and leadership. Knowing how to weave complex ideas of leadership, strategy, innovation and other aspects of one's business into a coherent speech helps the speaker create a strong sense of vision, purpose and unity. Business communication is one of the domains where the ability to tell a story and have a gripping influence on the audience remains the most important skill a leader can have and should strive for.

The present article focuses on one of the facets of business communication, business rhetoric[1] in particular. Any leader striving to use well-argumented and persuasive linguistic potential, as well as identifying and applying manipulative techniques to influence public opinion, is expected to follow the main principles of rhetoric, a discipline that Aristotle once defined as the 'technique of discovering the persuasive aspects of any given subject-matter' (cited by Lawson-Trancred 2004, 65).

The main objective of rhetoric to 'communicate, make a verbal impact and convince' (Buckley 2006, 19) is one of the fundamental pillars for the speaker to rely on in order to construct a persuasive, substantiated and vivid speech that would have the intended impact on the target audience. The fundamental reference point in this article is the Classical tradition of rhetoric, because it 'enables speech acts to be understood as performative interventions in general debates and in actual business practices' (Schonfield 2018, 2). Even though the rhetorical tradition has a long and complex history, the majority of scholars and authors traditionally acknowledge five canons of rhetoric,[2] *Inventio*, *Dispositio*, *Elocutio*,

---

[1] Yulia V. Daniushina characterises this discipline as including 'specifics of a leader's speech, argumentative and persuasive communicative strategies for carrying out presentations, conducting meetings and negotiations' (2010, 242), among other features. The main focus of business rhetoric, in the words of Ernest Schonfield, is on 'the literary representation of rhetoric and persuasion as essential aspects of any business activity' (2018, 2).

[2] The five canons, or tenets, of rhetoric are traditionally regarded as a template for creating and preparing an effective and persuasive speech. These canons are generally considered to 'facilitate a rhetorical process that enables the rhetor to communicate effectively' (Kirsch, 2014, 4).

Memoria and *Pronuntiatio*, that were originally constituted and are to be seen as a single system to help 'an orator to develop an effective rhetorical act' (Phillips 2014, 711) and prepare 'a strategy to achieve successful persuasion'[3] (Martin 2014, 51). Lately, however, we notice a gradual shift in this five-canon system, as some authors began to 'truncate the five canons from five to three', so that invention, arrangement and style 'repeatedly colonise' and 'eradicate' the other two (Getchell, Lentz 2019).

When it comes to modern rhetorical analysis, it is often narrowed down to the level of *elocution*, which encompasses only the study of verbal adornment, various tropes and rhetorical figures used in a spoken or written discourse. As the investigation of elocution alone cannot be sufficient to reveal the full potential of rhetorical analysis, other rhetorical components should also be taken into account. The other, no less important part of rhetoric is *disposition*, which is primarily concerned with identifying the parts of a text and organising them in a coherent whole. It is obvious, of course, that one cannot be without the other. Alongside the elaborate use of linguistic and rhetorical figures, the composition and arrangement of a written or oral discourse requires the speaker to ponder upon its structure, give careful consideration to the order of the material, and organise thoughts and ideas so that they have the maximum impact on the audience, meet the listeners' expectations, and as a result, successfully convince them. Indeed, as indicated by George Pullman, the arrangement is the most important thing to remember, as the order of structuring arguments in a text 'influences how people understand what [the speaker] is saying, what they will remember, and how much they will agree' (2013, 182).

The canon of structural arrangement, or *disposition*, is related not only to the organisation of words, sentences, paragraphs and sections, it also presupposes strategic decisions concerning the placement of organisational elements in such a way that would most likely allow the speaker 'to achieve a particular persuasive end' (Ibrahim, Kassabgy, Aydelott 2000, 99). It should be stated, though, that the prevailing principles of structural arrangement are not set in stone, and thus over the course of time are subject to change.[4] Richard Toye, for example, notes

---

According to Gerald M. Phillips (1991), the canons of classical rhetoric have 'stood the test of time' and 'represent a legitimate taxonomy of processes' (p. 70). Nowadays, the canons are typically seen as constituting an organisational structure, and are thus thought of as being five logical steps or stages that any person who is to deliver a speech should go through.

[3] Victoria O'Donnell defines persuasion as 'a complex and interactive process where the addresser seeks to affect the opinion of the addressee by following a particular system of verbal and nonverbal symbols' (1982, 12).

[4] The canon of arrangement of a written or oral discourse (dispositio) seems to be contingent rather than fixed, as there is still no clear agreement as to how many parts a text is supposed to have. Corax, whose teachings were greatly admired by Greek rhetoricians, for example, di-

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

273

that the arrangement of discourse is not necessarily to be 'invariably followed', or that a successful and persuasive speech must 'necessarily require all the elements, at least not in such a strictly demarcated order' (Toye 2013, 116). It is generally acknowledged, however, that it is a four-element system that best complies with the requirements of efficient rhetorical composition: *introduction* (a section where the main argument[s] is/are stated), *narration* (the statement of facts or background information), *confirmation* (proof and evidence to substantiate the main arguments), and *conclusion*. Alongside these 'compulsory' elements, two more compositional sections are generally proposed, namely, *division* (*partition*), by which the speaker briefly states the arguments that are to come, and *refutation*, which is used for enlisting counter arguments (Fahnestock in Enos 1996, 32–34). Although these elements are closely interrelated, each of them fulfils a specific function, at least partly corresponding to the main categories of persuasion.[5]

The present article **aims to** investigate the main components of rhetorical composition in the public speeches delivered by American business leaders renowned for their keen insights into the corporate world and who have gained authorial credibility through entrepreneurial leadership. The main objective of this research is to explore which elements of disposition are generally exploited by business leaders to convey their ideas, present their attitudes, and persuade their audience, and which ones (if there are any) are commonly disregarded.

