Rhetoric Fellows Handbook

2003-2004

The most beautiful thing about oral presentations is that you don't need to know how to spel.

PREFACE

The Dirty Dozen. The A-Team. The Harlem Globetrotters. The Rhetoric Fellows. Special jobs call for special individuals. If you continue to read onward, you will join one of the most specialized, highly trained SWAT forces ever to confront the fast-paced world of oral presentations! We hope you accept the challenge.

We set out during the summer of 1991 to write a handbook. In trying to figure out what such an animal is, we became involved in a sort of reevaluation of the program. So, what you have in your hands now is more than an instruction manual--it's also a status report with recommendations for change. It also slices, dices, and serves a family of four. Our goal was to provide you, the new RF, with an introduction to the issues as faced by your veteran colleagues, a pseudo-textbook for training, and a reference guide for problems you may face in the future. To do so, we organized it this way:

- The introduction provides a general discussion of what it means to be a RF as compared to a WF. It's taken from the mouths of old fellows, and it will give you an overview of points we will cover later in the handbook.
- Part 1 tries to tackle the age-old question "What Makes a Good Oral Presentation?" Generally good stuff to know if you're going to be a tutor. Questions about an ideal text can be referred to our complaints department.
- Part 2 gets into the real meat of the program: the logistics. This is how the program works. Here, we'll present a list of relevant topics as they occur over the course of the semester. The how-to's follow in the next section.
- Part 3 is chock-full of advice from old fellows for treating the issues raised in Part 2. If you're looking for concrete ideas on fellowing, you'll find them here.
- In the conclusion, there's a brief discussion of some of the programmatic unanswered questions that remain.

After each section, we've included a few blank pages that you can use for taking notes during training.

We hope that this handbook will be a springboard for questions. Consider this text a place to start. If you can't find what you're looking for here, we've included a few appendices which contain some RF commonplaces, a bunch of tip lists taken from various textbooks, and an annotated bibliography. If you can't find what you're looking for in the text or in the appendices, we highly recommend that you talk to Nancy. She doesn't get enough visitors anyway.

Good luck and have fun!

Keith Rosen and Katherine Seger

HOW DOES RHETORIC FELLOWING COMPARE TO WRITING FELLOWING?

To be a Rhetoric Fellow, you must start out as a Writing Fellow. Before going into Rhetoric Fellow training, you have already taken English 195, and fellowed at least one semester (if not more) as a Writing Fellow. With new-found expertise under your belt, you decide to take the next step. So at this point, as you head into Rhetoric Fellow training, the big question on your mind (other than "What the hell was I thinking when I decided to return to Providence three days early in January?") might be: "How does Rhetoric Fellowing compare to Writing Fellowing?" Thus our catchy title.

In order to answer this question, we interviewed current Rhetoric Fellows to see what they thought were the similarities and differences between Rhetoric and Writing Fellowing. In the remainder of this section, we'll take a general look at how being a RF and being a WF compare and contrast. If you're hungry for more specific details, don't fret. We'll explore these issues in more detail in the latter parts of the handbook.

First of all . . .

One important point that everyone agreed upon is that you aren't giving up Writing Fellowing when you become a Rhetoric Fellow. We call them "Rhetoric Fellow Courses," but remember that in the course that you fellow, you will work with students on both speaking and writing assignments. Fellowing the writing assignments is just like being a regular Writing Fellow--same logistics, same fellowing, comments, conferences, etc. The only difference is that you have fewer fellowees, and fewer papers (now you understand why people make the move to Rhetoric Fellows...).

The rhetoric fellowing, then, becomes an additional part of your fellowing experience. On top of your regular duties as a Writing Fellow, you will also be working on the students' oral assignment(s). Remember, however, that this additional work is compensated for by having fewer fellowees--which, by the way, is not the only benefit of being a Rhetoric Fellow. Most Rhetoric Fellows report that, because they have the same fellowees for both the rhetoric and writing assignments (if everything goes smoothly), they get to know their fellowees much better than they do in a Writing Fellow course. This increased contact is enjoyable and also valuable to your abilities as a fellow. The better you know someone, the better you can respond to their work.

Similarities

There are plenty of similarities between Rhetoric Fellowing and Writing Fellowing because the process involved in each is, to a certain point, similar. Certainly the two products--a paper and a speech--look very different, but the process of creating these two (and as you know, process is what we fellows do best...) is largely the same. Both a paper and a speech begin with the same invention and organization stages. Though these stages (invention, organization, delivery) are the same, what happens within them may be very different. Thus, you will still use many of your Writing Fellow "tools" from EL195 as you fellow oral assignments; you'll just be using them in new ways.

In addition, the interpersonal skills you use for conferencing a WF conference are the same ones you will need in RF conferences. Although the content of WF and RF conferences may be quite different, the conferencing techniques are similar.

The big difference

Almost all of the Rhetoric Fellows we interviewed agreed that the most fundamental difference between Rhetoric Fellowing and Writing Fellowing is the level of exposure that students have with the two modes of communication. Students at the undergraduate level tend to have far less experience and training in oral communication and speechmaking than they do in writing. As RFs, we frequently deal with novice speakers; yet as WFs, we rarely encounter students with virtually no writing background. Because of their relative inexperience as speakers and speechmakers, many rhetoric fellowees are uncomfortable and anxious at the mere thought of giving an oral presentation in front of a class. Because of this anxiety, confidence-building becomes an important function of the RF even more than it does for WFs.

In addition, many RFs find that because most students are less experienced and less comfortable with speaking, they tend to experiment less with speechmaking than they might with writing. What this means for fellows is that we tend to get many more "Should I . . .?" questions from rhetoric fellowees than we would from writing fellowees. In general, it seems that fellowees seek more concrete suggestions and "how to" advice in a rhetoric situation than they do in a writing context. Thus, many RFs report that their role is considerably different in the two contexts. As WFs, they help the student to explore the different alternatives that are available in putting together a paper; they encourage fellowees to experiment within the writing medium. As RFs, on the other hand, they help students get comfortable with the basics of speechmaking; alternatives are offered to help the fellowee find sure ground upon which to stand.

But wait, there's more

Logistics. Of the RFs we talked with, nearly all agreed that the logistics of rhetoric fellowing--getting in touch with fellowees, scheduling conferences, making conferences productive, etc.--are much more complicated than those involved in Writing Fellowing. In fact, the complexity of RF logistics has been one of the greatest problems in the program and the issue that has received the most complaints from RFs, students, and faculty. There is much that we can do to resolve this difficulty. So much, in fact, that we have an entire section of this handbook dedicated to discussing these issues and offering strategies for making the program run more smoothly. You will know this section when you come to it, by its apt title, "How the RF Program Operates: Logistics."

The spice of life. Another issue that RFs pointed out is that there is a much greater variety in oral assignments than there is in writing assignments. Yes, there is the literature paper vs. the science lab report etc. in writing, but the range of assignments seems to be even broader when it comes to the oral mode. There are debates, one person speeches, group presentations, role plays, "teach the class" assignments, "lead discussion" assignments . . . and the list goes on. What this means for RFs is that we need to be much more adaptable in our fellowing style, because what works for one type of assignment may not work for another. It is crucial that we see professors to find out exactly what their particular expectations are for these various assignments.

The group thing. Unique to rhetoric fellowing are working group presentations. Here, we encounter an entire set of issues that don't come up with individuals. What if one person is doing all the talking? all the work? What if someone is not pulling his/her share of the load? How does a group delegate tasks? Reach a consensus that all are happy with? Will the professor evaluate the performance of the entire group or the individuals separately? What about interpersonal conflicts within the group? etc., etc. In RF training, you will do some work on group dynamics. Also, see below for more on this topic.

Content vs. style (oh, no! not this again . . .) Because of the relative inexperience students have with preparing speeches, Rhetoric Fellows enter the speechmaking process earlier than than Writing Fellows enter the writing process. As RFs, we meet with fellowees at the first rhetoric conference to discuss organization and strategies for putting together the speech itself. Then at the second conference, we meet again to hear a "draft" of the speech and to polish it for the final presentation. This second conference is analogous to the entire Writing Fellow process, which, as you know, begins with the submission of a first draft. As WFs, we usually do not step in as the students are initially organizing, but only after they have already completed one draft. RFs, on the other hand, enter earlier in the process when organization may be just beginning. Thus, we are potentially much more involved in the content of the speeches than WFs are in the content of papers. Because of this situation, some RFs report that students have confused their role with that of a TA. Many RFs willingly accept a more content-based role, yet others try more forcefully to keep out of this area. Clearly, the whole content vs. style question deserves special attention in the rhetoric context. You will find some thoughts on this topic below, but for the most part, as a RF, you will come to decide for yourself how you will navigate through this territory.

Teaching how to teach. In so many ways, an oral presentation is a total teaching experience. The speaker's goal--often explicitly stated by the professor--is to teach the audience (the class) his/her material. Thus, a large part of Rhetoric Fellowing is really teaching fellowees how to teach. Because we don't do this on a regular basis as WFs, many RFs find this to be an exciting and challenging part of what we do. Look for tips in Rhetoric Fellow training on teaching how to teach.

The dreaded "dual" audience. In writing a paper, you commonly have only one audience--the professor for whom you are writing. But for an oral assignment, there are two different audiences--the class and the professor. Thus, there may be two different goals for your presentation. We call this the "dual" audience problem. On the one hand you are still "performing" for the professor, who is grading the presentation. On the other hand, you want capture the attention of your classmates. Unfortunately, the professor may not appreciate monkey tricks even if the rest of the class does. These two audiences aren't necessarily at odds, but it is important to be aware that the scenario might exist, and that it needs consideration.

SO, LIKE, WHAT IS AN ORAL PRESENTATION, ANYWAY?

For many of us, writing papers is a skill that has been (and is still being) developed and nurtured throughout our academic experiences. However, the same is not usually true for speech. There's a good chance that some of your fellowees, and even some of us RFs (Heaven Forbid!) have never been taught the basic elements of an oral presentation. Just as WFs need to be writers, so too do RFs need to be speechmakers and speakers. Accordingly, before we talk about the various aspects of being an RF, we will consider some of the key elements of effective speaking.

Most of this material has been drawn from different introductory texts, and has been summarized to give you a general sense of the concepts. If you find that in the course of your fellowing you come across a specific problem that's not treated in depth here, check the bibliography in the appendix. It will give you somewhere to turn.

A Rule of Elbow, or What's So Special About Speaking?

Peter Elbow, in his usual fashion, has indicated an interesting paradox about oral texts: they are simultaneously indelible and ephemeral. In other words, there is no physical permanence to the spoken message, yet once you say something, you can't take it back. As Elbow writes, listeners are "trapped in the flow of time." (p.294) What this means for us speechmakers is that we have to wrestle with the question of what the audience will remember, and how we can get them to remember what's important to us. Unlike writing, they can't flip back to "rehear" what they missed the first time. Below, we'll see how this affects the process of speechmaking.

The other factor which Elbow posits at the basis of all oral presentations is the interaction between speaker and the context. Every speech situation is different; once it happens, it can never be replicated. To that extent, every speech act is dependent on the context. Without getting into the theoretical bowels of sociolinguistic theory, suffice it to say that every speech will reflect not only the material, but the speaker, the audience, and the situation. As many RFs have pointed out, this can be especially problematic because student speakers traditionally face the dual audience. For now, we should realize that in going from the written word to the spoken word, we accumulate some additional baggage influencing the design of the final product.

6 qualities of successful speechmaking.

Across the board, there seem to be some basic qualities which characterize all successful speeches. These categories are drawn from a discussion in *Principles of Speech Communication.*

Integrity. As speakers, we need to establish a degree of trust and credibility with the audience. If we don't, they'll have no reason to listen to our words and will not receive our message.

Knowledge. Without question, we need to know our material. The less you know, the tougher it will be to talk about it.

Sensitivity to audience and context. As we mentioned above, the speech situation will be different in each case. More so than in writing, we speakers need to consider our audiences and adjust accordingly. Sometimes we do this in advance, sometimes we may have to make some on-the-spot changes.

Oral skills. There is no message without the delivery. More on this below.

Self-confidence, self-control. Overcoming or containing apprehensions and anxieties is not always easy, and it may take a very long time. But for the effective speaker, it is essential.

Communicative purpose. We don't speak to hear our own voice (well, most of us don't). We need to ask ourselves at each step, "Why am I doing this?" Or, as we like to say, "SO WHAT!"

Ye olde process

As with writing, the key to speechmaking is defining a purpose, narrowing the focus, and gathering the material before deciding on a definite presentation format. However, because of the new expectations which arise in the oral mode, the process takes on different characteristics. We break this system into three primary stages: invention, organization, and delivery.

Invention. At the earliest part of this stage, there is no difference between what you do in preparation for a paper and a speech. We've all been here before. From brainstorming, to researching, to freewriting, to deciding on a focus--the dreaded beginnings. At the end of the stage, however, as you begin to select content for the presentation, the differences emerge. In oral communication, it is much more important to choose your points and examples more carefully than you might for a paper because listening audiences can't retain as much information as reading audiences. Here is where invention and organization begin to merge.

Organization. For the most part, this is similar to organizing a paper, which means that all the old 195 tools are indeed appropriate. In this phase, we speechmakers will begin to develop a presentation structure which will reflect the goals of the speech and the audience/context. Am I going to talk while juggling? Am I going to turn the material into a skit? Am I going to stand ramrod straight behind a podium and moan? Now is a good time to start deciding.

In this stage, you begin to account for the various rhetorical elements which directly influence how you present your ideas in the talk. For example, many authors emphasize the importance of introductions for establishing the structure of the speech and forecasting it for the audience. Of course, we've all heard before that audiences only retain 20-30% of what they hear, so repetition and constant forecasting are vitally important. In addition, we need to put extra emphasis on the key points of the talk to make sure that they stand out. *Furthermore, we speakers want to keep the audience's attention.* If we don't, well, it won't be an effective speech. So, while we are forecasting and repeating, we need to make sure that what we are saying sounds interesting enough to keep the audience with us. If you're unsure how to do this, check the appendix--we've included a textbook list of suggestions called "Factors to help gain/keep attention."

Presentation and delivery. This is where it all happens. The old adage applies here: "It's not what you say, but how you say it." At this stage, we finalize our decision on the shape of the presentation, then rehearse (and rehearse, and rehearse...) until the big moment arrives. Here's a taste of things to consider:

- Presentation Style: This category includes the four basic types of deliveries: extemporaneous, manuscripted, memorized, and impromptu. It also includes the types of notes (cards, outline, etc.) you might use. You'll discuss this a lot in training, but if you are still unsure about this stuff, it's all over the text books.

- Voice: There's no speech without this thing. If the speech is a letter, this is the mailman. In *Principles of Speech Communication*, the authors indicate 3 aspects of an effective, flexible speaking voice: intelligibility (i.e. controlled loudness, rate, and enunciation), variability, and patterned stresses (i.e. emphasis, use of pauses). The combination of these factors forms your speaking style, and ultimately influences how your message is received.

- Breathe: We highly recommend that speakers do so. Sometimes, though, this is easier said than done. This seemingly innate ability is the device by which we control our voices. During training, Nancy once suggested to a RF who had a slight quiver in her voice (an intelligibility problem) that she "breathe from her toes." We don't really know if this is physiologically possible, but evidently it worked. Remember, breathing (no matter where it comes from) is a very good, very important thing.

- Non-verbal elements: There are plenty of facets of speaking which don't involve sounds. When we speak we need to try to control our movements and stance; like anything else, they should be used purposefully to reinforce the communication act. Gesturing, for example, can be a powerful descriptive tool when it is controlled. Facial expressions, including eye contact, can also provide a subtle indication of your attitude toward the material and the audience.

A plug

A discussion of this type of material is potentially endless. There are more than enough public speaking textbooks which can provide you with lists, tips, strategies, suggestions on every aspect of oral presentations. A large part of this kind of material will be discussed in training, and if you take TA22, you'll probably get it all. We've included in this handbook an appendix which contains some helpful (albeit general) lists of pointers. There are also notes in the bibliography to help point you in the right direction if you have more questions. Nancy also likes talking to people. You can always visit her with your concerns.

