

DRAMATIC CONSEQUENCES: INTEGRATING PERFORMANCE INTO THE
WRITING CLASSROOM

by

LOREN LOVING MARQUEZ

Bachelor of Arts, 2000
Christopher Newport University
Newport News, Virginia

Master of Arts, 2002
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
AddRan College of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Texas Christian University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May, 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the careful attention to this study and contributions to my professional development of my dissertation director and committee. To my dissertation director, Ron Pitcock, I extend a warm thanks for his mentorship and guidance, as well as encouragement throughout the dissertation process and the job search. To my committee members, Carrie Leverenz, Richard Enos, and Daniel Williams, thank you for your close readings and provocative feedback. I do want to especially thank Richard Enos for helping me to “see the forest” during meetings and in feedback and pushing me to make larger connections about my study’s contribution to Composition and Rhetoric. A special thanks to Carrie Leverenz for her encouragement during my pregnancy and words of wisdom on being a mom and an academic. Daniel Williams was also especially supportive during this time as well. Thanks to Charlotte Hogg for her guidance and also to Bonnie Blackwell for her work as Director of Graduate Studies. I must also thank Elizabeth Hodges for introducing me to teacher-research and response during my MA program at VCU.

To my family, Mama and Deddy, my mother-in-law, Ruby and father-in-law, Frank, I want to thank you for your support and for taking care of Nate. To my mom and Ruby, thank you for making several trips to Texas and spending time with Paul, Nate and me. You allowed me to have free time to write and go to campus interviews. To my sister, Dana, thank you for your research advice and your understanding about what it means to be an academic.

My best friend, Garnet Gilmore, who provided childcare for Nate and listened to many conversations about deadlines and stress, thanks so much. I also want to thank Rayshelle Dietrich for being a constant source of encouragement and for being a details person. Thanks to Kirstin Cassell, Stacy Dees, and Kim Sutton for encouragement and prayers. To Erin Sagerson, Amy Hermanson, Sarah Yoder, Angela Gonzalez and Brian Fehler, thank you for being good friends during these years of graduate school and for celebrating with me along the way.

I have to acknowledge my faith and thanks to God for many answered prayers to get through this process while being a full-time mom. Finally, I want to thank Paul for being a supportive husband through this trying process (and for tolerating my less-than-lovable moments). And, for always being willing to take many writing breaks with me. All my love to my son, Nate, who is the joy of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | ii |
| INTRODUCTION: Dramatic Consequences: Integrating Performance into the Writing Classroom..... | 1 |
| CHAPTER ONE: Performance: A Lens into the Writing Classroom..... | 4 |
| CHAPTER TWO: Setting: Project Design and Methodological Framework..... | 46 |
| INTER-CHAPTER: Performing Writing: Students' Presentations and Written Reflections on Speaking and Writing..... | 81 |
| CHAPTER THREE: The Authors: Jenna and Brett..... | 88 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: The Experts: Caitlin and Andrew..... | 104 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: The Crowd Pleasers: Michael and D.W. | 121 |
| CHAPTER SIX: The Resistors: David and Alex..... | 140 |

CHAPTER SEVEN:
Performing in the Classroom and Beyond: Practical and
Theoretical Implications of Performance Pedagogy158

CONCLUSION.....191

APPENDICES.....195

WORKS CITED.....232

-Introduction-

In the fall of 2004, students in my sophomore argumentative writing class enrolled in what I now reflect on as a “speech and presentation intensive” semester. For example, to help the group comprehend the importance of oral rhetoric, as a class we watched and analyzed the Bush/Kerry Presidential Debates and discussed the purpose and effectiveness of each opponent's delivery. Translating what they had learned from this analysis assignment, students also delivered two major presentations based on two of their major writing assignments, one collaboratively, in which they discussed how to implement specific changes at Texas Christian University (TCU) as part of a project called the “Collaborative Proposal,” and the other individually, in which they critiqued a documentary film. Students presented usually a week and a half before their final papers were due. As students presented on their proposals and analyses, I found that when they adapted their texts into an oral medium, not only did they have to consider more literally and physically how to reach a direct and immediate audience, but also how to convey the information in an effective, clear, and timely manner. Ultimately, students who presented their writing through oral presentations were considered by the class and myself as the authority on the matter about which they were speaking and writing.

In order to construct an effective presentation, students took many of the conventions of writing such as having a thesis, attention to audience, clarity, selection of relevant material to support the argument, and writing with authority and applied these conventions to their oral presentations. Students were literally embodying the roles as speakers and audience members. In fact, many of the concepts—such as audience, committing to a thesis, supporting a claim—which I teach through the use of comments

on students' drafts or through models and lectures—were being performed, so to speak, as students delivered their analyses and proposals to the audience. I began to ask myself how the physical act of delivery, which involves both students speaking about as well as being physically present before their peers, augments students' writing and thinking. What was it about this interaction between speaker/writer and audience that “created” the presentation? What made it succeed, or not succeed? Were there any transferable writing lessons in this activity? This line of inquiry led me to design a project which investigated students' oral presentations of their writing and the connection to performance.

As a teacher who incorporates speeches, debates, skits and a general focus on speaking and audience in the writing classroom, I have come to understand these activities as performance-based and the classroom as a site of rich *performances*—not in the connotation of evaluation or students' mastery over a particular set of writing skills—but one which draws from its theatrical roots and augments the interrelationship among writing, speaking, and audience. This project looks at performance in the writing classroom to mean the use of students' physical as well as mental processes to convey their ideas to an audience of their peers to take on real roles as speakers and writers.¹ Specifically, this project explores two moments of performance in the college writing classroom: students' oral delivery of an argumentative-analysis, written assignment and students' written reflections on speaking and writing about their arguments.

My goal for the comparison of the oral presentation to students' reflections on their presentations is not to demonstrate validity or improvement in students' writing. For

¹ Noting the connection between performance and delivery, Virginia Skinner Linnenberg's *Dramatizing Writing* reconfigures the canon of delivery as: “the use of noetic and physical processes by which students can convey their ideas and life experiences to their peer audiences in an effort to develop the best writing they can achieve” (105).

I did not compare students' written work to their oral work, nor did I compare the quality of writing when they had performed their texts to when they did not. This study is an interpretive analysis of the incorporation of one performance-based activity into students' writing processes. That is, just like we can evaluate aesthetic performances, as with a play, and benefit greatly from such an analysis, so also can we use performance-based analysis and approaches to heighten sensitivity to the performative features that may enhance composition.

CHAPTER ONE

Performance:

A Lens into the Writing Classroom

The term *performance* has entered the vernacular of Composition Studies recently as a way to explore the connection between the body and mind in Composition theory. Scholars have used both the term and the concept of performance Drawing on Speech-Act theory and the works of Judith Butler, scholars in Composition have connected the body, gender, and performance in a triptych in Composition to theorize about power relations in the classroom between teacher and student. These recent discussions of performance and Composition reveal a separation between the body and mind evidenced in the ways scholars have theorized about the writing classroom as well as how teachers have approached the teaching of writing.

Investigating the *self* in students' personal/autobiographical writing, Thomas Newkirk's *The Performance of Self in Student Writing* (1997) argues that students' autobiographical, or personal writing, is a complex, cultural performance of the student. The student must negotiate the academic and institutional constraints with the *self* presented in his or her writing. Drawing on Erving Goffman's *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Newkirk infuses personal writing with a social dimension not typically associated with it. Situating personal writing as a cultural performance of *self*, Newkirk investigates how students write by taking on roles constructed by the audience (of teachers or the institution) and negotiated with their own personal experiences, or their values, beliefs, and backgrounds that they bring into the classroom.. Newkirk

reunites the body with the *self* in order to argue that personal writing has a social dimension. Using this unity between personal writing and social responsibility, Newkirk defends personal writing ultimately against critical pedagogies which negate the importance of personal writing. Anne Ruggles Gere also discusses the “cultural performances”² in personal writing by investigating the physicality of personal “voice” and silence. Gere’s “Revealing Silence: Rethinking Personal Writing” (2001) argues that personal writing is a “cultural performance” and silence is a powerful concept that can be taught through published works to bridge social, expressive, and psycho-analytical discourses. Newkirk’s and Gere’s works complicate the notion of *self* and authentic voice by looking at these terms as part of a cultural performance. Newkirk and Gere view personal writing as a performance of self to argue bridging often contentious pedagogical approaches.

What Newkirk and Gere point out is that there is a separation between the *self* (as used to define the personal) and the social/cultural significance of writing. Both use performance to bridge this gap. Further investigating this separation between self and culture in writing, Kristie Fleckenstein’s “Writing Bodies: Somatic Mind in Composition Studies” (1999) argues for a “somatic mind” in composition, one that blurs the boundaries between “sign and flesh, individual and other” (282). By taking into account the literal body when discussing the “presence” of student writers and the writing they produce, Fleckenstein draws upon characteristics inextricably linked with performance:

² Gere draws a definition of “cultural performance” from Barbara Myerhoff’s *Remembered Lives: The Walk of Ritual Storytelling and Growing Older* (1992). Myerhoff defines a cultural performance as “opportunities for appearing, an indispensable ingredient of being itself, for unless we exist in the eyes of others we may come to doubt even our own existence. Cultural performances are reflective. As heroes of our own dramas we are made self-aware...at once actor and audience” (104-5). This definition holds some of the same characteristics of how cultural performance is defined in performance theories, but focuses on the reflective and personal’s place in performance.

literal presence, the physicality of writing and delivery, voice, and self. The separation of the body from the mind in writing has consequences for the writing classroom. She proposes, “In sacrificing bodies to some illusion of either transcendent truth or culturally constructed textually, we cut ourselves adrift from any organic anchoring in the material reality of flesh” (281). Fleckenstein calls attention to the bifurcation of the embodied writer from the textually evoked writer in composition theory and pedagogy “as a means to focus on the constructedness of rhetorical subjectivity and to prevent naïve autobiography” (300). For example, Fleckenstein reads David Bartholmae’s argument in “Writing with Teachers” (1995), for the theoretical and pedagogical necessity of separating “the textually realized persona” from the “enfleshed writer” as a typical move in Composition theory and pedagogy, which asserts that “we need to dismiss the embodied writer as a means of focusing on the textual writer” (300). The debate over academic discourse is evident here: in order to understand how a student approximates the language of the discourse community the student is treated separately from the text. Fleckenstein’s argument also is reminiscent of Newkirk’s investigation of personal writing as a cultural performance, one that draws upon social and the personal to render a holistic construction of the writer. The field, according to Fleckenstein “cannot afford to dismiss the body and place of the writer” (301). Fleckenstein stresses the connection of the person who creates the text with the text, itself, as a corporal expression, or contextualization, of classroom practices.

Extending the notion of social performance and the body, more recent discussions of performance have investigated performance in order to theorize about teacher authority and question pedagogies which propose that they give students authority.

Drawing on the work of Judith Butler and gendered performances, Michel Gibson, Martha Marinara, and Deborah Meem's article, "Bi, Butch and Bar Dyke: Pedagogical Performances of Class, Gender and Sexuality" (2000) challenges radical pedagogies which constantly undermine teacher and students' "fixed identities" through the metaphor of performance (70). The authors who self-identify as "bisexual, butch, and dyke" respectively, investigate the power associated with their presentational (performed) identities and work against stereotypical and often "neutralized" interpretations of race, class and gender that are masked by the academy. Likewise, Jonathan Alexander's "Transgender Rhetorics: (Re)Composing Narratives of the Gendered Body" (2005) seeks to understand the narration of gender as a social construct by examining sample student writing generated by a prompt inspired by transgender theories. The author's analysis suggests how transgender theories can help students and instructors to consider gender as both material and embodied. These two works reveal how the self is a social construction constantly at play in the contexts of the classroom, holding implications for teaching and writing.

Performance as it has surfaced in Composition studies has illuminated the connection between body and mind, the cultural dimension of writing, as well as the political concerns inherent in power relationship between student and teacher. The works of Newkirk, Gere, Fleckenstein, Gibson, Marinara, and Meem as well as Alexander theorize about performance generally to make arguments about the place and identity of self (both teacher and student), pedagogies, the nature of the discipline, and authority/power relations between student and teacher.

Only recently, however, has performance, itself, been theorized about for its value in Composition. Culminating the work on performance that has been emerging in composition, Jenn Fishman and Andrea Lunsford's "Performing Writing, Performing Literacy" (2005) argues that "student writing is increasingly linked to theories and practices of performance" (224). This work provides an opportunity to explore the relationship between Composition and Performance Studies. As the authors investigate how students' uses of performance outside the classroom inform their writing practices inside the classroom, (a poetry slam and live radio broadcast are two examples) they ground their research in the relatively new field of performance studies, which "changed their reading of more familiar work in rhetoric and composition." Though the authors talk about literal "performances" outside the classroom, as opposed to more theoretical applications of performance, they propose that performance studies has much to contribute to Composition Studies because it offers "useful ways of theorizing the oftentimes slippery idea of 'performing,' which is both medium and act, noun and verb" (227).

Performance studies is a relatively new field of study which finds its roots in theatre, but also reaches across the disciplines and draws on some of the same concepts as Composition and Rhetoric. Performance studies, an interdisciplinary study of performance as social behavior, self awareness, and audience, is a relatively new field of study which presents provocative ways of looking at the writing classroom as a site of performance—students' writing performances, behavioral performances within the social context of the classroom and academy, the physicality involved in acts associated with writing, as well as the role of audience in writing. Both performance studies and

composition have similar histories of disciplinary emergence, resist the confines of a set "discipline," and investigate political and social acts.

Fishman and Lunsford apply performance and performance theory to writing and establish the connections between the activity of writing and the corporeality of the student writer. However, this link is ultimately used to further the authors' argument that performance needs to be "restored to writing and literacy" (227). The authors claim, "When young people perform writing they perform literacy, and their activities . . . exemplify the self-conscious, multimodal communication that distinguishes literate interaction today" (225). The authors establish a connection between Composition and Performance Studies to argue that performance is a literacy on which students can draw to inform their writing practices. Furthermore, the authors use this connection to make larger, more theoretical arguments about new media and performance and the scope of writing in the twenty-first century. Though the authors focus on two students' uses of performance outside the classroom, their uses of performance are discussed in general, theoretical ways as a call for researchers and practitioners to investigate performance(s) in the writing classroom and to define a rhetoric of performance.

Fishman and Lunsford look at how students' performance-based activities outside the classroom inform their writing inside the classroom to consider how the embodiment of writing and performance needs to be "considered in helping early college students learn vital lessons about literacy" (226). Fishman and Lunsford's establishment of this connection between the body and mind, Composition and performance, provides a rich and timely opportunity to answer the call for research on performance in the writing classroom. The authors note at the end of their article that they wish to hear of writing

classes which integrate speaking and performance into classroom practices. In fact, none of the research on composition and performance discusses the uses, purposes, and implications of integrating performances *in* the composition classroom. In my study of performance in the writing classroom, I bring a performance-based activity, the oral/visual presentation, *into* the classroom to look at the implications of how students embody real roles as speakers and writers in the college writing classroom. I look at the presentation as a performance-based act which draws on aspects of Composition, Delivery, Rhetoric, Communication and performance which all inform students' writing. Students who presented on their writing relied on their physical bodies, their intellect, and the interaction with the audience to perform in several different roles. Performance and Performance Studies becomes a new way of seeing the presentation as an activity of the writing classroom. I am using performance theory as a lens to study presentations because of the performative elements both implicit and explicit within the presentation, how performance theory has overt connections to the fields of rhetoric and composition, and how performance theory provides a fuller perspective of using the presentation in the writing classroom.

Performance: Historical Traditions in Rhetoric and Composition

Before moving on to my discussion of the integration of the presentation as a performance-based activity into the classroom, we must consider four historical traditions which provide a basis to view the presentation as a performance-based event and bring to light the fusion and separation of body and mind in Composition and Rhetoric, as well as the oral, literate and performative dimensions of Composition and

Rhetoric.³ The oral, literate, and performative dimensions of Composition allow it to be read through the lens of performance, which imbues the writing classroom with both aesthetic and social characteristics. The similar roots between Rhetoric and theatre, the canon of Delivery in Rhetorical History, elements of performance in Composition history, and the connections between speaking and writing suggest how the presentation possesses performance-based elements that are infused within these traditions and directly correlate to the writing classroom.⁴ My project establishes the rich, historical connection between the Composition classroom and performance in order to investigate the integration of a performance-based assignment, students' oral/visual presentations of their writing, and argues that a heightened sensitivity to performative features in the writing classroom will enhance Composition theory and pedagogy.

History of Rhetoric and Theatre

Rhetoric and theatre have similar historical origins that connect discourse that is used in the classroom to discuss writing with dramatic purposes and discourse. Rhetoric scholar George Kennedy's *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (1994) accounts for features of early Greek literature that anticipated the formulation of rhetoric in his conception of *metarhetoric*. Kennedy defines *metarhetoric* as "a theory of rhetoric in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. of the development of that theory throughout the Greco-Roman period, of the teaching of literary and oral comp in schools, and of Greek and

³ Douglas Ehninger's "On Systems of Rhetoric" synthesizes "three crucial eras in the development of Western rhetorical thought"--the classical, the late 18th century, and the 20th century (post-1930). He characterizes these periods as "grammatical," "psychological," and "social or sociological" (319-320).

⁴ These four historical traditions as I am noting them also represent four approaches throughout my graduate studies that influenced my connection of performance to writing and rhetoric.

Latin oratory as the primary rhetoric genre” (15). In the introductory chapter, “The Nature of Rhetoric,” Kennedy states that the term *rhetorike* originated in the circle of Socrates and first appears in *Gorgias*, and is defined as: the power of words and potential to affect situation. Richard Leo Enos discusses emerging notions of rhetoric in *Greek Rhetoric Before Aristotle* (1993) that are closely connected with theatre in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. *Aoidoi*, bards who weaved together or composed stories of heroic tales to honor gods, traveled throughout the countryside performing myths and histories of a culture through music and stories and helped to stabilize literature from tonal to structural (Enos 14-15).

Kennedy points to Aristophanes, Plato, and the bards whose dramas and dialogues presented a rhetorical consciousness closely connected to performance. For example, Plato’s friend, Aristophanes wrote a comedic work *Clouds* in which the overarching question is: should rhetoric be taught? *Clouds* emphasizes the weaker argument through trickery, making it appear as the stronger argument. The subject matter of *Clouds* is remarkably similar to what Plato’s dialogues, especially *Gorgias* address: What is the value of rhetoric?

As Kennedy and Enos point out, in the *Illiad* evidence of the connection between drama and rhetoric can be found in Phoenix teaching Achilles to be a speaker. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus gives a well-arranged speech; the Homeric Hymn to Hermes also demonstrates the connection between rhetoric and drama (Enos 13). Similarly, forensic rhetoric is used in the legal procedures in Aeschylus’ *Eumenides*. Speeches in Greek drama share many of the features of invention and style of contemporary oratory, which leads Kennedy to the conclusion that art symbolized connection between thought and

expression. Though Kennedy's work does not explicitly focus on theatre and drama as the evidence of the development of rhetoric, he sees these developments as *Signs of Rhetorical Consciousness*, a term which he describes as the emerging consciousness of speaker and audience in the fifth century. This theory of metarhetoric not only is demonstrated through Greek drama but also as Kennedy points out, in the logical parts of speeches, the experiment in rhetorical style, (anaphora, antithesis, etc.) and also can be demonstrated through looking at the emergence of the science of philology and grammar, as well as the increased writing. Thus, history provides an arguably interdisciplinary connection among dramatic performance, writing, and rhetoric.

Historically, before the advent of writing, history was "performed" by storytellers to music to aid memory. These performances had a purpose beyond entertainment; they recorded and preserved traditions of a culture. Notably, some of the same themes treated in Platonic dialogues are also treated in theatrical performances. Even in performances legal procedures were played-out (Aeschylus' *Oresteia* is a prime example) and social commentary was made. As a culture, the Greeks used performance to work out complex ideas, the same ideas as grappled with in what we now call the rhetorical tradition. This "rhetorical consciousness" that Kennedy terms possesses characteristics of performance that ultimately connect it to education and the wider culture and undeniably solidifying the link between rhetoric and performance that needs to be reintegrated into education, especially the writing classroom.

Delivery in Rhetorical History⁵

As the historical connections between theatre and rhetoric demonstrate how performance and rhetoric both are used for similar aims, the practice of having students “deliver” their writing has a tradition in classical rhetoric within the canon of delivery. Looking at delivery’s place in rhetorical history reveals how delivery has been both associated with both the body and the mind as well as has been viewed as either physical or intellectual. Virginia Skinner-Linnenberg’s *Dramatizing Writing: Reincorporating Delivery in the Classroom* (1997) traces the rhetorical history of delivery and its vacillation between being associated only the body’s movements and voice control and being associated with only the *noetic*, which is the mind or intellect. This tension between the two extremes “eventually distanced delivery from the other rhetorical canons (1 -2).⁶ Such vacillation, Skinner-Linnenberg notes, eventually separated the senses.

This tension between body and mind is evidenced throughout rhetorical history. For example, Plato’s *Cratylus* (428 – 347 BCE) discusses imitation as an educational persuasive strategy (Skinner-Linnenberg 2). Plato does not discuss “delivery” per se but does comment that speaker’s gesture and voice should be ruled by the rhetorical situation.

canon

For by bodily imitation only can the body ever express anything. . . . And when we want to express ourselves, either with voice or tongue, or mouth,

⁵ This discussion is intended for overview purposes to highlight the performance features of Delivery and is by no means a complete and specific history of the canon of Delivery. A good source for Rhetorical History is Bizzell and Herzberg’s *The Rhetorical Tradition*. John Frederick Reynolds’ *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery* is another good reference to gain an understanding of the canon of Delivery alone.

⁶ Cicero divided the canons of Rhetoric delegating invention, arrangement, and style to the written composition and memory and delivery to oral composition.

the expression is simply their imitation of that which we want to express.
(qtd. in Golden 29)

Physicality is essential for meaning-making; it is an expression of the mind. Plato fuses the body and mind, but subordinates the body to the mind. Truth, and its pursuit, is at the center of Platonic discourse. Sophistic rhetoric, in opposition to Platonist rhetoric, places eloquence as the goal of rhetoric. Physicality is important in both rhetorical views: for educational purposes in Platonist rhetoric, and to heighten eloquence and thereby persuasive tactics in sophistic rhetoric.

In Plato's view the mind and body were connected; his student, Aristotle centered on the ability to affect the audience, thus rendering two perspectives of rhetoric, one which focused on the deliverer and the other on the receiver of the delivery. Aristotle subordinated delivery and style, viewing delivery in Book III of *Rhetoric* not an "elevated subject of inquiry" (Bywater 165). Nevertheless, delivery had to be considered because the hearers may not be able to discern truth alone, perspicuity and "aptness of language is one thing that makes people believe in the truth of your story" (Bywater 179). Believability can be achieved through clarity and good diction, according to Aristotle. Aristotle also claimed that dramatic ability relied on natural talent; good diction could be taught systematically to affect delivery (Skinner-Linnenberg 179). Aristotle noted the reciprocal relationship between speaker and audience as well as the educational role of delivery, distinguishing it from drama.⁷

⁷ Theophrastus elevated the status of delivery in persuasive speaking and considered it the greatest tool an orator has at his disposal (George Kennedy *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1963. 282). Theophrastus focused on "knowledge as the key for correct delivery" (Skinner-Linnenberg 4).

Cicero (106- 43 BCE) placed importance on the speaker's ability in delivery. Cicero wrote on delivery in *De Inventione*, Book 1, that delivery was "the control of voice and body in a manner suitable to the dignity of the subject matter and style" (21). Cicero writes in *De Oratore*, his more mature work, that delivery has "the sole and supreme power in oratory; without it, the speaker of the highest mental capacity can be held in no esteem; while one with moderate abilities with this qualification, may surpass even those with the highest talent" (255). Cicero emphasized the character of the speaker. Yet, Cicero, like Aristotle, did not equate orators with actors and expressed disdain for the equation. The rhetor, "should not toil like actors at the study of gesture [. . .] after the manner of Greek tragedians" (229). There is an authenticity expected from a speaker.

Quintilian strove to connect delivery to knowledge and learning as well as orality and literacy. Linking the body and the mind with education, William Smail points out, "Quintilian even went as far as to suggest that students should practice dancing as an exercise to learn grace in movement" (63). Similar to Cicero, he expressed reservation for feigned expression in delivery. "Unlearned pleaders" who try to gain a reputation of speaking well only through delivery "raging like madmen with incessant action, panting and swaggering, and with every kind of gesture and movement . . ." (Bizzell and Herzberg 315). Rather, Quintilian believed that both the quality of written and oral expression in rhetorical education were paramount, fusing physicality with the mind.

Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian all distinguish in some way orators and speakers from actors and theatrics. In doing so, though, these rhetoricians distinguish the two kinds of performance by the rhetorical purpose and authenticity of the speaker. In rhetorical performances, gestures are used to authenticate the speaker's role, not for the speaker to

take on a different role. Physicality in this sense distinguishes “unlearned pleaders” from learned ones, and connects oratorical ability to something that can be taught both physically and intellectually. The speaker’s performance is critical to these three rhetoricians; for the speaker to be well-received by his audience, he must be authentic, above reproach, and of good character. Physicality can betray or augment the delivery. In their very act of distinguishing a speaker’s purpose, character, and use of the physical from that of the actor, these rhetoricians note that there is a need for such distinction. In both theatre and in the act of rhetorical delivery, the speaker or actor is relying on the audience to receive the speaker, the message, and to make meaning. The rhetorical tradition from Plato through Quintilian do not separate the physicality of delivery from the intellect involved in delivery. Though some may privilege intellect over the physicality, there is not a separation, but a tension between the body and mind. Both, however, are used for rhetorical and educational purposes. The performance aspects of delivery are also highlighted here: the speaker must have the power to affect the audience through his character, knowledge, and overall ability.

During the Second Sophistic, (2nd and 3rd century CE) a period James J. Murphy describes as a time of rhetorical excesses, was marked by the loss of freedom of speech as the Roman Senate steadily lost power until the Fall of the Roman Empire in 476 CE. How a thing was said became more important than what was said, inevitably breaking delivery from its democratic and civic roots and linking it to more ornamental and physical nature (Murphy 37-38). From Cicero to the Second Sophistic, delivery was theorized about differently, moving from the importance to affect an audience, to its importance in education, to its stylistic importance.

In Renaissance rhetoric, two major figures of interest with opposing views of delivery were Peter Ramus and Francis Bacon. Ramus relegated rhetoric to the study of style and “delivery,” specifically as the study of voice and gesture” (Skinner-Linnenberg 8). Bacon, however, viewed delivery as more noetic, that is making knowledge visible and hence deliverable to an audience (Howell *Logic* 371). Bacon linked the visuality, or presence of a speaker, with the audibility of the speaker’s voice. He contended that “gesture and countenance were mirrors of the mind” (Skinner-Linnenberg 10). Bacon’s contention that gesture and countenance were mirrors of the mind echoes Plato’s sentiment that the body cannot express anything without the mind. Bacon and Ramus provide two opposing views of delivery, the latter one which is primarily physical in nature, the former is an amalgamation of both physicality and intellect. These two opposing views represent, too, how delivery came to be associated with physicality. Both views, however, reveal performance-based characteristics that infused education: the study of style as related to the body, and the embodiment of knowledge reflected in the speaker who was a literal, visual presence before an audience. The purpose of the physicality involved in delivery is also held in tension with these two viewpoints. Bacon’s view places physical expression as the mirror or reflection of the mind. Ramus sees the physicality of performance in and of itself, a subject to be studied.

The Elocutionary Movement and its proponents can be divided into those who possessed a more Ciceronian view of a good man speaking well and those, like Ramus, who tied delivery and oral rhetoric primarily to stylistic concerns. Thomas Sheridan, who gave up a career as an actor to devote himself to elocution and correcting language (Skinner-Linnenberg 13) placed an emphasis on delivery as if it were the only “part of

ancient rhetoric of importance” (Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric* 228). Sheridan used the term *conversation* to advise the orator how to treat public speaking and “focused on the use of natural gestures.” Skinner-Linnenberg attributes to Sheridan a more noetic sense of delivery (15-16). Sheridan’s emphasis on the conversational quality of the oratorical situation reveals a reciprocity that is involved in speaking before an audience. Perhaps this attention to audience stems from or at least in some sense is attributed to Sheridan’s work as an actor. George Campbell, Hugh Blair, and Richard Whately added another rhetorical dimension to delivery and rhetoric. Campbell “dwelled mostly on the vocal aspects of delivery, pronunciation, but believed in a natural physical delivery not governed by rigid rules” (16). Blair’s *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783) focused on voice and gesture of delivery as well as the speaker speaking earnestly (Howell *Eighteenth Century* 664). Whately’s *Elements of Rhetoric* (1825) also focused on the natural ability of the speaker but focused on the “mind as exclusively intent” during delivery (Skinner-Linnenberg 17) and thereby preserved an intellectual dimension to delivery. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the elocutionary movement was met with antagonism in academia. “It had become too much of a performer’s art and no longer met the needs of the students being trained in written literacy for professions of law and ministry” (Wallace 189). The emergence of writing and its importance in the academy took a focus off the physical nature of delivery; however, rhetoric’s rich tradition which linked body and mind to education encompassed an oral, literate, and performance qualities of voice, audience, and presence.

The importance of delivery is essential to rhetorical education, from education of a community from the *aiodoi*, to more formalized education that Quintilian proposes. The

social magnitude involved in education through delivery is also emphasized here. The debate over is what is said more important than how a thing is said brings to mind education's purposes—is rhetoric important for developing the whole person, or is it simply ornamental? This connection between speaking and writing fuses the body and mind and is evident in the history of delivery which carries-over into our educational practices in writing classrooms today.

A fusion of the noetic as well as the bodily arts which inform delivery describes performance theory and studies. The speaker's role and purpose, physicality, as well as the audience interact to create the performance situation. Rhetoricians throughout the rhetorical tradition point to aspects of rhetorical delivery which cross-over into the performative domain, even pointing to, at times, the differences between actors and speakers. The difference is in the authenticity of the speaker and the rhetorical purpose of speaking. Nevertheless, there is a power in the reciprocity between speaker and audience that is evident in performance situations as well as rhetorical ones.