The scope of empirical data. Fifty speeches delivered by celebrated American business leaders on various occasions in the period 1981 to 2019 have been selected and analysed in this article. It is assumed that a wider range of data under investigation will provide a more thorough understanding of the prevailing components of rhetorical composition and the linguistic means of persuasion used in the business discourse.

---

vided a speech into introduction, narration, argument and conclusion. These divisions, with some additions and modifications proposed by Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, were refined by adding an argument summary section, thus creating a five-part division: introduction (exordium), narration, partition (division), confirmation, peroration (conclusion) (Frost, 2016, 45). Ibrahim, Kassabgy and Aydelott share the opinion that the canon of arrangement and the varied parts of the speech should be divided as follows: introduction, statement of fact, confirmation or proof through arguments, refutation of opposing arguments through counterarguments, and conclusion (Ibrahim, Kassabgy, Aydelott, 2000: 99; see also Martin, 2014: 66).

5   Eglė Gabrėnaitė has outlined the main correspondences between these categories: introduction is directly linked to the category ethos, which postulates the necessity for due respect for the addressee and the selection of appropriate means for the expression of this respect; the narrative and argumentation are associated with the category of logos, referring to the power of proving, and the ending is attributable to the category of pathos, evoking a motivational power of feeling (2010, 16–17; for the main categories of persuasion originally outlined by Aristotle, see Thompson, 1998, 16).

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

274

According to Baramee Kheovichai, the analysis of business rhetoric in the majority of studies has been carried out by mostly focusing on written genres, i.e. 'research articles, mission statements, textbooks, economic reports, CEO letters, meetings and business training' (2015, 115), whereas studies in the ways that linguistic means of persuasion are 'used in spoken business discourse are still but limited' (2015, 116). The differences between these two communicative modes are easy to observe: in oral discourse (as opposed to written), there is a temporal and spatial contact between the interlocutors, which gives them a deep involvement in the situation, while the written discourse is more complex in its form, and the author is more detached from the intended audience. As a result, these types of discourse may result in a different use of lexical and grammatical resources.[6] Seeking to shed more light on linguistic means of persuasion and to provide some insight into the rhetorical composition of oral discourse, the present article focuses solely on oral speeches delivered by business leaders.

To achieve the aim of this article, the following **research methods** have been applied. The empirical method has been used to gather information on the topic of the article. The descriptive-analytical method has been applied to approach the study of rhetoric and persuasion, and present and describe the relevant theoretical insights into their history and main principles. The comparative method has been exploited to collate the information obtained and make a distinction between the postulated ideas. Moreover, methods of rhetorical analysis and analysis of content were employed. Finally, the quantitative method was applied to determine and indicate the number of cases where a particular rhetorical device was used in the speeches of business leaders.

Rhetorical disposition

Rhetorical disposition is the aspect of putting a speech in order, and is directly related to the placement of various parts of a speech and the 'way speech flows from start to finish' (Martin 2014, 65–66). After getting acquainted with the materials on disposition, it becomes clear that it is not its definition that raises questions, but whether there is a link between persuasion and the structure of a text. Accordingly, the structural arrangements of 50 speeches delivered by American business leaders were analysed from two perspectives: 1) the presence

---

[6]   The most obvious of them are differences of a syntactical nature: investigators typically attribute high levels of complexity, integration and detachment in written discourse to the greater frequencies of subordinate clauses, relative clauses, participial and appositive phrases, and passive verb constructions that prevail in this mode, whereas oral discourse, which is seen as more implicit, usually involves more coordinating clauses and active verb constructions (Leu, 1982, 112).

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

275

and/or absence of particular parts; and 2) the way the following parts were used to achieve persuasion.

1. Introduction (*Exordium*)

The introductory part of a discourse opens the speech and provides preparatory comments that are designed to achieve two objectives. Neil Elliot claims that in order for a piece of discourse to be persuasive, its introduction should be built on the basis of a formula, i.e., it should include the formulation of the salutation, the thanksgiving clause, and 'the disclosure that serves as a transition to the body itself' (2007, 70–71).

An introduction to a speech helps the speaker to become favourably disposed to the audience, to attract their attention, remove tension and build closer relationships. The opening part of the speech should be strong enough for the audience to most vividly remember the most outstanding facts presented. The research has revealed that authors believe it is necessary to start a speech by introducing oneself, greeting and thanking the audience, or marking the importance of the event. Nevertheless, depending on the occasion of the speech, almost one fifth of speakers chose to move directly to the narrative part, either rendering the introductory part very briefly or even omitting it.

In order to be persuasive, it is essential for the speaker to build a personal bridge and establish an initial relationship with the audience, i.e., one must refer to *ethos*[7] which would put the minds of the listeners in a proper condition to receive the rest of the speech and allow the audience to 'believe that the speaker is someone to whom they want to listen' (Frederick 2011, 19). Accordingly, before presenting one's view of the issue in question, and expertise and knowledge, the speaker has to alleviate tension and make the audience feel more comfortable. To that end, five speakers used a joke or humorous expression in their introductory parts.

In some speeches, however, the relevance of the introductory part is rather diminished: some speakers believe that moving straight to factual information is more desirable, especially in cases when the orator or the general purpose of the speech is widely understood (Martin 2014, 65). Accordingly, the analysis of the speeches delivered by various business leaders revealed that not all spokesmen started their presentations with greetings, thanking the audience, or making a reference to the importance of the event: there were 12 speakers who chose to

---

[7]   Ethos, pathos and logos are three modes of expression or approaches to persuasion that were distinguished in the late fourth century BC by Aristotle. The ancient rhetorician was convinced that a person who is to be in command must: 1) possess the necessary qualities and values required to gain credibility (ethos), 2) reason logically (logos), and 3) understand emotions, that is, to be aware of their causes and ways they are excited (pathos) (Aristotle, 2010, 8).