NOTES

NOTES

HOW THE RHETORIC FELLOW PROGRAM OPERATES: LOGISTICS

So now you know a little something about the difference between being a Writing Fellow and a Rhetoric Fellow. And you know the basic elements involved in an effective oral presentation. And that's all very nice. But the big question is: What are you going to DO as a Rhetoric Fellow? What's going to happen? Below is a skeletal model of the procedure for a semester's work. For details on HOW to go about doing this stuff, please see the next section: Fellowing.

The fundamental premises

Before we can discuss the operation of the Rhetoric Fellows program, it is important first to understand a few fundamental, unchangeable principles of the program that necessitate certain logistical acrobatics.

First, more so than in writing assignments, oral assignments from professors tend to vary tremendously. RFs need to be more flexible in their fellowing styles to accommodate these variations.

Second, although it seems very obvious, it is quite significant that with Rhetoric Fellowing, there is no concrete, tangible product like a paper. There is nothing for the fellowee to turn in, nothing to be handed back, nothing for the professor to see.

Third, the fellowees in a RF class are often not on the same fellowing schedule, like they are in a WF class. Whereas papers are all due on the same day, oral presentations may be staggered across the entire semester or a period of a few weeks or a few classes. This means that there is no standard schedule for the whole semester; the RFs and all the students in the class are all on different timetables of conferencing, due dates, etc. For this reason, it may be difficult (if not downright impossible) to use a sign-up sheet to make scheduling easier.

So what does all this mean? It means you gotta be flexible. And it means you may have to put in a bit more time on the logistical end of things. But it also means that each new class you fellow will be a fresh experience and, chances are, you won't get bored.

Getting down to business

As a Rhetoric Fellow, you will be assigned either individuals or small groups for oral presentations. In preparation for each presentation, you will have two conferences. The first (short) conference focuses primarily on the invention and organization stages of the process; the longer second conference is intended to be a time for the fellowees to rehearse their presentation and gain feedback from you.

Below, we offer you a more detailed look at the logistics of rhetoric fellowing over the course of a semester. Consider this a general plan to follow, although the particulars of your course assignment will certainly effect a modified version.

In putting together this handbook, we asked veteran RFs about the operational problems that they have typically encountered, and the solutions that they have found. In the process, we have compiled a wealth of ideas and strategies for eliminating or at least dealing with the potential pitfalls prevalent in this peer tutoring procedure.

We've tried to organize this section chronologically, in the order that things happen over the course of a semester fellowing.

The logistics of Rhetoric Fellowing -- your handy how-to guide:

Behind the scenes. Before you are even assigned to the course as a Rhetoric Fellow, Rhoda, Nancy, or the Assistant Director will have already talked with the professor. They have introduced the program, and explained how it will work, and what the professor needs to do to support our effort. Therefore, as a first step, you might want to find out from the professor exactly what he or she already knows about the program, and if there are any unresolved confusions or misunderstandings. It may also be a good idea to "refresh" the professor's memory on our basic needs.

Go to the "head" of the class. Because of the logistical complexity of a RF class, it is crucial that the RFs meet with the professor of the class EARLY in the semester to discuss:

The expectations and goals of the various assignments. One important question to ask, in particular, is whom the oral presentation is for. Is it for the professor to see what the student knows, or is it for the benefit of the rest of the class? These two aims are not always compatible. You will also find it helpful to know how the presentations will be evaluated and whether or not this criteria will be told to the class. Will the students be graded on the content of their presentations alone? If so, you may have to stress that form should be considered too. The whole thing becomes stickier when there are group presentations. Will the students be evaluated as individuals, or as a whole group?

What the professor needs to do in order to support the RFs. This usually includes announcing important scheduling dates in class and reminding the students about the integral role of the RFs in the course throughout the semester.

What the professor's feelings are about the "mandatoriness" of the program. If students don't participate, will they be penalized in any way? What should the RF's role be in all this? Most RFs are not comfortable with the policeman/monitor role. How do we deal with students who do not want to use us? For more on this question, see our final section called "Unsolved Mysteries."

Scheduling. It is critical that this stuff gets worked out early. This means that the professor needs to make decisions about the dates for oral presentations, and how they will operate--individuals? one per class, or more? groups? etc. It is especially important to discuss how groups will be chosen and when that decision will occur. Hopefully, they can be assigned before the first paper to facilitate fellowing the same students for writing and speaking. Only after these decisions are made, can the RFs figure out how they will divide the the students among themselves and ensure that they have the same fellowees for both the speaking and the writing assignments.

The head fellow. The role of the head fellow takes on more significance in a RF class because of the added logistical difficulties that arise. The head fellow is responsible for arranging meetings with faculty and the other RFs, assigning fellowees to fellows (hopefully so that they will be the same group for both speaking and writing), making sure that there is an accurate list of fellowee names and phone numbers given to all the fellows, etc. Furthermore, because of the ambiguity that can surround speaking assignments, it is the HF's duty to maintain an open channel of communication between the professor and the RFs. It is essential that HFs in RF classes get things going immediately at the start of the semester and clarify each assignment again as it comes up. Often, professors' plans will change.

Stand up and say hello. Early in the semester, the RFs should all go together to the class to introduce themselves and the program. This is your golden opportunity to lay out your expectations to the class, explain to them what your role is, and explain what their role is through this whole process of working on both the written and oral assignments. (NOTE: One very real problem with these introductions is that you may only get 1.3 seconds to say all that you need to say before the class period ends or before the professor butts in and takes over the class. To avoid being shortchanged, you must let the professor know ahead of time that you will need a certain amount of time to explain everything. If you are rushed, you won't be very clear; and the clearer things are at the beginning of the semester, the more problems you can avoid later.)

These introductions are your time to say whatever you want and need to say to the class. Below are some suggestions of items you might want to cover:

Explain why you are here. This means, of course, that you first have to figure out the answer for yourself. Why are you here? You may want to refer to your WF application cover letter for help on this one.

Let them know what you do, and what you don't do. You do process. You do delivery and style. You don't do content. Do you do lunch? Do you stay up all night with a RF conference if they still want your help?

Tell them how the program works. What is the purpose of each conference? What will be done at each? How will the schedule of conferences and presentations and papers work? How will you and the fellowees get in touch to set up conferences? (See below for more on this.)

Tell them what expectations you have of them. Explain that there is a process of creating a presentation or a paper which moves from invention, to organization, to product and revision. Neither Writing Fellows nor Rhetoric Fellows start with students at the very beginning of this process--because we don't (can't) "do" content, they need to have done the invention part of the work before we enter the process. Normally, this is very clear for written assignments. The students know that they have to present you with a draft of their paper first. But for rhetoric assignments, things can become very messy. Because there is no tangible product (i.e. a paper) to turn in, and because the purpose of the first conference is often unclear, it is easy for students to show up with not enough done for us to be useful. They arrive assuming that they can just brainstorm from scratch with you. If this is the case, you might be limited in your helpfulness. Therefore, it is crucial that you explain to your fellowees in this introduction that they must have done some basic preparation before coming to the first rhetoric conference and that they must have a completed "draft" of their presentation ready for the second conference--we will underscore the importance of this action below, when we consider potential problems surrounding the conferences.

Several of the RFs we talked to had helpful suggestions of things to tell fellowees at the outset in order to ensure that the rhetoric conferences are as productive as possible. If you are fellowing individual speakers, you could ask them to come to the conference with a rough outline or a few notes. This will give you something with which to start. With groups, fellows have found the first conference to be infinitely better if the group has already met once. You can suggest that before they see you, the group must meet together at least once to get to know each other and to brainstorm about their topic.

Get a list of fellowees' names and phone numbers now! This will prove to be priceless later in the semester when, inevitably, your fellowees have not called you to set up conferences. Finally, you cave in and decide that you will go ahead and call them.

Hand out your Info Sheet. Every fellow has one--you just revise it for each new class you fellow. It's a good idea to give some extra attention to the rhetoric stuff; you can summarize what you have said in your introduction for additional reinforcement. If you say it and you write it, your fellowees just may do it.

The royal pain: getting in touch with fellowees. This is a tricky issue if the speakers are spread out across the semester. Since RFs usually lack the luxury of the sign-up sheet, setting up conferences must be done individually with each fellowee or group over the phone, sometime before the first conference must take place. (If you can find a way to use a sign-up sheet, by all means DO IT!) It would be nice if fellowees would call you, but dreams are usually nice, aren't they? This is one of the drags of being a RF--most veterans agree that the burden of getting in touch to arrange conferences usually falls on them. You can try to avoid this, however. One fellow suggested that the professor designate a group leader (for group fellowees) who would be responsible for organizing the group and calling the fellow. There are potential problems, however, with designating a "leader" in what is supposed to be a collaborative group.

Square One: the first conference. Each Rhetoric Fellow has his or her own style of what to do in each conference. Certainly, you will need to decide for yourself what yours will be. In general, here are some basic logistical items and things other RFs suggest you cover in the first conference:

Where? You can hold a first RF conference anywhere that you would hold a WF conference, since all you are doing is discussing material and organization. The Blue Room or the Mezzanine of the Sci. Li. are good places to try.

How long? Of course, this is up to you. Most fellows report that the first conference usually lasts between 30 minutes and an hour, depending on the size of the group. You might want to let fellowees know much time you want to take before you start so that you don't have to cut them off too abruptly.

What to do? Here are some things you might want to talk about. (In our next section below on "FELLOWING," you will find specific fellowing methods and strategies for handling these items.):

- What have they done so far? What's the topic?
- Discuss the assignment--decoding. How do they want to handle the "dual audience" problem?
- What are their goals for the presentation?
- What are the time limits of the presentation?
- How can they best organize this material into an effective oral presentation?
- If it is a group, how will the group work together? How will they delegate tasks, etc.?
- What is the best way to prepare notes for use in the presentation?

- Tell the fellowee what you know about what the professor wants/expects from this assignment. (This is a controversial point among RFs because of the fear of an ideal text imposition upon the student.)

- Decide what they will do between now and your next conference, and what you will do together at that conference.

What if they come unprepared? Many RFs report that the first conference often is not very productive. This is one of the most serious problems RFs encounter. When the first conference accomplishes nothing, the second conference can get thrown off, too, because you then end up tackling organizational problems when you should be rehearsing.

The main reason for this lack of productivity seems to be an absence of student preparation. Whether as individuals or as groups, they may come to this first meeting having thought very little about their topic--in some cases, they haven't even finished reading the material. This leaves the conference at a very "inventive" stage, at which some fellows are (justifiably) not comfortable working. Rhetoric Fellows are not TAs--we don't "do" content (we don't do windows, either.) If you would rather enter at a later, organizational stage of the process, remember that prevention is the key--make your expectations clear ahead of time.

Lights, camera, action: the second conference. Below are some basic items to cover in the second conference:

Where? For this conference, you will need to find a place where the fellowee(s) can get up and rehearse their presentation. This means that the Blue Room is out. If everyone is comfortable with this, you could go to someone's house or room and use a living room or dorm lounge, as long as you can be there without too many interruptions or distractions. A better option, however, might be the Writing Fellows office. It has the amenities that make this job worthwhile--free coffee and unlimited Hydrox. Plus, you can feel important when you have the key to Rhode Island Hall for after-hours access. If you want to use the VCR--a great rehearsal tool--you will have no choice but to use the office. Just make sure that you get the key ahead of time from the coordinating secretary.

How long? There is no standard level of commitment for the work done as a Rhetoric Fellow. When we conference as WFs, we allot each fellowee about thirty minutes to discuss his/her paper. Because of the sign-up sheet we use, they come to conference knowing exactly how much time they have. Frequently, there is another fellowee waiting in the wings. With this limit in mind, both the fellow and the student work to make the conference as efficient and as productive as time permits. In rhetoric fellowing, however, there is usually a less rigid allotment of time for conferences. They usually take place at night when there may be nothing pressing to cut them off--unlike those afternoons in the Blue Room when you have six WF conferences in a row. Thus, rhetoric conferences tend to take on rather amorphous dimensions, and can go on forever. For non-masochistic fellows, this can become a real problem. The frustrating questions become: "How much is enough of a commitment on my part?" and "Short of ax-murdering my fellowees at 1:00 in the morning after 5 hours of conferencing, how can I cut this conference off?"

The solution to this problem may be to fix a time limit before the conference. Some saintly Rhetoric Fellows will choose to stay for however long it takes, regardless of what they had previously decided. Others will stay within their predefined limit, no exceptions. In any case, expect to spend at least 45 minutes to 1 hour for an individual, 1 1/2 to 2 hours for a group on this conference.

What to do? Here are some things you might want to talk about. (Again, see our next section below on "FELLOWING" for specific fellowing methods and strategies.):

- Delivery, style issues
- Effective use of notes, notecards
- Are there different parts to the presentation? A speech, and then a discussion session? How will the speaker handle the two? Be sure to spend time rehearsing both parts--there are ways to prepare for (even "rehearse") leading a discussion.
- How will the speaker field questions, if he or she has to?
- Problems of speaker anxiety; strategies for controlling and dealing with it.

What if they come unprepared? Coming unprepared to a rehearsal conference (i.e. not having a "draft" of the speech ready) is analogous to not turning in a draft of a WF paper. If this happens, you may decide to follow the model of a first conference, and try to reschedule another rehearsal (if time permits). However, do not feel obligated to hold another conference to help a fellowee who has not held up his/her end of the bargain. Just like with the WF paper chase, you will set your own rules and limits.

Whether to go to the final presentation. Going to the fellowee's final presentation in class is an option about which many Rhetoric Fellows disagree. Some consider their purpose as helping students with oral communication in general, not just on this one assignment. Thus, they like to attend the final presentation in order to give additional feedback. Others attend because they want to ensure that the fellowee has a supportive listener in the audience. On the other hand, many RFs feel awkward and out of place attending this class session. They worry that their presence will make the fellowee nervous. In any case, if you do wish to go, just make sure that you check with fellowees and with the professor to see if either objects to your presence in the audience.

Problems? What Problems?

OK, we admit it--the Rhetoric Fellows process does have its share of problems. Generally speaking, there is one basic source of all the snafus which occur (isn't life simple?). Difficulties tend to arise because of unclear expectations. The students don't know how much to be prepared ahead of the conference, because they are not explicitly told. Or if they are, they may be getting conflicting messages from the fellows and faculty. The faculty are not aware of the role that they must take in order to adequately support the RFs in the class. And even we fellows have unclear expectations about how things are supposed to work!

We hope that the plan we have detailed above will help you outline more clearly to your fellowees and to the professor what your expectations of the program are. One veteran RF has pointed out that our own flexibility in handling each situation can be solution enough for these problems. She posits that we do have all the answers; if we say that fellowees must be prepared a certain way on a certain day then they must.

On a program-wide level, however, these issues still need further consideration. Currently, for example, there is no uniform rule about how the fellowees should prepare before coming to conference. There is no rule about who is responsible for calling to set up conference times. There is no method set up to ensure that fellows get the same fellowees for writing and rhetoric work. There are no standards of how long rhetoric conferences should last or how many there should be. Many of these guidelines have been established for the Writing Fellows, but so far, none exist for the operational logistics of the Rhetoric Fellows program. And thus, the frequent confusion.

NOTES

NOTES

FELLOWING
(sounds scary, huh?)

This is the part of the handbook where we are going to try to provide as many practical suggestions as possible with respect to the issues we've discussed so far. Of course, each new idea raises five more questions. But, if you still find yourself completely confused--don't panic. That means you're as qualified to fellow as anybody else.

Heading in the right direction--backwards

Think back for a minute to all the stuff you learned in 195. Now think about the things you use in your WF conferences. Remember it all? Good, because that material is the foundation and the strength behind fellowing rhetoric assignments. All the pointers and suggestions we have compiled are based on the fact that new RFs continue to use their skills as peer tutors and WFs. Basically, a RF is a WF with more applications for his/her tools. To that extent, don't be afraid to use the pen and paper techniques you learned in 195. Using issue trees, etc. can be just as beneficial with RF fellowees as with WF fellowees.

Furthermore, many fellows have commented that their "skills" are largely common sense. That means you shouldn't be afraid to trust your intuitions. We find this to be quite comforting.

One of the impulses we try to tame as WFs is the impulse to talk too much. This impulse, some fellows have found, is even stronger in the RF conferences. As you step into this wacky new world, think about listening more than talking.

Along the same lines, the fellows we interviewed indicated that holding a RF conference is much more of a support-group experience than its writing counterpart. There seems to be a virtual consensus that reassurance, support, and encouragement are critical for helping fellowees. We'll return to this topic below.