This brief account of delivery's place in rhetorical history highlights the presentation as an act of delivery which possesses oral, literate, and visual components that push it beyond the rhetorical. Throughout the history of the canon of delivery, there has been a vacillation of views of delivery which separate body and mind and ones that fuse body and mind. This vacillation brings to light the necessity of seeing the body and mind as connected, as they both contribute to the oral, literate, and visual domains. This history also calls attention to remnants of oral rhetoric that are used to describe written discourse, the discourse typically used in writing classrooms. Terms such as *voice, tone, ethos, character, eloquence, control, speaker, role, style, hearer, listener, audience,*

presence, and *body* all have been used to describe speaking and writing, evidencing the cross-over from oral to literate domain, and the need to consider both alongside each other.

Performance in Nineteenth-Century Composition: Politics of Voice

As the history of rhetoric reveals an emphasis on oral delivery, the text became more important in education in the nineteenth century. As a result, the body or physicality involved in education, speaking, and writing became further separated from the product itself. The text became the medium through which education took place. The social influences on writing instruction even further separated the physical body from the intellect in the nineteenth century.

In the nineteenth century, a new group of students entered the university (women and men who had not been traditionally afforded the opportunity for education). Harvard, which was not a land-grant institution, but had been training wealthy, young, white men for the clergy, law, politics, and professorships, and was also considered the standard by which all other schools modeled themselves, adjusted classes to meet the demands of a new demographic of students who were not classically trained in oratory, did not know Latin Grammar, and who were not familiar with classical works of literature. Harvard, under the direction of Adams Sherman Hill, responded to this distinction in ability, (and what we know as cultural and class discrimination), and separated students into two tracks, English A, which took a belletristic approach to studying literature, and English B, the lower track where writing daily themes and grammatical correctness took precedent over any other purpose for writing. The classes

were overcrowded, often one hundred students or more to one teacher and one teacher assistant. This institutional history gave birth to the rise of current traditional rhetoric which is associated with correctness, an easy teachability factor, and pedantry.

Before the university demographic changed, rhetoric, literature, and writing were all taught throughout the university and were seen as more fluidly connected rather than divided. James Berlin's *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985* (1987), as well as his work *Rhetoric, Poetics, and Cultures: Refiguring College English Studies* (1996), discusses the far-reaching effects of the division between English A and English B. With the pedantry of daily thematic writing and the emphasis on correctness in English B, rhetoric, with a focus on orality, was even further separated from poetic. In fact, elocution was in such "disrepute in academia by the end of the century that oral rhetoric usually did not appear in any books published between 1893 and 1900" (Kitzhaber 86). As daily theme writing became a fixture in schools during this time, Skinner-Linnenberg notes Fred Newton Scott and John Villiers Denney's protestation of the "isolation of written from spoken discourse." They claimed that the "artificial separation of two things which naturally belong[ed] together takes the heart out of both of them" (qtd. in Kitzhaber 86). Denny contributed the term *oral English* to the study of English and placed both a physical and intellectual importance on the term (Faules 106). In most cases, though, the instruction of writing replaced instruction in rhetoric and the oral component in the study of English.

The structure of English classes also changed as the demographic of the classroom changed, rendering a more silent classroom. John Brereton's *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College 1885- 1925* (1995) notes that the

introduction of women into the university bore directly on Composition's changing status and pedagogical approaches as related to delivery. With the rise of common schools, more women were afforded the opportunity to become primary school teachers. Brereton reports that as women were "invited" into the university in the early twentieth century, changes in classroom structure occurred, notably more agonistic rhetorical forms of oral debate were replaced with the production and study of more written works. Brereton also notes the rise of more irenic, or relational rhetoric, as an alternative to agonistic discourse. In fact, in *Composition-Rhetoric: Background, Theory, and Pedagogy* (1997), Robert Connors points out that women were not allowed to compete with men in oratorical debates. Interestingly, the only oratorical competitions in which women could directly compete with men were in dramatic competitions, probably because these dramatic interpretive competitions did not engage questions of current politics. For a woman to speak out on these issues was a dangerous threat to society. Yet, she was afforded opportunities to speak in another "role."

In the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, with the influx of new populations entering the university (women, the non-elite), oratorical principles and delivery were replaced in the study of English with daily themes, which focused on correctness and stylistic purposes of writing. And with the neglect of delivery and oral rhetoric in these classrooms was a direct correlation to these students not having a "voice," both literally and figuratively. Michael Halloran states, "the voice of the orator was not supposed to be present in the dailies Barrett Wendell's students wrote for class or in the business letter and professional reports they would write in post-collegiate life" (qtd. in Murphy *Short History* 172-73). Tracking the place of delivery in colleges during

this time, Skinner-Linnenberg notes, “What once had been a whole theoretical body of rhetoric for some two thousand years was now dissected, with invention, arrangement, and style kept for the composition classroom, while the orphaned memory and delivery were now housed in courses of speech and theater” (24). Scholars of oral rhetoric “seceded from the English union and formed their own separate departments of rhetoric and public speaking” (Connors, Ede, Lunsford 5- 6). Robert Scholes discusses this institutional and disciplinary battle in *The Decline and Fall of English* (1998). The silence of writing and literature was contained in English departments. The physicality of writing, the expression of writing which draws on dramatic terms and metaphors from oral rhetoric (tone, voice, audience), was disembodied from writing.

The social and political implications involved in separately integrating oral and literate classroom components in the nineteenth century reveal a social dimension that is evident when writing is denigrated to correct form and teachability. Certain groups were “silenced,” not afforded a literal voice or the training to progress in professions which would allow them a forum for speaking. The disciplinary politics also had a role in separating the body from the intellectual work involved in the academy.

Writing Speaking Divide

As demonstrated by looking at the history of rhetoric and the history of the emergence of writing instruction, the body and physicality is emphasized and de-emphasized in relation to orality and literacy in various ways for various reasons that have a direct impact on education. Therefore, a writing and speaking divide emerged, partly because of disciplinarity and the politics of academia. The body and physicality is

further separated from written discourse in many of the debates over the connections and dissociations between writing and speaking. As early as the 1920s, research in education, linguistics, and speech compared speaking and writing and shaped the viewpoint that the two are different from each other (Chafe and Tannen, 1987; Schafer, 1981).⁸ Yet, to speak about written and spoken discourse is to consider the range of communicative processes involved in both writing and speaking—what gets said, who gets to say it, and the circumstances involved in the writing/speaking context. Much research has been concerned with whether or not students acquire discourse (academic and others) as well as an understanding of the discourse. This research has treated college-age basic writers whose oral skills do not translate or actually impede written literacy.

These social implications of linking orality with literacy are demonstrated in groundbreaking studies such as Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* (1977) as well as smaller-scale studies of essays produced by basic writers. These studies support the finding that writers have perceptions of written academic discourse that distinguish it from anything they would have produced orally (e.g., Bartholomae, "Expectation" [1980]; Daiute [1981]; Hull; [1987]). These studies suggest that writing in the academy is something akin to entering into a different culture, marked by a different language and different expectations of those who are deemed as "keepers of the language." Often basic writers in this context are non-White, non-middle-class (e.g., Harris [1989]; Rose [1989]; Walters [1984]) suggesting an uneven power dynamic of privilege. The view that speaking often interferes with writing challenges notions that orality and literacy are interconnected and should draw on one another in the writing classroom.

⁸ Melanie Sperling's "Challenges for Research on Writing" provides an extensive overview of research on writing and speaking as well as the cultural/political significances of the divide between speaking and writing.

Following in Shaughnessy's footsteps, a number of researchers have focused closely on how oral language habits carry-over into students' writing in ways that negatively serve them (Delpit 1986). Linda Flower (1979) characterized this as "reader-based prose" which, as opposed to "writer-based prose," does not take into account writing for an audience and exists very much as words that trigger a web of personal and public associations in the writer's mind. Often reader-based prose is what sociolinguists would recognize as possessing characteristics of "face to face contact" often associated with more oral cultures (20). Robert Ochsner theorizes that speech and prose differ in their production and delivery and admonishes that it is important for students to understand problems of using a speech based rhythm for generating writing (98-99). Ochsner claims that it is a social amenity to guide the reader by signaling a consistent and appropriate rhythm for interpretation. Thus, students gain this skill by modeling the prose of published writers by reading it aloud. "Students can learn to read aloud with emphasis, attentive to the pauses that different authors require, and transfer this 'rhythm' onto paper (37). Essentially, Ochsner is replacing one oral discourse with another, more contrived, academic one—a discourse based on textuality.

Walter Ong also points out the differences between writing and speaking:

Writing is completely and irremediably artificial . . . what you find in the dictionary are not real words but coded marks for voicing real words, exteriorly or in imagination Speech is structured through the entire fabric of the human person. Writing depends on consciously contrived rules. (129)

Moving from a more “natural” oral word into the man-made world of writing can be frightening for beginning writers. Skinner-Linnenberg proposes that if students could first deliver their ideas to an audience they could receive reactions and encouragement, lessening their fear. (38). At times when developmental writers are left to their own devices, moving from orality to writing leads them to make assertions that are totally unsupported by reasons, and they make a series of statements that want connections (Ong 131).

There is a historical precedent as noted here, of separating the physical qualities of delivery from the intellectual ones; however, there is also a precedent in current theories to unite spoken and written discourse. The position that speaking and writing are both similar largely stems from the belief that writing and speaking are conversational. (e.g., Bereiter and Scardamalia [1982]; Bruffee [1984]; Rubin [1988]). Like speakers with their interlocutors, writers engage in dialogue with other readers. In speaking, conversational dialogue is a given and explicit; in writing, there is no such explicit or direct reader with whom to converse. The question of audience, the writer’s voice, and readership become of key importance in these theories.

Research investigating how writing and speaking can inform one another, tends to center on the assumption that knowing one’s audience improves writing. When the teacher is audience, however, issues of authority are inherent. (e.g., Hull, Rose, Fraser, and Castellano [1991]; Sperling and Freedman [1987]). These conversations about student authority also affect the response situation as the teacher dramatizes certain reader-based roles when responding to student writing.

Harkening back to Fred Newton Scott's and Joseph Villiers Denney's challenges in the early twentieth century to the then contemporary, current traditional rhetoric by calling for the reunion of spoken and written discourse, James Berlin's *Writing Instruction in American Colleges* (1984) discusses the historical precedent for using spoken discourse as valuable training for the writer. Spoken discourse involves addressing an actual audience, requires students to shape their messages for a particular group of individuals, and provides a more holistic rendering of the rhetorical situation.

Janet Emig (1971) also notes the need to merge oral and written discourse by drawing on a study by Anthony Tovatt that focused on process writing as opposed to product. The study proceeded from the premise that "we write with our ears." In this study, students not only saw, but also heard, what was being delivered onto the papers through teacher modeling or through audio-active headsets. Tovatt's findings revealed that students showed general superiority over conventional approaches to increasing student writing abilities (Emig 20).

Similarly, Dorothy Augustine and W. Ross Winterrowd's "Speech Acts and the Reader-Writer Transaction" (1986) takes a cognitive approach and consider the hypothetical responses projected by a writer as a correlate to conversational cues (silent and spoken) that speakers constantly receive from listeners during delivery. Speakers know whether to continue speaking, stop to explain something, back up, or skip ahead because of listeners' verbal and nonverbal signals. In the writer-reader relationship, there is not such transaction, and this may be the most fundamental reason for the writer to invent an audience, to project hypothetical responses that indicate the audience's response to writing (Augustine and Winterrowd 128). For example, a pedagogical method

in the writing class, the use of writing groups demonstrates the dialogic relationship between speech and writing. A writing group combines speaker delivering and an audience responding (Skinner-Linnenberg 36). Augustine and Winterowd draw from J.L. Austin's Speech Act Theory to draw parallels between the writing and speaking situations, and thus rely on performatives, that is the very act of speaking can create meaning; this concept is a basis for Performance Studies.

With practices such as group work, speaking before an audience, and collaboration Barry Kroll theorizes that students' writing and speaking abilities become more extensive and overlapping in their possible uses. Kroll believes that when "oral and written resources are systematically integrated, not simply consolidated, an individual can make choices within a flexible, organized system of voices, registers, and styles most appropriate for the purpose, audience and context of communication" (53). James Collins states that in spoken dialogue meaning is the creation of more than one person, as speaker and listener roles shift, participants may alternately contribute to the construction of meaning (198). Hence meaning is established through cooperation and collaboration, a back-and-forth delivery (198-99).

These studies lead to questions about the best ways to instruct students in written discourse. Should teachers draw from orality to teach writing? A growing socio-cultural perspective on writing and learning brings to light that discourse in the academy is not a single, identifiable, entity (Faigley 1986). According to Melanie Sperling, "We still do not know whether or how different social or cultural spoken strategies show up systematically in students' school writing" (63). But few studies allow researchers and

teachers of writing to see how different uses of oral performance could foster students' learning of written discourse.

In our institutionalized histories there is a separation of the mental from the physical and a separation of writing from speaking. According to feminist Gabriel Josipovici, "Writing and speaking are at the crossroads of the mental and the physical, the orders of culture and of nature" (1). As recently as the 1960s when composition and communication sought to align themselves on the basis of demand for courses (when another large and new population of students entered the university) the two disciplines could not sustain the alliance because of departmental politics, pedagogy, and research.

In "The Communication Battle: Or Whatever Happened to the Fourth C?" (1999), Diana George and John Trimbur document the separation between composition and communication along pedagogical, research, and departmental lines. Even though the two disciplines have much to offer each other, much of the Conference on Composition and Communication (CCCC) focuses on written Composition and written communication. This reluctance to drop the fourth C is according to the authors, a good indicator that Composition acknowledges that "composing cannot be reduced to the mental act of composing" (697).

Performance emerges to account for the resonant qualities of voice, tone, body, and presence. If writing is different from speaking, (and in ways it is) then student writers can draw from those differences to inform their writing. If writing is similar to speaking (and in some ways it is), then students can draw from those similarities. Within the space between speaking and writing, performance accounts for both the physicality of the

writing/speaking situation as well as the materiality of the text. There is a performative dimension in writing and in the classroom for writing.

James Moffett's *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* (1968) discusses the importance of drama and speech in the study of English, reconceiving the study of language.

Drama and speech are central to a language curriculum" (60). . . . I see drama as the "matrix of all language activities, subsuming speech and engendering the varieties of writing and reading. But to regard it so is to reconceive it, to perceive in it the germinal ideas and actions of other language behavior. (61)

Performance becomes part of language behavior, in Moffett's perception. Moffett extends the speaking writing connection beyond the page and beyond orality and imbues it with a sense of performance, as an activity. Likewise Moffett proposes that students can learn language through role playing first and second personas. Performance qualities are abundant in speaking and writing. Performance accounts for the physicality of the body which has been all but absent in writing classrooms to aid students' ways of knowing.

The speaking and writing divide (on either side) considers the concept of audience and either places the value on the peer as audience or on the teacher (or academy) as primary audience, without taking into consideration the interaction between the student as producer of text with the audience and the context under which the product is produced. From a social/rhetorical standpoint, this consideration is the rhetorical situation which is comprised of the context in which the speaker/writer is producing the work and for what

purpose. The social perspective takes into consideration the power dynamics at play and the constraints under which the writing is produced. Of this omission Moffett writes:

One failure of English teaching has been to consider only messages, or consider them before or without placing them in the whole context of the communication frame. . . . He is writing always to the same old person, the English teacher. . . . While acknowledging that artificiality cannot be eliminated completely from the classroom situation, somehow we must create more realistic communication “dramas” in which the student can practice . . . in a way more resembling who he will have to read, write, speak and listen in the afterlife. (60-61)

Moffett places the importance of real life situation, contexts beyond the classroom and envisions drama and performance as one way to imagine audiences beyond the classroom.

What scholars such as Moffett are proposing is that the writing/speaking divide, or looking at the two as separate entities, does not serve students well beyond the academy. Though those proponents of separating writing from speaking for educational purposes do call attention to the ways in which basing textual discourse on oral discourse can negatively serve certain populations, (and these arguments are well-grounded), those who propose, after looking at the characteristics of each medium, the fusion of writing and speaking, underscore the significance of how one can inform the other in supplementary ways. When speaking or orality becomes an activity which informs the writing classroom, students can draw on their multiple ways of knowing to write. What the literature on the speaking/writing divide also emphasizes, as does the research

presented here, are the cultural and social implications of the separating the physicality and performative aspects of writing from speaking. Practically speaking, this research also demonstrates the importance of audience and how conceptualizing a literal audience can give students a better understanding of the writing situation.

Performance Studies: Providing New Insights for the College Writing Classroom

Rather than dividing the oral and literate domains, Performance Studies provides an oral, literate, visual, and performative perspective from which to view the writing classroom because it draws from many disciplines in order to account for both the social and aesthetic functions of the writing situation. The study of performance draws on many of the same theorists who inform writing and rhetoric. Performance is the amalgamation of the oral, literate, visual and performative and considers both the aesthetic and social function of language and body, together. There is a rich history of performance and theatre informing rhetoric and composition. As I have shown, theatre and rhetoric share some of the same roots.

Performance also allows for a different reading of delivery in rhetorical history, providing for the oral and literate dimensions, but also the visual, as evidenced by an actual physical speaker. Attention to roles, style, the fusion of mind and body, (which have been discussed at length here) are tenets of performance. The concept of audience, the reciprocity involved in the performance situation is also likened to the rhetorical situation. Performance, however, allows us to think about audience as both the creator of the event as well as the addressed in the event. The social implications of performance cannot be ignored, as they also cannot be in the history of delivery and composition. The

purpose of performance is often to teach; it is pedagogical in a sense because of an interaction with the audience.

Out of these histories as well as other disciplines such as theatre, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, psychology, emerges a disciplinary study of performance which also provides new ways of imagining the activities of the writing classroom. From the theatre, performance studies takes its connection to actors, live audience, and dramatic texts. Sociological and anthropological threads of performance studies imbue it with a sense of non-dramatic texts, everyday life interactions, ritual, ceremony, and power dynamics. Ethnographic research methods, which inform both anthropology and Composition studies, are part of performance studies.

Henry Bial, a noted scholar in performance studies chronicles the various disciplines and theories that inform performance studies. He explains, “Just as performance is contingent, contested, hard to pin down, so too is its study” (Bial Introduction 1). Performance is what it is because it cannot be defined or confined by its disciplinary boundaries. Though performance studies emerged in the 1950s, it declared its disciplinary status in the 1980s. Richard Schechner can be credited for the emergence of Performance Studies at New York University as he sought to account for and cultivate performance within liberal arts education and outside in the larger society in the 1980s. In “Performance Studies: The Broad Spectrum Approach,” which originally appeared in *TDR: The Journal of Performance Studies* in 1988, Schechner extends typical associative definitions of performance from “its subgenres like theater, dance, music and performance art” to “a broad spectrum of activities including “at the very least the performing arts, rituals, healing, sports, popular entertainments, and performance in

everyday life” (7). Treating this “performance in everyday life,”⁹ not just the performing arts, is what Schechner calls “the broad spectrum approach” (8). Pointing out that many American theatre and dance departments are reluctant to think that performance reaches beyond the stage, Schechner advocates broadening the performing arts curricula to therefore broaden performance.

What needs to be added [to the performing arts curricula] is how performance is used in politics, medicine, religion, popular entertainments, and ordinary face-to face interactions. The complex and various relationships among . . . authors, performers, directors and spectators ought to be investigated using the methodological tools increasingly available from performance theorists, social scientists, and semioticians . . . Performative thinking must be seen as a means of cultural analysis. Performance Studies courses should be taught outside performing arts departments as part of core curricula. (8)

Looking at various cultural sites: politics, medicine, religion, as well as face-to-face interactions through the lens of performance, Schechner not only extends Performance Studies from the stage to reach across the university and to the culture at large. He recasts performance, extending it beyond its theatrical implications and establishes performance studies as a uniquely interdisciplinary endeavor, one informed by theatre, sociology, anthropology and linguistics. Schechner’s expansion of performance responded to the limitations of the word and concept of “theatre.” Theatre could not signify the events that included the dynamism of everyday life.

⁹ Schechner borrowed this term from Erving Goffman’s *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). Goffman’s work, which proposes that the actual performance of behavior creates the roles in which people take on, is a major influence in performance studies.

Schechner's NYU program sought to account for theatre and performance as a behavior. Peggy Phelan, who charts the formation of Performance Studies' disciplinary emergence at New York University (NYU), discusses how "performance" replaced "theatre" as a way to represent the "wide range of theatrical acts" that intercultural observation was everywhere revealing" (Introduction, *The Ends of Performance* 1). Other approaches soon emerged to account for a more culturally-constructed and informed definition of performance. Barbara Gimblett-Kirshenblatt accounts, "If NYU initially enlarged the concept of theatre to include many other kinds of performance, Northwestern expanded to notions of literatures in terms of text, broadly conceived to include not only literature but also cultural texts (45). For example, Northwestern's program produces research and creative work in the "performance of literature; the adaptation and staging of texts, particularly narrative works; cultural studies and; performance theory and criticism; performance arts and dance theatre, and the practices of everyday life" (Northwestern University). Gimblett- Kirshenblatt charts the name changes in departments at Northwestern. The Department of Elocution became the Department of Oral interpretation in the nineteenth-century. In 1984, the department became the Department of Performance Studies. Importantly, Gimblett-Kirshenblatt notes that much of the "speech, communication, rhetoric, and oral interpretation curriculum remains intact" even as the new Performance Studies courses have been added (45). This blending of traditional and non-traditional curricula has its origins in the connection between rhetoric, literature, and theatre.

At the University of California at Berkeley, the study of performance is housed in the same department as theatre, dance, and rhetoric. Shannon Jackson, Associate

Professor in the department notes, that disciplinary labels such as theater, literature, speech, and performance studies should be viewed “less as stably referential terms than as discursive sites on which a number of agendas, alliances, and anxieties collect” (40). Performance studies seeks to push outside and across disciplinary boundaries to produce conversations with political, social, and artistic significance.

Performance and performativity also draw connections among linguistics, cultural studies, and literature. Linguistic performatives that J.L. Austin and John Searle consider the power of words to act and create into being. In performance theory as well as in English Studies, embodiment stresses the “existential discovery of a new mode of being, which can only be realized through the creative manipulation of a material medium— words, paint, clay, tone, rhythm, actions, gestures . . . (Reid 121). Well known in English studies is Judith Butler’s definition of embodiment. She writes of embodiment: “Drawn as it is from theological contexts, [embodiment] tends to figure ‘the’ body as a mode of incarnation and, hence, to preserve the external and dualistic relationship between a signifying immateriality and the materiality of the body itself” (*Gender Trouble*, n52). Butler exchanges the word “expression” for “performativity” when discussing embodiment and the relationship of the “sexed body” to gender in *Bodies that Matter* (1993). This exchange provides a link between performativity and embodiment and performance studies, and draws on the earlier works of Austin and Searle as well as Derrida. Butler uses “embodiment” to posit her theories on gender construction and performance. Eve Sweetser’s “Blended Spaces and Performativity” differentiates between performativity used in linguistics and its use in cultural studies. Sweetser

reviews Austin and Searle's use of speech act theory and cultural studies' uses of performativity to investigate gender.

Performance studies also takes theories and approaches to language from Kenneth Burke, who is in English studies known as a rhetorical theorist.¹⁰ This emphasis upon the *how* of performance instead of the *what* of performance, its particular nuances which make it a performance were results of Burkean ideas. What "marked" a performance was in these anthropologists' views what deemed it to be determined by a culture a "performance." Kenneth Burke's dramatism was applied by theorists such as Goffman, Turner, and Schechner to analyze a variety of social interactions and cultural behavior (Carlson 15, 34). *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) and *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950), outline Burke's annalistic terms and strategies for discussing human motivation and the devices by which people, consciously or unconsciously, try to influence others' opinions and actions. According to Burke, any complete statement about motives must answer five questions which lead to the "five key terms of dramatism" "what was done (Act), when or where it was done (Scene), who did it (Agent), how he did it (Agency), and why (Purpose)" (xvii). This theatre-based and metaphoric analysis of motives within a certain context is, according to performance theorist and historian Marvin Carlson identifies, what ties "Burke most closely to subsequent performance theorists [. . .] Theorists of social performance [. . .] have tended to place much more emphasis on the social

¹⁰ Folklore and anthropology, two disciplines which inform performance studies, look at "cultural performance" (Carlson 13). These two strands of performance studies relied on Burke's writings to understand the rhetorical function of folkloric performance. Similarly, sociologists who studied performative language relied on Burke's "situated modes of action" and his pragmatic assertion that "every text is a strategy for encompassing a situation" (Burke, *Philosophy* 3, 93). The shift from the more folkloric text to the performative context involved, as in Burke a shift from traditional context to the more "rhetorical study of means and techniques. That is, actions and behaviors had an argumentative function which relied on performance.

constraints governing an act than upon its specific motivation” (14-15). Burke’s central interest in motivation has proven for performance theory less important than his general approach, since those interested in the “theatrical” side of performance have tended to look more toward communication or the effect produced by performance than to the motivation of the artist.

Drawing from these various fields of study and schools of thought, Performance Studies again reveals its similarities to Composition Studies. Composition Studies has branched-off to include cultural studies, has roots in feminist theory and has expanded to include gender and queer theory (Branscomb 6). Identity, race, class, and gender are issues that both Composition Studies and Performance Studies grapple with, as Composition takes as its major topics literacy, access, ethics, citizenry. These social issues are discussed as well as performed in performance theory. Performance Studies as a discipline, or body of work, takes into account behaviors which are dependent on and connected by audience and act. Similarities between composition and performances studies are abundant and leave much room to explore these parallels.¹¹

Theorizing about performance, socio-linguist Dell Hymes states, “It is through the study of performance that one could look forward to an integration of the social sciences and the humanities” (qtd. in Gimblett-Kirshenblatt 44). This integration is a goal for many in Composition evidenced by some of Composition’s respected voices such as Carol Petersen Hartzog, Erika Lindemann, Sarah Warshauer Freedman, and Andrea Lunsford who all “endorse dissolving academic boundaries and enlarging the academic community” (Daiker “Introduction” 5). The interdisciplinary nature of performance

¹¹ As a side note, Composition Studies, like Performance Studies, takes ethnography as one of its methodological techniques.

studies even its inclusion of rhetoric, communication, literature and theatre—disciplines which are associated under a broader umbrella of English Studies—holds implications for composition, and specifically for integrating performance-based acts and assignments into the composition classroom.

Performance Studies brings together the social and the aesthetic purposes involved in writing. It merges the oral and the literate and considers the visual dimension of writing as well. The body and mind are fused rather than severed, bringing embodiment to the forefront of performance. Audience is central to theories of performance, for it shapes the act and shapes the speaker's/actor's purposes. Anthropologist and performance theorist Richard Bauman accounts for the audience as one who supplies the comparison of the executed action with a model, an ideal or remembered original model. But performance also accounts for the mental standard that exists within the performer who is able to compare his performance with that mental standard. Therefore, performance can take place for a "theatrical" audience or an "audience of self." Performance allows for a double-consciousness; an audience of self and the "elusive" other (Carlson 5). Such an approach has analogues in writing. Students writing in the composition classroom negotiate themselves with an elusive audience.

Performance and performance studies take into account the social dimension of writing, revealing a tension that rhetoricians such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian point out between acting and speaking. The social dimensions of performance recognizes that the speaker and audience create a performance situation, often one which dictates what is being said and how it is being said. The speaker's roles and interaction with the audience become major concerns. The skill of the speaker is important, but performance

also reveals according to Richard Bauman, “the enhancement of experience which is indicated by intrinsic qualities of the act of expression itself” (11). In other word, the qualities of expression which rhetoricians tried to distinguish from the performative need to be returned to the performative in order to render a more accurate understanding of students speaking and writing in the specific context of the classroom and a better way of describing the delicate ways they negotiate roles of students, speakers, writers and audience.

Performances in the Writing Class: Performing Writing through Presentations

Traditionally, writing studies, composition and the composition classroom have separated speaking from the writing classroom as well as any aesthetic arts and influences from the writing classroom. The historical traditions of the canon of delivery, rhetoric, and theatre, as well as the debates over the connections between speaking and writing all demonstrate a separation of the physical body from the mind, the materiality of writing from the materiality of the body. Within the academy, departmentalization has further stratified the body. Speech and communication classes deal with orality and oral communication. Theatre and the fine arts deal with the body and expression. In the writing classroom the topic and the produce is writing. As Debra Hawhee points out in her study of athletics and rhetoric in ancient Greece, *Bodily Arts* (2004), “Knowledge making habits and practices cannot be extricated from the body” (195). This is an argument made by Judith Butler, Michael Foucault, N. Katherine Hayes, Elizabeth Grosz, and Pierre Bourdeau (195). These theorists take several approaches to understanding the connection between body and mind and culture.

Writing cannot be separated from the body because the body is a part of intellect, and physicality is a part of writing. Yet, incorporating the oral presentation of writing into the writing classroom as an example of an assignment which is both oral and physical, but also depends on the students' written products demands the consideration of how these three modes—the written or literate, the oral, and the physical or performative—work together and can inform students' writing practices. Performance, in its interdisciplinarity, can create new ways of imagining the writing classroom and activities involved in writing as reciprocal exchanges between speaker and audience as well as an event created by the act and the audience.

My entry into the theoretical discussion of performance is at the nexus of literacy, orality, rhetoric, and the body. More specifically I look at a classroom practice, students' oral/visual presentations on their writing before a writing assignment was due for evaluation. Students adapted their written texts to an oral/visual medium to be delivered before an audience of their peers and teacher. Approaching the presentation solely from a rhetorical perspective provides a lens to understand students' motivations and purposes. Adding a performative dimension to this lens shows us *how* the presentation is achieved. Though this presentation of writing could be typically associated with speech and communication or the rhetorical canon of delivery, I am considering the presentation as an act of performance, grounded in the body and relying upon both orality, the spoken quality of the work, and literacy, the practices of writing. The delivery of writing cannot exist in any media without an audience, and an audience makes the presentation interactive. The audience, as much as the presenter, is present,

live, and concrete. Students also wrote about their experiences as speakers and writers in a reflective writing.