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

276

move on immediately to the narrative part of the speech. The table below summarises the main introductory strategies employed by the speakers:

Table 1

Speech opening strategies

Salutation (6% of all speeches)	(1) *It is, by my watch, one minute before noon, but I will still say, good afternoon* (Bloomberg, 2010). (2) *Good afternoon, all* (Tillerson, 2018). (3) *Good evening* (Gore, 2000).
Self-introduction (2%)	(4) *I'm Jack Welch, Chairman of the Board of GE. Here with me are Keith Sherin, Senior Vice President and GE's Chief Financial Officer, and Ben Heineman, our Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Secretary* (Welch, 2001).
Joke/humorous expression (10%)	(5) *Testing: One million $, two million $ ... three million $* (Buffett, 2006). (6) *G' morning – Introductions are pretty funny ... They paid me sixty dollars so I wore a tie* (Jobs, 1983).
Thanking clause (46%)	(7) *Thank you very much. Thank you. I would like to begin by addressing the terrorist attack in Manila* (Trump, 2017). (8) *Chairman Burr, Vice Chairman Warner, and Members of the Select Committee: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak with you today* (Sandberg, 2018).
All parts of the formula (12%)	(9) *Good morning! It is an honor to be here with you today in this grand hall, a room that represents what is possible when people of different backgrounds, histories, and philosophies come together to build something bigger than themselves. I am deeply grateful to our hosts. I want to recognize Ventsislav Karadjov for his service and leadership. And it is a true privilege to be introduced by his co-host, a statesman that I admire greatly, Giovanni Butarelli* (Cook, 2018).
Omission of the introductory part (24%)	(10) *The financial world is a mess, both in the United States and abroad. Its problems, moreover, have been leaking into the general economy, and the leaks are now turning into a gusher. In the near term, unemployment will rise, business activity will falter and headlines will continue to be scary* (Buffett, 2008)

Thus, the prevailing strategies for opening speeches used by American business leaders involve the thanksgiving clause where speakers provided recognition to specific individuals or the audience in general, preserving all parts of the formula and using humorous phrases. It is significant to note, however, that a substantial part of all speakers (12 out of 50) chose to immediately move on to the narrative part of the speech, omitting the introductory part; the underlying assumption could be inferred that the speakers regard the following parts of their speech to be of greater importance for achieving persuasion.

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

277

2. Narration (*Narratio*)

The body of the speech, also known as narration, is related to the enunciation of the issue under discussion and the statement of facts. Narration is considered as the 'fountainhead from which the whole remainder of speech flows', and thus is a crucial part of discourse because of its capacity for 'applying principles to situations' (Enos 1996, 453). It is the stage of acceptance and assessment of contextual information where speakers present their stories or other information that may persuade the audience and influence their beliefs or feelings.

Having slightly modified the three types of narration offered by Cicero, Theresa Enos states that a narration could be either a 'straightforward offering of facts or a story in which facts were interwoven within the entire speech or a presentation that was essentially unconnected with the case' (1996, 639). It should be noted that there is no strict regulation under which the speaker must undertake the only type of narration: according to Regina Koženiauskienė, the models of expression of thoughts are usually of a mixed nature, intertwining with argumentation and forming various combinations with rhetorical figures of thought that determine not only the individuality of the narrative, but also the individuality of the whole composition (2001, 122).

2.1. The first type of narrative offered by Enos (1996, 454) is related to the *immediate presentation of information and data*. As a matter of fact, Aristotle claimed that any persuasive speech has but two necessary parts, when the speaker must state their case, and then prove it (Aristotle 2010, 144). This type of narration was also mentioned by Cicero, who claimed that it is a kind of *narratio* 'in which the cause itself and the whole principle of the dispute is contained' (*The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, 1871, 262–263). Accordingly, the analysis of the speeches presented by business leaders revealed that 17 speakers constructed the narrative part of their discourse by focusing on the case and the reason for dispute. The application of this type of narration has its benefits, as the listeners are not actually distracted by the presentation of additional accounts or stories, but are immediately involved in the subject matter, as in the following example:

(11) *Our Macao operation produced its best quarter since quarter three 2014 with adjusted EBITDA reaching $731 million. Hold-normalized EBITDA came in at $758 million, representing growth of 30% over the prior year. Macao's mass market growth accelerated during the quarter from 9% in quarter three to an estimated 18% in quarter four. We again outperformed the market in mass gaming growth, as we have throughout 2017. Our non-rolling table grew by 18% over the prior year, while our non-rolling win grew by 27%; this outperformed its mass revenue growth rate throughout significant margin expansion. Our whole normalized EBITDA margin*

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

278

reached 35.1% through the quarter, an increase of 320 basis points compared with the prior year (Adelson 2018).

The audience are at once introduced to the situation and presented with statistical data and factual information that increase the credibility of the speaker and make them aware of the circumstances taking place:

(12) *In December, we announced that GM would build its next-generation autonomous test vehicle here at Orion. Production of those vehicles began in January, making GM the first and – to this day – the only automotive company to assemble self-driving vehicles in a mass-production facility* (Barra 2017).

On the other hand, depending on the occasion of the speech and the audience, such directness and candour in the discourse of business leaders can actually be seen as a drawback, since they appeal only to logic, and present factual information and data that do not allow building an emotional bridge with the listeners. It should not be forgotten that any piece of discourse that seeks persuasion should consist of 'an interaction or dialectic between persuader and audience' and 'the more the persuader understands the audience and anticipates their response', the greater their personal relationship, and therefore the possibility of persuading them, will be (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005, 135).