Go to the "head" of the class II. We have been emphasizing the importance of meeting with the professor of the class you are fellowing in order to reach an understanding of expectations and to facilitate logistical ease. Additionally, it seems to be worthwhile to encourage fellowees themselves to talk with the professor or TA. Because of the ambiguity of speaking assignments and evaluative criteria, such a discussion could be invaluable for the students.

Clearing the air. One important suggestion for any conferencing situation is to discuss the goals of the meeting at the start. Although the conference could move in an entirely different direction, such a discussion can at least help fellows and fellowees to understand each other's agendas, and set an appropriate framework.

Batting Practice: the Preliminary Conference

As we've seen, just about anything can happen in this first conference. Accordingly, be prepared to bring all the hats you wear: facilitator, moderator, and of course, RF.

Mission Impossible: Decoding Assignments. This is one of the most important (and trickiest) activities that you and your fellowees may confront. Here is the dual audience problem, the evaluative criteria problem, and the assignment goals problem wrapped up in one. This is a brief list of questions which you can use to facilitate this discussion:

- What questions do you need to ask/answer to understand the assignment?
- What does the assignment say about the criteria for evaluation? Does it say what makes an effective presentation?
- Are there disciplinary constraints?
- What would a final product look like?

Clearing the air II. One fellow suggests asking the fellowees to give short impromptu speeches at the start of this conference. If the speakers are preoccupied with the thought of performing a speech, this may help relax them. Hopefully, it will help the group get "warmed up," and ready to tackle the project.

Working the clay. Some groups or individuals may come to this conference with rough ideas and a bunch of notes. In that case, you may be in a position to help the initial organization of the material. As we mentioned above, this would probably be a good place to use some of the paper techniques you would use in an analogous writing situation.

Another good question you can ask at the pre-conference is "How are you going to make your speech stand out?" This can get the fellowees thinking about how they are going to manipulate their material into an interesting, focused presentation. Also, this question may get them to discuss their audience, who will ultimately decide what is or is not interesting.

Next steps. Some fellowees may feel ready to start preparing their notes for the presentation. Often times, speakers will plan to write out a manuscript, or an outline which is so detailed that it may as well be a manuscript. Although these are viable presentation styles, many textbooks and RFs recommend reducing notes to the smallest amount possible--a few cards or a one-page outline.

To help do this, Nancy has suggested that the speaker should first write out the notes in as much detail as desired. Then the fellowee should rehearse the speech, after which the notes should be reread and reduced to a comfortable minimum. Then the process is repeated. After a few rehearsals, the speech should truly be extemporaneous and the fellowee will have practiced--what more could we ask for!! The pre-conference might be a good place to explain or suggest this process.

Reduced notes are theoretically more beneficial than a manuscript because it allows the speaker a degree of flexibility in speaking--an ability to react to the audience. Of course, some fellowees may not see it that way. Nor do some RFs. One fellow whom we interviewed commented that the method of note use is not at all important; the fellowee should just go with what he/she feels comfortable. This fellow suggested that we shouldn't bring the issue up unless there is a demonstrated problem.

Um, I'll take the zero . . . Undoubtedly, you will sooner or later find yourself in a pre-conference with fellowees who haven't started thinking about the material. In that case, your RF skills may have to wait for the next conference, and your interpersonal/facilitator skills will take over.

In many cases, the ensuing discussion will deal heavily with content, an arena we are expected to avoid. How you handle this depends on how comfortable you feel leading such a discussion. You might try guiding the conversation back to the question of fulfilling the assignment, or toward outlining some specific goals for the presentation. However, you should be cautious of getting too involved at this level. As one RF warned, you can get sucked into the ideas and become a group member, not a peer tutor.

If you don't feel comfortable in this role, that's OK too. It is perfectly acceptable to say to the fellowees: "You're not prepared enough for me to be able to help. I'm going to go. Keep talking, and when you're ready to work on the next step, call me."

The big Uh-Oh. No matter how much we try, some fellowees may come to the first conference without having even looked at the material. As above, you are justified in taking off with the understanding that another conference will be scheduled. (If you use the WF office, however, be sure not to leave the the place unsupervised.)

If you do want to try to make the conference productive (or just don't have the time to reschedule), one fellow suggests that you get the group or individual talking about speech situations that they've been in before--or even some of the speeches that have already been given in the class. In that way, you can generate a discussion on what makes an effective presentation before the material is ready to be discussed.

A Nightmare on Rhetoric Street II: the Rehearsal Conference

When RFs reminisce about their experiences, they tend to talk about this part. If you only have one conference with a fellowee, it will probably resemble this one. As we said earlier, this is the time to give feedback on a run-though of the presentation. Be warned, however--the invention/organization stuff won't disappear completely. You can think of this conference as analogous to the whole process of fellowing a paper: seeing a "draft," commenting, and working toward revision.

Assignments, assignments, assignments . . . Most of the techniques and tips you will pick up in training and from the various textbooks are centered on the one-person "speech." As we've seen, however, fellowees are often asked to perform different types of speaking assignments which require different types of rehearsing. So how do we fellow all of them? Honestly, we don't know. The answer seems to be beyond the scope of this handbook; look for a further discussion in training. Most of the tips you'll find below, however, can be applied to many situations.

The Debate. This is one of the most formalized types of presentation you may be asked to fellow. Unfortunately, no one seems to know how to fellow one. Nancy mentioned that it can involve specialized information that most fellows don't have. This did not surprise us. She suggested that you come talk to her if you are assigned to a class with a debate assignment. Chances are, an additional conference between the fellows, Nancy and the professor will be set up to discuss the assignments and debate format.

In the past, there hasn't been a discussion of the debate form during the training workshop. By popular demand, Nancy has promised to rectify the situation.

Leading a class discussion. Another common assignment involves conducting the class for the day. Many times, the student(s) will give a short speech and then lead discussion for the remainder of the time. Unfortunately, they often concentrate on the former part and figure the latter will just happen. Experiences have shown that this is not the case. Nancy recommends that the content of the discussion should be prepared as if it were for a speech; in other words, you may have to indicate to your fellowees that they really need to prepare to lead a discussion.

One key to this is drafting many open and diverse questions. You may ask the fellowees to prepare a lengthy list, and bounce them off each other. You never know what question will bomb and what will take off.

Additionally, if you are working with a group, you may need to work out a plan of who's going to do what with respect to the discussion. Getting them to commit to paper who will ask the first question, who will call on classmates, etc. is a good way to avoid the "Oh, we'll just figure it out when it happens" response.

Fielding Questions. Sometimes, speakers may be asked to field questions from the class after speaking. During the rehearsal, we (or, even better, other fellowees) can ask some questions to give the fellowee practice. If the fellowee is having troubles with this, you can remind him/her that any question can be manipulated to the answer he/she wants to give. Politicians do it every day.

It's kinda like sex . . . There are many ways to hold a rehearsal. According to veteran RFs, conferences run the gamut from informal to formal. On one side of the spectrum is the RF who recommends doing it in a very relaxed setting, not trying to simulate the actual speech situation. She advises, for example, just sitting on the couch and casually running through the presentation. On the other side, however, is the fellow who asks the fellowees to pretend that they are actually giving the presentation for the class, professor, etc. In this situation, the RF would act as an audience member. Both approaches have their merit, and many fellows fall somewhere in between.

The cutting edge. We're a very lucky program. A generous benefactor has recently given us our very own video camera and VCR. Any fellow is able to use it--just check with the coordinating secretary a few days in advance. It's really easy to use.

What it does. Videotaping rehearsals is at the formal extreme of the fellowing continuum. There's no doubt that for most fellowees it heightens the pressure of the rehearsal and thus comes closer to simulating the actual class situation. But probably the greatest benefit of this technique is that it allows the fellowees to comment on their own speeches from a more objective viewpoint. RFs who have used the VCR have noted that the fellowees usually make all the comments that they would have made in their "expert" capacity. Since self-criticism is easier to take, this seems to be a real plus.

The Understatement of the Year. Fellowees have a tendency to be, well, reluctant when it comes to being videoed. And for some, it may be downright frightening. If you choose to try this method, it's a good policy to make sure that your fellowees are willing to do so.

Since part of the reason for using the tape is to give the fellowees practice in handling the pressure of a speech, one fellow said that he didn't really give his students much of a choice--he included the VCR as just another part of the program. Of course, he was willing to drop it if a fellowee seemed really anxious--which he did in one case.

Hi-technique. As you probably guessed, different RFs use the camera in different ways. For example, one RF takes notes while taping, and then proceeds to comment on organization/structure before watching it. He then only watches a few minutes of the tape to point out delivery problems and habits. On the other hand, another RF suggests not commenting during or after the taping. He recommends watching the tape in its entirety, commenting after each speaker or section. This method takes much longer, but he notes that it allows fellowees a chance for a fuller self-evaluation.

Another veteran strongly warns us of what *not* to do: Do not to tape the presentation, discuss it thoroughly, and then try and watch the whole thing. After going through extensive commentary by the other fellowees and also the RF, no one is in the mood to then go and watch the entire speech over again. Used this way, the tape becomes redundant and boring, instead of useful.

Two general suggestions. Working one-on-one with an individual speaker most resembles the WF conferencing situation. However, if you do fellow single speakers, some RF's suggest rehearsing fellows in pairs to provide peer feedback as well. The other fellowee could also comment on content. If this is logistically possible, it may be worth a try.

If time permits, you may want to give the fellowees the option of running through the presentation a second time. Just be aware of the amount of time you are willing to commit, and the time that they are willing to commit.

Taking Notes. Chances are, you'll want to remember what you heard in the rehearsal. Every RF uses his/her own notetaking style, and you may already have a system that works for you. Here are a few words of wisdom from your colleagues.

Be up front. It's a good idea to explain to your fellowees that you are taking notes on good things and bad things. They may get freaked when they see you scribbling all over the page, figuring that it's all negative.

Relax. Notes can be taken fairly casually so that you can maintain eye contact with the speaker. This can help you gauge his/her reaction to the speech while it is being given.

Content. You may want to take a few notes on the highlights of the speech. This will allow you to tell the fellowee what you heard, and see if that matches with what he/she wanted you to get out of the talk.

Categorization. Many RFs try to categorize their notes as they take them to expedite the feedback process. One method, for example, involves dividing the paper into quarters. Each quarter will be for specific types of notes: pro vs. con, organization vs. delivery.

As you probably guessed, there are plenty of RFs who say not to bother with categorizing your notes. They do suggest, however, that the notes should be categorized in your verbal response.

Time. In addition, some RFs recommend jotting down when things happened in the speech. Since presentations are undoubtedly limited by time, using a stopwatch can be helpful for discussing how the fellowees will have to adjust to match the constraint.

Giving feedback. Obviously, the way in which you give feedback will depend on how you conduct the rehearsal and the way that you take notes. Here are some general tips:

- Ask what the speaker (and other group members) thought before you give your comments. Self-criticism, as we mentioned, may be easier to take.

- Try beginning your comments with positives. Folks are usually stressed out after finishing their speech; they'll appreciate hearing what they did right.

- If you are working with a group, try to make individual comments relevant for everyone. You can use comments to make connections among the members.

- Hit the highlights. Just as with your WF comments, you don't have to talk about everything that you noticed. Remember, though, that you probably will only have one speaking assignment to fellow for each student--you may not be able to "save" things for the next conference.

Looking good: visual aids. These things can add a real punch to speeches--so much so that professors will often suggest that they should be used. If a fellowee is going to be using a visual aid, it's a good idea if he/she brings it to the rehearsal. That way, he/she can get a feel for using it. Of course, this does imply that the rehearsal will be on the formal side of the spectrum we described earlier.

A key question to ask a fellowee who wants to use a visual aid is "Why?" As with anything in the presentation, a visual aid must be instrumental in some way. Our textbooks tell us that they serve two primary functions: to add listener comprehension/memory, and to add persuasive impact to the speech. When you fellow, look to see if the visual aid fits one of these two end.

The danger of visual aids is that they will not reinforce the speech, but distract the audience's attention. Thus, you should see if your fellowees are compensating orally for the visual material. For example, they should try to talk to the audience, and not to the slide, book, etc. Another easy suggestion is to keep the visual aid out of sight unless the speaker is specifically talking about it.

Speaker Apprehension

Peter Elbow points out what may already be obvious: in oral presentations, the audience doesn't see our words, they see us. More than in prose, we reveal ourselves in speech. That's probably why so many speakers are apprehensive about talking in front of others. We often face fellowees who have deep anxieties about speaking, and it is not an easy problem to handle.

Speaker apprehension can result from many sources. The speaker may not feel comfortable with the material, or he/she may be nervous about giving a "speech" (even if he/she is relaxed during class discussions). In some cases, however, this may be an indication of a much deeper anxiety. Remember, we are here to provide support, but we aren't counselors. If you don't feel comfortable talking about somebody's problems, or if you think that you are in over your head, you may want to clarify your role (and your boundaries) to the fellowee, and to let him/her know that there are other student support organizations which can help. Because of our limited involvement with the student, one RF notes, we may only be able to help treat the symptoms and not the source of such deeper anxieties.

Building self-confidence. It is important to remind apprehensive fellowees that tension and nervousness are normal and can be beneficial. In fact, one author indicates that tension is physiologically reduced by the act of speaking. Chances are, once the student starts talking, the audience won't notice his/her self-perceptions of nervousness. You can tell the fellowee to picture himself/herself being successful--even when it feels like all has failed.

A Comfortable Audience. One RF advises that we ask fellowees about their speaking worries during the pre-conference, and proceed to validate them. This gets the issue on the table early, and can establish us as a comfortable first audience. Hopefully, this will ease the tension over the second audience: the class. Of course, we do need to be careful not to introduce anxiety in the mind of a speaker where it did not already exist. For that reason, some RFs recommend not addressing this topic unless it makes itself known. You'll have to judge the situation for yourself.

If a fellowee is nervous about giving a "speech," we can ask him/her to pretend that he/she is telling the ideas to a friend. Some RFs have noted that the perceived formality of the presentation is often the source of the anxiety; turning the situation into casual conversation can serve as a remedy.

A Comfortable Speech. One of the most important keys to overcoming apprehension is reminding the fellowee that he/she has practiced--that he/she has done it before, and can do it again. (Of course, this implies that the fellowee *has* practiced.) The more comfortable you feel with the presentation, the easier it will be to perform it; we need to stress practicing in this regard.

Along the same lines, one RF has suggested to his fellowees that they memorize the first minute or so of their speech. In that way, they'll know that they'll be able to get started all right, and the rest will fall into place. Be careful, however--this method can have its own problems. If the fellowee blanks on the memorized intro, he/she may be paralyzed for the rest of the speech.

Another RF underscores the importance of making a mental image of your notes. With practice, the picture will be fixed in the mind and the notes won't really be necessary. Still, she also advises fellowees to make notes which are easily used and numbered--just in case of a disaster.

As we noted earlier, it is always a good idea to breathe. Sometimes apprehensive speakers forget. It's a good idea to remind them.

The Key. Remember, you are not alone out there. If you have a fellowee who has a serious anxiety problem, talk to your HF or to Nancy. That's what they are here for.

How Many Fellowees Does it Take to Screw in a Light Bulb?

Dealing with groups is an occasional joy that WFs don't get the opportunity to relish. However, with the roses come the thorns (ugh!), and so come the problems of group dynamics. It is partly our responsibility to ensure that the group is focused on the task and is working efficiently. You will talk a lot about this in the workshop. As before, here's a taste of the issues.

Task Functions. There are plenty of logistical affairs to settle with a group. Responsibility must be delegated, agendas must be set, the RF must be updated, etc. As a fellow, you need to decide how comfortable you feel directing these problems toward solutions. Some RFs have found themselves choosing who is going to do what because no one else would decide! Do you let the group flounder, or do you take the lead?

Maintenance Functions. The needs of individuals must be taken care of by the group. To maintain a semblance of solidarity, differences must be mediated, tension must be minimized, and the channels of communication must be opened. Also, a group participation must remain balanced among all members. RFs have found that it is easier to encourage quiet members to contribute than to ask active members to reduce their participation. Once again, you may be asked by your group to control these factors. There's no clear-cut formula for doing this; you will be drawing on your ability to gauge and moderate the interpersonal dynamic.