At its most basic level of comparison between students presenting and students performing is that the presentations that students gave in this class were based upon their writing as well as a traditional genre of the presentation. Performance is a contested term, but what most scholars of performance agree upon is that it is “based upon some pre-existing model, script, or pattern of action” (Carlson 12). Students were given a pre-existing model of a presentation, and they “scripted” their presentations based on their written drafts of the analysis assignment.

Theoretically, as noted by the emergence of the metaphor of performance and focus on the acts of performance that have recently cropped-up in Composition journals, theorists, teachers, and scholars have linked writing and teaching to cultural performance. The student writer is constantly negotiating the writing for the academy with the self he or she presents in that writing; thus displaying a complicated social and cultural performance (Newkirk, Gere). Other uses of performance as in “Bi, Butch and Bar Dyke” point to the classroom as a space and culture wherein roles of teachers and students are played out, the self is performed (Gibson, Mariana, Meem; Newkirk; Alexander). In one strand of performance theory, a cultural performance is more broadly defined and based on the anthropological characteristics which also reside in theatre. Milton Singer’s (1959)¹² investigation of Asian cultures proposed that all “peoples thought of their culture as encapsulated in discrete events” He called these events “cultural performances”(xii).

¹² Singer’s approach and influence has contributed significantly to the “convergence of anthropology and theatrical theory in the area of performance from the 1970s onward. ... Throughout the 1970s and 80s the relationship between culture and performance became a matter of concern in folklore studies and anthropology” (Carlson 13).

Looking at the classroom as having a distinct “culture” which possesses performance “events” which make-up this culture, the incorporation of the presentation as an activity in the writing class makes it an event which helps to establish the culture of the classroom. Milton ascribes certain characteristics to the performance: a performance possesses “definitely limited time span,” a “beginning and an end,” “organized program of activity,” a “set of performers,” and “an audience” (xiii). On a practical level, but still regarding the classroom culture and the presentation as a performance event, the presentation is an event bounded by time; it has a beginning and end; it possesses an organizational component, a speaker and an audience.

Milton’s characteristics certainly render a conservative interpretation of cultural performance, but nevertheless provide a compelling strand of discourse in performance that holds implications for the writing classroom. The event of presentations in the writing classroom has roots in traditional rhetoric and the canon of delivery. Though students in Antiquity were taught to declaim in order to participate in the debates of the marketplace, law, and politics, the act of students speaking about and accounting for their work in this study makes a case that students’ performances provide training for the kinds of speaking and writing they will do beyond the classroom.

Students perform in the sense that they are relying on their roles as speakers, writers, and students in the classroom. They are a physical presence in the writing classroom and use their literal voices to communicate. Performing is the live action, the display of the performance act. Looking at students presenting as performing, I am not suggesting that students “perform” in the sense that they step out of the real and into an imagined role for an audience. However, looking at the presentation as possessing

elements of performance, we can better triangulate the interaction between self, audience, and discourse (oral, visual, and textual).

Using performance studies to theorize about how students embody language within the physical presence of their peers in the specific context of the writing classroom allows us to look at the many and varied ways in which performance enriches students' writing as well as writing theory. Performance considers the non-textual qualities of what precedes, informs, and interacts with the student to produce the final written product. The writing classroom and the ways in which student writer/speakers perform becomes at once a social performance as well as a writing performance and possesses implications which impact teaching and theory.

CHAPTER TWO

Setting:

Project Design and Methodological Framework

In the spring of 2005, I implemented performance-based assignments including the use classroom debates and oral presentations into my English 20803 sophomore argument course. The implementation of performance-based assignments was part of a larger project to study the connection between composition and performance. I designed the course based on the following broad research question:

In what ways do students' oral/visual performances of textual-based assignments augment their understanding and actual writing of their textual assignments?

English 20803, Writing and Rhetoric II, is a required course for undergraduates at Texas Christian University (TCU). All graduate instructors, a category of which I am a part must teach this course at least once during their graduate appointments. There are university core competencies and programmatic outcomes which all English 20803 courses must meet.¹³ Programmatic outcomes are set by the TCU English Department and are qualitative. These outcomes are based on the WPA outcomes statement and are divided into the following categories: Rhetorical Knowledge, Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; Processes; and Conventions. Specific statements for achieving these

¹³ University core competencies are: 1. Students will demonstrate a facility with the language and analysis of argument. 2. Students will demonstrate the ability to write an argument for a specific rhetorical situation. 3. Students will demonstrate competency in using sources (primary, secondary, electronic) in argument construction. 4. Students will demonstrate the ability to use computers effectively as a communication mechanism (<http://www.core.tcu.edu/documents/WrittenCommunication2.pdf>)

outcomes can be located in Appendix A: TCU Composition Program Outcomes for English 20803.¹⁴

As a teacher who had taught English 20803 before, I was given the opportunity to develop my own 20803 syllabus and assignments based on the programmatic outcomes. The course I designed, “English 20803: Social Critique of Textual, Oral, and Visual Discourse,” had students investigate textual, oral, and visual arguments and focused extensively on the analysis, evaluation, and production of arguments in the public domain. Students in this course were required to produce four major writing assignments, three individually and one collaboratively. These writing assignments included: an analysis of a recent nonfiction article, a rebuttal to an editorial, an analysis of a documentary film,¹⁵ and a collaborative project in which the class investigated a current event or pop culture phenomenon.¹⁶ For each written assignment I developed, I also incorporated a complementary performance-based assignment. The performance-based assignments included student debates and the use of students’ oral presentations of their writing before they turned in a final draft of a writing assignment, which is the focus of this study.

The performance-based assignments were presented to students on the first day of class. I asked students to think about the connection between writing and speaking and how the oral delivery of an argument had a direct effect on the audience. Below, an excerpt from the syllabus discusses the relationship between one’s participation in civic

¹⁴ Graduate students and all faculty teaching English 20803 must meet university and programmatic outcomes, but the design and progression of the course is the decision of the professor. Students across the program are required to produce at least 25 polished pages of prose.

¹⁵ Documentary film models such as *Super Size Me* (Morgan Spurlock 2004) and *Bowling for Columbine* (Michael Moore 2004) were used in class.

¹⁶ The class chose the then pop culture phenomenon *Napoleon Dynamite* (Jared Hess, 2004).

affairs and the ability to speak about such affairs. The entire syllabus is located in Appendix B: English 20803 Syllabus Spring 2005 Intermediate Composition: Social Critique of Textual, Oral and Visual Discourse.

Historically, one's degree of participation in civic affairs had a direct correlation with his or her ability to speak and perform in the educational and civic arenas of government and law. Since Antiquity, education has taken as its mission to train future citizens to participate in government and legal arenas. In the spirit of communication and rhetoric, two fields that have shaped the college writing course, this class will ask students to focus on the canon of delivery, asking students not only to analyze textual, oral/aural, and visual delivery in public domains, but also to present or "deliver" their findings in presentations and debates individually and collaboratively.

The four major writing assignments of the class are briefly outlined below along with their accompanying performance-related assignments.

Unit 1: Analysis of Social Critique in Textual Public Domain:

Writing Assignment: Analysis of Recent Non-fiction Piece

The first assignment, Unit 1: Analysis of Social Critique in Textual, Public Domain: Analysis of Recent Non-fiction Article, required students to choose a recent article of substantial length from a popular magazine, scholarly journal, or a newspaper. Students then wrote a five to seven page analysis of the article's content, organization, and style, types of Aristotelian appeals used, and how these features were used

effectively or ineffectively to persuade their intended audience. Students had to locate three secondary sources which advocated or refuted claims in the article in order to demonstrate that the piece was part of a larger discussion in the public sphere. Based on their analysis and secondary research, students were required to formulate an argument about the effectiveness of their article in the public sphere for its intended audience. The Unit One Written Assignment can be found in Appendix C: Unit One Written Assignment¹⁷

Presentation of Article Analysis

Individually, students were required to deliver a five to seven minute presentation on their rhetorical analysis and evaluate their chosen textual document. The Unit One Presentation assignment can be located in Appendix D: Presentation Guidelines of Article Analysis.

Unit 2: Professional Rewrite Rebuttal

Writing Assignment: Rebuttal Essay

The second writing assignment built upon students' acquisition of analytical approaches to texts from the first unit and required students to choose a recent newspaper or magazine editorial or opinion piece, identify the *stasis* of the article, and refute the argument in a five-to-seven page rebuttal paper using secondary research to support the refutation. Students were to keep in mind that the audience for their pieces was the same audience as of the original piece. For example, if the student found her op/ed piece in the

¹⁷ This project focuses on this performance-based assignment and will be discussed in greater detail throughout this chapter.

New Yorker, she would address that particular audience. The Professional Rewrite Rebuttal assignment sheet is located in Appendix E.

Informal Presentations on Rebuttal Paper

In unit two, I asked students to present informally twice throughout their drafting processes. These informal presentations were delivered at the beginning of class and each student had approximately two to three minutes to speak. These presentations were not evaluated but were part of the day's class activities. The first presentation was a rationale for their selection of the op/ed piece which corresponded to the invention stage of the unit. Students had to make a case for their selection of the opinion/editorial piece, stating its main claim, points used to support the main claim, the source of and audience for the piece and why the piece interested them. The floor was open for questions after each student presented. In the second informal presentation, students were required to report on the stasis of the article and how they were going to build a case to refute the article's main claim. Audience members were required to ask at least one question after each student presented to help them to clarify and organize their arguments, or to help them find secondary sources. After the informal presentations, students revised their one-page analyses based on the questions posed after the presentations or their own rethinking of how to approach and structure their rebuttal pieces.

Unit 3 Rhetoric of Visuality:

Writing: Analysis of Documentary Film

Students chose a documentary film produced in the last ten years and analyzed how it makes an argument through the use of visuality, sound, film shots, footage, etc.

Based on their analysis of the documentary film, students argued in a four to six page paper how the specific documentary they chose critiques society. Students were also required to use at least one secondary source to support their arguments, but their analysis of the film and film techniques consisted of the bulk of the paper. Much like the textual analysis assignment of unit one, students had to evaluate the effectiveness of their chosen documentaries. The written assignment for the documentary analysis is found in Appendix F.

Presentation of Documentary Analysis

Like unit one, students were required to deliver a formal presentation of their documentary analysis. Unit three presentations on the documentary film, however, extended the presentation time from seven to nine minutes. The primary goal for the presentation was to demonstrate to the audience how their analysis led them to deduce their theses. The guidelines for the documentary presentation are found in Appendix G.

Unit 4: Collaborative Rhetorical Case Study

Collaborative Writing Assignment

The collaborative paper, assigned as the culminating activity of the class, investigated the release, acclaim, and marketing of the then pop-cultural phenomenon, *Napoleon Dynamite* (2004). This culminating, collaborative assignment melded the goals of the class: visual and textual analysis, the use of primary and secondary research, analysis of multiple view points, and collaboration. Students started with broad questions: What is it about the film *Napoleon Dynamite* that is giving this film iconic status? Is it indeed art? Does it answer life's questions about growing up, or at least attempt to offer

an answer? Why is everyone quoting this film? Who is watching this film? Who loves it? Who doesn't? Why? Using their knowledge of stasis from unit two, each group was required to choose an angle from which to investigate the film and formulate a thesis that they would support in a ten page paper. Appendix H provides the guidelines for the collaborative project.

In-Class Debate

A class assignment which also incorporated performance-based elements in unit four was student debates. The protocol for the debate was as follows: Groups would elect a team captain. Students drew at random a piece of paper that said either “for” or “against” and were divided into two teams. Each group was instructed to make arguments for or against these two statements: *Napoleon Dynamite* is a film about class and racial consciousness. *Napoleon Dynamite* offers no moral redemption or plot; as a film it is a pointless movie for critique. These two statements were two of the four group's theses and were chosen at random by a drawing. The objective of the debate was not to win, (although, the class took winning the argument seriously); rather, the objective was to gather support for and refutations of these arguments.

Collaborative Works-in-Progress Presentations

Each group was given 10-12 minutes to explain their project, the difficulties and strengths of their projects at that point in their group's progress, and to ask questions of their audience. The guidelines of the presentation were open-ended; 1. Give the audience a short excerpt of your paper (1-2) pages for initial feedback. 2. Try out a thesis on the audience and have them support or refute it 3. Use the time as a research forum, wherein all members of the class share information they have gathered on the film. Because

students had the same broad topic, the investigation of *Napoleon Dynamite* as a cultural phenomenon, the class's works –in- progress presentations facilitated lively debate and classroom discussion as well as generated a helpful network of student research.

Final Collaborative Project Presentations

The final collaborative project required students to give a 10-15 minute presentation and share and support their theses about *Napoleon Dynamite* in a way that engaged the audience.

Written Reflective Component:

Students were also required to write five, one to two page reflections over the course of the semester which asked them to write about the performance-related aspects of their writing processes. These reflections were written during class. I provided a prompt for each reflection, which are bulleted below.¹⁸

Writing Prompts for Student Reflection After the Completion of an Assignment:

Unit One: Analysis and Social Critique in Textual, Public Domain

- In what ways was presenting on your analysis paper helpful or unhelpful to your process of composing your draft/final paper or vice versa? How has writing and speaking on this topic solidified or changed your position on this subject? While writing and presenting on your topic, did you take-on any role(s) which gave you a different perspective on your topic, writing, or speaking? (i.e. expert, audience, novice, other) Provide examples from your experiences to answer the questions.

Unit Three: Rhetoric of Visuality

¹⁸ The reflection marked by the fifth bulleted prompt below was not written during class time and was used to evaluate a group-work assignment.

- Based on your experiences in this course, and with the documentary unit in particular, construct an argument in which you describe what lessons you learned from presenting on your documentary film that can be applied to your writing of the documentary film paper. Use specific examples from your experience.
- If you had to present your entire documentary paper as a thirty minute presentation, how would you translate your textual paper into a visual presentation? What would you have to add or delete? How would this change the presentation you already delivered? Use specific examples from your texts and presentations to answer the questions.
- Based on the rubric we use for critiquing presentations as well as the expectations emphasized in this course, choose a presentation to evaluate, and write-up a critique of this evaluation in the form of a letter.

Unit Four: Collaborative Rhetorical Case Study

- Discuss the roles you and other group members assumed during your collaborative project. How did each of you contribute to the writing of the final written product? In the planning and delivery of your presentation for the collaborative project discuss selection of content, how you chose who would speak to the audience, and how you connected with your audience.

Grade Breakdown and Evaluation

The three individual papers were worth sixty percent of the final course grade. The collaborative paper was worth fifteen percent. The four evaluated presentations were equivalent to one paper, at five percent each. The five reflections students wrote about

their presentations were worth five percent of their final grade. The percentage value of each assignment was as follows:

- Article Analysis: 20%
- Rebuttal Essay 20%
- Collaborative Rhetorical Case Study 15%
- Documentary Film Analysis: 20%
- Reflective Responses: 5 % (total of 5 responses)
- Article Analysis Presentation: 5 %
- Documentary Film Presentation: 5 %
- Works in progress Presentations and Final Presentation (collaborative assignment): 5% each

Data Collection¹⁹

Because I was studying the connections among orality, literacy, and performance, over the course of the semester I collected the following data, using the research methods described below:²⁰

- Direct observation of student presentations and the videotaping of each student's presentation over the course of the semester.
- Collection of students' written work:
 - I collected students' written drafts for work in units one, two and three.
 - I collected electronic copies of students' written reflections on their presentations and writing using the course website
 - I collected electronic copies of students' evaluations of their peers' visual analysis presentations

¹⁹ Importantly, this research complies with human subjects research standards and was reviewed by the Advisory Committee of the English Department at Texas Christian University. I also obtained a certificate from Computer Based Training on the Ethical Treatment of Human Research Subjects, as suggested by Texas Christian University's Institutional Review Board (IRB), before beginning my research.

²⁰ Gesa Kirsch and Patricia Sullivan's *Methods and Methodology in Composition* (1992) relies on Sandra Harding's distinction between *method* and *methodology* in her introduction to the work. *Method* is a technique or "way of proceeding in gathering evidence." *Methodology* is "the underlying theory and analysis of how research should proceed" (2).

- A written record of day-to-day classroom assignments, formal assignments, and interactions among peers during discussions after the presentations concluded during the question and answer period.

Conducting Teacher Research:

I collected students' work throughout the spring 2005 semester, but I did not begin analyzing the data until the conclusion of the class. All of the students' written work including drafts, final drafts, and written reflections were submitted to the course website where they are archived for five years. Similarly, although all of the students' presentations were digitally recorded by a student worker from the Office of Instructional Support, I did not obtain digital video recorded copies of any of the presentations until the middle of May 2005, after the class had concluded and final grades had been distributed.

The students' written reflections on their writing and presentations were also set-up as a low-stakes assignments (as evidenced in the grade breakdown) because I did not want my role as researcher to bear directly on the value I placed on the reflective component. The reflective essays were integrated into the textual and visual analysis units at the end of the unit as a culminating knowledge-making activity. Because I used students' written reflections as data for this project, I assigned a nominal value to the written reflections. All but one, the student's evaluation of a peer's presentation, were written and turned in during class time.

The five reflections, together, equaled five percent of the total class grade. I constructed open-ended prompts so that students would not respond with a specific

teacher-driven answer. The prompts also consisted of several questions and asked for examples from their own experiences to demonstrate that I wanted their input, their voices, and their opinions to inform my inquiry. Students were told to answer the questions and give examples from their presentations, texts, and overall thoughts about the assignment and they would fulfill the assignment and receive an A letter grade. I collected these reflective pieces for evaluation at the end of each unit and assigned the grade based on whether students had thoughtfully answered the questions. I did not analyze the reflections until the conclusion of the class so as not to interfere with my role as the teacher. This activity of reflection is a knowledge-making activity, which asks students to account for and at times discover the learning that has taken place. Reflection also serves as material data in this project as students are asked to produce a written reflection on their presentation and writing performances.

My own reflection, that is looking at my process and work critically as a teacher and researcher, is central to teacher research and feminist methodology because it causes me to consider my subjectivity and how the project not only benefits the field of composition and rhetoric, but also how the project benefits students. Because both teacher and student voices are included in this study through the act of reflection and the analysis of written reflections, this project values the teacher's and the students' constructions of knowledge.

Teacher as Researcher: Methodological Rationale and Challenges

Valuing the teacher's role in the construction of knowledge is part of the teacher research movement. According to Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle, the teacher-

research movement,²¹ (which began almost 20 years ago) rejects the “authority of professional experts who produced and accumulated knowledge in “scientific settings” for use by others in practical settings (Cochran-Smith and Lytle “Decade” 16).

Recognizing the disconnect between the scientific and classroom environments, teacher research sets out to validate teacher’s contextual and experiential knowledge. Ruth Ray’s “Teacher-Researcher: Composition from the Teacher-Research Point of View” (1993) argues that there is “no separation between researchers (those who make knowledge) and teachers (those who consume and disseminate it)” (175). Teacher research emphasizes contextual knowledge and the relationship between theory and practice. According to Ray, teacher-research arises first and foremost out of practice. Within the origin of practice, Cochran-Smith and Lytle trace the body of teacher-research produced over the last 20 years and cite three conceptual frameworks in teacher research.

1. Teacher Research as Social Inquiry (creating a democratic society is their goal)
2. Teacher Research as ways of knowing within communities (“rooted in literacy studies’ agency in classroom and social change”)
3. Teacher Research as practical inquiry. (Focus is on “using teacher research, or practical inquiry, as a way to generate or enhance practical knowledge” (Decade 18-19).

²¹ Often pointed to as a seminal text in the teacher-research movement, Ann Berthoff’s “Teacher as Researcher” (1981) calls for teachers to take possession over knowledge-making in educational settings, stating that if educational research is going to have any significance at all it must be created “for by and among teachers” (qtd. in Ray 179). Jean Ruddock and David Hopkins point to Lawrence Stenhouse’s work as key in shaping teacher research. Stenhouse believed that the privileging of university research and dismissing of teachers’ experiential knowledge created a majority of teachers who were “ruled by knowledge” and not served by it (qtd in Ruddock and Hopkins 3). Such a system creates an improper hierarchy of knowledge and education based on “tyranny.” The teacher research movement shows teachers taking ownership over the subject matter and their experiences.

Teacher research is a contested method, yet most controversies arise regarding the third conceptual framework: Teacher Research as Practical Inquiry. These controversies center on the questions of: 1. How is knowledge defined? 2. How can teachers simultaneously be researchers? 3. For what ends is practical inquiry performed? For example, Gary Fernstermacher critiques practical knowledge by contrasting it with formal knowledge. Practical knowledge is “bounded by context” and is about “how and when to do things.” Formal knowledge is “knowledge about relationships between actions and consequences that are generalizable across contexts” (20). Because teacher research is context-specific and experiential, its practical knowledge is not always generalizable. Similarly, performing teacher research, according to A. Michael Huberman, (1996) is more “interpretive” than research. Huberman challenges that a teacher can occupy the role of researcher because “understanding events when one is a participant in them is difficult (20). The teacher must transcend self in order to generalize knowledge.

An example of Huberman’s critique of teacher research exists in my project. At the termination of the course, I analyzed data and made inferences about performances in the writing class based on my experiences and those reflected in the students’ writings. Though I tried to separate the roles of researcher and teacher by not analyzing the data until after the course was terminated, these two roles cannot be separated, especially when the data is not triangulated by a third party. My methods for data collection rely on a course I designed with research questions I composed based on teaching experiences and a pilot study of my own course. Observation of a particular phenomenon is usually indicative of empirically-based methodologies and locates truth externally. Yet, these

observations, when viewed and interpreted by the teacher who is conducting research of her own class, are also mediated by her experiences in the context of the classroom and her teaching experiences both past and present. Yet these practices are valued, even called for in composition research. Scholars such as Jane Mathison Fife and Peggy O’Neil (2000), propose that more contextualized research is needed in order to connect research to the classroom specifically and practically.

Ray cites other limitations of teacher research such as the teacher research creates a tension in the classroom between researching and teaching and divides the teacher’s attention between data gathering and instruction (184). Likewise, in some educational settings, teacher research caters to the logistics and politics of schools rather than promoting change from within the classroom. Another problem with much teacher research that Ray cites is that teachers need to be trained in methodological inquiry. And, with the demands placed on teachers, there is little time to do research.²²

Rather than viewing theory as existing “out there” to be applied to the teacher research when it is written up, Ray proposes to see theory as Robert Scholes does: as function rather than form. Theory is a way of seeing and questioning rather than a body of already existing knowledge.²³ Teacher researchers proceed on the “alternative premise that teaching and researching are interactive, that they form a dialectical relationship in

²² Ray argues that teacher researchers need to know how to address these critiques by seeing the classroom as the locus of change. She argues against the university-based research hierarchy that prevails, such as what Stephen North describes *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. She calls for more K-12 research and not viewing teaching as the transmission of knowledge, but as a powerful inquiry.

²³ Scholes calls this *textual power*—a willingness to step outside of patterned ways of thinking and behaving to make strange the familiar in order to see where change is needed in the classroom (qtd. in Ray 184).

which they continually inform each other” (184).²⁴ The benefits of teacher research are understanding one’s own practice and approach to teaching and being able to share these approaches and understandings in a way that can be generalized and create dialogue within the teacher community.

Teacher Research and Feminist Methods: Reflection and Collaboration

Teacher research takes a “questioning, reflective stance toward teaching and learning” in order to encourage the reciprocal benefits of research for teachers and students (Cochran-Smith and Lytle “Research” 3). Through this questioning and reflective stance, a teacher-researcher is always revising her teaching and questioning how knowledge is produced. This stance helps to account for some of the critiques of teacher research such as Huberman’s. Likewise, Sandra Harding’s “Is There a Feminist Method?” (1987) proposes that an open discussion of the “researcher’s *relation* to the subject (the researcher’s presence and authority are never neutral), the *purpose* of the researcher’s questions (they must be *grounded* in the subject’s experience and be relevant to the subject); and (3) the researcher’s *agenda* (it is never disinterested) (256). The tenets of teacher research as well as the feminist methods proposed by Harding complement one another and encourage the researcher to reflect and consider carefully the power dynamic and subjectivity involved in conducting teacher researcher. Feminist methodology demands attention to the position of researcher and participant.

²⁴ “Theorists of reflective practice are interested in helping teachers understand, question, investigate, and take seriously their own learning and practice. [. . .] They believe that practitioners, like teachers, must research their own work sites. This involves their recognizing and generating their own contextually sensitive theories of practice, rather than importing them from the outside. Through continuous investigation and monitoring of their own efforts, practitioners produce a corpus of valuable, though underprivileged, practical knowledge” (Brookfield 215).

I found certain challenges related to my dual role of teacher and researcher. As the instructor, I am in a traditionally authoritative role. I give students grades, plan class sessions, select course materials, create assignments, etc. Conversely, my subject position as a researcher of students' oral presentations calls into question my role as the authority figure in my classroom. For example, when I asked students to critique their peers' presentations and to write reflections on their presentations, I had to ask myself: Are students really free to critique and question when I am the evaluator of their oral presentations and writing?

More so in interpreting the data than in the actual classroom did I have to negotiate my role as researcher with my role as teacher. When I was in the classroom, I was not analyzing data. My goal was to collect data and then to analyze it after the conclusion of the course. Yet, even in the classroom, I recognized that my presence was not neutral, as Harding suggests. For example, as a reflective researcher, I had to be aware of the students' sense of the "teacher-as-audience" in their participation in class, in their performances within their presentations and within their writing. I continually asked myself throughout the course were these students, like David Bartholomae suggests, acclimating to the academic discourse which will serve them in the university; in critiquing each other are they mimicking what they have heard in order to make a good grade? (which also serves them well in the university).

Ultimately, I find occupying the role of teacher-researcher has advantages that outweigh some of the possible drawbacks. Teachers (as opposed to outside researchers) are able to "observe activities in the classroom on a regular basis" (Hawisher and Pemberton 79). Because my research is based on teaching practices and experiential

knowledge, I designed a course that met the expectations of the university and the writing program, as well as the needs of my research. Occupying both roles as teacher and researcher allowed me to contextualize the writing assignments as well as the students' participation in the classroom more fully than an outside researcher. In other words, I tried to make my agenda as a researcher augment my goals as a teacher. I saw incorporating performance-based assignments into the writing classroom as a way to give students a better facility with speaking, writing, and participating in civic discourse. This goal met both my teaching and research needs as well as benefited my students.

Taking a reflective stance as a researcher and teacher is of utmost importance to the teacher-researcher. Composition scholar Louise Wetherbee Phelps proposes that reflection helps to marry theory and practice (qtd. in Yancey 7). Teachers' reflections on their work in the classroom enhance their teaching (Applebee; Brookfield; Hillocks 7). Kathleen Blake Yancey describes the benefits of reflective practice cyclically. Teachers can "examine their own practices, make hypotheses about successes and failures there, as well as the reasons for each, shape the next iteration or similar experience according to what we have learned [. . .] and begin the cycle again" (126–127). Scholars claim that the benefits of reflective practices can lead to generating practical knowledge to enhance the field, as well as finding better ways to get students to participate in social/civic affairs.

Both teacher research and feminist methodology seek to produce research that not only benefits the field in general and the researcher, but also benefits the subjects, the students. Reflection, the students' and the teacher's, functions in this project as both an important part of the teacher research methodology as well as the material data, providing

what Yancey terms in *Reflection in the Writing Classroom* (1998) as “the processes by which we know what we have accomplished” and “the products of those processes (e.g., as in “a reflection) (6).²⁵

Thus, a reflective stance taken by both teacher and student in the research process leads to a collaborative knowledge-making endeavor. Grappling with the issue of classroom discourse Jim Berlin states in “Comment and Response” (1989) that “ rhetoric is always situated in ideology, not above it, providing a set of rules for deciding...who can speak, what they can say, how they can say it, who can respond to them, and who can make decisions about all these matters” (“Comment” 771). Students’ active reflection make them active participants in learning and research. Thus, through reflection this project is representative of both students’ voices (in their reflective writings) and the teachers’ investigation of the classroom. Through reflection, this project represents the collaborative nature of student and teacher voices in research in writing instruction.

Narrowing the Scope: The Presentation as Performance of Writing:

My initial goal in designing the course and the dissertation project was to look at how the incorporation of “performing writing” in several capacities could augment students’ writing. From my data, I chose to focus my inquiry on students’ oral presentations of their textual analysis written assignment as a qualitative study to determine the value of one particular performance-based practice in the context of a particular writing assignment. Given the nature of the presentation, its oral and visual

²⁵ Drawing on the work of Lev Vygotski, John Dewey, Michael Poloyani, and Donald Schoen, Yancey investigates reflection as a dialogical process of projection, retrospection (or review), and revision. For writing it likewise includes three processes: 1. goal setting, revisiting, and refining; 2. text revising in light of retrospection; 3. the articulating of what learning has taken place, as embodied in various texts as well as processes used by the writer. Reflection is a rhetorical event which Yancey relates to the writing process. (6)

components, the interactive nature of the presenter with the audience, and the rich association with the canon of delivery and rhetoric's connection to theatre, I narrowed the scope of my project to investigate two moments of performance in the writing classroom: students' oral presentations on a written assignment before the final draft was due and students' written reflections on their processes of writing and speaking about their written assignment. I had often incorporated presentations and informal impromptu speaking in my writing classes, as well as students' written reflections on assignments, but I had not formally studied the connection between composition and performance in such a capacity.

In order to more fully understand the connection among orality, literacy, and performance, I looked at students' presentations during unit one, the textual analysis written assignment. Students delivered oral presentations on their first writing assignment at least one week before their final drafts of the textual analysis essay were due. Therefore, the performance-based presentation functioned as part of students' writing processes. As I narrowed the scope of my project, I focused on the following research questions:

- How do elements of performance in students' oral presentations of their writing affect how they position themselves as writers/users of language?
- What are the implications of integrating a specific performance-based assignment, the presentation of student writing, into the writing classroom for students and for writing pedagogy?