2.2. The second type of narration suggested by Enos is related to a *story*, where the speaker consistently and comprehensively gives an account of events or situations that are associated with the context and content of the speech. Accordingly, Cicero claimed that this type of narration interposes some 'digression, unconnected with the immediate argument', but is closely related to the entire speech in general (*The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, 1871, 262). The main function of this type of narrative is to attack somebody or something, institute a comparison, provoke 'some mirth not altogether unsuitable to the business under discussion' or 'for the sake of amplification' (ibid). In other words, it is used to inform the listeners by providing more knowledge and information about the case in question that would influence their emotional stance and make them more open to persuasion. The research has revealed that the story-type of narration was used and employed by the majority of business leaders (24 speakers) who delivered speeches on various occasions. As a matter of fact, Robert and Susan Cockcroft claim that this type of *narratio* can be easily identified by its 'describing narrative structure' that has three basic units which are linked and serve as the building blocks: *and* (signifying number, relationship), *then* (signifying temporality), and *cause* (signifying cause/effect) (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005, 137). An example is presented below:

(13) *We've just finished a summer of big-ticket commemorations, celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Apollo landing <u>and</u> of Woodstock. 1969 <u>was also</u> a good year*

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

279

*to be a kid in New York – with Joe Namath calling the Super Bowl, and the Knicks'
season that ended up with the legendary Willis Reed in Game 7* [...]

*But perhaps the most momentous birthday from that famous summer of 1969 –
in its way, a miracle – went by just a couple of weeks ago with little mention. Just over
40 years ago, a handful of engineers in a UCLA lab connected two computers with a
15-foot gray cable and transferred little pieces of data back and forth* [...]

*Today, we can't imagine what our lives would be like without the Internet – any
more than we can imagine life without running water or the light bulb. Millions of us
depend upon it every day – at home, at work, in school, everywhere in between* [...]

*That's why Congress and the President have charged the FCC with developing a
National Broadband Plan to ensure that every American has access to open and ro-
bust broadband. The fact is that we face great challenges as a nation right now: health
care, education, energy, public safety* [...] (Genachowski 2009).

The four paragraphs of the speech correspond to the above-mentioned
structure, where the first and second sections have been constructed on the
basis of the *and* relationship, the block of *then*, and the *cause* section presented
in the last paragraph. This type of narration not only conveys statements or
facts, i.e. appeals to the logical side of the audience, but also 'furnish[es] either
background information or context for the case being argued' that arrays and
adorns the discourse, thus suggesting the audience liken themselves with the
speaker or the circumstances mentioned (Enos 1996, 453).

2.3. Cicero also distinguished the third kind of narration which is 'uttered or
written for the sake of entertainment, combined with its giving practice' and was
mainly conversant about events or persons (*The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cice-
ro*, 1871, 262). Moreover, the rhetorician identified three subtypes of narration
concerning events, *fabula*, *historia* and *argumentum*: where *fabula*, as claimed by
Cicero, uses fictional events, in which 'statements are expressed which are neit-
her true nor probable'; *historia* refers to the 'account of exploits which have been
performed, removed from the recollection of our own age'; and *argumentum* is
a narrative based upon fictional events that could happen (ibid). Having con-
ducted an analysis of the speeches delivered by business leaders, it was noticed
that no speakers used the *fabula* subtype of narration, whereas the *historia* and
argumentum subtypes were employed:

(14) *Before we discuss the Paris Accord, I'd like to begin with an update on our
tremendous – absolutely tremendous – economic progress since Election Day on No-
vember 8th. The economy is starting to come back, and very, very rapidly. We've
added $3.3 trillion in stock market value to our economy, and more than a million
private sector jobs.*

280   Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

I have just returned from a trip overseas where we concluded nearly $350 billion of military and economic development for the United States, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs. It was a very, very successful trip, believe me. Thank you. Thank you (Trump, 2017).

(15) *So here we are, commencement, life's great forward-looking ceremony. And don't say, 'What about weddings?' Weddings are one-sided and insufficiently effective. Weddings are bride-centric pageantry. Other than conceding to a list of unreasonable demands, the groom just stands there – no stately, hey-everybody-look-at-me procession; no being given away; no identity-changing pronouncement.*

And can you imagine a television show dedicated to watching guys try on tuxedos? Their fathers sitting there misty-eyed with joy and disbelief; their brothers lurking in the corner muttering with envy. Left to men, weddings would be, after limits-testing procrastination, spontaneous, almost inadvertent – during halftime, on the way to the refrigerator. And then there's the frequency of failure: statistics tell us half of you will get divorced. A winning percentage like that'll get you last place in the American League East. The Baltimore Orioles do better than weddings (McCullough, 2012).

Taking into account that the first extract was from a speech delivered by Trump on the Paris Accord, while the second extract was from the commencement speech delivered by McCullough, it becomes obvious that the information provided is not directly related to the matter of issue.

Despite the fact that in the narrative part the orator is supposed to provide information or facts that are closely related to the issue at hand, the analysis of speeches revealed that there were nine speakers who constructed their narration to present particulars that were essentially unconnected with the case. This allowed the speakers to present information concerning certain events or personal experiences, and build an interrelationship with the audience, making sure that the listeners see the world and situations from their personal standpoint.

3. Confirmation (*Confirmatio*)

Confirmation is 'a third obligatory element in the persuasive ordering and function' (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005, 144). It is the part of a discourse which presents 'a distinct conclusion or point of view of which the audience is to be persuaded' (Martin 2014, 52), the 'portion of an oration in which the speaker presents arguments and supporting materials to establish a fact or proposition in the minds of the audience' (Enos 1996: 138). By all accounts, confirmation is the argumentative part of a discourse that is devoted to the provision of closely related materials and evidence, and the organisation of arguments and proofs that the speaker will use to convince and persuade the audience, and which would lend credit, authority and support to the case delivered:

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

281

(16) *The STEM movement is an urgent priority for two reasons: First, it can resurrect the democratic promise of our school system – that it prepares all young people to succeed. And second, STEM can resurrect the spirit of innovation and economic vitality that has been so important to our prosperity for more than a century* (Raikes 2010).