Leadership. Appropriate leadership is essential for facilitating group success. Leadership does not necessarily denote an individual, but a function that needs to be served. Because of our status in the class, we will be perceived as "leaders" by some students; as a RF, you need to negotiate how leadership will be handled by the group, and the extent of your involvement. Once again, take care not to get too involved in this function; you may need to explain your concerns to your fellowees and then back off.

Solution-Centeredness. Many groups rush so hastily toward devising a solution to the assignment, that they don't adequately represent the problem. That is, they try to answer "What are we going to do?" before answering "What is the problem that we are trying to solve, and what solution does it entail?" As their RF, it may be your job to keep the discussion on this track.

Another Plug

If this were all there is to fellowing, our job would be pretty damn easy and this handbook would never need to be changed. Luckily, that's not the case. We've said it before, and we'll say it again: this text is meant to be a springboard for your questions, and the appendices are included to get you headed toward the answers. As more solutions are found and more problems arise, this handbook will need to be revised. Please keep us up to date on your findings.

NOTES

NOTES

UNSOLVED MYSTERIES

As a way of bringing the whole show to an open-ended conclusion, we decided to provide a short discussion of two of the yet-unanswered questions about Rhetoric Fellowing. While individual fellows may have found ways to navigate through this territory, we do not yet have uniformly definitive answers. These are representative of the issues which we as a program will have to aim toward resolving in the future.

Directiveness: to be or not to be?

We mentioned at the beginning of this handbook that many more students at Brown seem to be beginning speakers than beginning writers. Consequentially, RFs often feel that they become more prescriptive and directive in their rhetoric conferences. This may stem from the feeling that we possess so much basic information that fellowees need to know to be successful--more so than in writing. Some RFs find this to be problematic, others don't. The question is "Do we bestow this essential advice unsolicited or do we simply respond to what we see/hear in the conferences?"

The RFs we interviewed were split on this question. At one extreme, a fellow offered the idea of writing up a general "tip sheet" of pointers which he would hand out to all his fellowees. Indeed, another RF remarked that we shouldn't "hide" things from our fellowees--the advice we give may be intimidating, but they need to be made aware. Conversely, other fellows recommended not offering advice unless it is in response to a specific problem which arises in the conference. Accordingly, a "Should I...?" question would be answered with "If you were in the audience, what would you like to see?"

If you do decide that it is important to give unsolicited advice, the next question is "When?" The pre-conference? rehearsal conference? your info sheet? As soon as you have your first group of rhetoric fellowees, you'll have to experiment with a decision.

What's mandatory?

Writing this handbook, especially the section on logistics, we continuously ran into the question of what exactly is mandatory in the Rhetoric Fellows program. This is not a new question--it has come up over and over again for both Writing Fellows and Rhetoric Fellows. The Writing Fellows program has resolved this issue to a certain extent by setting up standards that are (supposedly) followed consistently. At least two written assignments must be commented on by the WF, and there must be at least one conference. The professor is supposed to penalize students who do not complete these requirements. In reality, we know that this is not always done. And besides, there is forever the question of what role the fellow is to take. Do we act as a police squad which "tells on" students who do not participate?

For Rhetoric Fellows, things get even stickier. Here, there is not even a paper draft for the professor to see whether or not the student has worked with the fellow. In addition, the program has not set up any guidelines for what is even supposed to be mandatory. What is told to professors? What do they tell their students? What do we tell our fellowees? There are no consistent standards, so each Rhetoric Fellow ends up negotiating this sticky mess by making up answers as they go along.

At an individual level, you can decide for yourself what will be "mandatory," and for that class, it will be mandatory. Just be aware that there is no program-wide definition, and so you may not have a carved-in-stone rule behind you to enforce your decisions.

There is much to consider in trying to resolve this issue. If students are not required to use the program (i.e. RF conferencing being a required part of the grade), do we lose credibility? Do we want to be just an option for students in the course who choose to use us? And again, if it is a "mandatory" program, what role are we to take? Being a police officer does not exactly fit with being a peer tutor. As a program, what do we want to decide? Certainly this issue needs some serious consideration. (Ah. . . retreat material. . .)

There are probably hundreds more items to add to this list of unresolved issues. Keep this handbook in mind as new concerns and new solutions emerge. Hopefully, it will continue to reflect the changing status of the program.

APPENDIX A: HELPFUL LISTS FOR ORAL PRESENTATIONS

As promised, here is a collection of pointers, tips, and other information which may or may not be helpful. Textbook authors have a tendency to use these things, so we figured it might be helpful to reproduce them. Most of this stuff goes back to the section on elements of an oral presentation (you can never get enough).

A. Things to consider about your audience
   1. Purpose of hearing the speech
   2. Level of knowledge on the subject
   3. Feedback cues
   4. Their attitudes towards the topic

B. Factors to help gain/keep attention
   1. Movement of the material
   2. Reality: use of specific evidence
   3. Connection to the audience
   4. Novelty
   5. Suspense
   6. Conflict
   7. Humor
   8. The Vital

C. Qualities of successful speechmaking
   1. Integrity
   2. Knowledge of the material
   3. Sensitivity to audience
   4. Oral skills
   5. Self confidence and control

D. How to make key points stand out
   1. Conciseness
   2. Vividness
   3. Immediacy to audience
   4. Parallelism

E. Keys to controlling apprehension
   1. Replace self-defeating statements with positive ones
   2. Be excited about the topic
   3. Practice!
   4. Expect a helpful audience
   5. Picture yourself being successful
   6. Act confident even if you don't feel so

F. Keys to using visual aids
   1. Limit the number--focus on the words of your speech
   2. Make a rough draft and test it
   3. Neatness and clarity are essential
   4. Only show it when you are using it
   5. Face the audience as much as possible

G. Ways to communicate confidence
   1. Be yourself
   2. Look at the audience
   3. Communicate with your body
   4. Know that your self perceptions of nervousness aren't noticable

H. Key areas of nonverbal communication
   1. Use of space, physical barriers
   2. Movement and stance
   3. Facial expression
   4. Gesturing

APPENDIX B: RHETORIC FELLOW RESPONSE CHECKLISTS

Below are two response checklists taken from a file that Nancy has in her office. Some RFs find these helpful to use as they take notes or give feedback to fellowees. Others have even xeroxed lists like these to give out to fellowees as reminders of important elements in an oral presentation. We've included two samples here for those of you who find such lists useful. If you want to see more, just ask Nancy.

Response Check-off List

Invention:
- topic worthwhile ____________
- clearly focused ____________
- adequately limited ____________
- adapted to audience ____________
- made interesting ____________
- supporting material sufficient ____________
- supporting material varied ____________
- supporting material interesting ____________

Introduction:
- gain attention ____________
- clear focus/central idea ____________
- establish rapport/interest ____________

Body:
- clear main idea ____________
- effective transitions ____________
- appropriate organizational pattern ____________
- appropriate number of ideas ____________

Conclusion:
- focused on central idea ____________
- clear ____________
- provide note of finality ____________

Language:
- oral (rather than written) ____________
- clear and articulate ____________
- vivid ____________
- adds impact and interest ____________

Delivery:
- extemporaneous ____________
- conversational quality ____________
- conscious of audience ____________
- voice clear and distinct ____________
- appropriate rate ____________
- adequate volume ____________
- lively and enthusiastic ____________
- supportive gestures ____________
- meaningful movement ____________
- effective eye contact ____________
- posture ____________

Rhetoric Fellow Prompt Sheet

Introduction:
1. Did the speaker capture the audience's attention?
2. Did the speaker explain the purpose of the speech?
3. Did the speaker establish credibility?
4. Did the speaker establish a connection with the audience?

Organization:
1. Did the speaker initially set up a clear organizational pattern?
2. Did the speaker then follow the pattern that was established?
3. Were the transition between points clear?
4. Did the speech flow in a logical way?

Supporting Material:
1. Did the speaker use various types of support (i.e. statistics, quotes, historical information, anecdotes, etc.)?
2. Was the supporting material relevant to the topic?
3. Was it information that the audience was interested in or could relate to in some way?
4. Did the supporting material enhance the speaker's credibility or detract from it?

Conclusion:
1. Did the speaker reiterate the main point of the speech?
2. Did the speaker effectively explain how the audience should change or be affected by the speech?

Style:
1. Was the speaker's tone appropriate for the massage?
2. How creatively did the speaker present the material?
3. Was the speaker able to maintain a connection with the audience?

Delivery:
1. Did the speaker maintain eye contact with the audience?
2. Were the speaker's posture and hand gestures appropriate?
3. Did the speaker use voice intonation effectively?
4. Did the speaker's facial expressions enhance the message?
5. Did the speaker talk slowly and clearly enough to be understood?

APPENDIX C: BIBLIOGRAPHY

As we mentioned in the text, this list is annotated to help you find a place to start on questions you may have.

Brilhart, John K. *Effective Group Discussion.* 2nd ed. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co. Publishers, 1974.
This work wasn't as effective as we thought it would be. There is, however, a good discussion of group building/maintenance functions.

Cooper, Pamela. *Speech Communication for the Classroom Teacher.* Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publishers, 1991.
This text is concerned with a broad range of communication issues in the classroom above and beyond student speaking. It was particularly helpful for us in trying to understand how to work with groups.

Devito, Joseph A. *The Elements of Public Speaking.* 4th ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1990.
This is the present TA22 textbook. Chapters 7 & 8 deal with audience issues; Ch. 13, 16, and 19 give info on different types of speaking assignments; Ch. 15 discusses visual aids; Ch. 20-23 are concerned with delivery issues.

Dunbar, Nancy. *Translating Texts.* Paper given at CCC, 3/91.
Nancy's feelings on writing versus speaking with respect to the program. Chances are, she'll be willing to show it to you and talk about it, too.

Dunbar, Nancy. *Writing AND Speaking Across the Curriculum: The Rhetoric Fellows Program at Brown University.*
The title is pretty self-explanatory. If you're looking for some background on the program, this is a good place to look.

Elbow, Peter. "The Shifting Relationships between Speech and Writing." College Composition and Communication . Vol. 36, No 3 (October, 1985): 283-303.
Keith thinks this is one of the most important articles that he has ever read concerning WF/RF issues. Elbow discusses with great precision the similarities and differences between writing and speech, specifically with regard to the actualization of meaning and temporality.

Gronbeck, Bruce E., et al. *Principles of Speech Communication.* Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1988.
This is the list book. Every chapter is filled with lists on a variety of topics. For a sample, check our appendix A. We found this to be a good introductory text.

Osborn, Michael and Suzenne Osborn. *Public Speaking.* 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1991.
Another nice introductory text. We used it primarily in our discussion of speaker apprehension and the use of visual aids. It also has nice pictures.

APPENDIX D: NAMES AND PHONE NUMBERS

Rhoda Flaxman
Director, Writing Fellows
Co-Director, Rhetoric Fellows
x 3-1404
009 Rhode Island Hall
Box 1962

Nancy Dunbar
Co-Director, Rhetoric Fellows
x 3-3565
University Hall
Box 1862

Wendy Sheridan
Coordinator
x 3-1404
004 Rhode Island Hall
Box 1962

Current Rhetoric Fellows

Jeremy Adams
Andrews Rm. 219
867-6413

Becca Bradburd
66 John Street
743-4271

Ariana Green
166 Williams
741-1943

Nathalie Jordi
18 Euclid Avenue
499-5757

Nick Mitchell
Young Orchard 4, Rm. 440
867-4545

Will Smith
14 Pitman Street, #3
521-5425

Russ Baruffi
61 Barnes Street
856-261-2415

Anthony DiPietro
Wooley, Rm. 129
867-6150

Ari Johnson
Slater, Rm. 304
867-6654

Miriam Markowitz
377 Benefit Street, 2nd floor
331-2626

Neel Shah
Barbour, Rm. 340
867-6753

Samm Tyroler-Cooper
183 Power Street
952-2077

Rhetoric Fellows

Training Manual

What follows is an attempt to systematize some of the activities that have become integral to the Rhetoric Fellows Program over the course of the last few years. Like any project of its sort, it is meant to outline—and not necessarily to prescribe—a proposed direction for the training sessions of incoming Rhetoric Fellows. Thus, while none of what is written should be seen as inalterable, much of it has been tried, tested and revised with an attentiveness to how each of the activities hits upon a specific issue. It may seem necessary to rearrange, to edit or to adapt the training manual from year to year, and in the process of compiling the material from year's past, we (Kélina and Mike) tried to allow for such alterations to be made.

In addition to potential adaptations, we wanted to make a few suggestions with regard to the timeline and organization of the program. Not knowing the school calendar from year to year, we have designed the curriculum to run as follows:

Beginning of the semester—convene returning Rhetoric Fellows to devise a selection plan and to forecast the upcoming events

Mid-Semester—after having advertised the program to the two sections of EL195, begin the selection process for the upcoming training (more on selection forthcoming)

Before the end of the first semester—conduct an organizational meeting with all selected Rhetoric Fellows. Holding this meeting before the Winter Training will be crucial to ensuring attendance and participation.

Winter Training Session—should be held the three days before the start of classes (in the past, trainings have been Friday evening, Saturday, and Sunday)

Semester Trainings—have been designed to take place during retreats and should be made to adapt to the Writing Fellows Calendar

We feel it would be best to form a permanent (and possibly paid) position for the Rhetoric Fellows Coordinator, someone who would coordinate the training and oversee the details of the day to day Rhetoric Fellows operations.

For the last two years, the selection of Rhetoric Fellows has been open-ended and the training has gone forth with whoever was willing to be in attendance. We feel it would be best to begin the transition to selecting the incoming Rhetoric Fellows in a manner similar to the Writing Fellows; that is, the interviewing and selection of applicants should be seen as a part of the training itself. In the interview, an incoming applicant should demonstrate potential as a speaker, a critic and as someone capable of coordinating group fellowing. The selection process should be formal (in the sense of having a formal atmosphere), but should not be a mere formality, and ideally, six to eight committed Rhetoric Fellows should be chosen.

Best of luck with the training, and we will certainly look forward to seeing the further development of the Rhetoric Fellows Program.

Rhetoric Fellows Training: Session 1
IMPROMPTU SPEECHES

Objective: The objective of this opening activity is twofold: 1) to provide an opportunity for trainees to speak extemporaneously in front of the group and 2) to begin to lay the groundwork for a common vocabulary and a trained mode of reading oral presentations. By the end of this activity, all of the trainees should have a better sense of what sorts of critique will be integral to the Rhetoric Fellows conference and how these critiques may be presented in a group setting.

Synopsis: The activity is divided into components, each of which is designed to take place the first training session. The first of these components is an introduction of the activity to detail the specific objectives and to encourage all of the trainees to participate actively in the critiques. The second portion of the activity involves the actual impromptu speeches and critiques to be delivered. The third, and perhaps most crucial, section is the summation of all of the modes of reading an oral presentation that take place over the course of the evening.

PART I: 20 minutes. The purpose of this introductory sequence is to acquaint the participants with the goals of the activity both in terms of the oral presentation and the critique components. Because this activity is the first in the series of sessions, it is particularly important to begin to lay some of the primary vocabulary integral to what follows. With this in mind, do not rush the introduction and be sure to prepare a very well structured lesson plan ahead of time to detail the varying elements of the evening.

1) 5 minutes. Introduce yourself and the training program. Be certain to emphasize the interrelatedness of each of the opening sessions. A sense of humor, personal anecdotes, or attentiveness to your own speaking style will be somewhat necessary to breathe life into this section.

- Address how the program is broken into components and always be sure to forecast upcoming events and their relevance to other activities.
- Tell an anecdote about impromptu speeches in years past, isolating what in particular was important, how it relates to all that follows it, and how it models the very basics of Rhetoric Fellowing.

2) 10 minutes. Begin to identify a series of crucial questions to frame the activity:

- *What is a Rhetoric Fellow?* The response to this question may be somewhat of a pep talk that addresses the importance of the Rhetoric Fellows and their relation to the university at large. While students tend to be trained rather extensively on issues relating to writing, they tend not to have the same critical attentiveness to spoken assignments. The Rhetoric Fellows Program helps to draw attention to modes of speaking and the fundamental role of speech in an academic setting.
- *How does Rhetoric Fellowing relate to Writing Fellowing?* Here you might want to address the commonality in terms of conferencing and peer tutoring. Where Rhetoric Fellows differ, however, has to do with 1) the fact that the text to be critiqued will not have been seen before the conference; that is to say, the Rhetoric Fellows will have to perform an almost impromptu

critique of what is seen and, for this reason, will have to be quick on her feet 2) a Rhetoric Fellow is always and inevitably a model of what she teaches; fellowees will look to your speaking skills as a model for what they should be doing; as a Writing Fellow there is a degree of transparency, a fellowee never sees your writing.