Oral/Visual Presentations:

In order to answer these research questions, I viewed and reviewed digital video recordings of students' presentations and analyzed them for performance-based elements which are listed and defined under the next heading "Definition of Terms for Analysis." Of the eighteen students in my English 20803 class, one elected not to participate in the research project. One student dropped the course after the first unit. For the other sixteen students in the class, I viewed the digital video recordings of students' presentations after the conclusion of the course. For all of the students' presentations, I took notes during their live presentations in order to deduce the performance elements. Using my notes from the live presentations, I based my analysis and interpretation of the digital video recorded presentations on the work of performance-theorists Richard Schechner, Marvin Carlson, and Henry Bial, as well as tropes used in speaking, writing, and theatre (voice, tone, aside, gesture for example).²⁶ Using the following definitions, I analyzed each student's presentation.

Definition of Terms for Analysis:

The differences among *delivery*, *presentation*, and *performance* are at times subtle, and characteristics of all three overlap at some point as discussed in chapter one. These definitions help to distinguish the use of these three terms in this project.

- **Delivery:** Canon of rhetoric which relies on the speaker's physical, intellectual, and verbal expression and abilities to convey ideas or persuade an audience.

²⁶ Two other theorists provide a rhetorical/social/performative dimension to this study. Kenneth Burke, often in English studies used for rhetorical theory is also used in performance theory, especially dramatism, which borrows dramaturgical terms as a heuristic for motives in rhetoric. Erving Goffman focuses on the social context of performances in everyday life, proposing that the event creates the role and performance, itself.

- **Presentation:** An event bound by time and format that relies on the act of delivery to demonstrate the analysis of an argument for an audience. This event is usually rehearsed and is the act on which this dissertation focuses
- **Performance:** The speaker's individual nuances, both aesthetic and social, within the presentation which, taken together, convey meaning. Performances, according to performance theorist Marvin Carlson, either "display skill or display behavior" (70). Further defining performance as a subset of conduct which is a subset of behavior, Dell Hymes adds that performances "assume a responsibility to an audience and to tradition as they understand it" (qtd. in Carlson 12).
- **Performance Elements:** Qualities related to theatre and drama, writing and rhetoric, evident within the act of presenting and the act of writing. These acts rely on rhetoric's relationship to theatre to convey meaning aesthetically and to describe social interactions which convey meaning.

Performance Elements

- *Voice* in a presentation: the literal heard quality of the spoken word; may include, volume, inflection, enunciation.
- *Tone* in a presentation: the overall attitude or quality of the speaker toward the subject matter when presenting.
- *Style* in a presentation: The way the speaker chooses words, arranges them in sentences or in lines of dialogue and develops the ideas before an audience. Also the overall quality of the presentation which draws from the physicality used in expression.
- *Movement* in a presentation: any physical changing of position within a presentation (includes gesture and positioning)
 - *Gesture:* a specific physical movement consisting of facial expression and hand movements for emphasis on a certain point. The physical movement(s) of the speaker during the presentation to emphasize a point. Gesture reveals character and may include facial expressions as well as movements of other parts of the speaker's body such as the hands for pointing.
 - *Positioning:* where the speaker situates himself physically in relationship to the audience or viewer
- *Aside* in a presentation: words spoken directly to the audience that are not central to the content or main idea of the presentation; words spoken in a parenthetical fashion. (could be scripted or impromptu)

- *Impromptu* in a presentation: as in theatre, lines spoken that are not scripted but “in the moment” of the presentation.
- *Role(s)*: a part one plays within a performance, characterization. Also described as “persona.”
- *Ethos*: Aristotelian artistic proof, an appeal in which the character of the speaker is portrayed through his or her delivery and interaction with the audience, as well as the overall character in a context.

Other Terms of Importance:

- **Setting:** In the presentation, the background knowledge or summary of the article or documentary so that the audience can establish a context for the work and its analysis.²⁷
- **Audience:** A term integral to delivery, presentation, and performance because performance cannot exist without the interaction between the speaker and the audience. Also, the people, group of peers, and teacher who view and listen to the speaker.
- **Rehearsal:** A preparatory event before the final performance or presentation. In this project students were encouraged to practice their presentations before delivery of their final. In this project the presentation also functions as a rehearsal for their essays since they are presenting some of the same material and getting feedback before their final essays are evaluated.

Using these performance elements to interpret a presentation has a precedent in performing literature, oral reading, and communication. Therefore, as students “perform” their writing by delivering an argument for the class, they have a specific, situated rhetorical and social interaction with an audience. These performance-based elements of students’ presentations can heighten sensitivity to how students use performance in the writing classroom.

²⁷ I provide this contextual information and do not refer to it as “setting” verbatim in the dissertation.

Analysis of Students' Written Reflections

After analyzing students' presentations, I compared my interpretation of students' presentations to students' reflections on their presentations. Their written reflections were based on the unit one prompt mentioned in my outline of the course:

- In what ways was presenting on your analysis paper helpful or unhelpful to your process of composing your draft/final paper or vice versa? How has writing and speaking on this topic solidified or changed your position on this subject? While writing and presenting on your topic, did you take-on any role(s) which gave you a different perspective on your topic, writing, or speaking? (i.e. expert, audience, novice, other) Provide examples from your experiences to answer the questions.

Students who wrote reflections on their own presentations and on their writing exercised what Yancey would term as “staged” reflection, (a fitting adjective for work that investigates issues of performance in the writing classroom). Questions guided students to think about what they have learned. Examples of “staged” questions are: “What have you learned? How does this connect with what you already knew/know? Is this what you expected to learn, why or why not? What else do you need to learn? How will you go about learning it? According to Yancey, reflection is beneficial to students as a knowledge-making activity, making them “agents in their own learning.” Yancey describes this activity of reflection as beneficial because it allows students to “articulate learning that has taken place” (6). In this project students' written reflections on their oral presentations and writing engage them in a critical process to articulate their learning as well as function as a literal product of that work.

Reflection as data in this project also benefits students in that it incorporates their literal voices into the research. Their written reflections serve as material from which to glean knowledge about the function of performance in students' perceptions of their writing. Students' oral presentations on their writing are analyzed for performative elements. This data is compared to and considered only in relationship to how students understood themselves as speakers and writers as evidenced in their written reflections. Incorporating student perspectives helps, at least in part, to provide a voice to mediate that of the teacher-researcher. Students' written reflections on their presentations and writing provide a fuller perspective of students' perceptions of their performances, as well as balance out a teacher-researcher based interpretation.

Students not only reflected upon their presentations and writing, but they also wrote about their peers' presentations by evaluating them using a rubric and an evaluation letter which was kept anonymous to the speaker. Students chose one of their peers to critique, and I averaged my evaluation with the peer evaluation. Adding a peer evaluation component gave the audience a responsibility to the presenter and the presenter a responsibility to the audience. I also think it took some of the authority from the teacher-as-evaluator, adding a more interactive dimension between student presenter and peer audience. Moffett firmly believes that peers are a natural audience; students write much better when they do so for their peers. A peer audience shifts authority to the peer group and the teacher takes an indirect role (*Universe* 194). Another advantage of peer audiences is that by habitually responding and coaching each other, students get more insights into their own writing. Thus, the role of the teacher, Moffett claims, is to teach the students to teach each other (*Universe* 196). Working with students' written

reflections is central to my study because reflection benefits the students in that they are synthesizing and taking stock of the work they and their classmates have produced. Including these reflections gives students a voice within the project and provides a dialogical perspective of both teacher and student.

Teacher research and feminist methods encourage the making of knowledge through *collaboration*. In direct opposition to positivistic research methods, teacher research assumes that knowledge and truth are not so much found through objective inquiry “as socially constructed through collaboration among students, teachers and researchers” (Ray 175). These two perspectives together—those of the teacher and those of the student—present a more collaborative project.

Preparation for Presentations: In-Class Unit One Activities

Students’ presentations of their textual analysis essays were a supplementary assignment to the textual analysis essay and were delivered a week before students turned in their final essays. Yet, before students delivered their essays, much preparation for the textual and oral assignment took place over the course of unit one. During the second class meeting, I introduced the textual analysis unit and the textual analysis essay. This unit introduced students to the concept of informed citizenry—that their participation as citizens, as readers and writers in the public sphere, depended on being informed, close-readers of current arguments and understanding the audiences to which these arguments are directed.

To illustrate this purpose, I brought in an op/ed piece “Diversity in Everything but Thought” by George Will, a writer for the *Washington Post* Writers Group. This piece

appeared in the local newspaper, *The Fort Worth Star Telegram* on Sunday, November 28, 2004 and examined the danger of one group's political ideology dictating the agenda of colleges and restricting intellectual diversity. In the piece, Will compares universities to "intellectual versions of one-party nations," yet contrasts the "candor" these nations have concerning their ideological monopolies to the university's proclamations of "their commitment to diversity as they have become more intellectually monochrome" (6).

Students and I read the piece aloud; I asked them to mark places in the text that they agreed or disagreed with, or were indifferent to. I opened the floor with a broad, but straightforward, "What is Will's main idea here?" Matt, who sat in the front of the class, took the lead stating that the author is pointing out a difference between what is preached versus what is practiced in academia. I then asked, "Who would care about such a thing as to what political and social values are being professed in the university?" This was a tougher question, as students looked down at the article, or looked at me with uncertain expressions. One student said, "I have never thought about that." I then directed the class to look further at Will's argument and how he proves his point. We discussed word choice, I wrote the words *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos* on the board and explained their meanings and asked for examples of each in the text. I pointed out the metaphor use in the text, Will's comparison of college campuses to one-party nations to demonstrate the university's non-democratic characteristics. And, we looked at sources that Will used within his text. After analyzing the text, I made the point that articles in the public domain are meant for specific audiences in order to make a claim that reflects something specific about our culture.

This discussion provided a segue to introduce the first assignment of the class, “Analysis of Social Critique in the Textual Public Domain.” (See Appendix *Unit 1: Analysis of Social Critique in the Textual Public Domain*). The Analysis of Social Critique in the Textual Public Domain asked students to write a textual analysis of an article (scholarly or popular) of their choosing and to demonstrate how the argument was constructed for a specific audience in order to make a claim that reflects something about a specific culture or cultures. Students were required to write a 5-7 page rhetorical textual analysis and present their findings to the class in a five minute presentation before the paper was due. Students were instructed to include two secondary sources: (1) to demonstrate that the topic they were discussing was relevant to a select audience and (2) to have a more informed knowledge base when speaking to the class.

Based on their analyses of the texts, which were to discuss the article’s appeal to a certain audience, its organization, style, and use of Aristotelian appeals, students were instructed to make a claim about *how their article achieves its argument and makes social commentary*. This was different from merely reporting the author’s claim or the students’ opinions on the author’s stance; students were arguing about how the author’s techniques formed his or her claim, not their opinion on the piece. I also commented that opinion/editorial pieces such as Will’s “Diversity,” made it easier to locate the author’s argument and more informational pieces will not put forth an overt argument. An overt argument would make it easier to determine how the author achieves his/her main idea through persuasive tactics.

Students read chapter two of the class text, *Everything’s an Argument* (2004) which discussed types of Aristotelian appeals, ethos, logos, pathos, how to connect to the

reader or writer, making a claim, the style of an argument, and organization of the argument. The next class period, we went over their reading and I introduced them to finding primary texts for their analyses essays. I showed them how to access periodicals such as *The New York Times Online* as well as *The Washington Post*. We also discussed the difference between those articles and ones written in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and practiced finding articles using databases available through the school's library. Students spent class time browsing online essays and articles of interest that could be approved by me for the analysis assignment; they were instructed to bring in two articles from a newspaper, magazine or scholarly journal for the next class period. I tried to stress the importance of selecting a topic that they were interested in because they would be working on this assignment over the course of four weeks and could potentially become more informed on something that they would talk about outside of class.

The next class period, students brought in a variety of articles ranging from scholarly journals to popular trade magazines. One student, Todd, brought in an article on steroid abuse by major league baseball players from *Sports Illustrated*. Many students browsed *Time Magazine*—both online in hard copy at the library—and brought in articles about health, sports, and politics. Only one student, Adam, selected a scholarly journal article which was about international law and the Alien Torte Claims Act. One student, Cindy, selected an article from *The New Yorker Online* about the founders of collegehumor.com, a popular website among college students created by twenty-somethings who are now multi-millionaires. I had students share informally the two pieces they brought. Then, they either brought-up the article on their computers or put the hard copies on a table in the middle of the room and had everyone “browse” our make-

shift reading room for an article of interest. The goal of the class was to have students select their article that they would analyze for the paper.

I continued having the class practice textual analysis with different types of essays and articles. During one class session, students read, “Dropping Men’s Teams to Comply with Title IX” by Peter Monaghan. This article originally appeared in the December 1998 *Chronicle of Higher Education*. We read the article aloud and then analyzed the piece for Aristotelian appeals. The class discussed both their opinions on the issue of Title IX and also their opinions on the construction of the article, which provided a rich discussion on how the belief that women and men deserve equal treatment shapes public policies from government to education, and in this case even sports. Students also worked in small groups to write a summary of the article and its main claim in order to rehearse their textual analysis essay. Students then had to summarize the articles they had chosen to write about and include a discussion of the cultural values advocated in the article.

Another topic discussed during the textual analysis assignment was the importance of audience: how a writer establishes credibility with them and the concept of *sensus communis*—how the author highlights shared values in order to connect with his or her audience. Using sample texts, we outlined as a class how the author did or did not connect with his or her intended audience. We also discussed the organization of sample texts and purposeful stylistic choices authors make in order to connect with their audience and to underscore their points. Students were also instructed to turn in a draft of their analysis papers to me to give them textual feedback on their writing three class periods after having been introduced to the assignment. These drafts were also archived on the course website.

During our fifth class meeting, I introduced the presentation assignment. I provided the criteria for the presentation, a rubric and modeled a presentation. The criteria for the presentations resembled that of the textual analysis essay, but because of time restrictions, students had to select the best and most convincing evidence to demonstrate their theses. Students were given five to seven minutes to present the thesis on the author's achievement of the argument, rhetorical findings, and the social commentary or values advocated in the piece.

The rubric for the presentation consisted of *content*, *organization* and *delivery*. The *content* was judged based on the speaker's inclusion of a summary of the article, a thesis about the author or article's achievement of the argument, details/analysis that led to the thesis, and social commentary being made. *Organization* was judged based on the clarity of the speaker's demonstration of the main points, smooth transitions from point to point, and if the presentation came across as rehearsed. *Delivery* was judged on the engagement with the audience, a clarity of voice, voice projection, presenting under the allotted amount of time, and enunciation. Based on a random drawing, students presented on one of three days devoted to class presentations and were instructed to bring hard copies of their articles the class period before their presentations so peers could familiarize themselves with the articles on which they were presenting. Students were given the ratings of unsatisfactory, poor, satisfactory, good, and excellent for each category. Appendix I contains the article analysis presentation rubric.

The audience also had specific instructions during the presentations. They needed to determine how well the presenter interacted and conveyed his or her message to them. Audience members needed to come away from the presentation knowing both what the

article was about and the presenter's thesis about how the author achieved his or her argument. They also needed to come away from the presentation with knowledge of how the presenter's analysis led them to their theses and how this article functioned in the textual, public domain. The audience was also responsible for writing at least one comment which would lead the presenter to think about the analysis of the text in greater detail or to give comments which would help the presenter enhance the clarity of his/her argument.

After explaining the presentation assignment and handing out criteria, I told the class that I was going to model a sample presentation for them. "Pretend I am a student in this class and I am writing on the opinion/editorial piece, 'A Personal Account By Any Other Name Is . . . (2005) from the *Fort Worth Star Telegram* by noted columnist Molly Ivins." I handed-out copies of the article to the class and gave them a basic synopsis while I brought up an outline of my presentation on the projected screen behind me. Ivins's article focuses on the shift in semantics for political purposes, specifically how President Bush's proposed new social security policy has morphed from a plan which would allow younger workers to put money into "private" accounts into one which was now called a "personal" account. Ivins makes the point that semantics is used for political purposes. Social security reform proved a timely argument for the class to discuss and to understand how cultural values were being shaped by political language.

Though not a requirement, in my model presentation, I incorporated a visual aid: a word document which contained an outline projected behind me as I spoke. The outline followed the points that I made orally. I explained that a visual aid would help highlight certain points and could give the audience a better sense of the article.

I first gave a summary of the Ivins's piece: "Through the use of the example of the Republican's shift from using the term 'private' accounts to 'personal' accounts to describe the proposed social security policy, Molly Ivins discusses the Right's manipulation of language to serve its own interests." My thesis about the analysis of the article was, "Ivins's argument relies on ethos: the ethos of the right, the left, and of certain right-leaning personnel to demonstrate how the right manipulate language to persuade the public. I highlighted several points of my analysis such as the dichotomy set up in the word choices of Liberal and Conservative, right-wing and left wing, Republicans and Democrats. Liberals, for example, use language as to "not hurt people's feelings; whereas, Republicans "march lock-step to change language to respond to the public." I also included Ivins's examples of Republicans such as John Leo, Karl Rove, and Frank Lutz who manipulate language to gain political control. I included a source from PBS's *Frontline* interview with Karl Rove and a *Washington Post* article which focused on how semantics shapes politics to demonstrate the importance of this controversy in the public sphere. The larger conclusions and social critique that I saw in these pieces were that rhetoric has importance and has influence on the media and the public's understating of an issue and how certain groups can capitalize on the emotions of the general public rather than using logical appeals to support claims. Appendix J contains the visual aid that I used during my model presentation.

The students critiqued my presentation, and most of the comments were positive, I suppose, because I was their teacher. I asked students to give feedback that would help me draft my final essay or to clarify anything that they did not understand. Jenna, a freshman who had clepped-out of freshman Composition, said that she felt she needed

more background about the issue of social-security reform, even though that was not the immediate topic of the piece. Another student, Raymond, a political science major and a Democrat, filled Jenna and the rest of the class in on Social Security Reform. Another student, Matt, also a political science major and moderate Republican, joined in this discussion and brought the topic back to the “war of the words,” his term for the Right’s battle to control language, but then used his comment to tell the class how Republicans are more or less “winning” this war. I encouraged the class to let me know how I could add or delete any details to help me write my paper. This question prompted Todd, a junior who was in the process of applying to TCU’s School of Business, to ask me to elaborate on how the article gave social commentary. Students used their various interests, political affiliations, and insights to respond to the topic on which I presented.

Modeling this presentation for the students provided them with a format and expectation of what needed to be covered and argued in the presentation. Giving students a model and a set format also conforms to one of the tenets of performance as discussed in chapter one, that a performance must be “based upon some pre-existing model, script, or pattern of action” (Carlson 12).

Before presentations were delivered, students spent another four class periods on the textual analysis paper. They also read “Spoken Arguments” in *Everything’s an Argument*, a chapter which focuses on arguments for the purpose of discussion, aspects of spoken argument which rely on its aural qualities, composing an argument to be heard, and incorporating visual resources into spoken arguments in order to prepare for their oral presentations of their textual analysis. We covered organizational strategies, stylistic choices, how to theorize about the social commentary being made through their analyses,

drafting, and incorporating fitting secondary sources into the assignment. Students turned in a draft of their analysis papers to me for textual feedback seven class periods before the final was due and four class periods before their presentations.

-Inter-chapter-

Performing Writing:

Students' Presentations and Written Reflections on Speaking and Writing

Because students are largely unaccustomed to having their writing taken seriously, teachers may well have to dramatize the transfer of control they wish their students to perceive.

*---Brannon and Knoblauch
"On Students' Rights to Their Own Texts" (161-62)*

The theoretical purpose for integrating and investigating the presentation as a performance-based activity in the writing class was to understand how attention to performance-based elements can enhance students' understanding of writing as well as instructors' approaches to teaching writing. Pedagogically and performatively, the purpose of integrating and incorporating the presentation as part of students' writing processes was for students to rehearse their writing analyses for a real audience.

Overall, students' presentations were a mix of carefully rehearsed, well thought-out, well-connected to the audience, carefully articulated and enunciated, as well as unorganized, barely audible, and a struggle for the audience to hear. The eight students' presentations and written reflections that I showcase here render a representative sample of the students of English 20803 in the spring of 2005.²⁸ These eight students represent a wide range of oral/visual and textual performances. Of the eight students, Jenna, Brett, Caitlin, Andrew, Michael, D.W., David P., and Alex, there are those who gave good

²⁸ Of the 18 students in the class, one dropped the class, one elected not to participate in the research, and one did not turn in a written reflection, leaving only fifteen students' presentations and writing as possible examples for performance-based writing practices.

presentations as well as poor presentations. Some were excellent students, and others were average to below-average students. Some of these students were extremely performative and engaging during the presentation; others simply gave a no-frills, standard presentation. There are two students, Jenna and Brad, who took the presentation in a different direction than what the assignment asked. Others, such as Caitlin, Andrew, D.W., and Michael followed the specific assignment guidelines and genre conventions of the presentation. There were also students, David P. and Alex, who resisted presentation guidelines. Some students in the sample stated in their written reflections that they learned much from their presentations that carried-over into their written assignments; others stated that the presentation was not helpful at all in aiding them to write on the same assignment. Yet, both the oral and written performances demonstrate how students gained authority over the assignment in varied ways that a written text cannot demonstrate alone. The ways in which scholars of writing have defined students' taking control or gaining authority over their writing have not accounted for the various ways in which students take ownership over "what they say." Performance demonstrate these various ways.

Authority is a contested term in composition. From classroom dynamics and student agency to teacher response and evaluation, *authority*, as noted by Peter Mortensen and Gesa Kirsch, rests on several contingent meanings in composition studies. Other terms such as *empowerment*, *power*, and *control* also denote the idea of authority as a condition of persuasion, coercion or a mandate. Mortensen and Kirsch's "On Authority in the Study of Writing" (1993), notes that there are multiple, contingent

meanings of the word *authority*; therefore, it is necessary to discuss “concepts of authority” (556).

Though many composition courses and instructors attempt to teach students to “write with authority” in order to empower them, Mortensen and Kirsch point out that there are limitations in theoretical approaches to empower students. The authors contend that theories which support assimilation and those that favor resistance tend to “objectify authority, to cast it as something fixed and autonomous that writers or writing can possess” (557). For example, in current traditional rhetoric, authority resides in the work, or text, itself. Mortensen and Kirsch point out, “Even the most effective challenges to current traditional rhetoric . . . still end to align authority with technique” (562). In cognitive theory, “authority is “seen as an independent entity waiting to be learned or used, making the instructor’s job that of teaching students how to find and use this skill” (563). Social constructivists reject a “model of authority grounded in absolute transcendent truth,” but Mortensen and Kirsch critique social constructivism for its continued dependence on authority as an autonomous entity to be garnered” (563). In expressivism, authority resides within the author as evidenced by an “authentic voice” (see Elbow *Writing with Power* 1981). Ann M. Penrose and Cheryl Geisler complicated the sense of students’ voice contending that students need to feel a sense of expertise about their subject in order to write *from* authority rather than *with* authority (emphasis mine 506–507). Based on Mortensen and Kirsch’s concepts of authority in various theories in composition, *authority* is not fixed, does not reside exclusively in the product, the author, or even the outside world.

In this teacher-research project, my use of the term *authority* pertains to classroom dynamics and the collaborative nature of the performance, based on the interaction between the performer and the audience. That is, performance provides a direct interaction with an audience which allows students to take on authoritative roles. Students who perform their writing are in ways placed in the role of expert when they have to deliver a speech about their subjects before their peers. The very nature of the medium of performance fosters an authoritative stance, as students are literally positioned before their peers. Students given the opportunities to perform their writing before their peers have the floor to command authority. There is an interaction that must occur in a performance between performer and audience member. The audience comes to the performance expecting a performance event. This expectation of the exchange guides the performance act. Students in the role of performer, or speaker, in this case, must transact with the audience. They have a purpose for speaking, and the audience has a purpose for listening.

Though not speaking specifically about performances or oral presentations, Peter Sotiriou bases his discussion of authority on the work of Hans-Georg Gadamer to advocate a shift in the emphasis in authority from one based on obedience to that authority to one grounded in knowledge” (7–8). Instead of thinking about *authority* as control, or power, or the enforcement of laws, Gadamer asserts that knowledge is the guide to gaining authority. Gadamer states, authority is granted when “the individual, group, or text has something to teach” (qtd. in Sotiriou 8). According to Sotiriou, giving students the chance to let their own knowledge instruct others may help them assume more confidence in that knowledge, allowing them more control over their writing. I

contend that even though some students are not as knowledgeable about their topics and subjects, or even good speakers and presenters, all are in the role of instructing others by being positioned in front of the audience for a performance event.

Students who are given the opportunity to speak in front of their peers illustrate the concept of “ethos.”²⁹ Nan Johnson traces ethos historically in “Ethos and the Aims of Rhetoric” (1984). Grounding her contrast of ethos as virtue and prerequisite for speaking to ethos as selected and stylistically presented, Johnson relies on Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian: “A focus on the ‘opinion of the hearers is typical in pragmatic definitions of ethos; the emphasis is placed much more on the speaker’s need to be aware of audience needs than on the disposition of the intrinsic value of the orator’” (108). Johnson describes contemporary rhetoric as guided by this pragmatic and strategic approach and critiques pragmatic approaches to ethos for eschewing “moral implications” (112-13)³⁰. However, she notes in this pragmatic understanding of ethos that it is often conflated with what she calls stylistic headings: *tone, writer’s voice, personal voice, attitude, persona, and credibility* (51). A pragmatic understanding of ethos often conflates with dramatic/theatrical terminology associated with performance.

Because this study focuses on performance, taking its theatrical connotations of the interaction between the performer and the audience, this study highlights the presenter’s need to be aware of the audience as well as what the audience desires in and from a speaker. This reciprocity is essential in order to fully understand the concept of audience. Empathy helps to explain this transaction and can be described in short as

²⁹ *Ethos* is a controversial term when discussing voice and authenticity. The question of ethos as real virtue in a speaker or just the appearance of virtue is one that has been debated throughout the history of rhetoric. (See Plato’s *Gorgias*)

³⁰ Johnson exempts Richard Weaver and Wayne Booth from this critique of modern rhetoricians.

putting oneself in the other person's shoes, having an affinity with others on an emotional level. Empathy is explained in communication theory, according to Denise Mier (1983) as a way to "skillfully link the analytic rational sense with an emotional empathic sense for effective communication" (297). Identifying four functions of empathy in communicative reading processes, Elbert R. Bowen, Otis J. Aggertt, and William E. Rickert state,

First it operates to guide the reader's response to the literature. . . . Second, empathy functions in the audience response to the reader. . . . Third, if genuine communication is taking place, the interpreter will experience an empathic response to the audience. . . . The fourth instance of empathy occurs as the produce to the preceding three: the audience responds empathically to the literature. (173)

The concept of empathy explained in the context of oral reading and literature can be applied to the act of presenting in the writing classroom. The speaker is the one interpreting his or her work for an audience of peers. Authority for some students was garnered through empathy. The presenter controlled the presentation. The audience responded; the speaker did/didn't experience the response. The successful presenter considered empathy as a way of engaging his audience and experienced empathy in the form of actual feedback from the audience.

For some students in this project they gained authority based on how they constructed their ethos as presenters and in their written reflections. Students gained authority over the assignment by drawing on various approaches to interact with the audience. Each student entered into the assignment differently to gain control or expertise

over the material. The following chapters, 3, 4, 5, and 6, are analyses of eight students' presentations and written reflections which demonstrate the many and varied ways students gained authority over their writing assignments through performances. Throughout chapters three through six, students' written reflections on their speaking and writing are italicized as a marker for the reader to distinguish between the oral performances and written performances showcased here.³¹

Chapter Three discusses The Authors—Jenna and Brett, two students who take the assignment in a different direction than what was asked of them by assuming the roles of the authors of the articles they are analyzing. Chapter Four looks exclusively at The Experts—Caitlin and Andrew, who use their personal connections to the topic to assert authority over the assignment. Chapter Five treats The Crowd Pleasers—Michael and D.W. The Crowd Pleasers, like The Experts, conform to the genre conventions of the presentation, but garner authority by attending to their audience and interacting with them. And finally, Chapter Five acquaints us with The Resisters—David P. and Alex, who resist the conventions of the presentation, thereby gaining authority over the assignment by resisting it.

³¹ The full texts of students' written reflections are located in Appendix K. Written reflections are listed in the order they appear in the dissertation.

CHAPTER THREE

The Authors:

Jenna and Brett

Though the assignment for the presentation asked students to argue a thesis about how the article or author uses rhetorical strategies to convince the reader of the argument, Jenna and Brett took on the stance of the author of the articles they were analyzing. Jenna's article "How Old Is Too Old to Have a Baby?" (2005) argues for age-limits on the use of reproductive technology. Brett's article, "Lying about Terry Schiavo" (2003), argues that Michael Schiavo did not have his wife, Terry's, interests in mind when he enacted the decision to remove the feeding tube that was keeping her alive.

In their written reflections on their presentations, both students comment on their positions in relationship to the author. Jenna literally writes in her reflection that the "stance of Caplan became the stance of me." In Brett's written reflection, he states that Hentoff, the author of the article he analyzed, made some good "observations" which led him to agree and to "take the position that Michael Schiavo is killing his wife by discontinuing the use of her feeding tube. Brett states in his reflection that it is his *belief* that Michael Schiavo is not acting in his wife's best interest.

Jenna and Brett take on the author's argument in different manners in their presentations. Jenna is more performance-based. Her goal is to persuade the audience that the government should provide age limits for those seeking fertility treatments. Brett identifies the author's stance as his own only at the end of his presentation, telling the audience that Michael Schiavo did not have his wife's best interest at hand when he

removed the feeding tube. Each student's performance demonstrates how they assume the role of author to gain authority in the writing classroom.