The argumentative part of the discourse requires the speaker not only to invent and present evidence, but also to take 'consideration of the types of proof' as well as the 'forms of argument and the status, or bases, upon which those arguments were built' (Enos 1996, 138). Cockcroft & Cockcroft (2005, 83) note that the audience and the occasion of the speech determine the choice and development of persuasive proof, and suggest that there are no less than nine types or models of argument that the speaker can select and employ. Consider the table below:

Table 2

Types of arguments employed in the analysed speeches

Definition model of argument	(17) *Integrity means always abiding by the law, both the letter and the spirit. But it's not just about laws; it's at the core of every relationship we have* (Welch, 2001). (18) *With all of our colleagues around the world watching today, I want it known that this recall issue isn't merely an engineering or manufacturing or legal problem, it represents a fundamental failure to meet the basic needs of these customers* (Barra, 2014).
Cause and effect model of argument	(19) *You see, if everyone is special, then no one is. If everyone gets a trophy, trophies become meaningless* (McCullough, 2012). (20) *It was all complex, and of course, things did not always go to plan. But it was also exhilarating. The result was that we brought readers across Australia a better product, and helped transform Australian journalism* (Murdoch, 2008).
Similarity model of argument	(21) *And enough wind power blows through the Midwest corridor every day to also meet 100 percent of US electricity demand. Geothermal energy, similarly, is capable of providing enormous supplies of electricity for America* (Gore, 2007). (21) *While the foundation's resources may seem large, we are all too aware that they are no more than a drop in the bucket compared to the huge challenges facing governments and civil society to deliver sanitation services* (Burwell, 2011).

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

282

Oppositional model of argument	(23) *John McCain doesn't want to tax success and achievement; he wants to encourage it. He doesn't want to redistribute our national wealth; he wants to increase it. He doesn't want more big government; he wants much more self-government* (Whitman, 2008). (24) *So relocating these monuments is not about taking something away from someone else. This is not about politics. It's not about blame. It's not about retaliation. This is not about a naïve quest to solve all of our problems at once* (Landrieu, 2017).
Degree model of argument	(25) *Because no city on earth has been more rewarded by immigrant labor, more renewed by immigrant ideas, more revitalized by immigrant culture, than the City of New York* (Bloomberg, 2010). (26) *If we keep going back to the same policies that have never ever worked in the past and have served only to produce the highest gasoline prices in history alongside the greatest oil company profits in history, nobody should be surprised if we get the same result over and over again* (Gore, 2007).
Testimony model of argument	(27) *In the news, almost every day, we bear witness to the harmful, even deadly, effects of these narrowed world views* (Cook, 2018). (28) *The whole world witnessed the might and resilience of our nation in the extraordinary men and women of the New York Fire Department and the New York Police Department, selfless patriots of unmatched character and devotion* (Trump, 2019).
Genus/species model of argument	(29) *Our role is to serve as a catalyst of good ideas, driven by the same guiding principle we started with: all students – but especially low-income students and students of color – must have equal access to a great public education that prepares them for adulthood* (Gates, 2017). (30) *Our early and strong defense of open and free exchange has enabled Twitter to be the platform for activists, marginalized communities, whistleblowers, journalists, governments, and the most influential people around the world* (Dorsey, 2018).
Part/whole model of argument	(31) *All Americans, whether first generation or tenth generation, are bound together in love and loyalty, friendship and affection* (Trump, 2019). (32) *When churches start demonstrating on debt, governments listened – and acted* (Hewson, 2006).
Associational model of argument	(33) *We've all started lifelong friendships here, and some of us even families. That's why I'm so grateful to this place. Thanks, Harvard* (Zuckerberg, 2017).

The analysis of the speeches delivered by business leaders revealed that, depending on the occasion of the presentation, speakers tend to employ the mentioned models of arguments separately and combining them within their speeches, thus increasing their persuasive opportunities. In the context of persuasion,

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

283

speakers define, examine, qualify, assert, compare, oppose and associate their arguments, in order to focus the awareness of the audience and make them believe that the evidence presented is true and worthy of attention and action.

4. Refutation (*Refutio*)

Another part of a persuasive oration, refutation, is related to the 'recognition of faults and flaws in the proofs offered by one's opponents' (Enos 1996, 639). Having encountered contradictory points of view on the matter being discussed, the speaker uses refutation to prove their trustworthiness, and answer all adversarial arguments and opposing claims.

Over the centuries, the relevance of this structural part has notably changed: while in ancient times *refutation* was an essential and even obligatory part of a spoken discourse used to prove an opponent's point wrong, and negate the opposing arguments by presenting evidence to become (even more) credible in the eyes of the audience, nowadays this compositional part has actually lost its obligatory power, and is mostly considered to be an optional part. It is still employed in legal trials and political debates, where two or more speakers have to present their own views on a matter and counter the alternative arguments of their opponents. On the other hand, in order to make a speech even more persuasive, modern speakers sometimes employ refutation for subjective intentions as well, even if there are no actual opponents whose deliberately different arguments they need to reject. Accordingly, only three instances have been detected where the speakers did use *refutation* in their oral discourse. Consider the following example:

(34) *Contrary to what your U9 soccer trophy suggests, your – your glowing 7th grade report card, despite every assurance of a certain corpulent purple dinosaur, that nice Mister Rogers and your batty Aunt Sylvia, no matter how often your maternal caped crusader has swooped in to save you – you're nothing special* [...] *So think about this: Even if you're one in a million, on a planet of 6.8 billion, that means there are nearly 7,000 people just like you. Imagine standing somewhere over there on Washington Street on Marathon Monday watching 6,800 'yous' go running by* (McCullough, 2012).