- *What is the purpose of the training session?* Here you might want to mention that the program depends in large part on the engagement of those who participate. Ultimately, it is hoped that by the end of the training session, those being trained will have a method of reading an oral presentation and will have a command on how to run a conference with a fellowee.

3) 5 minutes. Turn your focus to an explanation of the Impromptu Speeches in particular, at first forecasting how the activity will run and then placing emphasis on the two components outlined above 1) extemporaneous speaking as a means of isolating personal speaking patterns and 2) critiquing speeches as a means of generating a common set of terms with which to proceed. Year after year it has been quite important to draw out these relations explicitly for the participants. Dedicating your energy to explicating the relevance of the activity should never be undermined. What seems valuable to you will seem valuable to the trainees if you are able to communicate the relationship between the varying components of the training.

- Explain the trial by fire method. This session is meant to throw each trainee into public speaking and is not meant to be at all comfortable. In fact, efforts should be made to make this activity as intimidating as possible: a video camera should be set up and the room should be configured so as to mimic a conventional classroom.
- Present the format of the presentations. The impromptu speeches will occur in the order that the trainees are seated. Two will go into the hallway at a time after having drawn a impromptu topic from a hat full of speech topics (in the past, topics have included: if I were stuck on a desert island what would I bring, or the most important thing in the world is...etc., effort should be made to be more creative than those topics I just offered). After each group of two speakers has presented, you should lead the group in fellowing each of the speeches. Be sure to round out the types of critique offered by encouraging the two speakers to re-enter the room or to respeak a portion of their speech.
- Having set forth the framework, the activity should run on its own. Your role from here on out should be to oversee the types of critique and to begin to systematize a listing of attributes to look for in a spoken presentation.

PART II: 2 hours. Impromptu Speech Presentations and Modes of Critiquing Oral Presentations

Exercise: Trainees will be asked to deliver a two minute speech with a minute of preparation in the hallway outside of the Writing Fellows Office. Each speaker will draw a topic from a hat, go into the hall to brainstorm, and be called into the room to deliver the impromptu speech. After each set of two speeches, those trainees in the room will offer a speech critique, isolating certain tendencies in the speaker's style and ultimately developing a series of techniques for fellowing speeches.

1) What follows is a step by step guideline for running the activity. If all goes well, it should not be altogether necessary to follow this formula verbatim.

Pre-Session activities:
- Seat the group in an arrangement facing the speaker. This set-up might be kept for the duration of the training session and is intended to mimic a conventional classroom.
- Make certain to set up the video camera. Each of the speeches this first evening should be videotaped to allow trainees a chance to review their speeches later in the workshop.
- Write out the impromptu themes for the activity. In the past, these themes have varied—one word of caution would be to avoid making all of the topics humorous. It is good to get a variety of speaking topics for the evening in order to identify different fellowing strategies.

Impromptu Speeches:
- Before beginning the speeches, designate a time keeper to cut each speech off at two minutes. This rule should be followed stringently as no one speaker should be given more time than another.
- Select two trainees to present (one will wait in the hall while the first presents—the first speaker should have a minute to prepare, the second will have more time). The order of the speakers should follow the seating arrangement.
- After each group of two trainees presents, have the group discuss each of the speeches. At times, it is helpful to fellow one of the speeches by having one of the speakers re-enter the room, or by having the speaker restate the first few moments of the speech. Use this time to effectively demonstrate the numerous exercises a Rhetoric Fellow can use when working with a speech.

Follow-Up:
- Once all speakers have presented, be certain to summarize or review the types of commentary offered over the course of the evening—this might entail getting the group to make suggestions and writing these down on a piece of paper
- Emphasize the types of skills demonstrated in this type of critique—analysis and description—and, more crudely stated, tell them what they have learned
- Before leaving for the evening, forecast the next day's events: the Academic Paper Presentation and in doing so, try to emphasize that the trainees should plan carefully and should pay attention to the strategies learned from the impromptu speeches

PART III: 20 minutes. The summary of the activity is one of the most crucial points of the session. Because it is the first training session, it is important to systematically present each of the potential fellowing strategies demonstrated over the course of the evening. Do all that you can to draw on examples from the speeches so as to put all Rhetoric Fellows on common grounds. For the duration of the training, the impromptu speeches serve as a common text, something with which all trainees will be familiar.

1) There is no possible way of presenting a summary here other than to briefly list some of the topics that generally emerge the first night of training. Be certain to write these out for the trainees at the end of the evening and to reemphasize how those skills demonstrated in the critiques will be essential skills when conferencing with fellows.

List of types of critique:

- Volume
- Eye contact
- Entry
- Conclusion
- Beginning of speech
- Body language
- Posture
- Enunciation
- Command of space
- Gestures
- Comfort-level
- Structuring
- Speed of speech
- Use of pause
- Repetition
- Organization of material
- Development of ideas

Conclusion: Having reviewed all of the skills to emerge over the course of the evening, be certain to reemphasize a number of crucial points raised in this first session: 1) a Rhetoric Fellow is both a model (in so far as she demonstrates good speaking) and a critic (in so far as she reads oral presentations) 2) the skills learned in the impromptu speech exercise will be integral to the cumulative training sessions designed for the course of the semester.

Preview for next session: The next training session will be the Academic Paper Presentation. Be certain to emphasize that skills learned this first session should be incorporated into the next and that speeches should have a preliminary outline by the beginning of the next session. Whereas the first session aims to isolate patterns of good speech, the Academic Paper Presentations will help to practice how to structure and organize a speech.

Evaluation: As always, encourage feed-back on the activity and any potential suggestions for changes to be made in the future.

Rhetoric Fellows Training: Session 2
ACADEMIC PAPER PRESENTATIONS

***Objective*:** The Academic Paper Presentations are set forth to model the most frequent type of speaking assignment and to give an opportunity for the Rhetoric Fellows to isolate attributes of a group conference. This exercise is to assist the trainees in learning methods of speech writing and to instruct strategies for coordinating a group conference.

Synopsis: This lesson will be divided into its distinct parts: 1) the morning activity of how to structure a speech and hold a pre-conference, 2) the afternoon activity of how to conduct a group conference, and 3) the summary period drawing the entire day's activities together in order to propose yet another series of strategies learned in the training. The first portion of this exercise involves simulating a pre-conference where each Rhetoric Fellow will be paired off to evaluate the outline for the speech to be given in the afternoon. The second half of the activity involves the actual presentations and the mock group conferences. Although this session is designed to take up an entire day, it is structured to accommodate a number of different group sizes and a number of different types of instruction.

PART I: 2 hours. The Pre-Conference and Structuring a Spoken Presentation. Like most of the components of the Rhetoric Fellows Training, the morning activity will combine an activity with a lesson, in a way enabling the opportunity to learn both what it is to give a speech and what it is to be fellowed in the process of doing so.

1) Introduction of activity.* 45 minutes. Begin the morning by reflecting on some of the challenges of preparing a speech. Emphasize the relationship of the day's exercises to the overall training, and rearticulate the importance of engaged critique. Then, having forecasted the day's activities, it might be helpful to isolate a series of questions to be considered over the course of the exercise.

- How do you translate a written paper into a speech? This question is perhaps the most important question to be considered in this exercise as it points not only to the similarities and differences between the content of a paper and a speech, but also to the formal distinctions to be drawn between the two.
- What elements differ and what stays the same in the paper versus the presentation? A brainstorming of effective techniques might best follow this question.
- How much of the presentation will be remembered? Nancy Dunbar's mantra. At most 20% of a speech will be remembered—whatever number you chose, just make sure to emphasize that very little is remembered.
- How does emphasis differ in a speech versus a paper? This question should allude to the importance of repetition, logical structuring and varying ways in which gestures and voice inflection can bring emphasis to parts of the presentation.
- How do you plan a speech so as to leave room to cut portions at the last minute to fit time constraints? The infamous trap door trick: never give away your structuring entirely, and be certain to structure in escapes if you find yourself short of time. That is to say, structure your speech such that leaving out a last support or example will not be detrimental to your overall presentation.

- What techniques can be offered to deal with time limitations and to oversee preparation so as to prevent frantic conclusions? Encourage the trainees to accord a lot of attention to the conclusion and to use the conclusion as a means of stabilizing the audience and drawing attention to all that has been heard. The conclusion should never be rushed or skirted, so it is important to be wary of the time factor.

Then, as relates to pre-conferencing:
- How do you raise these formal and content-based issues with a fellowee? This question is meant to point to a number of issues that differentiate the Rhetoric Fellow from the Writing Fellow. A Rhetoric Fellow serves as a resource to the fellowee and should function in many ways as a mirror (to mirror back what is seen) and also as an informed peer willing to share strategies. Because the pre-conference occurs even prior to the planning of the presentation itself, many of the strategies for reading an oral presentation will not seem applicable. For this reason, use this question as a means of suggesting various tips for planning a speech: repetition, structuring, cut down on the information included in the paper, think of visuals and their relation to the content, etc.
- How does the pre-conference compare with Writing Fellows Conferences? As has been suggested, the pre-conference occurs prior to any presentation—for this reason, it is important that the Rhetoric Fellow not position herself as the organizing agent. Use this question as a means of discussing how to position oneself as a resource.
- How can you lead a pre-conference without seeming too teacherly (what questions should you pose of the fellowee)? Given that the Rhetoric Fellow is set-up as a resource and not as the authority, there is always a tendency to slip into teacherly ways. While this training does encourage trainees to impart their knowledge with fellowees, it is often best to do so through exercises and activities. Doing so draws attention away from the Rhetoric Fellow and onto the fellowee.

*In the past, trainees have suggested that this morning activity be more thorough and offer them a more fleshed-out version of the speech preparation process. All of that said, be as methodical as possible in forecasting what sorts of issues might be addressed in the pre-conference, describe in detail what activities will go on once the trainees break into pairs, and explore the potential activities that may be tried out in this setting. Whatever worksheets you may want to draw up or whatever resources you may want to offer by way of readings may prove extraordinarily helpful to those being trained. As a rule of thumb, it is better to be over-prepared in presenting these activities than to find yourself grasping at straws—this also holds true when you are in a conferencing situation.

2) Fellowing the Speech Outlines in Pairs. 1 hour 15 minutes.
- In the introduction of the pre-conference exercise be certain to draw attention to the importance of this activity for the actual fellowing situations.
- Trainees should be as methodical as possible and should write down suggestions for the fellowee.
- Among issues to be discussed, time constraints, experiences with speaking, and the context of the paper should all be raised.

- The leader of the exercise should be on hand to assist with any questions that might be raised. Feel free to sit in on one of the conferences and to make suggestions as to what strategies might be employed.
- Ordinarily, this morning activity ends with an extensive lunch break to allow trainees to fine-tune their speeches for the afternoon.

Exercise: Trainees will be asked to split into pairs to hold a model pre-conference. In this preliminary session, each trainee will walk through the outline of the speech to be delivered in the afternoon as though in a conferencing situation. Trainees might find it helpful to encourage their partner to deliver portions of the speech and to begin to isolate attributes of effective delivery.

PART II: 3 hours. The purpose of the afternoon activity is twofold: 1) to provide the opportunity for each trainee to make a 7 minute academic paper presentation and 2) to model how a Rhetoric Fellow might conduct a group conference. In this exercise, after having convened as a large group, the trainees should be subdivided into groups of 4 or 5 with no two partners from the morning activity in the same group. In the past, old Rhetoric Fellows have returned for this portion of the training to assist with each of the small groups and to help coordinate the speech critiques.

1) Introduction of Activity. 15 minutes. Immediately following the extended lunch break, dedicate a few minutes to sketch the afternoon activity and to relate it to the other activities in the training. A good way of hitting all of the major issues might involve reiterating some of the goals of the days activity, placing special emphasis on the importance of the active engagement of all group members in the speech critique.

Exercise: Each trainee will participate in the small group of four to five trainees to present a seven minute academic paper presentation and to critique the other presentations in the group. There will also be a question and answer component to each speech which will entail a five minute period of content-based questions to be posed to the speaker immediately following her speech. The outline of the exercise will be roughly as follows:

Speaker 1—7 minute presentation
5 minutes of questions
Group—20 minutes of feedback on the presentation
Speaker 2—7 minute presentation
5 minutes of questions
Group—20 minutes of feedback on the presentation

2) Instructions for the Training Leader
- Assign each of the groups to a separate room in the basement of Rhode Island Hall; ordinarily, the Writing Fellows Office is avoided in favor of the classrooms located at the end of the hallway. Each room should be set up to mimic a conventional classroom setting, and certain members of each group should sit far back in the room to ensure sufficient volume on the part of the speaker.
- Make certain that each group designates a timekeeper to monitor each speech and to cut off at the 7 minute mark.

- Provide an overview of the question and answer period, and explain its relevance to the assignment. The Rhetoric Fellows Program provides insight into what makes for an effective answer in the question and answer period: for example, repeat parts of the question, relate it to your presentation, feel free to critique the question and to reemphasize the particular scope of your presentation.
- During the critiques of the speeches, be certain to note the types of strategies that emerge and to suggest alternate strategies as relevant. Remember that the training is to provide tools for the trainees in conferences, so it might be helpful to constantly relate back to the conferencing situation. The leader should feel free to make certain speakers respeak portions of the speech with altered conditions: i.e. with the speaker's hands behind her back, without a podium, etc. Trainees will get out of this exercise what the leaders put into it. For this reason, do not rush the critiques and try to be as consistent as possible in following the guidelines set forth for each speaker.
- As a rule of thumb, it is helpful to be extraordinarily rigid about time even if it means periods of silence. Every speech should be given 20 minutes response.

Conclusion: At the conclusion of this activity, all of the varying types of critique and strategies for fellowing should be reviewed. In light of differing time schedules, it is probably best to have each of the groups follow their own schedule by having each small group leader provide the overview of the days' activities. Prior to assigning small group leaders, be certain to emphasize the importance of the concluding remarks.

Preview for next session: The next session is directly addressed towards the Rhetoric Fellows Conference. Because of the cumulative nature of this training, many of the skills from the preceding two sessions will prove essential to the next. Encourage trainees to brainstorm and review the varying activities learned that might potentially be of use in a conference. By the end of the next session, each trainee should have a compiled list of activities to perform with a fellowee.

Evaluation: Make note at the end of the day of what worked and what did not. This self-reflexiveness might demand asking some of the participants for feedback on the activities.

Rhetoric Fellows Training: Session 3
CONFERENCING

Note: Of all the exercises to be offered over the training weekend, the conferencing exercise has most consistently proven the most beneficial to trainees (as reported in evaluations) and yet also the greatest challenge for the leader. Run effectively, this activity can enhance the confidence of incoming fellows; run poorly, the links between conferencing and speech-making can lead to a great deal of confusion. Here, in laying out the definite steps to be taken, I hope to elucidate the varying dimensions of the exercise and to suggest activities and connections to be drawn for the group. Similar to the academic paper presentations, it is beneficial to have old Rhetoric Fellows on-hand to serve as the voice of experience and to help to annotate the varying components of this lesson. (Participation in the training of incoming Rhetoric Fellows might be considered as OGT credit).

Objective: The goal of the conferencing activity is to encourage participation in a mock conferencing session, designed to introduce the trainees to the numerous distinct attributes of a Rhetoric Fellow conference. If the previous lessons have been designed to give the trainees strategies for critique, then the conferencing scenario has been designed to provide the trainees with a sense of the formal structuring of a typical conference: in other words, where the previous activities stress what to say in a conference, this portion addresses how to coordinate the development of a conference itself.

Synopsis: It is difficult to prescribe a set time limit for this exercise other than to mention that it ordinarily takes up an entire morning. It is also important not to short-change the trainees by abbreviating this exercise, in spite of however tempting it might be to rush through some of the explanation. Ordinarily, this session is the most didactic and tends to be driven by question as much as it is driven by any formal lesson. The first portion of the morning, in sync with the previous sessions, should address the relevance of the activity and should set forth some of the guidelines. Over the course of the activity, trainees will learn varying strategies of working with groups and individuals and will be acquainted with the video equipment. Then, having provided a broad framework of strategies and resources, the mock conference situation (pre-conference, conference and follow-up) should help to give the trainees a clearer understanding of the nature of the program.