Jenna

Jenna, a freshman, stands in a blue hooded sweatshirt and jeans to the right of the blank screen projected behind her. Waiting for her peers to all look at her before she begins her presentation, she adjusts her glasses and glances around the room. Her presentation follows one of her classmates, Melissa. The two sat next to each other in class, often partnering-up for group-work assignments, both turning in optional drafts for me to respond to before the final assignment. Once, the two told me they bonded over being freshmen in a sophomore-level class. English 20803 is a requirement for graduation, but unlike English 10803 which is usually comprised of freshmen who are just beginning to negotiate college classroom dynamics, deciding on a major and getting a sense of the University life in general, English 20803 usually consists of sophomores, juniors, and senior who have declared their majors. In this class in particular, out of the eighteen students, three were freshmen. Jenna, who had tested out of freshman English and Melissa and Andrew who had received college-level credit for freshman English in high school. These three freshmen, however, rose to the level and beyond of some of their more senior peers. Though many freshmen do not declare a major until after their freshman or even sophomore year, Jenna is majoring in criminal justice and is an incredibly focused student, as evidenced by the fact that she only turned town an appointment at the Naval Academy because of a medical problem.

Jenna demands the attention of her audience. "Okay, she says loudly, boldly, "I want you to imagine that you are talking to your parents, about the weather, about what's

going on in school,” Jenna says quickly and casually to her audience of college students. Jenna pauses for dramatic effect, “And they tell you out of the blue, we are going to have a baby.” She pauses again, emphasizing the gravity of her last phrase.

She continues, “Now most of you in this room have parents who are in their 40s, 50s, or even 60s,” her voice crescendos with each rise in decade. “They shouldn’t be having a baby, or,” Jenna pauses again, “should they?” She inflects the end of her sentence to ask the audience a rhetorical question. “That is exactly the question that Arthur Caplan addresses in ‘How Old Is Too Old to Have a Baby?’”

Jenna summarizes the article in which Caplan condemns the world’s oldest, (new) mom, Adriana Iliescu, as irresponsible and suggests government intervention to set guidelines for those who receive fertility treatment.

Jenna steps over to the computer and brings up a powerpoint slide which has her thesis statement written on it. To the left is a picture of Iliescu who is sitting in a hospital bed with a blue blanket covering her.

Reading promptly from the projected screen behind her, Jenna turns to the screen and states, “My thesis is that the article is effective because it connects with the audience through Aristotelian appeals in order to sway them to limit use of reproductive technology to include age limits.” She does not pause here in order for the audience to process her thesis, but the thesis is written on the slide next to the picture of Iliescu. Jenna moves on to talk about her first point, the author’s use of pathos. She directs the audience to look at the picture of Iliescu:

This is Adriana Iliescu. If you look closely at her picture, you will notice that around her eyes are crow's feet. Look at her sagging jowls. Even her hands are all wrinkly. Her hands look like my grandmother's.

As Jenna talks about Iliescu's eyes, jowls, and hands, she takes her index finger and traces under her right eye; she then clasps at her throat with her thumb and index finger and pulls at the skin on the top of her left hand. Jenna is both visually and rhetorically relating to the audience through a shared experience—all of the students in the class are youthful and most of her audience members' grandmothers are older adults.

Standing stage left of the projected screen, Jenna continues to critique the woman's appearance. Jenna neither lets the screen overtake her presence nor dominates the physical space by standing in front of it. Standing so that she is positioned to analyze the picture she continues, "Iliescu is clinging to her youth. Just look at her gaudy jewelry and her jet-black hair." As Jenna walks over to the computer to cue her next Powerpoint slide, under her breath she adds, but still audibly, "Now you know that's coming from a bottle." The class laughs at this remark.

When Jenna moves on to discuss the author's use of ethical appeals, she contrasts the author's credibility with the character of Iliescu. "Arthur Caplan [the author] is director of the Center for Bioethics at the University of Pennsylvania." "The author portrays Iliescu as a bad mother." Jenna precedes to cite examples from the text: "She did not have any eggs, she needed a donor for the sperm, because she was over forty; she was a high risk pregnancy; she already had an early miscarriage, and after she gave birth to twins one of them died."

Using her hands to stress the point about Iliescu's character, Jenna takes her right hand and turns it outward, "Older people who use artificial means to get pregnant don't even care that they are putting their children at risk or that their children may grow up without them, or not be functional adults."

At the conclusion of her presentation, Jenna gives her "social commentary" on the piece. But rather than couching it in terms of "what I learned from this piece" or "the social commentary is...", she brings-up the last panel of her presentation, the picture of Iliescu. "Older people are having children for their own selfishness. There is no set criteria for fertility treatment, and we need government intervention for criteria." She ends her conclusion emphatically, "Why should we let older individuals take care of children when," she pauses, "they can't take care of themselves? Thank you."

After her presentation, Andrew asks her, "What is your major?" "Criminal justice," Jenna replies. "Maybe you could be a prosecutor." Jenna smiles humbly and later writes about the compliment in her reflection on her presentation: *Even though studying law is not in my future, his inquiries were complimentary because he implied that I did know what I was talking about.*

Taking on the Author's Role

Jenna begins her presentation not with a thesis about how the author achieves the argument, but with a scenario which puts the audience in a position to reason that anyone their parents' ages or older is too old to have a baby. As the presentation progresses, Jenna argues the author's position that age limits should be set by the government for those seeking fertility treatment. Her juxtaposition of Caplan's character with Iliescu's and turning her hand out towards the audience when she says, "Older people who use

artificial means to get pregnant are putting their children at risk . . .” is one way her literal performances—selection of material, tone, and gesture—reveal her assumption of the role of author.

Reflecting on Her Role: Shaped by Performance and Shaping Performance

Much of Jenna’s written reflection on her presentation discusses taking on the role of the author. Jenna articulates her stance on the topic as informed by Caplan:

I had never thought or heard about older individuals having children. The information presented by Doctor Arthur Caplan . . . helped me realize that the government should intervene and establish set regulations in the fertility clinics. I agree with him that people over a certain age should not be allowed to have babies. . . . The stance of Caplan became the stance of me. In other words, I was his pupil and he was my teacher. Older people wanting to have children when their bodies are saying ‘No’[sic] do not seem to care for the welfare of their child. These adults do not understand that they will not be around for a large portion of their child’s life.

I had never been exposed to this topic, so I took the word of Caplan and various other authors who supported Caplan’s argument. I rarely came across any sources that suggested there should not be age limits for the use of reproductive technology. Obviously, Iliescu felt that there should not be age limits, but the majority of people feel having a baby at her age, 66-years-old, is unethical [. . .] not only because of the medical risks, but because it is equivalent to orphaning a child.

Jenna credits Caplan's information for formulating her position. In her written reflection she performs in many of the same ways as she did in the oral presentation. She degrades Iliescu's character and praises the author's. In fact, the bulk of her reflection is about her taking on Caplan's argument as her own. Jenna positions herself under Caplan's argument, even assigning herself a role in relationship to him as his pupil.

Jenna writes about learning from Caplan but performing in the presentation as an expert:

As I was presenting, however, I took the role of expert. I was very familiar with my article by then and knew what I was talking about. Although I was a novice while writing my paper, I became the expert during my presentation because I think the audience would respond better to somebody who knew what they were talking about.

Based on Jenna's written reflection and presentation, her role as expert (what I am calling author) gives Jenna a purpose. She takes on the role for the purpose of becoming "believable" to the audience. This role determines her performances within the presentation.

Though she relies on the role of author to establish her analysis of the piece for the presentation, in the act of putting the presentation together for the audience, she gleans her most performative material.

[A]fter adding a picture to my power point, I then discovered new information could be gleaned from the photograph [. . .]. Noticing that Adriana Iliescu wore gaudy jewelry and dyed her hair black illustrated

that she is trying to cling to her youth, which furthered my argument that she was too old to have a baby.

Incorporating the picture of Iliescu from the article, Jenna builds a case around the argument that Iliescu is too old to have a baby. Jenna's more performed-based portions of the presentation occur when she is discussing material that she, not the author presents. Performing her writing, then, becomes an invention technique for Jenna, one that helps solidify her argument. She even states that incorporating the picture helped her "discover" new information.

Brett

Unlike Jenna who is incredibly performative when taking on the author's role Brett, is not as performative. Yet, he advocates the author's position in his presentation and reflection. Brett, a quiet student, presents on the article, "Lying About Terry Schiavo," by Nat Hentoff from *The Village Voice*. Brett accessed the article from the conservative e-magazine *Frontpage.com*. After introducing the article by summarizing it, Brett delivers his thesis, "The author uses a great deal of sarcasm and by comparing his work with others he is able to establish credibility with his readers."

During his presentation, Brett speaks quickly with little enunciation, and I have to strain to hear him. He loses his place while explaining the "sarcastic" word choice of the author, pointing the class to words in the text such as "shoddy" and "inaccurate" to illustrate the author's opinions opposing Michael Schiavo. When he directs the audience to places in the text, he does not give the audience time to locate them. In support of the second point of his thesis (the author establishes credibility with his readers), Brett bends

down over the desk and then explains very quickly, almost mumbling, “The author cites sources to build credibility.”

After Brett vaguely explains the author’s use of sources to build credibility, he returns to his previous point about the author’s sarcasm. Brett then tells the class to look at paragraph five which contains an “example of his use of sarcasm.” Brett points out that after the governor’s orders to reconnect the feeding tube, “Michael Schiavo faxed doctors in the county where the life-saving procedure was about to take place, threatening to sue any physician who reinserted a feeding tube. Brett then states, “The author calls him a ‘devoted husband who has been living with another woman since 1995. Was that part of his marital vows?’” There is inflection in his voice when reading the rhetorical question. Brett looks up at the class after reading, “That’s how he uses sarcasm.”

As Brett concludes his presentation, there is a long pause. “Michael Schiavo’s actions are for his own benefit. The author uses sarcasm and credible sources to prove this.”

Though Brett provides one strong example of textual analysis in support of his thesis, his aesthetic performances portray him as an unsure and unorganized presenter. For the most part there is no inflection in his voice; it comes across almost monotone. When Brett directs the class to paragraph five, this is his most poignant example and the only time when he takes charge of his presentation and comes across as a presence during his presentation. Brett never seemed comfortable talking about the material in front of the class. During the presentation he stood behind a desk the entire time as to provide a barrier between him and the audience. His hands were shaking and he even began wringing them at one point. This posturing made the presentation seem unrehearsed, but

it could have just as easily been attributed to his uneasiness about delivering a presentation in front of the class.

Based on the style of Brett's performance, the way he arranges his evidence, and his physical movements, his trembling hands, standing behind the desk, and looking away from the audience, his aesthetic performance within the presentation do not coincide with his taking on the author's role. But the act of presenting in the author's role does allow Brett to gain authority over the content.

Reflecting on the Presentation:

Brett's performances within his presentation, his attempt to build a case around his thesis as well as share his opinion on the Terry Schiavo case, do not translate to the audience. However, when writing about his goals for presenting and sharing his opinion on the Schiavo case, Brett is more articulate. He writes:

As I look back on my presentation I did learn the contents of my article better. Having to present my presentation orally I was forced to find evidence for the position I was taking. . . . All of the words and quotes that I found to solidify my position suddenly stood out more than any of the other information. . . I didn't really have much prior knowledge of the specific story . . . or assisted suicide. In one way I wish I had prior knowledge . . . because it's always easier reading and analyzing a piece you have some familiarity with. On the other hand . . . I was able to go into the article with an open mind.

The author makes some very good observations on the husband's actions and words that led me to agree with him, taking the position that I have. . . . I feel the author has presented his facts and opinions in a very convincing way. I am very much in favor for letting Terri Schiavo live . . . I don't believe that her husband is acting on what he calls are sincere intentions.

Brett comes to the text, as he states, with no prior knowledge about the Schiavo case in particular and with an “open mind.” Yet, as Brett explains the process of presenting on the Schiavo article, he more vividly takes on the argument of the author. Brett writes about his agreement with the author in one full paragraph in his four-paragraph reflection. Conceding that the author’s “observations” led him to agree with the author, Brett takes on the Hentoff’s view as his own by the end of the reflection. He made a similar move in the presentation, where it was not until the end that he fully proposed the author’s view. Interestingly, Brett’s use of the term “my position” evidences his adoption of Hentoff’s point of view on assisted suicide in the case of Terry Schiavo. Brett also uses some of the same techniques as the author. In his presentation he discusses the author’s use of sarcasm to describe the author’s tone toward Michael Schiavo. In Brett’s reflection, he attempts a sarcastic stab at Michael Schiavo, calling his actions “sincere.”

Addendum

As Brett takes on the author’s role, and that is the subject of this interpretation, I must note that Brett finds a more comfortable role in that of “*an active audience member.*” He

finds that he learns more by watching his classmate's presentations than actually presenting himself. He writes:

As I took on the role of an active audience member I did learn some things that made my paper better. By listening to the other's presentations, I got a better understanding of what our paper was to consist of. I picked up on a few things that I was missing in my paper, which allowed me to add into the final draft..

As an audience member, Brett sees how the oral presentation can inform his written work. Brett, finds a more practical authority in the role of being an “audience member,” who learns from his peers. In the classroom, he is shy, reflective, and chooses to ask me questions either at the end of class when students are walking out of the classroom, or when students are working in small groups. His position as an audience member allows him a more contemplative, reflective authority over the assignment. As an audience member he is able to construct his role as a writer; as a speaker, he is unable to portray an authoritative position on the matter on which he is speaking.

Presentational Roles:

The role of *author* that these presenters take on translates into their performances. Jenna literally and physically embodies the argument of the author: her goal is to convince her classmates that Iliescu is too old to have a baby. She reasons alongside her classmates through the use of rhetorical questioning, the crescendo in her voice, anecdotes, and the use of a visual aid of Iliescu. She credits Caplan throughout her

presentation, but much of her performative style is more about persuading the audience that Iliescu is too old to have a baby. Her conclusion to her presentation is similar to a closing argument in which she argues that there should be age limitations on those who wish to use artificial means to have a baby. These performative elements augment Jenna's argument. When she is quoting from the text, Jenna seems restricted in her performances; they are not as engaging or interactive. When she is incorporating the visual, using an aside, or asking the class a rhetorical question, she embodies the author's argument to the point that it becomes her own.

Brett's performance augments his role of "author," but not with the same aesthetic nuances and overall appeal that Jenna's possesses. Brett's role of author is found in his selection of material to share with the audience, his admission at the end of the presentation and in his reflection that Michael Schiavo does not have his wife's best interest in mind. He takes authority over the presentation in his performance when he directs the class to paragraph five to quote from the text about Michael Schiavo living with another woman while he is legally married to Terry. He recognizes that the author is clearly hostile toward Schiavo's decision to remove his wife's feeding tube. Brett interprets the author's persuasive tactics as "sarcastic" and shares these "sarcastic" statements with the audience of his peers. The performance, because of its poor aesthetic, nearly inhibits the audience from seeing his role.

Though Jenna's and Brett's presentations and assumptions of the author's roles are vastly different, there are some striking similarities in how they take on these roles. First, they both use the stance of the author to gain familiarity with the information. Jenna

states that she needed to be “believable” to her audience. Both students state in their reflections that they had never thought about the topic before.

For both students, too, the material presented by the authors of the articles persuades them to agree with the author’s argument. Jenna states that she couldn’t find information supporting Iliescu’s position and found Caplan’s more believable. Brett does not discuss if he considered any other sources besides Hentoff’s, but acknowledges the source credibility helped to persuade him that the author was believable. Such a discussion of acquiescing to the author’s argument, almost without any reflection on the social or moral consequences, begs a discussion of academic discourse and students’ acculturation into the academy (e.g., Bartholomae 1980; Daiute, 1981, Hull, 1987). As students in this instance engage in a new social and cultural pursuit, they must learn to write within a culture in which they have little to no experience. Students must be socialized into this new culture and gain familiarity with its language and epistemology. In this way, Jenna’s and Brett’s assumption of the authors’ roles can be seen as an attempt to gain authority by using an authoritative stance to ground their relationship to the text.

Being persuaded by the material and not thinking about the other side of the argument may seem sophomoric or suggest that the assignment failed the students in that they were not able to see how these arguments involved multiple stakeholders. However, their engagement with the material and understanding of how an argument is constructed is a necessary first step for writers who are using source information and learning how to incorporate it into their work. Engaging with difficult material by taking on the author’s

stance helps these students who are working with unfamiliar subject matter and writing in an academic setting.

Both of these students engage with the author's material in a way that helps them to understand the practical concept of ethos as source credibility. Intriguingly, both students juxtapose the poor character of their subjects with the credibility of the author. Jenna juxtaposes the "bad mother" Iliescu with the "doctor" and "director of bioethics," Caplan. Brett juxtaposes Hentoff's use of authoritative sources to Michael Schiavo's wayward lifestyle. He lived with another woman while he was legally married to Terry Schiavo.

Though Jenna uses the presentation as a forum for invention overtly, Brett's invention process takes the form of revision. As he participates as an audience member, as he notes in his written reflection, he gets ideas for how to revise his paper. Though remarkably different presentations and uses of performance-based elements, both Jenna's and Brett's assumptions of the author's role and the medium of the presentation in general provide opportunities for them to gain an understanding of source credibility and invention. Jenna and Brett are learning to voice their opinions by identifying with the author, but their performances allow for an invention of their own ideas. There is a connection among dialogic, collaboration, creation and voice which contends with authoritative discourse. "Authority" has been used in *Composition* to describe both giving students "authority" over their writing and students' lack of authority. Bakhtin argues that the notion of retelling in one's own word is really discursive; it is a "revoicing" (*Imagination* 342, 345).

Such discourses is of decisive significance in the evolution of an individual consciousness. . . . the process of distinguishing between ones' own and another's discourse . . . is activated rather late in development. When thought begins to work in an independent, experimenting and discriminating way, what first occurs is a separation between internally persuasive discourse and authoritarians' enforced discourse . . . as [internally persuasive discourse] is further, that is freely developed, applied to new material, new conditions, it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts. (*Imagination* 345-6)

In the case of Brett and Jenna, who come to their topics with little to no knowledge and take on the role of the author in their presentations, the presentations allow a space to create their roles as authors, to try out arguments, to reason alongside a literal audience. Jenna invents her own argument, what Bakhtin would term, "half hers" and "half someone else's." She uses her experiences with the text as well as her personal experience in the performance to create material in her presentation. The performance situation and performance elements within the presentations provide ways for these presenters to gain authority before an audience.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Experts:

Caitlin and Andrew

Caitlin and Andrew are two students who choose to present on articles in which they have a personal investment in the topics. Caitlin chooses to present on the article, “Young Teens and Sex” (2005), from *People Magazine*. Caitlin is an avid reader of the magazine and also shares in her reflection that she supports an abstinence program, “The Silver Ring Thing,” featured in the article. This program advocates that young people should wait until marriage to have sex. For Andrew, being personally-invested in a topic is a fitting descriptor. He is an economics major who chooses to analyze and present on “The Economist’s President” (2005) from *The Wall Street Journal* which discusses President Bush’s economic policies. Both topics are vastly different, and both students have different ways in which they are personally invested in the topics.

Caitlin

Caitlin, like another student in the class, Melissa, has chosen to present on “Young Teens and Sex” from *People Magazine*. She introduces herself to the class and tells them, “My article is on ‘Young Teens and Sex’ from *People Magazine*. It is the same article as Melissa’s, so I apologize if it sounds extremely familiar.” Unlike Melissa, however, Caitlin does not have a Powerpoint presentation, and places a piece of white posterboard on the whiteboard with the words, “audience,” “logos,” “ethos,” “pathos,” and “organization” written on it in blue marker. She tells the audience, “I don’t do well with computers so this is all I have.” Though she words this statement as an apology,

Caitlin does not come across as ashamed of her lack of facility with technology or as inferior to Melissa, in fact, she looks directly at the audience and speaks to them clearly and confidently.

Caitlin opens her presentation with a statistic.

Sixty-four percent of TV shows contain sex, and this fact has parents worried that their teens are having sex.” *People* conducted a poll of teens ages thirteen to sixteen “in order to find out if our nation was over-sexualized,” or if “TV was making teens have sex and found out that only thirteen percent of ages thirteen to sixteen are actually having sex.

Caitlin goes on to give more background information about the poll *People* conducted and about the magazine itself.

She then present her thesis, “The article is effective because it knows the audience is both parents and teens, and it communicates through its use of Aristotelian appeals and organization.” Caitlin begins the analysis by talking about the audience of the piece. “The article talks to both teens and adults. It refers to the ‘OC’ for teens and has statistics for parents.” Caitlin goes on to give an example from each point of her thesis about the article. She articulates her points with no frills; she simply speaks to the audience confidently and clearly. She does not try to persuade them that teens are/are not having sex at too young of an age, only that the article is effective in communicating to both teens and their parents.

When she describes how the pathetic appeal is used in the article, Caitlin is especially vivid. “Pathos is in the article, but it doesn’t come out and make emotional claims, but it uses stories from the lives of teens.” She skims over one story of a girl who

lost her virginity just for the sake of losing it, but then she chooses to give more in-depth details from another featured story.

“Kim lost her virginity when she was thirteen years old and has since then decided not to have sex until she gets married.” Caitlin looks down at one of her note cards, “Kim says she now sleeps with a teddy bear.” Caitlin has a gentle look on her face as she describes Kim. Her voice gets softer. “This is not an overt use of pathos, but it shows you that she’s still a child because children sleep with teddy bears.” Caitlin crosses her arms over her chest as if she is hugging something (presumably an imaginary teddy bear).

As support for the point about the organization of the article and how it appeals to both teens and adults, she picks up the magazine which has rested behind her on the table. She states, “*People* is an entertainment magazine with pictures and boxes The stories are intertwined with statistics. Teens have something that is entertaining with pictures and stories of other teens.” She points to a picture of two teens near the title of the story. “And parents have text boxes with statistics.” She points to a red text box on the facing page which has a statistic printed in bold. “This is easy to read,” she says as she flips through the magazine. It is not a scholarly journal.” Caitlin ends her presentation by restating part of her thesis, “This article is beneficial for both parents and teens.” She pauses, “And that’s it.”

Reflecting Her Personal Views and Interests:

Caitlin’s personal views, however, become apparent in her written reflection and provide insight into her personal investment in the topic:

Writing and speaking on young teen sex helped to solidify my opinion . . . that sex is something that should be shared between two people only in the bonds of marriage. Every story within the article that depicted young teens losing their virginity for stupid reasons reassured me in my stance. . . . It was encouraging to see a full spread on abstinence programs. Although I do not believe that it is practical to have abstinence-only sex-ed classes, it is great to have programs like The Silver Ring Thing touring the nation, encouraging teens to wait for marriage to have sex. I actually wear a silver ring on my ring finger. Although I didn't get mine through this particular program, it serves the same purpose. I was thrilled to see the idea being made so popular through exposure in People magazine.

One reason why Caitlin may come across as such a strong and confident presenter is because her “opinion” on young teens and sex has been strengthened by reading and speaking more on the subject of teens and sex. Unlike Jenna and Brett who come to their articles without any prior knowledge or an opinion, Caitlin has a very strong opinion on her topic. She uses the word “solidified” twice in her reflection to describe her interaction with the material. She has found, in this article, support for her own beliefs. Her performance demonstrates her beliefs. Caitlin’s selection of material to share with her audience play-out these values. When she includes the example of Kim who, after losing her virginity at the age of thirteen, has not chosen to remain abstinent until marriage and sleeps only with her teddy bear, Caitlin demonstrates that a thirteen year old is still a child. Children sleep with teddy bears. Caitlin says in her presentation, “She’s still a little

girl,” to reiterate this point. Her gesture of hugging herself as mimic holding a teddy bear is a performance that supports this view.

Another one of Caitlin’s personal experiences, her readership of *People Magazine* allows her an authoritative position from which to speak because she understands the audience of *People* because she *is* the audience of *People*. From the position of audience member and interested reader Caitlin develops her thesis.

I am a devout reader of People, and thus a member of their audience. Therefore, when I discussed how the magazine targets both teens and adults, I was speaking from experience. I wrote my essay from the point of view of an audience member who loved the article and understood how the editors and authors had pulled me in to the story.

Caitlin describes herself as a “devout” reader of *People*. This role as audience member allows her an insight into the article so she can easily see how it is geared toward “teens and adults.” She even performs her readership of the text by flipping through the pages while explaining that the article has “something for both parents and teens.”

Caitlin’s authority in the presentation comes from her knowledge about *People* magazine as well as her personal beliefs about teens and sex. Caitlin’s authority is garnered through personal experiences and personal values. This authority is evidenced in two of the most performed-based elements of her presentation. When she discusses thirteen year old Kim sleeping with her teddy bear she gestures hugging the teddy bear. The second is when Caitlin discusses the layout and design of *People*. She holds up *People* magazine and flips through it, performing the ease of reading associated with the

text. In her presentation, she chooses to highlight the story of Kim to demonstrate that young teens are in fact too young to have sex. Her performances within the presentation, her no-nonsense approach, pantomiming a hug for a teddy bear, and her direct, clear tone all work to demonstrate her authority as a reader and as someone with personal interest in the topic.

Taking her authority from her personal values and beliefs, Caitlin is able to articulate her position on her topic. Caitlin is a confident speaker and clear presenter, speaking from a position as an authority, as a “devout reader of *People* magazine” directly reflects her performances in the writing classroom. Caitlin speaks in class only when she has negotiated an authoritative position. For example, in the collaborative unit, she argued with a group of students who found *Napoleon Dynamite* pointless. She found the movie funny and let her opinion be known to the class. She also explained to other students, David P. and Adam, who were having trouble formulating thesis statements about their documentaries after she had rewritten her thesis and drafted her paper two times and asked me about her thesis. Her thesis about the documentary, *Spellbound*, related social class and the American Dream with the documentary and was one of the most complex and articulate statements in the class. I wrote on her draft that her thesis was “complex” and “really smart,” and praised her for “best draft to date.” She used her position to help her classmates. I am not suggesting a direct correlation between my praise and Caitlin’s authoritative and helpful position in relationship to her classmates. But I am suggesting that validating her work may have given her confidence and encouragement enough to help others.

Andrew

Andrew, one of the three freshman in this course, also garners authority from personal experience. Andrew's piece "The Economist's President," is an opinion piece from *The Wall Street Journal* written by Michael J. Boskin. For his presentation Andrew is dressed in a button-down shirt, jeans and a white TCU ball cap and stands stage left of his projected word document which displays the headings: Summary, Thesis, Analysis, Conclusion.

Following his outline, Andrew tells the audience the title, author and source of his piece and then summarizes the article. Andrew reads from his notes rather than from the screen behind him.

The article praises President Bush for his first term economics and argues that more needs to be done to free the economy of taxes and help streamline it. Boskin contends that in order to help the economy the administration should listen to he and his colleagues. He lists policies steps that should be taken that would reform much of the government's budget. A big-ticket item he maintains is the reformation of Social Security. He primarily supports the President's economic goal of introducing personal accounts for Social Security.

Andrew is a strong conservative and Bush supporter. I know this from class sessions in which he would talk about his Republican sentiment from an economics standpoint. In fact, two out of the three assignments that he chose to write about were related to revitalizing the President's reputation. In this presentation and in his textual analysis paper, he chooses to talk about the President's strong economy. In the visual

rhetoric unit, he chose to analyze and theorize about *Fahrenhype 911* (2004), a refutation documentary to Michael Moore's *Fahrenheit 911* (2004). He chose this piece only after another student, Raymond, who sat beside Andrew and was a liberal Democrat, decided to present and write on the Michael Moore piece.

As Andrew reads from his notes during his presentation on "The Economist's President," he is barely audible. He is not shy about presenting, he often looks up at the audience and he stands ramrod-straight and exudes confidence. Yet, Andrew does not enunciate, speak clearly or loudly enough for the audience to hear him.

After reading the article summary from his notes, Andrew gives his thesis about the article. He reads again from his cards. "Um, my thesis on the article is that it relies on logos and ethos to connect with the audience to provide answers to economic problems that affect every American." Andrew adds, "I found that Boskin's style is sometimes difficult to understand because he is addressing an audience that has more than basic knowledge of economics and politics." This statement is also written below the heading "Analysis" on Andrew's projected items. Andrew discusses Boskin's style and his "quick flow" of words before he discusses points to prove his thesis.

Andrew makes eye-contact with the audience when giving his thesis. He looks to his right, where one of his good friends in the class, Matt, is sitting. Matt, a philosophy major, and Andrew sat next to each other and discussed politics, economics, and any topic on which they were writing. Raymond, who sat on the other side of Andrew, often joined in political debates as well, but only to present his side of the issue. All three had vastly different political affiliations. Raymond, was a liberal Democrat, Andrew a conservative Republican, and Matt, who identified himself "more with republicans,"

considered himself an Independent. Matt was known in class as “the philosopher” and said things such as, “I don’t know how much neo-conservative, hyper-babble, I can take” after a class discussion on Carl Rove’s manipulation of language for the Republican Right. Amber, another student in the class once shared with me that Matt was so smart she couldn’t “understand a thing he said.” Nevertheless, Andrew and Matt were often allies on many issues, but it was Matt, not Andrew, who vocalized his opinions for the class.

When Andrew gives examples to support his thesis during the presentation, he speaks in economic terms. In Andrew’s introduction, he tells the audience, “One of Bush’s *big ticket items*” is to reform social security. Similarly, before moving on to the analysis, Andrew tells the audience that the economic concerns that Boskin writes about “*appeal to everyone’s pocket books*” because they affect everyone’s “future.”

Though his thesis is about Boskin’s connection to the audience through logos and ethos, Andrew reiterates the difficulty of Boskin’s style multiple times throughout the presentation. When he is discussing Boskin’s use of logos, Andrew tells the audience in a low murmur, “I think most people reading this need a higher education to understand terms of economics.” He presents an example of Boskin’s use of logos and reads from his note cards as the audience follows from the projected screen behind him. “In paragraph five of the article Boskin states, ‘It is not widely appreciated that, under current law, the federal tax share of GDP is scheduled to bloat over the next 20 years to almost 25%, due to real bracket creep, the alternative minimum tax cut, and other factors.’” After reading this sentence Andrew shakes his head, “This is definitely not pleasure reading.” He then adds as an aside, “The whole article sounds like this.”