In general, the application of the structural part of refutation depends mainly on the occasion of the speech, and is employed when the speaker is contending with a controversial topic to disprove opposing arguments. It is a helpful tool to assert and prove arguments by negating the arguments of one's opponents by means of contradictory evidence to establish the credibility of the speaker and reach the persuasive effect.

284

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

5. Conclusion (*Peroratio*)

Conclusion, according to Enos, is the 'segment of a classically arranged discourse charged with summing up the arguments and appealing to the audience' (1996, 504). Researchers generally agree that *peroratio* should sum up the strongest arguments laid out in a speech to be savoured and memorised by listeners. In order for the speech to be persuasive and present in the minds of the audience, the orator needs to conclude the speech in an effective way that would create a desired emotion that the audience will go through and take with them after the presentation. Indeed, the appeal and incorporation of the power of *pathos* in a speech allows the speaker to leave a 'powerful impression in the audience's memory and a strong stimulus to their wills' (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005, 136). The prevailing concluding strategies exploited by American leaders are presented below:

Table 3

Speech closing strategies

Appreciation of the presence of the audience, thanksgiving clause (70% of all speeches)	(35) *I close by thanking all for the privilege of serving beside you for the last 14 months. Importantly, to the 300-plus million Americans: Thank you for your devotion to a free and open society, to acts of kindness towards one another, to honesty and the quiet hard work that you do every day to support this government with your tax dollars* (Tillerson, 2018). (36) *Thank you for listening* (Murdoch, 23 November 2008).
Reference to spiritual domain (16%)	(37) *And in that spirit, let us give thanks to the divine 'Author of Liberty'. And together, let us pray that this land may always be blessed, 'with freedom's holy light'* (Romney, 2007).
Recapitulation/summary (8%)	(38) *So before we part let us again state clearly for all to hear: The Confederacy was on the wrong side of history and humanity. It sought to tear apart our nation and subjugate our fellow Americans to slavery. This is a history we should never forget and one that we should never, ever again put on a pedestal to be revered* (Landrieu, 2017).
Invitation to ask questions (3%)	(39) *So what do you wanna talk about?* (Jobs, 1983). (40) *Thank you for joining us on the call today. And now, we'll take questions* (Adelson, 2018).
Reference to the future, predictions (3%)	(41) *I will hazard a prediction. When you are 80 years old, and in a quiet moment of reflection narrating for only yourself the most personal version of your life story, the telling that will be most compact and meaningful will be the series of choices you have made. In the end, we are our choices. Build yourself a great story* (Bezos, 2010).

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

285

In spite of the fact that conclusion 'clearly has a recapitulative function' (El-liott 2007, 91), some authors suggest that there are other ways to end a speech. Accordingly, to finish a presentation with impact and enhance the conclusion of the persuasive speech, it can be 'expressed either as a question, a statement or a command' (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005, 144). Consider:

(42) *Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life. Don't be trapped by dogma – which is living with the results of other people's thinking. Don't let the noise of others' opinions drown out your own inner voice. And most important, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become. Everything else is secondary* (Jobs, 2005).

Moreover, the conclusion is an important constituent where 'a final frame is placed on the speech and the place where its essential qualities may be invested' (Martin 2014, 69). Therefore, the speaker might return to some issue (or saying, quotation, proverb, etc) provided at the start, tell a joke or anecdote, present powerful statistics, or make some gesture that would embody a sentiment for the audience:

(43) *Now the political struggle is over and we turn again to the unending struggle for the common good of all Americans and for those multitudes around the world who look to us for leadership in the cause of freedom. In the words of our great hymn 'America, America': 'Let us crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea'* (Gore, 2000).

To sum up, in order for a speech to be persuasive, the orator needs to con-clude the speech in an effective way that would impart an intended emotion to the audience. Thus, the final statements used by speakers reinforce the message of the orator, give the speech unity and closure, influence the behaviour and beliefs of the listeners, and awaken certain emotions in them, so that they can make necessary and/or positive changes.

Conclusions

1. The analysis of 50 speeches delivered by business leaders in terms of rheto-rical disposition revealed that the arrangement of a speech is of great importance, as patterns of structural arrangement help the orator to construct a speech, allo-cate emphasis, and outline the following main points to come. The proper orga-nisation and compositional arrangement of a speech proved to be a powerful tool to reach persuasive effect. The analysis has shown that oral business discourse is mainly structured and arranged on the basis of the prevailing four-part system (*introduction*, *narration*, *confirmation*, *conclusion*), each part having its own per-suasive character. On the other hand, depending on the content of the speech,

the occasion and the audience, the disposition of the spoken discourse allows the speaker to improvise, i.e., to develop some parts at greater length, present them in a different order, or even omit some compositional parts.

2. The analysis has revealed that the *introductory* strategies tend to vary in the speeches: while the majority of speakers place great emphasis on the introduction, and use this part to appeal to the audience, some speakers choose to render it very briefly or even omit this part of the arrangement, believing that the next parts and further information are of greater importance to achieve persuasion. The research has demonstrated *narration* and *confirmation* to be compulsory parts of a speech, in which speakers enunciate the issue under discussion, and establish and provide facts and arguments, thus employing the logical appeal of persuasion (*logos*). Due to the fact that the speeches analysed in the present article were not variances or an exchange of views and opinions on particular issues, but rather personal presentations on matters at hand, *refutation* proved to be an optional part of the arrangement of a speech.

3. *Conclusion*, generally considered to be a segment of a Classically arranged discourse intended to sum up the arguments and appeal to the audience, has revealed that only a small part of all speakers (8%) tended to repeat the main points presented in the speech, while others chose more elaborate and sophisticated ways of ending a speech, such as presenting powerful statistics, jokes or anecdotes, or making gestures that embody a sentiment for the audience. All things considered, business speakers tend to conclude their speeches by appealing and incorporating the power of *pathos*, which allows the speaker to leave a powerful impression in the memory of the audience, and add a strong stimulus to their will.