PART I: 45 min. The Conference Scenario. The introduction to this activity is meant to detail some of the key concepts to emerge in the lesson and to provide insight into the relationship of the previous two lessons to the on-site conferencing scenarios. In contrast to other sessions, the conferencing session is meant to be the bare-bones of the program, the type of activity that appeals to trainees concerned with the applicability of what they have learned.

1) How is a Rhetoric Fellow Conference different from and similar to a Writing Fellows Conference? Begin by posing this broad question to the group of trainees. The following distinctions might prove helpful in further noting some distinctions.

- The goal of the Rhetoric Fellows Program is to turn all of our fellowees into Rhetoric Fellows; in a word, the program serves not to tell the fellowees what to do, but to train them in critiquing one another. The skills to be learned by the Rhetoric Fellow for a conference entail structuring activities that allow for group critique to take place. Crucial here is setting up an environment where fellowees feel versed enough to begin to critique others and to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their own presentation.

- Like Writing Fellows conferences, Rhetoric Fellows conferences can take on numerous forms. This particular lesson details both the group conference and the one on one conference. When possible, group conferences tend to prove the most effective means of actualizing the goals of the Rhetoric Fellows Program. More so than a Writing Fellow, the Rhetoric Fellow must know how to adapt to a number of unique scenarios—it is almost impossible to prescribe a set method.
- The Rhetoric Fellow must know how to work with a text as it is being produced. Part of this lesson will also involve modeling how to use the video equipment and will introduce trainees to the check-out system for the video camera, tripod, and television. Because the impromptu speeches will have been filmed, it might be helpful to use some of this footage to help model effective fellowing techniques. Have the trainee self-evaluate based on the video footage.

2) Crude explanation of the steps to a Rhetoric Fellows Conference. Emphasize that many of these components have already been fleshed out for the group in the previous two lessons. This session, more so than any other, demands the leader to play the role of the confidence-builder. Assure the trainees that what they are learning is valuable and that they will be well prepared.

- First Step: PRE-CONFERENCE. Review and outline strategies learned in the speech outline critiques of session two. What was helpful? What was not? Suggest that the pre-conference is an opportunity to first meet with a group or fellowee and should be used to introduce the program, the types of resources it offers, and to begin to address some of the basic issues of delivery. If all goes well, a fellowee normally has an outline and at this point, it is up to the Rhetoric Fellow to suggest some of the helpful hints of structuring a presentation. Address issues of trap doors, time limitations, room set-up, and also assess some of the fellowee's tendencies as a speaker: generally nervous in front of a group, previous experiences, etc. Often times, even if dealing with a group, the pre-conference is best held one-on-one so as to be able to address some of the basic issues and to offer personal advice.
- Second Step: CONFERENCE. Review outlines and strategies learned in the speech critiques of the first and second session. What was helpful in the group critique? What tone was used? Suggest that the conference is meant to turn all of the participants into Rhetoric Fellows. Rather than necessarily functioning authoritatively and offering all critique, use the time to work with the group and to encourage them to participate in the critique. The Rhetoric Fellow should be a confidence-booster insofar as she helps her fellowees to feel confident offering advice to one another. The leader of this activity should feel free to provide personal insight and to formulaically offer certain step-by-step advice.
- Third Step: FOLLOW-UP. Frequently a conference is not the final step when dealing with a fellowee. It is important, as in a Writing Fellows Conference, to put yourself forth as a resource, to offer your advice should it be needed, and to propose an extra session. However, should this extra-step not be feasible, do try to contact the fellowee prior to the presentation to wish her well and to see if she has any additional questions. Some Rhetoric Fellows even go so far as to attend the presentation.

3) Resources available to the Rhetoric Fellow. Before ending the introductory sequence, be sure to go through all of the policies regarding the use of the camera and the television. Emphasize the importance of this equipment for conferences, particularly when working one-on-one. The camera enables the fellowee to participate in her own speech critique and allows the Rhetoric Fellow to isolate the spoken text from the speaker.

- Introduction to the Video Camera. Show the group the tripod, explain the basics of filming and answer any questions. Do mention that Wendy is the holder of the equipment and should be contacted for checkout.
- Room reservations. Discuss the policy for getting into the Writing Fellows Office after hours. At times, it works best not to use the office, but to use some of the classrooms at the end of the hallway instead.

PART II: 1 hour. The Mock-Conference Skit. With all of the basic terms set forth in the first part of the activity, the second portion should model an effective and in-effective conference. Whoever leads the workshop might find it helpful to bring back a number of old Rhetoric Fellows to be on-hand as participants in the skit or as resources to answer questions.

Exercise: Two old Rhetoric Fellows design and act out a skit of an in-effective conference and then an effective conference in front of the trainees. The skit has been done differently each year, but should demonstrate quite clearly each of the distinct steps and should include the initial phone call between Fellow and fellowee. The skit should be followed by questions and answers.

1) Different types of conferences available to a Rhetoric Fellow.
- Group Conference. In the group conference, the challenge becomes how to manage a group without making yourself the organizing agent. That is to say, the challenge of the Rhetoric Fellow has to do with serving as a resource and not as an organizer—all organization should depend on the group. If, as the date of presentation approaches, a group member has not contacted you, contact the one group member. By no means should you arrange the date to meet yourself. Tell a group member times you are available and ask them to get back to you. Also, during this initial contact phase, it is important that you describe your role. Many groups want the Rhetoric Fellow to organize them all. YOUR ROLE IS NOT THAT OF THE ORGANIZER.
- Individual Conference. An individual conference tends to differ from the group conference only insofar as it is not quite as difficult to avoid organizing the speaker entirely. When working with someone one-on-one, it is almost imperative that the video camera be used. Ideally, you want to position the fellowee in the role of the critic and the speaker.
- Mixed Group and Individual Conference. If you are not working with a group assignment, but are working with a class where a number of presentations fall in a condensed period of time, it is often helpful to bring these presentations together for a group conference. Thus, after having held an individual pre-conference with each speaker, have them all meet up for a group conference. In the past, this type of conferencing style has proved the most effective.

Conclusion: Review the key concepts that emerge over the course of the activity. It might even be helpful to provide a handout of the varying conferencing strategies.

Preview for the next session: This session brings an end to the introductory sequence. What follows will be sessions that flesh-out some of the critical vocabulary as relates to body language, space and delivery styles.

Evaluation

Rhetoric Fellow Training: Session 4
BODY LANGUAGE (Day 1)

Objective: This session, which will take place over two half-days, is designed to acquaint fellows with fundamental physical aspects of public speaking. We will place emphasis on the speaker's body.

Synopsis:

- Introduction. 5 minutes. This is the physical component to your training, derived mostly from techniques for the stage.
- Part I. 15 minutes. Freeform.
  1) What are phenomena that you have experienced in public speaking? (Sweat, dry mouth, nausea, stomach pain or difficult digestion, difficult breathing and red face or pallor)
  2) What "tricks" or techniques might you use to deal with these phenomena?
- Part II. 90 minutes. Lesson.
  1) Conditions
  2) Panic Reflex
  3) Posture
  4) Trunk of the body
  5) Arms and hands
- Conclusion, Preview and Evaluation. 10 minutes.

PART I: 15 minutes. The purpose of this initial brainstorming session is to set the stage (haha, the pun is intended) for the physical component of Rhetoric Fellow training by asking the trainees to pinpoint specifically physical phenomena that they have experienced when standing in front of large or small audiences. If all goes well, the trainees will find that they do have a language for describing physical events and the trainers might find new sorts of events to consider.

1) We found the following examples of phenomena that trainees had experienced when speaking in public or when anticipating speaking in public:

- feeling faint
- voice shakes
- heart beats faster
- aware of hands
- lose awareness of all but hands and head
- face gets hot
- mind goes blank
- look down/ hide from audience (avert gaze)
- lips quiver
- mouth dry
- what else?

2) We found the following ways to deal with these phenomena:

- breathe/ deep breaths
- take minute to get composed

- water (for dry mouth)
- plan what you're going to say
- make joke (haha)
- shift focus e.g. to feet/ continual shift of focus→ take emphasis off hand gestures
- acknowledge that you're nervous (to audience and/or to self)
- take self seriously and not seriously→ perspective
- look out into audience and realize that they're just people
- what else?

PART II: 90 minutes. Now that we have a list of scary physical events (problems) and a list of only mildly reassuring ways to deal with these events (solutions), let's see if we can develop techniques for putting these and other solutions to work.

1) Conditions: A few tips to start off:

Food:

- coffee will dehydrate you and give you the jitters: avoid it in the half hour or the hour before you speak publicly
- milk products make mucous in your throat: avoid them too if you can, in the half hour or the hour before you speak publicly
- bananas are your friend: the potassium calms, energizes

Sleep:

- Please remind your Fellowees to be relatively well rested before they speak publicly. Our brains muddle when we're sleep-deprived, our reaction time slows, connections are more difficult to make, tunnel vision means that we can't properly gauge audience reaction.

The lesson to be learned: your food intake and your physical state generally will affect your performance. If you know that you get grumpy or confused when you're hungry, eat. If you know that you'll feel sick, give yourself enough time to digest. This seems obvious, but we forget that public speaking is like giving a recital: 5, 10, 20 minutes and it's over. Make it good.

2) Panic Reflex: (See hand-out from the Voice Book)

When we stop breathing → neck muscles tense, oxygen stops going to brain → mind goes blank
Solution: Relax shoulders, neck and tongue muscles: PRACTICE THIS!

3) Posture: Allowing for breath

The trainer should refer to the handout from The Voice Book for this section.
The main points to emphasize are that:
a) slouching makes you look and sound weak and depressed
b) over-arching your back constricts your ribcage and also makes you sound weak
Therefore:
c) ☺ straight back = free air flow = powerful voice → PRACTICE THIS!

4) Trunk of body: Stable

When you stand on two feet, shoulder width apart, you will look and feel centered and in control.

Exercise: Trainees should stand with their weight shifted to one leg (you can tell if your weight is all on one leg if you can lift your other leg without falling over). Have the trainees, with both *feet on the ground but with the weight all on one side, (gently) push the person standing beside them. Everyone will probably wobble and lose their balance. Now have the trainees stand with their weight distributed evenly between both legs and (gently) push the person standing beside them. Everyone will probably wobble much less. In fact, everyone should find that they have become pillars of strength and stability when they distribute their weight evenly between both legs.*

5) Arms: Tame the beasts! They are your friends and allies

We saw earlier that hands can be awkward. Do you put them in your pockets? Do you clutch cue cards? What happens when they flail uncontrollably? We will see that your hands not only can not be in your way (forgive the double negative), they can actually serve to underscore your points and help sway your audience.

How??

The trainer may opt to demonstrate the following hand positions didactically (x position represents X intention) or to play at audience participation and invite the trainees to interpret his or her hand positions, as well as to call out hand positions that come to mind.
We found that the following hand positions suggest the following intentions:

a) hands out and open ('orchestra conductor'): social sphere: very rhetorical: I reach out and include you, my audience, into this statement.
b) hand with palm out: don't contradict me
c) closed fist: conviction, we will fight! for our right (to paaaarty! just kidding)
d) index and middle finger together, touching the thumb: fine point, detail, precise
e) fingers on temples: abstract thinking, very intellectual; invites audience to ponder the problem posed
f) hiding hands behind back or in pockets: avoidance: I'm not about to find a solution to this problem, and I'm not making much of an effort to do so. Quite laid back, not very industrious. (But are there positive connotations to this hand position?)
g) hands on sternum: emotional/sentimental
h) hands in front of mouth: introspective/ inside your head
i) hand at nape of neck: indecisive
j) hands at ears: we couldn't figure this one out; can you?
k) hands at hips, with fingers back: weak, backache-like
l) hands at hips, with fingers front: authoritative, Momma's-gonna-whip-you-boy.
m) what else?

The point is that when we speak in front of an audience, we can use our hands like punctuation to convey intellectual or emotional modes. The audience may not perceive the hand gestures consciously (oh! she has one hand on her hip and the other open in front of her chest, that means...), but we are 'hard-wired' to read these body positions subconsciously and to derive extra layers of meaning from them.

Whether these capacities for 'reading' certain postures is biologically ingrained or culturally assimilated is a question that we need not address here unless trainers or trainees have insight that they wish to share—briefly.

Do any international students in the program 'read' certain hand gestures differently?

Exercise (optional): Have the trainer or one of the trainees stand in front of the group and deliver a simple sentence (e.g., The Society for the Elimination of Homelessness will eradicate homelessness in Rhode Island within five years) first simply—feet shoulder-width apart, arms hanging loosely by the side of the body, trunk upright. Have this person repeat the sentence as many times as the group sees fit, varying the hand and arm positions each time. Does the sentence take on different connotations? Do we perceive the speaker to be more or less genuine, more or less ready for action, more or less informed given his or her body position?

Conclusion/Questions: We perform as we carry ourselves. A speaker who controls various aspects of his or her stance (head, back, arms) will have greater control over the flow of thoughts that reach his or her head. He will know to put himself not in a defensive, but in a receptive position. This means standing open, arms open, and air canals unblocked.

Key terms: panic reflex, defensive *vs.* receptive *body position,* free air flow.

Preview for the next session: *More on body language: eyes, projection (vocal), presence.*

Evaluation

Rhetoric Fellows Training: Session 4
BODY LANGUAGE (Day 2)

Objective: See Body Language (Day 1) above. In addition, fellows will explore more intangible physical aspects of public speaking such as projection and presence.

Synopsis:
- Introduction. 5 minutes.
- Part I. 15 minutes. Warm-up.
  1) Face
  2) Head/Neck
  3) Shoulders
  4) Bounce
  5) Roll
  6) What else?
- Part II. 90 minutes. Lesson, continued from Body Language (Day 1).
  6) Eyes
  7) Vocal work (Projection)
- 8) Self-Expansion (Presence)Conclusion, Preview and Evaluation. 10 minutes.

PART I: 15 minutes. Warm-up: The warm-up is designed to remind trainees that they feel more alert and alive once they have stretched. Oxygen flow, endorphins... are good friends in stressful situations like public speaking. Hopefully, doing the exercises will drill that principal into the trainee's bodies and not just their brains.

1) Face
Stand up. Yawn. Gently tap your forehead, cheekbones, jaws, chin, temples, eyes with the tips of your fingers. Rub small circles into the same parts of your face, with the top parts of your fingers. Very gently pull your ears outwards, up, down.

2) Head/Neck
a) Gently roll the head so that your right ear almost touches your right shoulder, then down, then to the left so that your left ear almost touches your left shoulder, then back. Now in the other direction.
b) Gently swivel your head so that your chin almost touches your right shoulder while remaining upright and then do the same with your left shoulder, as if to say "No."

3) Shoulders
The trainer should demonstrate this exercise first.
Make sure to stand far away from anyone else. Bend the knees just a bit. Swing the right arm very fast, like a propeller. When the trainer stands upright again, the right shoulder will be higher than the left. Do the same on the left side. Repeat, swinging wildly towards the back.

4) Bounce
Small jumps in place, enough to get oxygen flowing and adrenaline up.

5) Roll

Flop over so that you're just about touching your toes, arms loose, neck loose, knees slightly bent (not locked). Now gently roll up, one vertebra at a time—the image is that each vertebra neatly stacks itself onto the one before, with the neck bones and finally the head last.

6) What else?

The number of relevant warm-up exercises is endless. Feel free continually to modify this oh-so summary list, and invite the trainees to input—within the constraints of time.

PART II: 90 minutes. Continuation of Body Language Lessons and Activities

6) Eyes

> *NOTE: Because this information may not be evident at first sight—haha, no pun intended—the trainer may wish to begin this section with the exercise outlined below and then explain the ideas that lie behind it.*
>
> As always, it is highly recommended that the trainer(s) experiment with the following exercises and comments before doing the training, if this spares him or her the embarrassment of having the points flop.