Moving on to talk about Boskin's concise style, Andrew states, "He presents a problem and provides a solution." He continues, "Like in paragraph sixteen." Andrew does not read from paragraph sixteen in this instance, but tells the audience, "The article is not very long because it is in a newspaper and *the more lines you take up the more money it costs.*" The words, "Paragraph sixteen" are written in bold behind him on the projected screen. As an audience member, I strain to hear what Andrew is saying and try to follow along using the word document projected behind him. Andrew again states, "Most people would have to know about economic policies to fully understand the article though."

Andrew concludes his presentation re-emphasizing the points: that the Bush administration is doing a good job and that the article is meant for a specific audience. He states,

Boskin directs the article to a specific audience who knows economics and tries to persuade them that the president has done a fairly good job in his first term economic policies. I believe readers of this article would likely be persuaded to support President Bush if they were neutral and if they had a background in business and economics.

Reflection on Audience:

Andrew's authority in the oral presentation is based on his personal background and interest in economics and finance.

My background as well was important to the composition of my paper. Since I am very interested in economics, I study it every day and my major is economics, I was able to understand my article better than an average

person who lacks any knowledge of the topic. This helped with my analysis and the basic understanding of the article.

Though Andrew is an expert over the material, he finds presenting the material to non-experts difficult:

For the presentation it was difficult to argue my analysis well because not all of the people in the room might have known economics well. I learned from that experience that my paper must also be clear and understandable. . . . While I was organizing my presentation I decided that I needed more quotes from the texts to help the audience understand what I was saying about the article. The presentation assisted me in deciding what information was the most useful to the reader.

Andrew has thought about how to connect with the audience so they will understand what he is saying. Andrew struggles with the concept of audience, how to reach them, how to envision them as both a physical presence for the presentation and a reader of the analysis text he will produce. But throughout the presentation, he neither enunciates nor slows down to explain these terms in order to reach his audience of peers or his teacher.

Terminology is essential to Andrew's ways of thinking. As apparent in his presentation, finance and economics are Andrew's terministic screens. His use of the phrases, "big-ticket item" and "appealing to people's pocketbooks," as well as his direct correlation between the number of lines used in a newspaper and its cost to run the article demonstrate that Andrew thinks with a business mindset. This evidences his expertise, yet this expertise is not shared with the group. Though Andrew approaches the text as an

expert, he does not seek to bridge the informational gap between him and his audience. In the presentation Andrew focuses on the audience's lack of understanding, rather than on ways to help them to understand the text and his analysis. In fact, Andrew performs the "difficulty of the text" when he reads the excerpt which possesses several financial acronyms and numbers. He tells the audience three different times in the five minute speech that they will have trouble understanding this article unless they know business/finance terminology.

His reflection, as demonstrated, echoes this tension so much that he concludes, "*I was not the greatest presenter but I learned from my peers. One thing I learned is that the speaker must speak comfortably to the audience or they will get restless.*" Andrew is more aware of audience and its repercussions of not reaching them in speaking and writing as a result of performing his writing for the class.

Andrew's interactions in the classroom play-out much in the same way as his presentation. Andrew discusses his political viewpoints and opinions on topics with people he sees as experts, Matt and Raymond. Although Matt and Raymond were more willing and open to sharing their opinions with the group, Andrew finds ways to assert his authority and opinions through his selection of material which mirrors his political views.

Authority Based on Personal Experience

In some fashion, both of The Experts, Caitlin and Andrew, keep their beliefs and experiences personal when in the public, presentational situation. Andrew is an authority over the information and ideas presented in his article. He takes on an authoritative role

and connects with his peers with whom he debates whenever they encounter a new topic. During his documentary film presentation, he referenced Raymond's presentation as an opposing view. The two laughed about it after class. Andrew, however, does not try to teach or share with others even when given the medium to do so.

Caitlin does not share her personal beliefs and values with the class during the presentation. Her reflection provides a way of knowing that Caitlin's authority depends on her personal interest and support of the content of "Young Teens and Sex" and her readership of *People*. In a more private forum, her reflection, Caitlin discusses how she relates to the article. Even though she is an older teen and in the late stages of adolescence, she takes a vested interest in the claim presented in "Young Teens and Sex," that not as many young teens are engaging in sexual activity. She identifies with the article in that she, herself, has decided not to have sex until she is married. She identifies with the overall topic. In this way, her vested interest in the piece allows her to "speak with authority." Her performances for her peers are more publicly, rhetorically aligned; her written reflection is addressed only to me, or perhaps she sees the audience as herself, and she takes on a more personal point-of-view on the subject.

Andrew, like Caitlin, shares more of his personal, political beliefs in his reflection. How Caitlin claims authority in her performances for an audience is more associated with her position as an "avid reader of *People*." She is an expert audience member" in her performances as she gives background on the periodical. She even incorporates the concept of audience as part of her thesis. Her gestures of literally pointing to places in the text where teens would be mostly drawn, what she calls,

“stories” and to “pictures” and also to places where parents would be drawn, the “boxes with statistics,” perform her role as expert audience of *People*.

As Caitlin performs her readership, Andrew performs the difficulty of the text. He literally reads aloud a excerpt full of economical syntax. As Caitlin uses her performance of readability to connect with the audience, Andrew alienates the audience.

Caitlin and Andrew’s personal investment in their topics is evidenced in their identification with the material. As she tells the story of “Kim,” who loses her virginity at thirteen, Caitlin is even identifying as a “teen” who would enjoy the story, rather than a “parent” who would be drawn to one of the “boxes with statistics.” Finally, as Caitlin flips-through the magazine article before the class to demonstrate how easily the article could be read, she is performing as an expert audience member of *People*, performing how one does not have to pour-over the text, it is easily consumable.

Andrew’s financial use of terminology during the presentation evidences his identification with the material. He may say the Boskin’s text is difficult for the average reader, but Andrew is a specialized reader, part of the community of *Wall Street Journal* readers. Similarly, Andrew does not take on the role of “author” in his presentation. He has his own opinions on President Bush’s first term economic policies because of his expertise. Though he aligns himself both politically and philosophically with the author of the piece he analyzes, he states in his reflection that Boskin’s use of financial theories and facts “solidified” his position rather than formulated it, unlike did Brett and Jenna.

Andrew’s performances within the presentation reveal his hesitancy to bridge the “informational gap” between his knowledge on the subject and the class’s perceived lack of knowledge on the subject. Andrew admits that his presentation was not “the greatest,”

but aesthetic qualities aside, Andrew does not connect with his audience; his verbal admission that one needs a “degree in higher education” to understand the article puts up a barrier between him and his audience.

Richard Beach proposes in “Writing about Ourselves and Others” (1977) that students recognize value inherent in writing when it is used as a means of understanding themselves or others. Though Beach references the autobiographical genre, he also advocates that the students’ choices of topics that best portray self allow them a personal investment. Though neither Caitlin nor Andrew were writing about themselves expressly, their connection to their topics drives their analyses and writing. In Caitlin’s reflection it is evident that this topic holds great importance for her as a reader as well as for solidifying her belief system. As Linda Miller Cleary writes in “The Fragile Inclination to Write” (1990), there are several keys to fostering the inclination to write. These include “self-determination, natural inquisitiveness, an inclination toward self-expression, and feelings of competence. (28). What inclines Andrew and Caitlin to take authority over their writing and speaking is their inquisitiveness about something that is important to them and their self-expression of that inquisitiveness. Adding a performative dimension to the writing assignment, provides Caitlin and Andrew the opportunity to perform their readership and difficulty of the texts respectively, and they demonstrate both their confidence in the subject matter and competence as “experts” with that subject matter.

I must note, however, that Andrew’s authority seemingly inhibits his performance in the way he speaks to his audience. For Andrew, who already has authority over his topic and subject matter, his performances do not augment his role as expert or author or

allow him to try to connect with a literal audience. But what performing his writing for a diverse audience in this case indicates is that Andrew does recognize that he cannot work from the same set of assumptions about a starting point from which to argue.

In the presentation, Andrew excuses the audience from understanding his analysis; in his written work, he does not excuse the reader, but expects them to intuit much of the analytical work he is doing. In Andrew's final textual analysis essay, wherein I am the audience and a *reader*, Andrew also struggles with clarity and proving his points, not because the terminology is outside my area of expertise, but because Andrew fails to convey his analysis and knowledge in a usable way for the reader. He expects more from a reader than a literal audience. He writes without explanation of his particular analyses and without organization. In this way, the presentation could have augmented Andrew's performances if he would have made a viable connection between speaking to a literal audience and writing for an implied audience.

When no such connection or understanding about the function of audience is comprehended or even incorporated into writing classes by teachers and students, writing can become, at the most, an autonomous intellectual activity and at the least, a monotonous exercise in producing materials which serve no function but to earn a grade. What Andrew's presentation demonstrates is that students must be taught how the concept of audience can enhance their writing. An audience can be an audience of peers in the same discourse community, or an audience of peers in the same classroom or community group. These different constructions of audience can allow students to think in different ways, one to create knowledge among members of the same discourse community, the other to present information which will allow the audience to apply

understanding to their own topics, and create knowledge across different discourse communities.

What is also important about performance and personal authority in the cases of Caitlin and Andrew is that the presentation allowed a forum for these students to build theses around their personal experiences and to identify with the material in ways in which others without prior knowledge of the topic/subject matter could not. Their presentations and written reflections demonstrate how the expertise allows them to identify (or not identify) with the audience. They present and write from authority based on their expertise.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Crowd Pleasers:

Michael and D.W.

In contrast to the authority gained through personal interest and expertise on the topic is authority gleaned from a presentational ethos, or the character of the speaker, derived from being given a forum for speaking. Presentational ethos directly depends on the interaction with the audience, a careful consideration of how the speaker is coming across to the audience, and how his ethos is constructed by his peers based on his performances.³² This presentational ethos is most boldly seen in the presentations and performances of Michael and D.W., who are favorably received as good speakers by their peers and myself, but for very different reasons.

Michael's presentation is on the article, "Whatever It Takes," from the January 18, 2005 issue of *The Economist* about the fight to end world poverty. The article asks if wealthy nations are doing all they can to help end this problem and offers solutions to end poverty. His presentation style is clear, organized, straight-forward and rehearsed. D.W. analyzed and presented on "Behind the Thrill of Victory: We Root Like Maniacs Because We Are Compelled by Our Instincts and Because It's Fun" (2005) from *Time Magazine*, written by William S. Nack. This article posits that there is a connection between sports fans' emotions and the success or failure of their favorite sports teams. His presentational style is more interactive and spontaneous.

³² The speaker's ethos is not only constructed by the individual performance, but also the performance of self in the classroom throughout the semester. This "type" of ethos is what Richard Leo Enos describes as "long-term ethos" as indicated by Classical Rhetoric's Latin term *auctoritas*.

Michael

Michael's oral presentations followed suit with his written work and overall participation in the course: all were clear, efficient, and concise. As his teacher, it always seemed to me as if Michael were one of those brilliant students who did what he needed to do to receive a good grade and nothing more. He always did what was asked of him, understood assignments the first time they were explained, and turned in drafts that were A quality.

When I would try to push Michael by writing comments such as, "This is good. Could you talk a little more about it?" Or, "This is an interesting point, could you elaborate?," or "Could you draw further implications from your thesis?" He would then make a few changes, add a sentence here or there, but once he had fulfilled the requirements for the assignment, he was finished. The quality of his drafts was better than most of the class's final essays after several revisions. I talked to Michael about his potential to make a great paper even better, and I even encouraged him to speak-up in group work when another student did not understand an assignment. Toward the end of the semester during a collaborative project he did begin helping students in his group more, one of which lived in his hall in the dorms.

On the day of the presentation, Michael has an outline of his presentation format projected as a Microsoft word document for the class and begins the presentation by introducing the article and then his thesis: "The argument of the article depends entirely on the emotional appeal which is intended to inspire action within its readers toward reducing poverty." Unlike some of the students who formulated broad theses to include

all types of Aristotelian appeals, Michael focuses on a specific type of appeal used throughout the article and its purpose.

Not only does Michael have a focused thesis for the presentation, which gives his audience a manageable amount of information to process, but his outline is projected and used effectively. When discussing the initiative to provide mosquito nets to children in Africa to prevent outbreaks of malaria, Michael introduces the point and walks over to the computer to cue his outline without missing a beat; he continues talking to the audience. “Something as simple as providing a mosquito net to countries with problems like this is not a lot to suggest, according to the author.” Unlike some of the students who projected their outlines for their audience but did not make sure their classmates could follow them (some did not even follow their outlines when speaking), Michael guides his audience by using the outline. He also uses words like, “first,” “second,” “in the third paragraph” and points to the outline as he makes the corresponding argument.

Michael’s effective use of visual and oral markers is another indication of his generally good speaking ability and his ability as a student. He takes into consideration the points of effective speaking and presenting that we discussed before the oral presentation assignment. Michael speaks slowly enough for the class to understand what he is saying, varies his speech inflection, and is clear.

To illustrate the author’s use of the emotional appeal, Michael directs the audience to the conclusion. “If you look at the conclusion of the piece, the author’s word choice really affects the reader.” He pauses as students locate the last paragraph in the article. “The author uses the words ‘children dying’ and ‘dehumanizing condition’ to describe the living situation of these people.”

Michael also points to the author's choice to leave the reader with the image of a child dying because "we have done nothing, not even given small donations, which would save the lives of children." Michael states, "These are not logical claims; the author relies on emotion. He has included this in the conclusion because the conclusion is what people remember." He looks directly at the audience as he supports his thesis.

Ironically, after telling his audience that the conclusion is important because that is what the audience remembers, Michael does not conclude his presentation. He simply says, "That's what I did."

Conscious Authority

Michael's presentational ethos is constructed by his conscious effort to focus on the audience's interest level. Michael selects interesting material and thinks about World hunger in generalizable truths (children, poor, third world countries) and compares them to American society (our affluence, the niceties and basic needs that we take for granted). For each point he makes, he brings it back in support of this thesis. For example, the author leaves the reader with the image of the dying child. Michael points out to the audience that this is a conclusion that the audience will remember and it is part of the pathetic appeal.

Michael also thinks about how to interact with the audience literally. Michael's literal act of pointing to the outline and stating, "first," "second," and "if you look at the conclusion," directs the audience as to how they will receive the information. He provides clear concise examples and gives the audience time to locate them in the text. He makes the presentation feel less like an informational session and more like an interaction.

Conscious Reflection:

Unlike Jenna and Brett, who take on the roles of the authors, Michael's decision not to persuade the audience of Sach's thesis is a conscious decision, one which he reflects on. Michael describes himself "not [as] an expert on world hunger;" he writes that he would "rather rely on the information" in the article than his own expertise. His decision not to take on the author's role—as Jenna and Brett did—is perhaps why Michael develops conscious strategies for reaching the audience. He alludes to this when he writes that the audience can be influenced more by information provided by an expert than him.

Even though I know a fair amount about . . . reducing poverty and hunger, . . . certainly, the author (Sachs) . . . knows a great deal more than I do. . . . Thus, I felt that my paper would appear more credible if adhered to the information provided in the article and used a limited amount of my own information. . . . The audience can be influenced more by information provided by an expert than by me.

The presentation allows Michael to think about the audience as a literal concept. Michael looks at his presentation in terms of protecting his "ethos" or saving face. He presents the information and does not want to "embarrass" himself. Similarly in his presentation he makes efforts to engage the audience.

Additionally, by presenting . . . I began to think about the audience of my paper. . . . Since I am less eager to embarrass myself in a presentation than I am on paper. While it is important to consider the education and comprehension levels of the audience, I concern myself more with the

interest level of my audience. Since the audience for both my paper and my presentation is a college English class, there is no need to worry about the subject being beyond the audience. Maintaining the interest of the audience, though, is a tough task. When I put together my presentation, I tried to find pieces of information that thought might be interesting to my audience. For example, I knew that simply presenting a great deal of data and figures would not hold the attention of my audience. Thus, I decided to connect as much of my analysis to American society as possible. Since my audience is composed of young, active members in American society, I felt that I could connect to my audience by making generalizations about the society.

Unlike Andrew, who thinks that economic policies are beyond the comprehension level of the audience, Michael states that college-level students should be able to comprehend the subject matter. He chooses to focus on how to gain the audience's interest, providing examples of what and what is not engaging to an audience.

The presentation also allows him a test run of his paper and allows him a test run of his paper. Thus, the presentation functions as "a second draft."

I feel that the presentation served largely as a second draft of my paper. I simply condensed my paper in order to come up with information that I could present to the class. . . . The presentation . . . aided me in the composition of my final paper by forcing me to critically examine my first draft . . . There were many other parts of my paper that were a bit sub par. . . . My article came from The Economist, but aside from mentioning

the magazine in the introduction, I never referred to the significance of that fact. In the final draft, I will spend some time exploring the significance of the . . . The Economist.

Michael sees the presentation as giving him pointers for revision. Accordingly, and very true to his performances in the classroom and during the presentation, Michael finds a way to make the assignment work for him. He summarizes his process in terms of its efficiency.

The concept of audience, which is central to performances, (for there must be an exchange between actor and audience in the conventional sense of performance) dictates the “expert” role Michael takes on. Having a literal audience creates the roll of expert for Michael. His careful consideration of audience through his performances make him a believable presenter. These same careful considerations are taken in Michael’s writing as well. Michael provides common ground in his presentation through his asides about the mosquito netting, for example, which allow his audience to reason alongside him, much in the same way he reasons alongside the author of his piece. He embodies the role of expert presenter and expert student in his presentation.

D.W.

D. W. is a laid-back presenter and a laid-back student. He draws out his voice, often adding a pause between words in a sentence and uses words such as, “okay,” “like,” and “you know,” as if he were talking to one of his buddies. His baggy clothes and sandals give D.W. a hippy-esque quality. When D. W. disagreed with someone during a class discussion, he expressed himself confidently, but not harshly. For example, at the

end of the semester during the class collaborative project which investigated the movie *Napoleon Dynamite* as a cultural phenomenon, Raymond and Jenna debated nearly everyone else in the class over the value of the movie. Raymond, on the edge of his seat, shaking his head emphatically, declared that the movie had no plot. Across the room, Jenna piggy-backed off of Raymond's statement calling the movie absurd and stupid. D.W. literally reclining his swivel chair back as far as it would go said very calmly, "You know, I thought the movie was awesome. It's about friendship, you know?"

D.W. is not so laid-back to the point that he doesn't do his work. In fact, just the opposite is true. D.W. attended every class session and turned in all of his work on time. Yet, D.W.'s presentation of self in the classroom is informal and relaxed.

As D.W. stands in front of the class, he begins by introducing the article and then gives his thesis. D.W.'s thesis is that the author makes his point through Aristotelian appeals and word choice.

D.W.'s first example is the article's use of pathos. He provides an example of one pathetic appeal: Boston Red Sox fans visiting the gravesites of their loved ones after the Sox's World Series victory in 2004. D.W. rolls up the notes and puts them behind his back when he explains this example. "You know," he pauses ever so quickly, "gravesites bring-up emotion."

He provides no other explanation, other than a very loose connection between the loss of a loved one and the image of the grave associated with death. But, in terms of providing evidence of how the author is using this example as a pathetic appeal, D.W. does not communicate this effectively to his audience.

Following the very loose connection D.W. makes between pathos and gravesites, D.W. discusses the author's use of the ethical appeal. "In paragraph four the author compares the thrill of victory to Ben Hur's chariot race." D.W. puts down his notes and looks directly at the audience, "Ben Hur is an example not intended for our age but older people, or maybe you've seen the movie." D.W. does not say why this use of the allusion to Ben Hur is effective in the article, or how it is an example of the ethical appeal, but rather he focuses on how it was an ineffective allusion for the age of the audience in the room.

D.W. does not use verbal markers to move the audience to the second portion of his thesis, the author's use of word choice. He begins citing arbitrary, decontextualized examples. He tells the class, "The word 'euphoria' is the fourth word of the piece. The word is used to describe Red Sox fans' emotions after the Red Sox won the World Series." He pauses, "They could have said it was a great day." He holds his hand out. "And to me," D.W. clinches his fist, "that's something that meant it was awesome." His gestures mimic his verification of the word choice. Making a fist to emphasize the word "awesome" and to establish the relationship of the word "euphoric" to sports, D.W. captures the aggressive nature of sports and the enthusiasm that he sees in the word "euphoria."

D.W. performs similarly when he directs the class to paragraph six which denotes the University of Kentucky Wildcats sports as the "the state's secular religion." "You know," D.W. begins, "they could have just said, 'they liked going to a game,' but when you say 'religion' that means something you are passionate about; you'll almost worship

it.” He holds out his hand at the word “worship,” and concludes, “so I think that’s an important word choice.”

D.W. does not talk about the author’s word choice as a stylistic approach to help further the larger claim of the piece. As he presents on the article, D.W. compares the words used in the article to another word of greater or lesser degree. He often underscores his interpretation with some sort of gesture. His argument about the author’s word choice can be boiled down to the word chosen expresses a thought with more fervor than another word, and, because as D.W. says, he “thinks it is important.”

Not following suit with the order he establishes in his thesis, (his thesis suggests he will first discuss the article’s use of Aristotelian appeals and then its word choice), D.W. returns to the author’s use of Aristotelian appeals at the end of his presentation. He cites a study wherein fans of a sports team will wear the team’s logo and shirts when the team is doing well. In order to connect with his audience, D.W. gives an example that the students at TCU can relate to. “It’s like when TCU was doing well with football last year and everyone was wearing the ‘Bust-up the BCS shirts,’ but, this year, no one is wearing the shirts.” D.W. pulls at his own shirt when he gives this example. I cannot determine if D.W.’s use of this poignant example was an impromptu connection with the audience, but it is an example of D.W.’s use of effectively connecting with the immediate audience. D.W. ends his presentation after this point and states, “And this is what I did.”

Though D.W. does not adequately support his thesis, what is interesting about D.W.’s presentation is that he meets all criteria for the presentation. He has a thesis, engages the audience, supports his points (although rather loosely). He projects and enunciates. Meeting the criteria earns him credibility with his audience of the teacher and

peers. He works within the genre conventions of the presentation. His thesis sounds valid. His confidence while speaking, talking directly to the audience without looking at his text, even rolling his notes up, or when he uses his very own shirt as a prop, all of these performance elements demonstrate that D.W. is a confident speaker who connects with his audience.

D.W., like *The Experts*—Caitlin and Andrew, has chosen to speak and write on a topic which he is very familiar with, sports and sports fans; however, his authority on the topic does not come across in the presentation. As the teacher, I realize that D.W. is struggling to interpret the text, but in spite of this struggle he embodies the role of expert through his attempts to interact with the audience to claim authority. For every point he makes in his presentation, from word choice to the types of Aristotelian appeals used, he does not back-up his claims with textual, or even logical support; his support is because he “thinks it is important.”

Two of D.W.’s examples, the author’s use of Ben Hur’s chariot race as an analogy of the thrill a sport’s fan feels when rooting for his or her favorite team as well as his college-specific reference to the TCU football team are two points within the presentation where D.W.’s performances demonstrate his attempt to connect with the audience. In order to demonstrate the author’s use of the ethical appeal, D.W. refers the author’s comparison of the “thrill of victory” to “Ben Hur’s chariot race. Because the author specifically mentions “Ben Hur,” D.W. treats this appeal as an ethical appeal of the text. He does not tell why the author uses the allusion to Ben Hur or how it functions as an ethical appeal in the text. What D.W. does focus on is how this allusion is “not intended for our age,” when talking to the audience of his peers, unless they have “seen the

movie.” He is positioning himself as one with the audience. They all belong to a similar group based on their age.

Similarly, when discussing how sports fans are more loyal, encouraged, and affected psychologically when their teams are doing well, D.W. makes the point that even on the TCU campus people were wearing t-shirts to support the football team. He pulls at his t-shirt to make the connection with the audience. His calm, soothing voice, the way he rolls-up his notes and puts them behind his back when he explains his (loosely) based support for the textual analysis, and his enthusiasm evidenced in his gestures when he replaces one word from the text with his synonym “awesome,” all work together as ways D.W. connects with his audience. What D.W. does not do well is actually support his statements; what he does do well is present himself to the audience because he provides actual common ground for them to reason along with him, even when he does not reason logically.

Written Performances of Authority

D.W. is the consummate performer both “on the stage” and “on the page,” so to speak. He takes on various roles: *sports expert*, *teacher*, *observer of audience*, and *expert* in his reflection.

I consider myself better informed about sports than most and I thought that the class might not be able to relate to my topic as I could. To my elation they did. I also was able to put my thoughts into words that were very concise and easy to understand to the student audience. . . . I know that no one in the class beside myself had done any research on the topic besides maybe reading my article. I had gone through tons of

articles for secondary sources . . . I know information about sports because I have played them, watched them, and cheered for teams. . . . I had to become just that much more familiar with my topic because I didn't want to look stupid or misinformed in front [sic] of the class.

I felt that it was necessary to put yourself in the normal person's shoes when presenting, who might not know that much about my topic. I tried to keep this in mind while presenting because I did not want to become too precise about my facts. I did not want to confuse or disinterest my fellow classmates because I did want them to listen. . . .

I had to realize that not everyone might understand the topic as well as myself so I had to go through and make everything crystal clear to allow the class to follow my presentation. I knew everything went well because of the body language of my audience. I noticed that many of the guys in the class were very interested in what I had to say because they might have been interested in sports. I also noticed that the cameraman was shaking his head as if he was agreeing with what I had to say. I obviously noticed the teacher looking down and writing down notes whenever I came to key parts of my presentation. Through this I came to realize that my arguments that I presented in my paper actually made sense to more people than just myself.

Relating to the audience is D.W.'s primary concern. So much so, that his written reflection performs "the ideal presentation." Of course the camera man did not shake his head; he was looking through the camera. D.W. is correct in saying that I was writing

while viewing his presentation, but I wrote throughout everyone's presentation and even told the class beforehand not to be daunted by my writing but to continue on with the presentation. Perhaps my notetaking was in sync with key points in his presentation. Or, perhaps, a more likely conclusion is that D.W. wrote that I was taking notes during key points of his presentation to argue for why he delivered an effective presentation. He did not do "tons" of research on his topic because only three outside sources were required, and none were cited in the presentation.

Even so, D.W.'s awareness of how his presentation is received is prevalent in the reflection. In order to prove the effectiveness of the presentation, he goes to great lengths to describe his expertise and how well he connected with the audience. He tells the reader that he is the expert who made his thoughts concise and that the class understood and interacted with him *ad nauseum*. Just as he supported his analysis of Aristotelian appeal with "because I think so" over and over again, so too, does he give the same argument for the effectiveness of his presentation.

D.W. draws authority because he is the only one in the class who had researched the topic and analyzed the argument. Though D.W.'s knowledge about sports and passion for them might have played a part in his selection of the article, his knowledge does not help him to convey the thesis he is presenting. He makes a quantitative argument in this excerpt for the amount of research he had done, "tons." He also draws authority for presenting from his background knowledge of sports as a fan and participant. His written performances and his presentational ones uses the same persuasive tactics—repetition and personal opinion, (his say-so). He is keenly aware of his audience in both written and oral performances.

D.W. acknowledges a responsibility to know his article so that the audience will take him seriously. D.W. relies on authority garnered from his own voice, backing up his arguments with both experiences his audience can relate to as well as his logic of “because I said so.” For D. W. his word is his own authority and his support is, “because I think it is.”³³ His position as a presenter gives him authority, or “the floor,” so to speak, but he does not take his purpose of the assignment as to explain his analysis or to persuade his audience of his thesis. He performs as expert even in his reflection, and I suspect, he is performing for me, the teacher, in order to persuade me that he is “the expert.”

Presentational Ethos and “Identification”: Performance Techniques

The performance elements in Michael’s and D.W.’s presentations and their relationships to the audience are efforts to “identify” with the audience and construct how they are received. Though greatly contrasting in their approaches, both performances reveal the presenter’s efforts to connect with the audience in order to be received well by them. Both of these “Crowd Pleasers” discuss in their reflections that they don’t want to “embarrass” themselves or “look stupid” in front of their peers. Both are overtly concerned with keeping the interest levels of their audience and not inundating them with facts. Based on their reflections, these two have similar goals for presenting. However, their approaches to connect with the audiences and their performances are different and demonstrate different presentational ethos as authority.

³³ D.W. earned a B in the course and asked if I would give him an A because he had done all of the work I assigned, turned it in on time, and come to every class. Like the presentation, wherein David fulfilled the content-based requirements but lacked a coherent, quality-driven performance, David met the requirements of the class without truly understanding the function of the work itself. Granted, David’s argument for his grade gave real evidence, but again it boiled-down to because “I think” I deserve an A.

First, while Michael consciously decides not to perform as the expert in order to connect with the audience, D.W. takes on the expert role in order to support all of his claims. Michael, though resisting the role of *expert* and *author* in his reflection, comes across as one during his presentation. He gives the audience a manageable amount of information. He relies on the information presented in the article and his personal knowledge to connect with the audience as well. He looks directly at the audience when he tells them that something as little as a mosquito net would make a world of difference in malaria-ridden countries. Similarly, he again looks directly at the audience when he tells them that the United States for example, as a wealthy nation has done little to nothing to help Third World Countries and their battles with poverty. D.W.'s expertise is not based on information, at least not on correct information; his performances which create an authoritative stance. D.W.'s actual content of the presentation is flawed in the way that he misunderstands the use of Aristotelian appeals and then presents his interpretation of their use. Yet he remains within the genre conventions of the presentation which also help him to come across as a confident presenter. His method of arguing is repetitious: his two examples of the pathetic and ethical appeals used in the article, the Red Sox fans visiting gravesites and the comparison of watching and experiencing the thrill of victory to Ben Hur's chariot race both depend on the same argument: because D.W. says they are examples of the emotional and ethical appeals. Similarly, his two explanations of the word choice in the article, "euphoria" as the fourth word of the article, and "state's secular religion" to describe Kentucky's devotion to the Wild Cats are both based on his synonym argument: he chose a word because another word is not as strong as what he would have thought of.