Primary sources

Adelson, Sheldon. *Las Vegas Sands Fourth Quarter 2017 Earnings Conference Call.* Delivered January 24, 2018.

Barra, Mary. *General Motors to the Orion Assembly Autonomous Vehicle Announcement.* Delivered June 13, 2017.

Barra, Mara. *Commencement speech to University of Michigan students.* Delivered May 3, 2014.

Barra, Mary. *Remarks to employees at a town hall meeting.* Delivered June 5, 2014.

Bezos, Jeff. *We are What We Choose. Commencement speech to Princeton's Class of 2010.* Delivered May 30, 2010.

Bloomberg, Michael. *Press Update on Hurricane Sandy.* Delivered October 29, 2012.

Bloomberg, Michael. *Address in Support of Religious Tolerance and New York City Mosque.* Delivered August 3, 2010.

Bloomberg, Michael. *Third Mayoral Inaugural Address.* Delivered January 1, 2010.

Buffett, Warren. *Buy American. I Am.* Delivered 2008.

Buffett, Warren. *Memo to All Stars.* Delivered September 27, 2006.

Burns, Ursula M. *Commencement address for MIT's 145th Commencement.* Delivered June 3, 2011.

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

287

Burwell, Sylvia Mathews. *Reinventing the Toilet*. Delivered July 19, 2011.

Cook, Tim. *Address at the 40th International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners.* Delivered October 24, 2018.

Desmond-Hellmann, Sue. *From "Me" to "Us". The Ohio State University Commencement.* Delivered May 6, 2018.

Dorsey, Jack. *Opening Statement to the House Energy and Commerce Committee on Twitter Transparency and Accountability*. Delivered September 5, 2018.

Gates, Bill. *Speech delivered at the Reaching the Last Mile Global Health Forum. Delivered November 15, 2017.*

Gates, Bill. *Council of the Great City Schools. Delivered October 19, 2017.*

Gates, Bill. *Teaching & Learning Conference 2014. Delivered March 14, 2014.*

Gates, Bill. *Speech to the American Federation of Teachers*. Delivered July 10, 2010.

Genachowski, Julius. *Brookings Speech on Broadband & the Internet.* Delivered September 21, 2009.

Gore, Albert Arnold. *Political Will Is a Renewable Resource. Address to the United Nations Bali Climate Change Conference.* Delivered December 14, 2007.

Gore, Albert Arnold. *Nobel Lecture.* Delivered December 10, 2007.

Gore, Albert Arnold. *Concession Speech.* Delivered December 13, 2000.

Hewson, Paul David (Bono). *Address at the 54th National Prayer Breakfast.* Delivered February 2, 2006.

Jobs, Steve. *Commencement Address at Stanford University*. Delivered June 12, 2005.

Jobs, Steve. *From the International Design Conference in Aspen in 1983.* Delivered June 15, 1983.

Koch, Charles G. *Adam Smith Free Enterprise Award.* Delivered 1994

Landrieu, Mitch. *On Confederate Monuments Removal in NOLA*. Delivered May 19, 2017.

McCullough, David Jr. *Wellesley High School Commencement Speech.* Delivered June 1, 2012.

Murdoch, Rupert. *Who's afraid of New Technologies?* Delivered November 16, 2008.

Murdoch, Rupert. *The future of newspapers: moving beyond dead trees.* Delivered November 16, 2008.

Page, Larry. *Commencement Address to the students of the University of Michigan*. Delivered May 2, 2009.

Raikes, Jeff. *Foundations of Science*. Delivered March 2, 2010.

Rockefeller, John D. Jr. *On Behalf of the United War Work Campaign.* Delivered 1917.

Romney, Mitt. *Faith in America*. Delivered December 6, 2007.

Sandberg, Sheryl. *Opening Statement to the Senate Intelligence Committee on Facebook and Foreign Influence*. Delivered September 5, 2018.

Tillerson, Rex. *Farewell Remarks at the State Department.* Delivered March 13, 2018.

Tillerson, Rex. *Statement on the 2016 Religious Freedom Report*. Delivered August 15, 2017.

Tillerson, Rex. *Address to State Department Employees on "American First" Foreign Policy.* Delivered May 3, 2017.

Trump, Donald. *9/11 Victims Compensation Bill H.R. 1327 Signing.* Delivered July 29, 2019.

Trump, Donald. *Address to the Nation on Immigration Plan Compromise to End the Government Shutdown*. Delivered January 19, 2019.

Trump, Donald. *Paris Climate Accord Address*. Delivered June 1, 2017.

Weiner, Jeff. *Be Compassionate. Commencement address at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania*. Delivered May 13, 2018.

Welch, John Francis (Jack). *Annual Shareowners Meeting.* Delivered April 25, 2001.

Welch, John Francis (Jack). *GE and the Internet. Presented at the General Electric Company 2000 Annual Meeting.* Delivered April 26, 2000.

Welch, John Francis (Jack). *Key Annual Speech to Shareholders.* Delivered 1981.

Whitman, Meg. *Speech at the Republican National Convention*. Delivered September 3, 2008.

Winfrey, Oprah. *Cecil B. DeMille Award Acceptance Address*. Delivered 7 January 7, 2018.

Zuckerberg, Mark. *Opening Statement to the Senate Judiciary and Commerce Committees on Facebook Data Privacy*. Delivered April 10, 2018.

Zuckerberg, Mark. *Commencement address at Harvard University*. Delivered May 25, 2017.

List of references

Aristotle 2010 – Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Translated into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross. NY: Cosimo, Inc.