What are the ideas that inform eye-work? We store different sorts of information in different parts of our brain. Our eyeballs travel to different corners of our eye sockets depending on the information that is to be retrieved. So for example, if I'm trying to remember what I had for breakfast the day before yesterday, on their accord my eyes will veer to the left at about a 30-degree angle above the horizon. If I'm trying to figure out where I'll be next fall, my eyes will veer towards the right, at about a 30-degree angle below the horizon. The complexities of the neurobiology contained in these observations need not detain us here, although I urge anyone interested to pursue the question in greater depth. What's important for Rhetoric Fellows and their fellowees is to understand that:

a) If their mind goes blank in the middle of a speech—they can't remember what they were going to say, or they can't remember a date or a name—then they should relax, think about the question genuinely and let their eyes swivel at their own pace to wherever that information is stored. It's easy for us to panic; we saw earlier that our neck and tongue muscles tense and that we stop breathing. We also freeze our eyes in a certain position that is not amenable to our retrieving some piece of information. So the lesson to learn is not that we need to memorize the different angles at which our eyes rest given past, future, or imaginal sorts of information but that these angles exist. If we're stuck, but we know in what way we have become stuck, we can relax our eyes. Is that overly naïve or quixotic?

b) When we're not listening, we look like we're not listening. Our eyes are elsewhere. Even if our audience or interlocutor hasn't a clue that the upper right corner of our eye socket retrieves x sort of information which is entirely unrelated to the speech, subconsciously (there it is again, that word!), he or she can tell that we are absent.

Exercise: Ask the trainees to think about what they had for breakfast on Monday last. Then ask them to picture one of the bathrooms at their parents' house: where is the extra toilet paper *stored? How much is 23 x 3? The trainer can think up a number of questions of this sort; what's important is that the questions call up different sorts of information—past, present, future, spatial, verbal, numerical, geometrical, imaginal, problem-solving... The trainer can choose to make the purpose of the exercise explicit at any point, but preferably after having posed at least a couple of questions. If the trainees know what they're looking for before they begin, then they may be less willing to recognize the phenomenon (viz., that our eyes travel to different parts of our eye sockets when retrieving different sorts of information from our brains). Or, they will believe that the phenomenon is true, but it is less likely to sink in and be useful to them in the future.*

> *NOTE: The purpose of this exercise is not to teach the trainees anything that they didn't already know, since the fact that we store different sorts of information in different parts of our brain is well known and the fact that our eyes move around when we're thinking is easy to recognize. Rather, the purpose of the exercise is to take five or ten minutes to have the trainees act out this information. The idea is that our bodies are intelligent and operate their own memory system. Having done something such as looked to the right or to the left and retrieved left- or right-brain information is entirely different from reading about doing this—ask a dancer, an actor or a musician, and they will attest to the same. Because we are dealing with public speaking, which is performative, we must practice on our feet, or we won't remember. In a public speaking situation, our body must be programmed to act in a certain way—it must learn a new sort of instinct.*

Alternate exercise: Ask the trainees to look towards the upper left and imagine a house (or an apple, or whatever the trainer sees fit). Then ask the trainees to look towards the upper right and imagine a house (or an apple...). What differences do the trainees detect? Sample answers might be that on one side, the house is more stick-like, or three-dimensional, it might be in color, not in color, photograph-like, recognizable, unknown... Can the trainees walk through this house? Can the trainees hold it in their hands, or is it bigger than they are? The images generated will depend on whether the trainee is appealing to the right or left side of their brain. The trainer and trainees may choose to experiment with all nine main eye positions: up, upper right, right, lower right, down, lower left, left, upper left, and straight ahead.

Again, the purpose of the exercise is:
a) In general, to drill into the trainees' bodies the notion that our thoughts and ideas are inextricably linked to our body positions, and
b) In particular, to show that our thoughts and ideas depend on our eye positions but that if we're stuck in a rut when we're preparing or delivering a speech, we can become unstuck by shifting our eye position.

7) Vocal work: Projection

Listening to a speaker who is muttering can be an infuriating experience. How can we train ourselves to project so that our voice fills a large classroom or an auditorium without our having to use a microphone?

Proper vocal training calls for weeks of work—obviously not possible in these circumstances. But if a vocal expert can be found who is willing to offer a workshop for the fellows, jump on the opportunity. In the meantime, here are some basics, enough perhaps to whet the appetite of the trainees and encourage them to seek further information.

Although Rhetoric Fellows rarely will have to deal with microphones, a few considerations may be in order, if the trainees are interested:
What sort of microphone will allow the speaker to move most comfortably? This depends on the speaker's propensity to move when he or she speaks.
The dancing speaker. If the speaker knows that he or she paces, or that he or she sways wildly when the subject matter becomes exciting, then a standing microphone or a microphone fixed to a podium might feel cumbersome. The speaker will periodically stray from the microphone area and the sound will be lost. This sort of speaker might opt for a small microphone that she can pin onto her shirt.
The self-conscious speaker. If the speaker knows that he or she gets nervous and feels self-conscious about his or her body (we hope that some of this self-consciousness will be eliminated during the Rhetoric Fellows training!), then a fixed microphone might work better, and a microphone fixed to a podium might work best.
The gesticulating speaker. This speaker uses his hands and arms grandiloquently. A hand-held microphone spells disaster, since the speaker would move the microphone away from his mouth at every gesture; half the sound is lost.
What else?

Reminder: In the previous day's work, we discussed free airflow for breath. The same principles hold for sound (upright spine; neck, shoulders and tongue relaxed).

Exercise: The trainees should stand, legs shoulder-width apart and arms hanging loosely by their sides. They should relax their tongues and lips and exhale: if their abdominal muscles are relaxed, their lips will vibrate. The trainer should have them start with a low hum, which they will open to an Ahhhhhh. They should imagine the Ahhh as a tunnel of sound that projects forward to the wall opposite, through the wall opposite, through to the room that is beyond the wall opposite or outside the building, continuing through to the next street. They should sustain the Ahhh, taking breaths when necessary, and at the sign of the trainer, bring the Ahhh back through this tunnel, in a reverse trajectory. The same should be repeated through the trainees' backs so that they imagine first a hum and then an Ahhh sound projecting behind them through the wall, the next room, the outdoors into the next block, and back again. The same should be practiced up through the top of the head and down into the bowels of the earth.

8) Self-Expansion (Presence)
This last segment of our training on body language may be the trickiest, but also the most intriguing. Actors learn to fill a space when they are on stage. They may expand themselves to fit or to surpass the room, as they do with their voice. And they may nuance this expansion during the performance so that they fill more or less space relative to the other actors on stage at key points. Or they may tailor this expansion to an audience's distance in the space or receptivity on a given night. Let me give a more mundane example of this process: when we walk down the street or enter a room, we carry around us a protective bubble—our personal space, or private space. We may carry this bubble around us at all times, but we are more aware of it when other people, all of whom also carry bubbles, are in the space with us. Our bubbles

clash, or don't clash. We may feel that individuals who rub us the wrong way intrude on our bubble. Conversely, we may greet other individuals into our bubble. Our bubbles are always expanding or contracting, hardening or melting, and most often we're completely unaware of them.

(Americans who travel abroad often feel tense when people are standing too close to them: we live in large, open spaces and carry voluminous bubbles.) What happens when someone walks into a room, even silently, and we think we sense their presence? Or what happens when we seem to detect the presence of someone close behind us even though we can't see him or her? Their breathing, or creaks in floors and chairs help, obviously, as might pheromones. (Watch the biologists in the group tear my theories to bits. Do they have thoughts to add?) How come some people seem to fill up a room as soon as they walk in the door and others might sit for hours in a corner and you wouldn't have noticed they were there?

Even if we have no answers, what can we do with these observations? Check into a loony bin, or into a society for the advancement of yogic enlightenment. Or we can learn to work our bubbles, or presence—to fill the space between our bubble and us so that that space is not hollow but full, and so that it projects outwards into the auditorium or classroom.

Exercise [Variations on the Vocal Projection exercise]: Stand, feet shoulder-width apart, arms hanging loosely by your side. Now imagine that a gold rope is attached to the top of your skull and gently pulls your head and spine up from the top. Feel each vertebra, from the top of your butt-bone all the way through to the top of your neck-bone stretch upwards, away from the vertebra immediately below it, so that each vertebra stacks itself neatly but airily on top of the one below it.

Remember to breathe, and remember to relax your shoulders, neck, tongue and eyes.

Now imagine that your feet begin to grow roots—little ones, like veins, and these veins infiltrate the [carpet, if there is one,] the floorboards, [the floor below, if there is one], the dirt, gradually thickening until they gain the thickness of thick tree roots, and sink deeper into the first crust of the Earth, down into the second, thicker, then down into the magma substance that encircles the pit of the Earth, and finally into the pit. [The trainer now has the trainees traverse the same, in reverse.] [The trainer has the trainees drop the gold rope that was pulling their head, neck and spine up.]

Feedback? Did the trainees feel the pull, or the roots? This is an exercise for the imagination; everyone will not play with the same intensity. That's cool too.

Optional, additional exercise: Stand, as before, but this time imagine a horizon line in front of you that is the first row of an audience. See their faces—are they familiar faces? Hostile? Friendly? Older or quite young? Now imagine the second row behind them, and the third, and fourth. Wash over this audience with a gush of blue, so that they appear cold and stony. Now imagine that a small, hot red light burns in the pit of your belly. It expands slowly until it fills your ribcage, your pelvis, down through your thighs, knees, calves, ankles, feet, and into the *floorboards [...see above], then up through your shoulders, arms, hands, fingers, then your neck and head, until the hot, red light comes with renewed force from your belly out through your mouth in the shape of an ahhhhhh, and the ahhhhh infiltrates the audience first in the front row, so that they imbibe the hot, red light, slowly melt, and turn red too, then to the second, and third, and fourth rows. Now gently pull the red light back in through your mouth [etc., in reverse, until it has resumed the shape of a little ball].*

Feedback?

Conclusion/Questions: Today's work was probably more elusive than the work from the day before, but hopefully it will encourage fellows to approach public speaking from multiple angles. The imagination—the capacity to conjure images, or to visualize situations—cannot be overestimated in performance situations of any sort.
Key terms: eye-freeze vs. eye-loquence [haha, terrible neologism], sound canals, resonance (vocal), presence.

Preview for the next session: We have seen the body, now we will turn to the body's relationship to the space it inhabits—its situation. We will look at more mundane aspects of public speaking such as managing physical objects.

Evaluation

Rhetoric Fellow Training: Session 5
SPATIAL ORGANIZATION

***Objective*:** In this session, trainees will learn to manage place and space in various classroom situations. Emphasis will be placed on the relation between the speaker's body and the room, and by implication between the speaker and the audience. Potential props or obstacles (objects) in the room will also be addressed.

Synopsis:
- Introduction. 5 minutes.
- Part I. 90 minutes. The Space and its Implications.
- Part II. 15 minutes. Objects in the Room.
- Conclusion, Wrap-up/Preview and Evaluation. 10 minutes.

PART I: The Space and its Implications: Most often, we will not have control over what sort of classroom we're speaking in, but being aware of the dynamics that that classroom commands allows us to play them up or down, or to manipulate whichever elements are flexible.

In EL195, we learn to distinguish teacherly from cooperative educational models. The spectrum between these two poles is immense and informs any public speaking situation.

> *NOTE: The trainers may choose to brainstorm with the trainees first. Hopefully, the group will come up with more or different situations than those outlined below. These should serve as a mere guide. The trainer may choose to brainstorm the relational implications of these situations at the same time, for example on the other half of a chalkboard split down the middle. Or, the trainer may choose to brainstorm the relational implications of the situations after, once the purely physical characteristics of the situations have been described.*

Examples of classroom situations, their implications, and tactics for manipulating them:
- The auditorium, with audience higher than speaker: the speaker is in the pit of the auditorium, facing the audience; the audience is raked, as in a concert hall.
  In this situation, the audience has power over the speaker; the speaker looks small to someone sitting in the back row.

  Pros and cons of this situation and tactics for dealing with it: The speaker should project to the wall opposite him or her, and even beyond it. The speaker may choose to use bold visuals to complement the speech.

  In an extreme situation, such as Solomon 101 (I doubt many fellows or fellowees will be speaking in such a space, but power to whoever does, and we may as well prepare for it), the speaker will have to account for the gap between him or herself and the audience. This means that arm motion, hand gestures and sweeps of the head (which acknowledge all members of the auditorium) may be amplified slightly—in magnitude, not frequency. But note too that finer, precise movements may be most effective in such a setting: a speaker on a large stage in a large room, if he stands stable, commands our attention. Slightly amplified but painstakingly precise gestures—more precise, or acute, than usually—punctuate his speech. We may call this tactic gestural articulation.

In an unusually large space, the speaker should expand herself as in Session 4 above.

- The stage, with the speaker elevated on a small or a large platform. The speaker has power over the audience. This is a teacherly setup: the speaker looks down onto the audience.

  Pros and cons of this situation and tactics for dealing with it: The speaker may choose to counteract the dynamic imposed by this situation by sitting on a table if one is available. This not only brings him closer to eye-level with the audience; it also makes the setup more casual. If there is enough space between the small stage and the rest of the classroom, the speaker may choose to step off the stage entirely. Alternatively, the speaker may decide that the small stage setup is appropriate to his presentation, for example if he is imparting information on the audience but doesn't care to interact with them—by calling on them to participate, to answer questions, etc. (We don't encourage this type of presentation in the program, but we are loathe, too, to discount any situation entirely!) If a discussion session follows, the speaker may choose to step down into the audience.

- The panel discussion. Usually, the speakers sit or stand in a broken line or a clump in front of the audience. The panelists should decide whether they want to stand up when it is their turn to speak.

  Pros and cons of this situation and tactics for dealing with it: The panelists must listen to each other. Because the panelists are facing the audience, their inattention will distract the audience and (subconsciously?) will invite them to be inattentive as well; this is the herd phenomenon. If the speakers aren't engaged in what their colleagues have to say, why should the audience be any more so? The argument is flawed: some audience members will pay close attention to a speaker they find interesting regardless of whether the speaker's colleagues are picking their earwax or reminiscing about a roommate's green bean casserole.

  Again, we want to minimize distraction, and since the law of the jungle compels us to watch moving targets—that's why TVs in bars can be so aggravating: they monopolize our attention—squirming panelists must be shot. Just kidding. But too much motion on the part of non-speaking members of the panel may detract from the speaking member of the panel. The lesson to learn is that speaking is not enough to monopolize the audience's attention. Anyone who has had a latecomer walk in on her speech or class can attest to this: the moving target will co-opt her audience's attention long enough to interrupt her train of thought.

  Solution: Listen to your fellow speakers, and the whole session will be more enjoyable! Or, swivel your chairs slightly so that the panelists are at a diagonal, slightly turned in towards the other panelists.

- The round-table. In a seminar situation, the speaker may sit at the head of an oval, round, rectangular or square table. The speaker should decide whether he or she wants to maintain a speaker/audience division (hierarchy) and sit at the head of the table, or whether he or she prefers to mingle, as it were, in the group. The position of the professor in this situation should also be taken into account: where does he usually sit and does that position help him to monopolize the group's discussion? Will sitting in that position shift the burden to the student almost automatically? Is the professor likely to back off? These questions seem obvious, but a fellowee who does not strategize before class may find herself scrunched at the corner of a table and fighting for attention more than if she were sitting at the head. All it takes is two minutes of planning and five to ten minutes to arrive early to class. Banal as it may sound, it is the Rhetoric Fellow's job to ensure that the fellowee takes this trivial consideration to heart.

- What other spatial arrangements exist in classrooms at Brown and how can we use them to our advantage?

NOTE: Pacing can work to your advantage if, for example, you stop right before delivering earth-shattering remarks and start pacing again right after. The audience will hold their breath when you stop; their attention is focused, and still. They will relax slightly as you begin to pace again. But make sure you don't speak to your chest or to your hands when you pace, because the chances are great that you will lose your audience. Bring them in, look at them, as you would if you were facing front.

PART II: Objects in the room. The goal is to minimize distraction.

NOTE: The trainer may choose to omit this section or to broach it during an ongoing training session. In any case, it may be treated briefly. If the trainer feels so compelled, she may demonstrate the various situations as she outlines them. This will provide extra stimulus to this section of the program and offer a visual as well as a verbal cue for the fellows-in-training to remember to bring this up with their fellowees. We recommend that the trainer ask the trainees whether they have questions or situations to add to the ones outlined.

This section may also seem trivial, but two minutes spent discussing the following points with a fellowee will help reduce unnecessary distractions at the time of the presentation.