The concept of empathy here works to describe how these Crowd Pleasers gain authority and construct a presentational ethos. Both of the writers share in their written reflections how they take the audience's interest level into account. Both do not want to inundate their audience with facts or bore them with a topic that they do not have interest in. In the actual performance of empathy, Michael has a more deliberate approach. Michael's clarity, concision, fashioning of a specific thesis and giving the audience a manageable amount of information demonstrate that he is aware of his audience. Throughout his presentation, he directs the audience, pointing to the visual aid, using words like "first," "second," and "third," and giving the audience time to locate the portions of the text he quotes aloud. His awareness of the audience's needs to hear what he is saying, to locate places within the text before explaining them, and to be able to correlate his visual with what he is saying all construct him in a role of believable presenter and give him authority.

D.W.'s performances are more spontaneous, but are still emphatic. D.W. gains the interest of the audience by identifying with them as a "young" college student and "college football fan." These are two ways in which his words construct a sense of community with his classmates. D.W. says "Ben Hur is not intended for *our* age" and therefore categorizes the book/movie as passé, or even an allusion that his age group would not understand. An even stronger use of identification is how D.W. takes on a role as a college football fan. D.W.'s literal performances, for example, touching his shirt remind TCU students that they actually wore the BCS shirts when the football team was doing well. As an impromptu, when D.W. pulls at his shirt, he performs the identification, empathizing with the audience.

So much so does D.W. empathize with the audience that he is attuned (perhaps imaginatively, or hypersensitively) to his audience's responses during the presentation. He is gauging "listener response" (Mier) when he watches the facial expressions and physical posture of his audience. He gives example after example of the audience's reaction to his perceived "successful" presentation.

Knowing the audience, empathizing, identifying with them is of valuable concern to student writers and oftentimes an abstract concept that is difficult to teach. In writing studies, researchers in both the rhetorical and cognitive traditions have addressed the writer-reader's need to establish a relationship and/or awareness with the audience (Sperling 64). Ede and Lunsford (1984) as well as Kirsch and Roen (1990) center on the assumption that a writer's knowledge of his or her audience improves his or her writing. Sperling points out that in much research done on manipulating writing assignments and changing teaching strategies was done to better understand how the concept of audience improves writing. (e.g., Beach and Liebman-Kleine [1986]; Hays, Brandt, and Chantry [1988]; Kroll [1984]; Raforth [1985]; Redd-Boyd and Slater [1989]; Rubin and Raforth [1986]; Schriver [1992]). According to Sperling "generally these studies have reached compatible conclusions." One of which is that "Assignments specifying real audiences affect writer's composing more than assignments specifying imaginary audiences or no audience at all" (65). The presentation as performance-based approach specifies a real audience to these presenters. The Crowd Pleasers' heightened awareness of their audience allowed them to identify with them as well as gain authority from considering the audience in great conscious and reflective detail. Allowing both Michael and D.W. a

forum for performing their writing reveals how the concept of ethos is used and performed by both. Each of the presenter's ethos makes him an "expert" in his own right.

CHAPTER SIX

The Resistors:

David and Alex

David and Alex, whom I have termed “The Resistors,” resist the presentation and written assignments and gain authority through that resistance in different ways. David gains authority from the act of speaking. Alex gains authority by resisting speaking and prefers the role of “writer.” Each student finds a more comfortable position for himself in these preferred roles and can voice his ideas and opinions more fully in his respected preferred mediums. David presents on “Genes: What We Eat and What We Are Born With,” a *Time Magazine* article from January 2005, which provides a glimpse into health care of the future when patients will be able to receive a food plan tailored to benefit their specific genetic make-up. Alex’s article, “The Candidate” (2005), ultimately argues that both the U.S. and Iraq are failing in their efforts to stabilize and keep peace in Iraq.

Resistance is a complex term in Composition. Geoffrey Chase’s “Accommodation, Resistance and the Politics of Students Writing” (1988) uses Henry Giroux’s categories: accommodation, opposition, and resistance (which Giroux takes from Gramsci) to describe ways students’ learning responds to dominant culture. Accommodation is the process by which students learn to accept conventions without necessarily questioning how these conventions privilege some forms of knowledge at the expense of others (Chase 14). Opposition refers to students’ behavior “which runs against the grain and interrupts what we usually think of as normal progression of learning” (Chase 14). Resistance, according to Giroux:

[. . .] redefines the causes and meaning of oppositional behavior by arguing that it has little to do with the logic of deviance, individual pathology, learned helplessness [. . .] and a great deal to do with the logic of moral and political indignation. (107)

Chase links refusal with liberation and uses an example of a student, Bill, who resists an assignment because he sees writing as an exercise that is only fulfilled when one complies with the directions within the parameter of the assignment (16). “Resistance reveals the need to struggle against the social nexus of domination and submission” (Giroux 108-09). Both David and Alex find ways to challenge the traditional assignment in order to gain authority. But, unlike Jenna and Brett, who also challenge the traditional assignment by taking on the roles of authors, The Resisters resist the act of writing and speaking because of constraints imposed by the assignment and the teacher, both representations of institutional power.

David

David slouches centered in front of the whiteboard. He has one hand in his pocket and the other holding note cards and begins. David explains the premise of “Genes: What We Eat” to the audience. He puts down his note cards and picks-up the issue of *Time* magazine up off the table. He holds it in front of him while he talks. “Scientists will be able to tell some people to eat broccoli and others to eat more broccoli.” He waits for the audience to laugh, or respond in some way, looking up at them and pausing but they do not. He starts to explain the quote by adding, “Some foods will be important to almost everyone.”

David seems to be talking to the audience at random even though he is using his notecards. Immediately he states as if an impromptu:

Oh, this is kind of interesting and kind of goes along with what I was saying. It's called the Woodrow Wilson effect and that's quoted in the article and that's because Woodrow Wilson lived to be 90 on a diet of champagne and cigars, so people think, 'Oh, well Woodrow Wilson did it so why can't I?

David puts up both of his hands and shrugs as if to ask the question of the audience, looking up at them and pausing.

David looks over his note cards and proceeds to talk about the benefits of turmeric. He incorporates an aside, "It's in curry, that's what makes Indian food smell," and then continues, "This is an important issue because it is the cover story." David goes on, "A person's genetic make-up is just one factor to living well."

He stops speaking and picks-up the magazine off the table and presumably is not able to locate the quote he is looking for. He tells the audience, "Oh, and I thought it was interesting that there was an article for a Slim fast-type diet drink at the end of the article, and at the beginning there is an advertisement for diet pills." He turns to the beginning and end of the article and shows each advertisement to the audience.

At about the five minute mark (when I hold up my hand as an indicator that he has reached five minutes), the end of the set time frame, David introduces his thesis, "American society wants to change how they view dieting." This is the article's thesis, not David's thesis based on his analysis of the article.

David follows no organizational pattern in his presentation. He keeps repeating the words, “ethos” and “logos” throughout the presentation but provides no specific examples of how these appeals are used in the text. For example, he tells the audience, “The author provided a lot of background evidence. He backs up a lot of stuff with science and a lot of examples and it really builds on his ethos of his credibility, and it gives you a better understanding with logos, with logic, of how this is working.”

He ends his presentation abruptly when I hold up two hands showing seven fingers, a signal that he has reached the time limit for the presentation. “I guess that’s all the time I have,” he says as he shrugs his shoulders and walks to his seat.

In summation, David has enacted a directionless presentation and does not connect with his audience. David’s use of the broccoli quote, “Some people will be told to eat more broccoli . . .” is an attempt to interact with the audience, but his delivery techniques prohibit an interaction with them because of his lack of organization and purpose. He does not set-up the line about broccoli; he just picks up the text off of the table beside him and reads at random. Unlike David W., who is more conversational and claims a role of expert to connect with the audience David does not connect with the audience in his conversational tone. His incorporation of the comedic line (from the text) “some people will be told to eat more broccoli” gets no response from the audience. His rhetorical question: “If Woodrow Wilson did it, why can’t I?” is not a relevant example that would establish a connection with an audience of his peers. Yet, his demeanor, confidence, conversational tone, and literal manipulation of the text all embody David’s role as expert—his selection of material to share, gestures, and overall style maintain an authority over the presentational genre established within the class.

Likewise, I doubt if anyone in the class is thinking, as David suggests, if “Woodrow Wilson did it so why can’t I?” when David incorporates the “Woodrow Wilson Effect” in his presentation. Despite David’s talking about the article at random, improvising, and what appears to me as barely getting through the presentation, he seems very comfortable in front of the class doing just what he is doing, talking. In his ease before the audience, he comes across as confident. David relies on this performative confidence and ease in presenting.

David is performative throughout his presentation. When he tries to locate the quotation he intended to share and cannot find it, he improvises by showing the class the Slimfast and diet pill advertisements which bookend the featured article. This act also demonstrates his lack of preparedness. The whole presentationver could be called an exercise in improvisation. David uses the text itself as a “cheat sheet” whenever he doesn’t know what to say, as if he were forgetting his lines during a performance.

Reflecting Written Resistance

Based on his presentational performance, it is clear that David was not prepared to deliver his presentation. In his reflection, David’s sentiment against the assignment (and inadvertently me, the teacher) is strong. David portrays his presentation as effective because he was able to talk to an audience of his peers. He compares the ease and effectiveness of his presentation to his less effective and strained written assignment

He writes:

When giving my presentation orally my audience consisted of my peers it was much easier to express my ideas to my peers than to put them on paper. It was something that was very natural and I was used to

doing. . . .When writing my analysis I felt that it was much harder for me to prove a point. Backing up my arguments with factual evidence became much more difficult, and much more important. I felt that while writing the paper I was much more prone to altering my opinion based on what I could prove, or what I thought a teacher would want to hear, and not on what my true opinion was. . . .

When writing formally all of my ideas seemed to shrink. . . . As a result of a lack of paper length, and not substance, I felt forced to analyze the article more than I already had. Sounds great if you're the teacher...however, the result of forced analysis wasn't necessarily a good thing for proving my thesis. The only thing it forced was more words. Which seemed to be lacking in substance. . . .

It is hard to argue that articles in Newsweek do anything else but entertain their readers. Next time I am given an assignment like this I think I will pick something that was written by an author who had a deep personal motive for writing. An article that is rich in personal experience and strongly opinionated would have made this assignment much easier, and much more honest.

David's distinction between the oral presentation and the written textual analysis is one of audience. His audience for writing is solely the "teacher." In his written assignment he found himself writing what he "thought the teacher wanted to hear." He writes that he needed to "back-up" his arguments with factual evidence for the written

document. His reflection even takes a defensive tone toward the teacher as audience, who he sees as “forc[ing]” him to analyze the text at length.

As the teacher and an audience member of this written reflection, I can’t help but to point out the irony in David’s reflection. In his presentation, in my opinion, he added words which made the whole presentation seem to be lacking in substance. Yet, he complains about a page requirement in the written assignment because it makes him add length “not substance.” In his reflection David sets up a dichotomy between the audience as a peer and audience as teacher. Yet his oral performances do not support the dichotomy he sets up because he does not fulfill the assignment, nor does he organize the material in such a way that the audience of peers can understand the overall purpose of the presentation.

David’s reflection can be used to read his presentation more fully. In his presentation, David positions himself as one of his peers, who is casually talking to them. This is also evident in his informal tone when presenting, his use of hand gestures and taking a more informal, conversational tone. In fact, his tone affects his role, which is defined in relationship to his audience. When he is talking to his peers, he does not need to rely on the text. When he needs to support his analysis, he sees the audience-as-teacher and goes to the text, literally turning pages, to integrate a quote. What David’s reflection reveals is how he resists the assignment.

David garners authority by resisting the assignment. He sees the presentation as a forum where he has more control as compared to the written assignment, where he feels stifled. David resists the assignment in his presentation by ignoring genre conventions such as not having a clear purpose and most boldly by going over the time limit. David

resists the authority of the assignment and the teacher by choosing to go outside the parameters of the assignment. His random rattling-off of information without regard to the time limit and guidelines is another embodiment of David's authority over the presentation as a mode of communication as well as the authority of the teacher who set the guidelines. He converses with the audience about the article not about the article's use of rhetorical strategies.

In the reflection David performs his resistance by critiquing the assignment. Instead of David critiquing his inability to meet the goals of either the presentation or the written assignment, he supports his critique of the assignment with an opinion that an article cannot have a purpose, or even a social dimension unless it is written by an author advocating a strong opinion. Yet, David gives no reason why this would have been a better stipulation for the assignment. David ignores the fact that he chose the article and that what he had to do was to discuss how the rhetorical and stylistic choices of the author shape the argument.

David did not do the assignment that was required. He has a good idea at the end of the reflection about the audience and purpose of *Newsweek*, one which could have made for a great thesis and analysis presentation. His performances and his written reflection solidify that David sees himself as an authority over the assignment. David enacts resistance throughout his written performances. Yet what seems to be missing is any purpose other than to be resistant and to assert his authority as a speaker. David does not take into account what he is actually persuading his audience about. Performance, according to Dell Hymes occurs when one or more persons "assume a responsibility to an audience and to tradition as they understand it" (qtd. in Carlson 12). When David resists

the form of the presentation as well as the time limits, and he does not provide the audience with a thesis or guiding outline, his attempt to perform as an expert does not assume a responsibility to an audience, nor does his resistant stance create a connection with the audience.

Alex

Without the benefit of learning from his peers' presentations, Alex, a junior journalism major, is the first person to deliver a presentation in English 20803. Slouching in front of the whiteboard in a white, short sleeve casual button-down shirt and faded black jeans, Alex asks the student-worker who is recording the presentations if he is ready and begins his presentation. The camera-person nods, and Alex brushes his brown hair away from his eyes. "Okay, well, I did my analysis on 'The Candidate,' by Johanna McGeary from the January 31, 2005 edition of *Time*." He holds up the *Time* magazine which is on a table to his left. Alex gives the audience a synopsis of the article which is about Iyad Allawi, the Iraqi Presidential candidate who the United States supported during the Iraqi elections.

Alex stands looking at the audience shifting his weight from right foot to left foot and continues:

The argument of this essay was not really "spelled out." McGeary was reporting about the state of affairs in Iraq and did a good job of presenting and supporting both sides of the issue. After digging deeper though I found a thesis: The U.S. and Iraq are failing in efforts to stabilize the country and keep peace.

Without looking at his audience rather softly and fugaciously, Alex spends the first three minutes discussing how McGeary presents both sides of the argument, Alex never mentions a thesis for his analysis about how the author achieves her argument. He even tells the audience, “I spent most of my time trying to figure out McGeary’s argument.”

In an attempt to talk about the nuances of the text which help to further McGeary’s argument, Alex briefly discusses the word choice in his article, pointing out that McGeary uses the words “iron hammer” to discuss the situation in Iraq. Alex does not have notes or an outline of his presentation; instead, he uses the hard copy of the article in *Time* almost as a prop, holding the article in his hands as he talks, looking down at the article most of the time he is sharing with the class. This physical movement of looking down at the article instead of the audience is a cue he is dependent on the text for his performance. As Alex vacillates between demonstrating the author’s thesis and a thesis on how she achieved her argument which gives me the impression that he doesn’t understand the assignment or has not chosen the best material for his presentation.

About three minutes into his presentation, Alex attempts to support his thesis that the “U.S. and Iraq are failing in efforts to stabilize the country and keep peace” by giving an example from the text of the unrest in Iraq. “Um, in paragraph four, toward the bottom, this is an example of my thesis.” Paragraph four in his text displays a *Time* reporter asking an Iraqi citizen on the street who is gutting a sheep what he thinks about peace-keeping efforts in Iraq.

Looking directly at the audience Alex says, “Pretend my right hand is a knife and the left is a sheep.” Alex takes his right hand and slices it downward through the

imaginary sheep in his left hand and says, “This is what we want to do with Allawi and the Americans.”

Alex steps out of his performed role of “Anti-American Iraqi on the street” and tells the audience, this is an example of “the resentment toward American troops in Iraq.” Smiling from the corner of his mouth, he laughs as he adds in self-deprecation, “That was also the highlight of my presentation.”

Though Alex must have planned his performance of a quote from the text, his tone indicates that his aside is unscripted, almost comedic. He uses his humor and self-deprecation performance as a way to connect to the audience, fulfilling one of the requirements for the presentation: to engage the audience. Alex’s performance leaves the audience with a picture of the Iraqi sentiment toward the U.S and does prove his thesis about the article: there is unrest in Iraq. Alex ends the presentation shortly after his performance telling the audience as he shrugs, “That’s what I did.”

Textually-Bound Reflection

The purpose of the presentation was to demonstrate how the author achieved the argument. Alex, however, as stated above, presented the article’s thesis: “The U.S. and Iraq are failing in efforts to stabilize the country and keep peace” and focused his presentation on how he struggled to find the argument. His performances reveal Alex’s preference to talk about his struggle to locate McGeary’s argument. The organization of his material in the presentation mimics his process as a writer; he talks about his struggle to locate the argument after giving the thesis of his essay for three minutes. Besides the point where he actually acts out a portion of the text, Alex does not make much eye-contact with the audience and speaks softly and at a quick pace.

In his written reflection, Alex focuses on the tension between writing about and presenting on his subject.

In my paper . . . most of my effort went into trying to explain how I came up with the author's argument. Explaining this verbally was much harder for me. I'm a big fan of putting my thoughts down where I can see them. . . . When the time came to organize these thoughts in a way that I could present them, I perhaps regretted not going about the construction of my analysis while thinking in terms of verbal communication.

Alex sets up a dichotomy between writing and speaking that he sustains throughout his reflection. Writing is a way to “put his thoughts down where he can see them,” but verbal expression is used for explanation. There is an implied assumption of different audiences in these two media: Alex is the audience for his writing (a place for him to get his thoughts down) and others are an audience for verbal expression (an event that requires one to explain).

He uses the presentation to solidify his role as a “writer”; the presentation is a rehearsal for the main event, the textual analysis essay.

Presenting my analysis did not have an effect on the composition of my paper. I refrained from thinking about the fact that I was to present the material, and simply got all my thoughts down. After the presentation took place, I felt like I had a better grasp of my article. . . . The process of rehearsing, and composing a presentation made the ideas I had about my article become more concrete in my head.

Although Alex admits that speaking on his subject gave him a better grasp of the article, he continually comes back to the dichotomy of writing and presenting, wherein writing is a place to “*simply [get] all my thoughts down.*”

At the end of his reflection Alex again reveals his preferred role of writer rather than presenter and explains how he is the primary audience for his analysis.

If I were to repeat this process all over again I don't think I would change the way I did it. I would still write the paper with no consideration for the presentation. Even though I could have made it easier on myself by including things in my paper that would be easier to convey verbally, I would have been leaving myself less time to stress the thing I thought were truly the most important. By allowing myself to be freeing myself of the inhibition of knowing I eventually had to present the information, [sic] I let myself include in my paper and presentation the material I thought was most important.

According to his reflection, Alex's choice to discuss how McGeary's argument was buried in the text was not based on the presentation criteria or on connecting with the audience but based on what he thought was “most important.” Alex disregards the assignment and its purpose and chooses to present and write on what's important to him. Both Alex's reflection and his presentation reveal his preference to take on the role of “writer” rather than “speaker” and uncovers a resistance to the oral presentation.

Alex's acting out of the quotation was the highlight of the presentation because he highlights his preference for the text over speaking. Alex literally performs the text as if it is his script—something no other student did throughout the course of the two sets of

presentations. He treats the article as a prop during the presentation. This performance of the text represents Alex's predilection for writing over speaking.

Reading Alex's reflection alongside his presentation illuminates his struggle to present the content in such a way that it is effective for an audience outside of himself. His presentation is indeed, a "rehearsal" of his paper and thoughts with no consideration of molding the material for an audience. He positions himself in relationship to the article and as a writer, rather than a speaker to an audience.

Though I am not comparing Alex's presentation with his final written textual analysis, I must note that in his writing Alex also struggled with the concept of an audience outside of himself. That semester, I offered a revision opportunity to students who had earned below a C+ on one out of three final papers. Alex chose to rewrite this textual analysis assignment after earning a D. As much as Alex vied for authority as a writer rather than presenter, his paper followed-suit with his presentation. He wrote about the author's thesis and how he had trouble discerning what it was. Like the presentation, his paper also included random examples of word choice and appeals which did not connect to his thesis.

Alex takes on the role of "writer" so much so that he could not put himself in any other role. Alex's reflection reveals his primary role and resistance to any other activity in the writing course other than writing. But this construction of self-as-writer inhibits Alex's conception of audience, both the literal one in his presentation and the one he must write to in order to be heard or understood in his written work. In the case of Alex, taking on a "real role" as a writer does give him a sense of authority, but it is at the expense of his work. When teachers advocate to give writers real roles in the classroom,

we must make sure that it is not at the expense of the writer's learning. Alex wants no other role but writer, when a role of speaker or performer could greatly augment his writing by giving him a concrete experience of audience as well as a forum to test run his argument.

Resisting Roles

Both David and Alex gain authority in one role by resisting another. David gains authority as a speaker and rejects the role of writer. Alex gains authority as a writer and rejects the role of speaker. Both set up a dichotomy between writing and speaking in reflection. Alex does not see how his speaking can inform the writing, or vice-versa. He is opposed to the role of speaker and sees a very specific purpose for his writing: to get his thoughts down and to see them in front of him. David sets up a dichotomy between writing and speaking in terms of audience. He resists writing because it is for the teacher, who "shrinks" his ideas.

Both students are dependent upon the texts for their presentations in different ways. Alex is textually-bound. He prefers the text. His presentation even performs the text. The text is a prop for him in the presentation. He depends on it. David resists the assignment and would rather talk to his peers. The text is a prop for David to gain information to fill his presentation when it stalls.

Both of these students' presentations failed to enact the purpose of the assignment. Alex uses his presentation as a forum to discuss how he found the thesis of the article, and though he does reflect that he would revise his presentation if he could do it over again, his revisions are what are akin to "surface level" revisions in a text. He

would add discussion of the appeals, for example. David does not have a purpose other than to talk to his peers.

The Resisters do not construct a thesis, but present the thesis of the article they are rhetorically analyzing. Their presentations of the articles' theses are different from the Authors' presentations, however. The Resisters do not advocate the thesis or take on the author's roles as Jenna and Brett did. Looking only at the Resisters' oral presentations, one could simply dismiss them as not following directions, or as being poor students. But reading their presentations alongside their written reflections provides insight into their resistive stance and allows me to ask some questions about resistance and authority in the composition classroom. For example, in this instance, using Giroux's stratification of accommodation, opposition and resistance to describe students' stances in the writing classroom, these two students fall somewhere between opposition and resistance. Giroux's stratification suggests a conscious decision of resisting for social/political purposes; David and Alex rebel against the constraints of the assignment and the institutional constraints that the teacher puts on them.

What was their purpose for resisting the assignments and their respective roles? For David, it was that he would rather talk to his peers as more of a conversation. He chose an authoritative role as a speaker. For Alex, he would rather write to see what he had to say and to explore his positions. He chooses an authoritative role as a writer. In this way the Resisters' choices to not to do the do the assignment or take on roles related to the assignment demonstrates social resistance to roles constructed by the classroom and university at large.

In my authoritative position as the teacher and as a researcher reading their reflections, I am aware that both of these students resisted accounting for their arguments on which they presented. David says numerous times he felt that he needed to provide support for what he said in the paper, but when speaking he was just talking to his peers. Alex, too, resists accounting for his positions. He sees his writing as a space and place for him to get thoughts down. His purpose for writing is almost exclusively inventive, according to his reflection. In their resistant positions, they take authority in their preferred roles. Alex as a writer, David as a speaker.

Resistance, especially in composition is often equated with freedom and upsetting the uneven power dynamic in the writing classroom. These two students, David and Alex, take the assignment in a different direction, like Jenna and Brett did. Both “The Authors” and “The Resisters” move outside the parameters of the assignment. Brett and Jenna take on the author’s roles and arguments. And even though taking on the author’s role does not allow them to critique this viewpoint, or in the case of Brett, gain a perspective of his own, they both are learning to support a view. There is a direct interaction with an audience outside the self. Jenna tries to persuade the audience of the author’s argument. Brett is introduced to new information, an ethical/social problem of assisted suicide, and formulates a position based on the information he interacts with. One of the purposes of this assignment was to gain a greater facility with source information and to understand that points must be supported—both in the oral medium and in the textual one. Though David admits that when writing for the teacher his ideas “seem to shrink,” which is a valid response and denotes his apprehension toward writing, I cannot be sure if he is trying to understand or resist the teacher’s authority. When David and Alex take the

assignment in a different direction, they do so because they resist supporting their arguments. David, perhaps when he critiques the assignment, deflects responsibility through his resistance. But again, he does not support his reasons for the critique. Both students perform resistance and gain authority, but do so without a purpose. Performance in this instance demonstrates how authority resides in the self and allows a space for these students to create while operating in their respective roles as resisters. When allowed to perform their writing, the two resisters take on their preferred roles, David as speaker, Alex as writer. Clearly, the two write about their authority in each of these roles. But, without purpose in their presentations, the authority is not understood by the audience and the presenter reciprocally; authority is evident only to and *within* the presenter.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Performing in the Classroom and Beyond:

Practical and Theoretical Implications of Performance Pedagogy

As a composition teacher, I wonder just how much we are missing when we ask that all knowing be translated into writing

---*Elizabeth Cheseri-Strater Academic Literacies 150.*

Chapters three through six demonstrated the various ways students gained authority as speakers and writers through their oral presentations. These sketches and overviews of performance-based elements within students' presentations reveal different types of authority each student speaker gained during the presentation. Students gained authority by trying out arguments and trying on roles (The Authors), drawing on personal experiences and interests (The Experts), identifying with the audience (The Crowd Pleasers), and also by resisting the assignment and roles associated with writing and speaking (The Resisters). By highlighting the several performance-based elements in students' presentations of their writing and in their written reflections, I have demonstrated that students can garner authority through the act of performance. Performance-based authority plays-out differently in each of the eight students' presentations and their written reflections.

A heightened sensitivity toward performances in the writing classroom holds implications for the teaching of writing and composition theory. One of the implications of this study is that integrating performance-based activities into the writing classroom enhances the traditional ways in which we have approached producing texts in the

writing classroom. Instead of focusing solely on writing at the expense of students' other literacies that can augment writing, integrating performance takes into account both the textual and non-textual qualities inherent in the writing classroom and therefore broadens our conception of the activities which inform writing.

Incorporating performance-based activities to complement writing assignments brings students' proficiencies beyond the page into the writing classroom and draws on students' non-textual literacies to complement their facilities with producing texts. Interweaving orality, literacy, and performance allows students three interrelated domains for communication on which to draw when producing writing. This study synthesizes the senses rather than isolates them, as conventional methods of teaching writing do.³⁴ That is, the practice of performing writing does more than make language visible, it makes the author visible and audible, too. This triangulation of senses provides dimensions to writing that conventional approaches sever and constrain.³⁵ These new dimensions cause us to re-think the meaning of audience, and author, for we clearly have a different sense, for example, when we consider the concepts of audience set forth by composition theory, communication theory, and rhetorical theory alone.

Integrating performance-based activities such as the presentation into writing classes has a number of teaching implications. Some are particular to each student's performance, but more common are implications for teaching that run across the sample of selected students in this work. Two in particular pertain to teaching the concepts of audience and ethos. Another implication is more conceptual: In the act of presenting, students also embodied many of the writing concepts taught in writing courses.

³⁴ Marshall McLuhan called this "synesthesia of senses."

³⁵ Thanks to Dr. Richard Enos, who helped me craft this argument.

Audience

The role of audience is debated in many of the disciplines which inform this project: composition, communication, and performance studies and theatre. Teaching audience and analyzing the audience is, as a generality, important to the teaching of writing. The debate as to whether an audience is addressed or invoked, fictionalized or materialized is one that has a longstanding tradition in composition studies. Walter Ong argues in “The Writer’s Audience is Always a Fiction” (1977) that a writer must first “construct in his imagination , clearly or vaguely, an audience cast in some sort of role.” To be able to do so, the writer draws from “earlier writers who were fictionalizing in their imagination audiences they had learned” (11). Ong emphasizes the audience as constructed by the writer. Others theorists such as Fred Pfister and Joanne Petrick (1980) as well as Ruth Mitchell and Mary Taylor (1979) emphasize the reality of the audience in order to argue that an audience must be addressed. Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford discuss the role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy in “Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked” (1984) and suggest that each side of the debate of an invoked or addressed audience has failed to recognize the “fluid, dynamic character of rhetorical situations and the integrated nature of reading and writing.” Based on their analyses of several theories, the authors argue for concepts of audience that are situational, based on how the writer is “guided by a sense of purpose” and “the specificities of the rhetorical situation.” The authors state that readers can “accept or reject the role or roles the writer wishes them to adopt in responding to a text” (89). Beyond stressing the rhetorical situation, what Ede and Lunsford stress is the interdependent relationship of reading and writing, the roles the writer and reader take on,

and the context of the writing situation. Ede and Lunsford point out the tendency in composition theory to overemphasize the difference between writing and speech. Moffett's *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* (1968) offers a corrective to considering the audience addressed or evoked in a binary as well as separating speech from writing through its helpful consideration of the distance needed in some rhetorical situations between speech and writing, and the similarities between the speaker and writer in relationship to an audience.

The usefulness of having a “real” audience has been a matter of debate in the field of Communication as well as in Composition. Recognizing the differences between analyzing an audience and actually “experiencing” an audience, Theodore Clevenger wrote in 1966, that “Each individual behaves as he does because of his prior experience coupled with the stimuli operating upon him at the moment, including the context as he perceives it. . . .” (9-10). This social constructivistic approach to audience is also described by Edwin Black (1992) argues that the audience looks for “cues” from the discourse to tell them “how they are to view the world” (113).