Buckley 2006 – Irena Buckley. *Retorikos tradicija XIX amžiaus lietuvių literatūroje*. Vilnius: Versus aureus.

Cockcroft, Cockcroft 2005 – Robert Cockcroft, Susan Cockcroft. *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elliot 2007 – Neil Elliott. *The Rhetoric of Romans. Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. USA: Fortress Press.

Enos 1996 – Theresa Enos. *Encyclopaedia of Rhetoric and Composition*. UK: Routledge.

Frederick 2011 – Peter Frederick. *Persuasive Writing: How to Harness the Power of Words*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Frost 2016 – Michael H. Frost. *Introduction to Classical Legal Rhetoric*. London: Routledge.

Gabrėnaitė 2010 – Eglė Gabrėnaitė. *Reklamos topika: persvazijos instrumentai*. Daktaro disertacija. Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H). Vilnius, 2010.

Getchell, Lentz 2019 – Kristen M. Getchell, Paula. J. Lentz. *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in the Business Communication Classroom*. NY: Routledge.

Ibrahim, Kassabgy, Aydelott 2000 – Zaynab Ibrahim, Nagwa Kassabgy, Sabiha T. Aydelott. *Diversity in Language. Contrastive Studies in Arabic and English Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*. NY: The American University in Cairo Press.

Kheovichai 2015 – Baramee Kheovichai. Metaphor in Business English. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, 15*(1), 93–130.

Kirsch 2014 – Sharon J. Kirsch. *Gertrude Stein and the Reinvention of Rhetoric*. The University of Alabama Press.

Koženiauskienė 2001 – Regina Koženiauskienė. *Retorika: iškalbos stilistika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Lawson-Tancred 2004 – Hugh Lawson-Tancred. *Aristotle: The Art of Rhetoric*. London: Penguin.

Leu 1982 – Donald J. Leu. Differences between oral and written discourse and the acquisition of reading proficiency. *Journal of Reading Behaviour: National Reading Conference*, *XIV*(2), 111–125.

Martin 2014 – James Martin. *Politics & Rhetoric. A Critical Introduction*. NY: Routledge.

O'Donnell, Kable 1982 – Victoria O'Donnell, June Kable. *Persuasion: An Interactive Dependency Approach*. New York: Random House.

Phillips 2014 – Denice Ch. Phillips. *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Phillips 1991 – Gerald M. Philips. *Communication Incompetencies: A Theory of Training Oral Performance Behavior*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Pullman 2013 – George Pullman. *Persuasion: History, Theory, Practice*. USA: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Schonfield 2018 – Ernest Schonfield. *Business Rhetoric in German Novels: From Buddenbrooks to the Global Corporation*. Boydel and Brewer.

Thompson 1998 – Peter Thompson. *Persuading Aristotle. The Timeless Art of Persuasion in Business, Negotiation and the Media*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Toye 2013 – Richard Toye. *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina
The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches
of American Business Leaders

289

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, **Margarita Čiročkina**

AMERIKOS VERSLO LYDERIŲ SAKYTINIŲ KALBŲ STRUKTŪRINĖ KOMPOZICIJA

Santrauka

Straipsnyje analizuojama Amerikos verslo lyderių sakytinių kalbų retorinė dispozicija (struktūrinė kompozicija), padedanti sukurti įtaigumo efektą. Tyrimo tikslas – išanalizuoti dispozicinę kalbų topiką: nustatyti ir apibendrinti pagrindinius retorinės kompozicijos komponentus. Tyrimui pasirinkta 50 žymiausių Amerikos verslo lyderių kalbų, pristatytų įvairiomis progomis 1981–2019 m. Šiuo tyrimu siekiama išsiaiškinti, ar šiuolaikiniai oratoriai laikosi klasikinės retorikos postuluojamų struktūrinės kompozicijos principų ir kaip kinta dispozicinė topika sakytinių kalbų atžvilgiu.

Analizė parodė, kad per pastaruosius 40 metų pristatytose viešosiose Amerikos lyderių kalbose vis dar paisoma klasinės retorikos principų, kalbos struktūruojamos pagal klasikinį kompozicijos modelį: *įžanga*, *pasakojimas*, *argumentacija*, *pabaiga*. Vis dėlto dėl individualių kūrybinių priežasčių – ekspresijos, individualaus stiliaus, įtaigumo – autoriai linkę improvizuoti: išplėsti vienas dalis kitų atžvilgiu, o kartais tam tikrų dalių apskritai atsisakyti. Tirtose kalbose neretai praleidžiami įžangos ir išvadų bei apibendrinimo etapai. Pastoviausi retorinės kompozicijos elementai oratorių kalbose – *pasakojimas* ir *argumentavimas*: jas pasitelkę verslo lyderiai įvardija ir plėtoja pasirinktą problemą, pateikia paaiškinimus, argumentuoja pasitelkdami racionalųjį diskurso lygmenį apimančią loginę įtaigą (*logos*). *Argumento paneigimas* (*refutatio*) tirtose kalbose aptiktas rečiausiai, todėl laikytinas tik alternatyvia retorinės kompozicijos dalimi.

Išvadų apimtis ir loginis išdėstymas tirtose kalbose įvairuoja: tik keletas kalbėtojų pakartojo esminius jų kalbose paminėtus elementus, daugelis verslo lyderių pasirinko vaizdingesnius būdus savo kalboms užbaigti: kėlė klausimą, pateikė įdomių faktų, juokingą frazę ar išreiškė padėką auditorijai. Galima apibendrinti, kad verslo atstovai užbaigia savo kalbas pasitelkdami emociniam diskurso lygmeniui priskirtiną *pathos* kategoriją, leidžiančią palikti klausytojams stiprų įspūdį ir formuoti ar net keisti klausytojo nuomonę.