Points to consider:
- Is there a table at the front of the room?
- If so, where does the fellowee want to stand in relation to it?
- Does he want to use it as a prop table, for maps and other objects he intends to use during the presentation?
- Does he feel more comfortable standing behind something, rather than exposed to his audience?
- If he intends to use a map or to write on the blackboard, will he have to navigate around chairs, tables, or a podium?
- Erase irrelevant information on chalkboards before you start!
- Where can he best set up his computer, if he needs quick and easy access?
- What else?

***Conclusion/Questions*:**
- Minimize distraction.
- Props: Use 'em or lose 'em!

- Plus un texte est riche, plus la musique de l'acteur doit être pauvre (Étienne Decroux): More a text is rich, more the actor (speaker) must restrain his or her performance.

***Preview*:** Thanks for giving your all during the training. The next Rhetoric Fellows event will be the [insert event: lecture, Career Services Presentation Skills workshop...].

Evaluation

Rhetoric Fellows Training: Session 6
PRESENTATION SKILLS WITH CAREER SERVICES

Objective: To familiarize the Fellows with real world interview situations and to generate a game plan for the Presentation Skills workshop to be held with Career Services.

Synopsis: This session will be divided into two parts: first, a training session for the Rhetoric Fellows to prepare to meet the Brown Community and second, the Rhetoric Fellows/ Brown Community interface—not that Rhetoric Fellows do not belong to the Brown Community. The two parts should be spread over two days.

Preparatory session for Rhetoric Fellows. 1h30.
- Introduction and logistics. 10 minutes.
- Fellows' introductions. 10 minutes.
- Fellows' introductions revisited. 15 minutes.
- Preparation for leading small groups, or reconsideration of the issues to be addressed. 45 minutes.
- Conclusion, Preview and Evaluation. 10 minutes.

Training for Brown students (to be lead by Rhetoric Fellows). 1h30.
- Introductions. 10 minutes.
- Structuring a speech. 15 minutes.
- Body language. 15 minutes.
- Small-group activity. 45 minutes.
- Evaluation. 5 minutes.

NOTE: This session should be conducted late in the semester, in conjunction with the Career Services Presentation Skills workshop. If the Rhetoric Fellows Program or Career Services decides not to offer the Presentation Skills workshop, then the preparatory session may be called off. If the workshop is held, then we leave it to the discretion of the Rhetoric Fellows and program directors whether to make the preparatory session and training optional for Rhetoric Fellows. In either case, Fellows must commit to attend both the training and the workshop, unless otherwise noted by the trainers and/or program directors. When planning this session, trainers should take into account the interview-training workshop held for all fellows in the second semester, and tailor the material covered to that workshop so as to avoid redundancy.

We found that fellows who chose to engage in this workshop learned a lot from the exercise, which may be more practical, or less directly academic than any other portion of the Rhetoric Fellows program to date. Plus, it's fun.

PART I: Preparatory Session for the Rhetoric Fellows

NOTE: This session may be conducted casually, as a discussion rather than a lesson. As usual, the trainers may find that the fellows generate new material or raise concerns different from those outlined below. Power to that.

1) Trainers' Introduction and Logistics
- Word of welcome: The Rhetoric Fellows should be prepared for harsh judgment. Job interviewing can be excessively nerve-racking and the participants in the Career Services workshop will probably feel far more insecure, pressured or apprehensive than in a classroom situation. On the other hand, they may care more and participate all the more keenly than if they were simply assigned to a class that happened to have Rhetoric Fellows.
- Logistics: When/Where the workshop will be held and how long it will last.

2) Fellows' Introductions
Fellows should state briefly their experience interviewing for jobs, fellowships, internships, as interviewers or interviewees, and the areas in which they acquired this experience (medicine, publishing, computer science, education...). If participants have not interviewed or been interviewed, they should indicate their areas of interest.

3) Practice introducing selves
Lesson: We learn that listeners form an impression of a speaker in the first twenty seconds, perhaps before the speaker even opens her mouth. Likewise, the workshop participants will judge the workshop leaders quickly and harshly, not least because they are nervous about finding a job or an internship and may eye their peers—the fellows, but also the other workshop participants—with mixed feelings. This unease can be dispelled quickly in the fellows' introductory statements, if these are delivered with clarity, grace and concision.

Exercise: The fellows should introduce themselves in turn to the group, selecting relevant information such as years and/or classes rhetoric fellowing, experience with interviews... (see section 1 below).
Did some fellows stumble? Ramble? Mumble? Speak in question marks rather than periods? Exhibit arrogance or spinelessness?

PART II: Training for Brown Students (to be lead by Rhetoric Fellows)

The format for the workshop is open. We divided it into two parts, the first of which we subdivided also into two parts.
1. Theory
- Preparing a Speech
- Body Language
2. Practice

1) Introductions
10 minutes, courtesy of Rhoda and/or the director of Career Services, and the Rhetoric Fellows: name, concentration, interview experience, career interests.

I. **Structuring a Speech. 15 minutes. Most of the material covered here relates to structuring and researching a speech. Please refer to the first and second workshops for details.**

II. **Body Language. 15 minutes. Most of the material covered here is from the two sessions on Body Language in the Rhetoric Fellows' training. Please refer to that section for details.**

- Breathe!
- Speak in sentences: Kélina's anecdote of the spaghetti vs. the macaroni:
  Nervous speakers often blurt long strings of phrases and words, usually linked with coordinating or subordinating conjunctions but almost never broken up with periods. The effect for the audience member is that of a looooong spaghetti that she aspirates and aspirates and aspirates until near suffocation. Preferable to the long spaghetti is the macaroni, which she can eat in more manageable bits.
- Get to the point
- Definitiveness is your friend. Are you really sure you want the job? Or do you think maybe you don't perhaps maybe want the job?
- Spine! No mollusks need apply. Slouching, like overarching, will block your air canals and make you sound weak.
- Hands
- Vocal Power
- Stance: Feet shoulder-width apart, arms by your side. Exercise of pushing your neighbor over (see Body Language: Day 1: Trunk of Body).
- Repeat yourself, especially key words. Emphasize them by pausing right before or right after.
- Beginning and end points: never, ever trail off into a sort of… self, uh doubt

II. Practice: Divide the workshop participants into groups of about 3 or 4, with one fellow per group, depending on the number of fellows and participants present.

NOTE: The trainers and trainees may decide to divide the Career Services group according to areas of interest or preparedness. For example, the group may separate according to career paths (law, medicine, communications, graduate school…) or to type of interview (inter-university, business…). However, we found that dividing the Career Services group into random subgroups allowed students who were less experienced or focused to learn from those who were more so and that in any case, Brown students are so multitalented that to dividethem into interest groups was irrelevant.

Activity 1: Each group retreats to a separate room. The participants introduce themselves, in turn. The fellow 'fellows' this introduction, preferably soliciting feedback from the other members of the group first.

Points to look out for:

- Concision: Did the speaker state information only as it related to the position desired?

- Getting to the point: Did the speaker ramble circuitously and forever before stating his name, qualifications and interest?
- Eye contact
- Vocal projection
- Presence
- Apologetic tone or stance, or over-assured (arrogant) tone or stance
- Structure, especially final summary
- Beginning and end points

NOTE: As in any fellowing situation, the fellow should organize her comments mentally before delivering them to the fellowee. Easy methods for organizing comments are 1) content or information delivered verbally, and 2) form or information conveyed non-verbally.

Activity 2: Sheila's scenario. The head honcho of Firm We're The Best is stuffing a muffin down her throat at the Blue Room right before zipping off to the airport. You have just sat in her presentation and are dying to introduce yourself—this could be your lucky break! What do you say? Remember: her mouth is full, so for thirty-five seconds her attention can be yours, if you snatch it with enough zest. Remember too that she will not give you a job or an internship in the Blue Room, in those thirty-five seconds, but she may agree to listen long enough to remember you for later. Finally, making a favorable impression in the Blue Room in thirty-five seconds is not enough, even if she gives you her card; you want her to remember one thing about you—just one—so that when you do make contact, she knows who you are and will listen.

Alternative Activity: Hand shake
In the same small groups, workshop participants can practice shaking hands with fellow participants or with the fellow and introducing themselves succinctly, firmly and memorably. Feedback should be delivered as above.
Points to look out for:
- Firm clasp, wet, dry,
- Eye contact: shifty? laughing? Narrow eyes? Frightened eyes? The participants may list and qualify various eye types.
- What else?

Evaluation
The groups do not need to reconvene.

Arnold, Carroll C. "Oral Rhetoric, Rhetoric, and Literature." In Contemporary Rhetoric. Ed. Douglas Ehninger. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1972, pp. 60-70.

Braithwaite, Dawn O. "'Anyone Can Teach Speech, Right?' Impact of Speaking Across the Curriculum on the Discipline." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, Nov. 1988. (xeroxed)

Britton, James. "Language and Intention." in Prospect and Retrospect: Selected Essays of James Britton, Pt. II, ed. Gordon M. Pradl. Montclair NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1982, pp. 71-145. (re. relationship between speech and cognitive structures, hence learning)

Cannon, W. W. and C. V. Roberts. Communication Education Across the Curriculum: The Plan and the Actuality." Paper presented at the Conference on English Education, Analheim, March, 1981.

Cannon, W. W. and C. V. Roberts. "Teaching Communication in Content Area Courses: Another Functional Use of the Liberal Arts Curriculum." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Pittsburgh, April, 1981.

Carroll, Joyce Armstrong. "Talking through the Writing Process." English Journal, 70 (Nov. 1981), 100-102. (xeroxed)

Cayer, Roger L., and Renee K. Sacks. "Oral and Written Discourse of Basic Wirters: Similarities and Differences." Research in the Teaching of English, 13 (May, 1979), 121-128.

Connors, Robert J. "The Differences Between Speech and Writing: Ethos, Pathos, and Logos." College Composition and Communication, 30 (October, 1979), 285-290.

Cooper, P. and K. Galvin. "Designing Faculty Seminars for Incorporating Speech in the General Curriculum." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association , Cincinnati, April, 1986.

Currier, Cathy, and Christy Frisky, "Speaking Across the Curriculum: Project Guide Book and Sample Assignments." Tucson, AX: Pima Community College, 1987.

DePauw University. A Report on the Final Year (1982-83) and After of DePauw University's Project to Enhance Teaching and Learning Skills Within a Liberal Arts Environment. Report to the Lilly Endowment. 1983.

Dukes, J. "Speaking Across the Curriculum: Integrating Speech Throughout the College Curriculum." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Cincinnati, April, 1986.

Dukes, Janice L., and Lyle Flint. "Speaking Across the Curriculum: Teacing Colleagues in Other Disciplines to Instruct Speech Communication Courses." St. Mary-of-the Woods College, July 1987.

Dyson, Anne Haas. "The Role of Oral Language in Early Writing Processes." Research in the Teaching of English, 17 (Feb 1983), 1-30.

Einhorn, Lois, "Oral and Written Style." The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 43 (Spring, 1978), 302-311.

Emig, Janet. "Writing as a Mode of Learning." College Composition and Communication, 28 (May 1977), 122-128.

Erlich, Howard, and Mary Lynch Kennedy. "Skills and Content: Coordinating the Classroom." Journal of Developmental and Remdial Education, 6 (1982), 24-27.

Farrell, Thomas J. "Differentiating Writing from Talking." College Composition and Communication, 29 (Dec. 1978), 346-350.

Gaff, Jerry G. General Education Today: A Critical Analysis of Controversies, Practices, and Reforms. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1983.

Gibson, James W., Charles R. Gruner, Robert J. Kibler, and Francis J. Kelly. "A Quantitative Examination of Differences and Similarities in Written and Spoken Messages." Speech Monographs, 33 (Nov, 1966), 444-451.

Griffin C. W. "Programs for Writing Across the Curriculum: A Report. College Composition and Communication 36 (1985)398-403.

Halpern, Jeanne W. "Differences Between Speaking and Writing andTheir Implications for Teaching." College Composition and Communication, 35 (Oct. 1984), 345-357. (xeroxed)

Hay, Ellen. A. "Communication across the Curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, Nov. 1987.

Hirsch, Jr., E. D. "Distinctive Features of WRitten Speech." in The Philosophy of Composition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977, pp. 14-32.

Hymes, Dell. "Speech and Language: On the Origins and Foundations of Inequality Among Speakers." Daedalus, 102 (Summer, 1973), 59-85.

Kroll, Barry M., and Roberta J. Vann, ed. Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrasts. Urbaba, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981.

Lerstrom, Alan C. "After the Honeymoon: Maintaining the Communication Across the Curriculum Program." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, Nov., 1988.

Loacker, G., L Cromwell, J. Fey, and D. Rutherford. Analysis and Communication at Alverno: An Approach to Critical Thinking. Milwaukee: Alverno College, 1984.

Mix, C. Rex. "But Can They Teach Speech." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, Nov., 1987.

Modaff, John and Robert Hopper, "Why Speech is Basic." Communication Education 53 (1984): 37-42. (re. speech promotes learning, etc)

Moffett, James. Active Voice: A Writing Program Across the Curriculum. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1981.

Newman, John B., and Milton W. Horowitz. "Writing and Speaking." College Composition and Communication, 16 (Oct. 1965), 160-164.

Olson, David R. "From Utterance to Text: The Bias of Language in Speech and Writing." Harvard Educational Review, 47 (Aug. 1977), 257-281.

Ong, Walter J. Orality anbd Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. New York: Methuen, 1982.

Ong, Walter. "Media Transformations: The Talked Book." In Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 82-91.

Palmerton, Patricia R. "Speaking Across the Curriculum: Threat, Opportunity or Both?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, Nov., 1988.

Radcliffe, Terry. Talk-Write Composition: A Theoretical Model Proposing the Use of Speech to Improve Writing." Research in the Teaching of English, 6 (Fall, 1972), 189-199.

Roberts, C. V. "A Report of a Three Year Program in TEaching Communication Skills Across the Curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Nov. 1984.

Roberts, C. V. "Speaking and Listening Education across the Curriculum." In R. B. Ruben, ed. Improving Speaking and Listening Skills. San Fancisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Robinson, Jay L. "Basic Writing and Its Basis in Talk: The Influence of Speech on Writing." fforum, 4 (Fall, 1982), 73-83.

Rubin, Rebecca B., and Elizabeth E. Graham, "Communication Correlates of College Success: An Exploratory Investigation." Communication Education 37 (1988): 14-27.

Sawyer, Thomas M. "Why Speech Will Not Totally Replace Writing." College Composition and Communication, 28 (Feb. 1977), 43-48.

Snipes, Wilson Currin. "Oral Composing as an Approach to Writing." College Composition and Communication, 24 (May, 1973), 200-205.

Steinfatt, Thomas M. "Communication Across the Curriculum." Communication Quarterly, 34 (1986) 460-470.

Steinfatt, Thomas M. "Communication as Education: Implementing a Communication Program Across a Non-communication Curriculum." Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Nov. 1986.

Tannen, Deborah, ed. Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy. Vol. 9 in Advances in Discourse Processes Series. Ed. Roy O. Freedle, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1982.

Tannen, Deborah. "Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives." Language, 58 (March 1982), 1-21.

Vygotsky, Lev S. Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1962.

Walvoord, Barbara "Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication Across the Curriculum: Where We've Been and Where We're Going." Address at Cenral College, Pella, Iowa, September 7, 1985.

Wanguri, Deloris McGee and Henry L. Roubicek, "Communication Across the Curriculum: An Alternative Approach." Paper present to the Speech Communication Association Convention, Nov. 1988, New Orleans. (xeroxed)

Weiss, R. O., " Rhetoric Invades Reality: Public Address Research in 1977." Association for Communication Administration Bulletin #28 (1984): 34-38.

Weiss, R. O., "Discourse Fields Across the Curriculum. Paper Presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston, 1987.

Weiss, Robert O. "A University Program for Speaking and Listening Across Disciplines." Association for Communication Administration Bulletin. Issue #65 (1988) 79-84.

Weiss, Robert O. "Start-up Strategies For Speaking and Listening Across Disciplines." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, 1988. (xeroxed)

Weiss, Robert O. "Teaching Colleagues in Other Disciplines to Assess Communication Competency." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Nov. 1986.

Witt, Stanley P. "Beyond Writing-Across-the-Curriculum: The Communication Corps." in Writing Across the Curriculum in the Junior College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Wolff, L., "Enhancing speaking and Writing Across the Curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, 1987.

Zoellner, Robert. "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition." College English, 30 (Jan. 1969), 267-320. (xeroxed)