In theatre and performance theory, the audience is theorized as an essential element, for no performance can take place without an audience. In fact, Carlson states in *Performance: A Critical Introduction*, “All theorists of performance recognize . . . the essential quality of performance, that it is based upon a relationship between the performer and the audience” (35). Theorists used in Performance Studies such as Goffman stress the notion of behavior performed for an audience, while Burke (in English Studies known primarily as rhetorician and philosopher), emphasizes the conscious production of behaviors for persuasive matters, placing the emphasis on the

performer (Carlson 35). Both Goffman and Burke's influences on performance studies imbue it with psychological and sociological characteristics.

These multiple lenses, when taken together, provide a rationale for approaching the concept of audience in a variety of ways in the writing classroom. When integrating performance into the classroom as a way to discuss audience, the consideration of the text on which performances are based, the interaction between speaker and audience, the speaker's construction of the material, and the dependence upon the audience for receiving the material must be considered. The interrelated nature of the speaker, who is presenting based on his or her writing, and audience, and the situational context of the writing classroom can draw upon all three of these disciplines to come to an understanding of the function of audience in performance-related assignments in the composition classroom.

Teaching Applications: Teaching Audience

Having students present their writing to an audience of their peers gives students a literal encounter with a live audience. Using the concept of performance as related to theatre, there is an expectation of an exchange between the performer and the audience. This same expectation exists when students deliver their writing for an audience of their peers. The situational demands of the presentation itself provide the student with a responsibility to the audience to perform in a certain way, as evidenced in the eight presentations showcased here. This awareness of audience is evident in most students' written reflections on their presentations. For Jenna, she takes on the role of author because she thinks "the audience will respond better to someone who knows what they are talking about." Similarly, Michael and D.W. have an acute sense of audience

awareness which affects how they present to their peers. Both write that they do not want to “look stupid” and want to be “believable” in front of their audience and take careful consideration to identify with them. Even Alex, who does not really care for the presentation assignment finds a way to interact with the audience by performing his text. The act of presenting provides just enough “performance anxiety” that students take seriously the performance event. Students want to be perceived and received favorably by their peers.

Reaching an audience is the primary concern of performance as well as rhetoric. Performances within the presentations and reflections demonstrate how student presenters identify with the audience. Students found various ways in which to identify with their audience. Two students, Jenna and D.W., connected with their audience by identifying with them on the basis of age and youth. Jenna identified with the audience by incorporating comments which contrasted her youth with Iliescu’s, comparing Iliescu with her grandmother. D.W. identified with students by telling them that no one their age would have seen the movie, much less read the book *Ben Hur* he referred to. He also incorporated examples about TCU football to emphasize that he was talking to his fellow college students. Students such as Caitlin and Michael relied on a more traditional approach of identifying with their audience. They worked within the prescribed format of the presentation and gave clear, compelling presentations. Michael, as well as Alex, worked to bring in interesting material. Michael did not want to inundate the audience with facts and figures. Alex performed a quotation from the article on which he was presenting. Even David, whose presentation did not meet many of the requirements and was disorganized, found ways to make what he was saying conversational. And, perhaps,

even in his resistance he was perceived as engaging because he did not do the assignment. Not doing the assignment that the whole group had done certainly would spark some response on the part of his audience of peers. Being aware of his audience, Andrew realizes that his material probably will not engage the audience, but he chooses not to identify with the audience. Or, perhaps he feels he is sparing them a less-than-interesting presentation and is identifying with them on some level, on the level that they would not be interested in President Bush's economic policies.

Teaching how to identify with an audience could be approached by having classes watch their own presentations and pointing out the ways in which selected presenters identified with the audience. This would have to be done with the presenters' permission of course. Asking student to incorporate some of these strategies for identifying with the audience when they compose or revise their arguments is one way to take the visual and performed-based activity and have students apply it to their writing.

Another companion assignment would have students give a five minute presentation on a topic of their choice and try in as many ways as they could *not* to connect with the audience. Then, the class would have time to discuss what strategies they used to not connect with the audience, and how one would approach a presentation trying to find ways to connect with the audience. Another approach to teaching identification with the audience which would not rely on the presentation, would work more as a preparatory assignment: Have students freewrite individually or develop in groups during class a list of instances when they remember thinking someone should or should not have said something in a particular social setting. Students would then have to explain why these things that were/ were not said did not take the audience into account.

The presentation also helped students to focus on and engage with the material they were to present and become close readers of the texts for which they were responsible. Three of the eight students wrote in their reflections that having to present made them pay more attention to the material, reread the material, or engage more fully with it in some way. Brett and Alex wrote that the presentation “forced” them to analyze the material more carefully. Michael stated that having to present made him write his paper earlier than he would have so he had time to revise after the presentation. Teaching close-reading of texts is a task that sometimes falls by the wayside in writing courses, but when students are asked to give presentations to a direct audience, they must become the experts over their texts and material to be received well by that audience.

Likewise, asking students to translate their arguments from a text to an oral/visual medium also requires that students to consider how the medium shapes the message of their arguments. Similarly, when students translate their arguments into a different medium, there is also an opportunity to teach the many and varied ways in which students encounter arguments in their everyday lives: visually, audibly, textually, and a combination of all three. Performance-based assignments demand that students engage with argument and their material in different ways.

Though only Brett wrote that he learned quite a bit from participating as an active audience member, the very nature of the presentation or any performance-based activity provides a situation in which students can learn from listening to their peers. Participating as audience members is one teaching implication of performance-based assignments. As Brett discusses in his reflection, he more fully understood how to craft his paper and got a better sense of the genre of the presentation by watching his peers.

Though there is an expectation for exchange between presenter and audience, teaching about this exchange and the rhetorical situations which arise within it can be difficult. Andrew provides an interesting case from which to derive teaching implications for a literal audience. He does not expect his literal audience of peers and teacher to understand or be interested in his finance and economic-driven presentation. He continually qualifies throughout the presentation that the audience “just won’t understand” what he is saying. Though he expresses this concern in his written reflection, in his final paper, he makes no such qualifications. He struggles, however, with being clear about his argument for the reader.

Assigning students the task of identifying material or words that would be unfamiliar to a “non-expert” and then defining those terms is a good preparatory assignment to the presentation or as an assignment before a final draft is due. A discussion about discourse communities, syntax, specializations, and expertise is a good way to approach this assignment. Similarly, once students have established working definitions for these terms, a discussion on reaching audiences with varying interests and establishing common ground would be appropriate. The presentation asks students to see the transaction between writer and audience through the lens of performance. That is, students are placed in a situation where they must reach a direct audience by establishing common ground and clear definitions. Therefore, the responsibility of moving the audience to reason along with the speaker/writer is placed on the speaker/writer.

Andrew’s lack of connection with the audience provides a compelling reason to create assignments which require students to situate their writing in a larger social context and push them towards seeing the social significance of their topics. When

students place their arguments in a larger social context, they can begin to comprehend the complexities of reaching an audience beyond the self. For example, a portion of Andrew's thesis was that the economic problems that the author described affect every American. Andrew, did not, however, provide support for this portion of his thesis. If Andrew had found ways that the economic problems cited in the article did affect his audience, he would have had a better opportunity to connect with them and to make the information he presented relevant.

A companion assignment that could be approached through a presentation or through a more traditional writing assignment would have students present or write on a topic of their choice, but the purpose of their argument would be to convince their audience of how the subject directly affects them. A good example exists in political discourse and it is one that I have used in my argumentative writing classes. I brought in examples of the debate that in order to defeat "estate tax" political strategists changed the name of the tax to "death tax," in order to demonstrate to constituents that their estates would be taxed when they died. The opponents of the tax argued, "why should someone pay taxes when they are dead?" The tax was defeated. Students were then assigned the task of looking at an editorial or opinion piece and deciding how this issue affected "everyday people." Examples of how ordinary issues can affect them provide vivid models from which students can begin to argue. .

Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike (1970) point out that the individuals who make up an audience are diverse; they hold different values and opinions. To communicate effectively, we must "overcome the barriers to communication that are, paradoxically, the motive for communication" (30). The writer must understand

what she and the audience have in common. In this situation wherein students performed their writing for an audience and attempted to engage the audience in various ways, they literally were interacting with the audience, attempting to communicate and find values that were similar starting points for that communication event. The various authoritative roles these students took on allowed for communication.

Ethos

The concept of ethos is debated in much of rhetoric and communication, as classical texts argue with the speaker's virtue and purpose for speaking. Discussions of ethos are centered upon the debate: is ethos the appearance of virtue or actual virtue? Is ethos a strategy? Nan Johnson comments (as stated in chapter three) that practical approaches to teaching ethos often reduce it to the character of the speaker. Peter Elbow's Introduction to *Landmark Essays on Voice and Writing* (1994) associates the debate over ethos as "constructed" and "strategic" or "virtuous" and "true" with modern debates of "voice as self vs. voice as role" (xvii). Aristotle observed that the ethical appeal is exerted when the speech impresses the audience that the speaker is a persona of sound sense, high moral character, and benevolence (Corbett 1971, 93). Aristotle emphasizes the audience's reaction as what counts in the speaker's persona. Quintilian however, focuses on the audience's reception but also on the true virtue in a speaker. The rhetor must "possess, and be regarded as possessing, genuine wisdom and excellence of character" (Corbett 93).

Roger Cherry's article, "Ethos Versus Persona: Self-Representation in Written Discourse" (1994), distinguishes historically and etymologically between ethos and

persona. This distinction helps to delineate the debate about ethos as virtue in the real person versus the appearance of virtue. Cherry argues that because the two concepts have come down to us through different traditions, they render different perspectives on self-representation in the written text.

With its roots in the rhetorical tradition, ethos refers to a set of characteristics that, if attributed to a writer on the basis of textual evidence, will enhance the writer's credibility. Persona, on the other hand, traces its roots through literature and literary criticism and provides a way of describing the roles authors create for themselves in written discourse given their representation of audience, subject matter, and other elements of context. (101)

Cherry distinguishes between the rhetorical and literary traditions of ethos. Arguably, this distinction points to the blending of the rhetorical, literary, and dramatic references of ethos, and how those three references provide a fuller context of the concept.

Cherry points to Book II of the *Rhetoric*, in which Aristotle analyzes the ethical argument in greater detail by identifying the characteristics that lend credibility to the speaker *phronesis* (practical wisdom) *arête* (good moral character) and *eunoia* (goodwill towards the audience) (86). Cherry describes the fullness of these terms and how they inform Aristotle's construction of ethos. The first two characteristics of ethos do reflect the nature and character of the speaker.³⁶ The third, *eunoia* relies on an interaction between speaker and audience. *Eunoia* is emphasized in the *Rhetoric* in connection with

³⁶ The Roman rhetoricians, Cicero and Quintilian focused on the moral virtue of the speaker (Cherry). Ethos is not named specifically, but stressed in Roman rhetoric by Cicero and Quintilian as the moral character of the speaker. Cicero was also concerned with the larger, public image of the speaker, what Enos and McClaren describe as a "long range ethos" (102).

deliberative rhetoric. “For Aristotle an important aspect of ethos involves assessing the characteristics of audience and constructing the discourse in such a way as to portray oneself as embodying those same characteristics” (86).

Persona differs from ethos in its origins. Richard C. Elliott concludes that in Latin persona refers originally to a device of transformation and concealment on the theatrical stage (21). In literature, persona is used to distinguish the historical and actual author from the character he creates. Cherry casts the attention to persona as a question of “self representation” (97). The question of self-representation, however, intrinsically defines the self as the constructor. Cherry then goes on to recast the question of self representations in terms of the rhetorical situation and how the writer is placed in the situation.

Cherry concludes it is not useful to think of the terms *ethos* and *persona* in a binary opposition. “Ethos and persona are not mutually exclusive but interact with one another in rather complex ways” (100). He returns to Aristotle’s concept of ethos, especially *eunoia*, serves some of the functions ascribed to persona (101). “Because the components of ethos—*phronesis*, *arête*, and *eunoia* are socially determined and because ethos involves adapting discourse to audiences, thinking of ethos in terms of role in a discourse community or in a larger social sense can be justified” (103).³⁷

What is important to note in Cherry’s discussions is that he is also accounting for the role of “self” in written discourse, a discussion that contemporary compositionists such as Newkirk and Gere are currently approaching through the lens of performance.

³⁷ For a discussion of ethos in speech communication see Ken Anderson and Theodore Clevenger Jr.’s “A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos.” Also see McCroskey and Young’s “Ethos and Credibility: The Construct and Its Measurement After Three Decades.”

What I would like to point out here is that Cherry is crossing disciplinary boundaries as well as other media to describe ethos. He draws from rhetoric, composition, drama, and literature, and in doing so discusses the textual representation of self with terms and metaphors which are oral and performance-based. This extension beyond the text, so aligned with performance theories, takes into account a performative dimension to ethos: one that draws on characteristics of the speaker/writer in a very literal sense of the word and depends on the reception by the audience.

Though performance theory does not specifically name *ethos* as a controlling concept; many performance-based theories discuss the performer's role in relationship to an audience and have obvious analogues in rhetorical theory. Goffman's "On Facework" (1955) and *The Performance of Self in Everyday Life* (1959) suggest that certain behaviors are performed for an audience and distinguishes between the self and the presentation. Goffman's interpretation of performance emphasizes the audience. The presenter/performer is not strategizing but behaving in a way that relies on the audience. Though Goffman analyzes the "theatre of everyday life," his concept of the self relies on a social construction. That is, we behave a certain way based on how we have performed for certain audiences in past experiences.

Teaching Applications: Teaching Ethos

Taking what Nan Johnson would deem "a practical approach" to teaching the concept of ethos to undergraduate writers, I teach students about ethos in a variety of ways, but the first point I make is that the credibility of a speaker or writer can determine how the argument is received by an audience. The concept of ethos in this practical sense is a lesson with transfer value when teaching using texts, teaching students about the

ethical appeal (as an artistic proof), and teaching students how to decide if a source is credible.

Teaching about ethos literally asks students to consider the character “around” the speaker, the actions past and present which construct how the presenter is received by an audience. D.W.’s presentation was entertaining, well-connected to the audience, and followed the genre-specific requirements, but overall it lacked substantive claims. Such a presentation provides an example of the character and characteristics “around” the presenter which help to establish how he is received by the audience. D.W.’s character in class is “laid-back.” He is not outspoken, but he is comfortable during class discussions and as a presenter. When he connects with the audience through the use of his examples of the football team and reminding the audience that he shares the same characteristics of youth as they do, D.W. constructs his ethos as one of the students.

Though I do not know if this is an intentional strategy, D.W.’s presentation also stresses the importance of teaching students about constructed ethos/ethos as a strategy versus ethos as virtue. For example, D.W. never truly supports any claim that he makes. But, even I, the teacher/researcher, did not pick-up on the degree to which D.W. did not support his claims until I had viewed and analyzed his presentation for performance-based techniques.

Having students view a presentation in which a student did not substantiate claims but presented well is a good way to discuss the concept of ethos as virtue or strategy. Another technique with the same premise would ask the audience to record how the presenter substantiates his or her claims. I have had students in my classes look for how a writer substantiates claims by exchanging papers and identifying “claim” and “support.”

Having students demonstrate how to support claims in front of an audience of their peers draws upon the performance-based aspects of the presentation. A student is responsible to the audience to support a claim. This thought is echoed in Aristotle. Aristotle writes in the *Rhetoric*: “People always think well of speeches adapted to and reflecting their own character and we can now see how to compose our speeches so as to adapt them and ourselves to our audience” (Roberts 1930a). Using this one aspect of ethos to discuss why an audience would be not be likely to question the substance of a presentation such as this is a good way to introduce a fuller constitution of ethos in the writing classroom. Using political speeches and debates in which sound bites and buzz words substitute for substantive answers is another way to introduce the concept of ethos and to generate discussion on this same topic.

Roles

As discussed in chapters three through six, students gained authority through the act of performance. Yet, within these performances students took on certain roles. Taking on the author’s role, for Jenna and Brett, becomes a way for these speaker/writers to gain a better understanding of material with which they have little familiarity. In the case of Jenna, “performing as author” helped to build her ethos as a presenter. In this case, Jenna constructs her ethos to be received as the “expert” by her audience. Her performance-based actions throughout her presentation only augment this role. Becoming the “author” is a way to gain authority.

Asking students to take on roles as the authors when they encounter research or sources they are incorporating into a research or argumentative paper, is one way for them to gain an understanding of source material that is often impenetrable. Extending

the teaching of ethos and authority, students could be asked in presentations to take on another role, such as the oppositional position, when presenting. Bringing theatrical approaches into the classroom, role playing provides a structure for the student's exploration of human behavior (Morgan and Saxton 38). Having students take on a role enriches the material for the students (Morgan and Saxton 39). Role playing could apply to presentations of many types of writing assignments. For example, in this assignment, presenters delivered an argument based on a textual-analysis. They could take on roles as critics and evaluate the article. If students were presenting on autobiographical writing, for example, they could take on the role of "outsider" or another important character in their personal experiences. Conversely, asking the audience to take on the role of "hostile audience" and having the presenter approach this audience differently than a complicit audience is another way to using role-playing to teach students about ethos and audience. The teaching of ethos and students' assumptions of roles is aligned with Aristotle's sense of ethos in that students are adapting spoken discourse to audiences, but they are also able to do so through the act of performance. The performance, as well as the speaker, creates the roles that the students take on.

The Resistors' and D.W.'s case studies have direct teaching implications for the concept of ethos as well. D.W. does not account for his positions or support his claims with more than his own word. He does not resist the assignment, but it does affect his credibility. He gains authority through being well-received by the audience. Though both David and Alex are hesitant to account for their positions and wish to remain in their desired roles where they have their own authority, resistant students, as well as students who do not rely on appropriate support for argumentation can be taught the power and

value of performance by asking them to account for their positions. Accounting for positions, as the very act of performance necessitates, is empowering because it builds students' ethos. For example, they are given the literal time and a captivated audience to talk to. Accounting for positions also can imbue performance with a social function. By presenting performance-based assignments in such a manner that addresses the power and social function of performance, students can come to understand that "having a voice" and a physical space in which to speak is a powerful forum.

Performing Writing Concepts

Student presenters relied on their physical bodies, their presence before an audience, as well as their intellectual abilities during the presentations and were actually *performing* writing. Along with the concepts of authority, roles, ethos and audience, students also performed conventions particular to writing.

Invention

In this project, students tested out arguments before an audience of their peers. In this sense, the act of debating an argument has resonances with the classical definition of *invention*; however, considering the presentation as an act of performance as well as an act of argument allows consideration of how the physical act of the presentation and the transaction with an audience can enhance and create arguments. Karen Burke LeFevre's *Invention as a Social Act* (1987) expands traditional, classical definitions of "invention" and describes invention as a social process that "may involve speaking and writing, and that at times involves more than one person" (1). LeFevre focuses on the act of invention as an interaction between writer and reader; however, she recognizes the social

dimension of invention in the interdependency of speaking and writing. For Jenna, the presentation became an invention technique, one akin to the drafting process. When translating her argument to an oral medium, she incorporates a visual and begins to discover new ways to reach her audience. The visual aid becomes a literal frame for her presentation. For Michael as well as Andrew, the presentation helped them to invent ways for reaching their audience. Neither wants to bore the audience with facts and figures, so they select an alternative approach to reaching their audience based on that medium of presenting. (Even though Michael more successfully reached them than did Andrew).

Moffett's *Active Voice* proposes ways in which using a dramatic medium can foster invention. Moffett's activity "dialogue of ideas" asks students to use two voices, A and B, to discuss or argue some controversial issue in script form. Students then write dialogues based on these voices and take the dialogue in any direction. The idea is to generate as many ideas as possible. Skinner-Linnenbergr discusses how this approach may help students who "go blank when faced with an assignment or who attempt to guess what the teacher wants to hear" (95). As in the cases of *The Experts*, Caitlin and Andrew, as well as D.W., the open-forum for presenting on any article of their choice allowed them to select topics which were of a personal interest. Through presenting these speaker/writers take-on the act of invention.

Rehearsal/Drafting/Revision

If performances are, as Richard Schechner states, "twice behaved behavior," then the performances of students' writing, the act of translating a text into an oral medium becomes a rehearsal of the final product. This rehearsal is akin to multiple drafting and

the revisions students make in that process. The performance dynamic again is at work here. The transaction between speaker and audience helps students to “see again” some conceptual changes to make in their final papers. This renders a definition of revision that literally enacts Donald Murray’s definition “of “seeing again as “what the writer does after a draft is completed to understand and communicate what has begun to appear on the page” (87). Michael talks about how the presentation helped him to write and revise his final paper. Alex’s reflection on the presentation after the fact allows him to see how he could have used the presentation as a “test run” for his argument. He even states that he will revise his paper to include an analysis of artistic proofs because he has seen his peers do the same in their presentations. As part of a true “rehearsal” in a more theatrical sense of the word, Brett discusses how he learned what to incorporate in his paper by viewing others’ presentations. These broad range of performances exposed Brett to a variety of approaches for his paper.

Supporting a Claim

Making a claim and supporting it is a process that is integral to teaching argumentative writing. Students at times rely on information they find haphazardly, or they do not understand the relationship between claim and support. When given a direct and immediate audience, students perform “supporting a claim.” There are examples of students performance of claims in their presentations. These are most vividly seen in Alex’s and Jenna’s presentations. Jenna performs how to support a claim when she claims that Iliescu is too old to have a baby and then presents a picture of post-labor, sixty-six year old Iliescu to her audience and proceeds to analyze the picture by describing the woman’s aging body—her sagging jowls, her wrinkly hands, her crow’s

feet. Alex, literally performs the text when he makes the claim that there is fierce, Anti-American sentiment in Iraq and acts out the role of “Anti-American Iraqi.” He acts-out cutting the head off of a sheep, as the “Anti-American Iraqi” did. These two instances are of students performing their writing, performing making a claim and supporting it with textual evidence. Similarly, David P. pointed out how the presentation made him support his thesis, “especially in the paper.”

Translating these oral acts into writing lessons, teachers can help students to consider these tacit performances and make their rhetorical implications overt to students as ways to augment their arguments or to analyze the arguments of others. Students can begin to understand both physically and intellectually the concepts of ethos, speaking with authority, gaining common ground with the audience in order to effectively communicate, creating an argument based on personally-based values or convictions, and having a literal conception of audience.

The purpose of the presentations in this particular writing class was to have students analyze a text and argue how the text achieved its thesis in front of an audience of their peers. Yet, within this overall purpose, students found ways in which to create a persona which allowed them to interact with the audience and comprehend the complexities of argument in many and varied ways. For example, some students, such as David W. were able to understand the concept of identifying and seeking common ground with an audience; others, like The Experts—Caitlin and Andrew, were able to understand how the personal beliefs inform argument. Alex, understood how the message changes depending on the medium as he preferred writing to speaking and the form of writing over the presentation. Brett embodied the concept of audience, preferring to learn

from his position as an audience member and applying what he had learned to his work. Some students, such as Jenna, invented in order to persuade the audience of her argument.

Debra Hawhee's *Bodily Arts* (2004) investigates the connection between athletics and rhetoric, drawing on ancient constructions of the body. Citing the examples of Aristotle's comment about knowing a healthy man's walk by virtue of having seen it repeatedly, and the story of Demosthenes' development as an orator through observation "turn on a logic of the visible." The visible, "in turn, depends on the knowable, an associative knowledge of the bodies: Aristotle's perceiver, for example, must recall instances of healthy men walking, and such recalling requires a prior articulation of walking style as healthy (162–63). Seeing, and being seen, is the crux of theatre, as Froma I. Zeitlin points out, which is the reciprocity between oneself and other in the mutuality of vision (189). The act of students performing their writing becomes for these students a way of seeing: seeing their writing, seeing themselves, seeing each other. This performance makes the author audible and visible, the performances of writing visible, and the (classroom) culturally constructed, authoritative roles he or she takes on visible as well. There is no separation between the writing that the students produce and the physicality in which it is delivered.

Theoretical Implications:

Extending the conversation of how students perform certain writing techniques holds implications for the progression of assignments and the traditional activities in the writing classroom. One of the typical approaches in the first year course, for example, is

teachers textually responding to students' drafts. Based on my research of students performing writing techniques and using the presentation as a forum to rehearse their arguments, I see a relationship between students' performance of writing concepts and the types of textual comments that teachers give when responding to students' drafts. Having students present on their writing provides a way to teach writing concepts that teachers often mark on the page. As the concept of giving students' authority and control over their writing has dominated much of the literature on response (Sommers "Responding"; Brannon and Knoblauch "Students' Rights; Straub "Concept" 1996), giving students an alternate medium to gain response to their writing can help foster this authority. Response to student writing has been primarily exercised as teachers' penned or electronic comments on a student's paper. Yet, based on the literature on response, there is an oral, collaborative, and visual component which performance can augment.

Performance Response

Looking briefly at the history of research on response reveals that in efforts to understand and give students more control and authority over their writing, metaphors such as *reader*, *role*, *voice*, and *conversation* emerged to account for a more reciprocal response situation. These metaphors reveal textual, oral, dialectical, collaborative, and performative qualities inherent in response.

The metaphor of *reader* denotes the textual qualities inherent in our constructed notions of response. The teacher as *reader* of student writing denotes an uneven power dynamic, as the teacher has more expertise in writing than the student. Brannon and Knoblauch and other early writers on response point out that the teachers' textual

commentary produces a text that competes with the students' purposes both spatially (their comments literally read alongside that of the students' drafts) and authoritatively.

Role as described in literature on response imbues response with a performance based quality, a quality that makes us consider the ways in which teachers *and* students can take on roles as active audience members and writers, respectively. The teacher as *reader* and the textually-based roles she takes on demonstrate a connection between the textual and the performative that is inherent in response. Alan Purves' delineation of teacher *roles* as "gatekeeper" and "evaluator," for example, are textually based and represent a power struggle between teacher and student as well as with the demands of the institution. Cheryl Flynn, Elizabeth Cheseri-Strater, and Paul Rubin reveal gender-roles which teachers take on, valuing the feminized role rather than the masculine one, to make a social critique of patriarchal ways of knowing which have dominated education.

The *role* of audience is central to understanding the performative qualities of response. If roles are to be constructed to give more control and responsibility to students, then students need to be considered as an audience of response. For a response situation to be less teacher-dominated or controlled, both student and teacher must have a conception of each other as an audience.

Accounting for the "heard" quality in writing as well as the response situation, the metaphor of *voice* is also used in response literature to describe competing voices between teacher and student in the response situation. For example, Elizabeth Hodges' "The Unheard Voices of Our Responses to Students' Writing" (1992) captures the reciprocal qualities in the nature of response practices when we consider commentary as voices of both teacher and students. Like Hodges, Anne Greenhalgh also recognizes the

implications of the metaphors used to describe the response situation and replaces the concept of *roles* with *voices* in “Voices in Response: A Postmodern Reading of Teacher Response” (1992). She claims that “Since [roles] are fixed in a social hierarchy” not much more information about the roles teachers and students are assigned is needed. Instead, a “better understanding of how they ‘voice’ their set ‘roles’ is needed” (402). Greenhalgh argues that demonstrative comments (comments which are facilitative and modeling) function as an “extension of the teacher as reader, an extension of the teacher’s voice” (Greenhalgh 403). Rather than fixed responses dictated by *roles*, the **voices** of both the teacher and student ensure that “the conversations between teachers as readers and students as writers are open and ongoing” (410). Greenhalgh expresses the mutuality of teachers respecting and responding to students’ purposes for writing.

The metaphors of *roles* and *voice* describe the active, heard, spoken, and transactional qualities of response. The interplay of these qualities inherent in response is captured in the metaphor of *voice*, which grew out of the metaphor of *roles*, and describes non-textual qualities of response. The use of the term *voices* when discussing response reveals its live, oral, aural, and open-ended qualities, which leads to posit a collaborative response situation.

The metaphor of the *conversation* emerged from *voices* to describe a fully social and collaborative response experience. Kenneth Bruffee’s “Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind” (1984) brought attention to *conversation* as a metaphor in the field of composition studies. Bruffee’s work connects oral and written discourse to argue that “if thought is internalized public and social talk, then writing of all kinds is internalized social talk made public and social again” which makes writing “a

technologically displaced form of conversation” (641). *Conversation* represents a social, open-ended method to share knowledge and negotiate the power dynamic.

Many of the strategies for making response a collaborative *conversation* are taken from writing conference response methods, largely due to the connection between written and spoken language (Sperling 282). Muriel Harris’ “Teaching-One-to-One: The Writing Conference” (1986) argues that the conversation in a writing conference can combine types of directive and non-directive commentary as long as it meets both the teacher and students’ goals. Thomas Newkirk’s “The First Five Minutes: Setting the Agenda in the Writing Conference” (1987) also provides a model of a more negotiated conference where there is an equal exchange between student and teacher.

In “Teacher Response as Conversation” (1996), Straub offers an interactive model for teacher response practices that enables student writers to imagine that their thoughts and ideas, their voices, are heard and received by their teachers. Francine Danis calls this interaction between teacher and student, the students’ abilities “to compensate for that person’s physical absence” when writing (Danis 19). Nancy Sommers describes the ability of the student to imagine an audience “dramatiz[ing] the presence of the reader (148). *Conversation* gives the teacher a role of audience, one that is actually interacting and giving feedback to the student writer who is receiving the comment. This metaphor encompasses an interactive, collaborative quality which teacher and researchers of response were grappling with since before Brannon and Knoblauch and continue to grapple with today. This metaphor also encompasses some of the qualities inherent in other metaphors. For example, “dramatizing the presence of a reader” manifests a performance within the response situation.

Knowing that response possesses textual, performative, oral, aural, and collaborative qualities requires both students and teachers to move in and out of roles constructed by traditional textual response methods rather than remain in stagnant relationships which continue the uneven power dynamic. Using performance theory to more accurately describe the response situation, as proposed through the use of the presentation, demonstrates how performance can enrich teacher response practices.

Classroom activities such as debates, presentations, and actual performances (or skits) of students' texts play-out their arguments before the class and give the class the role of live audience, thus granting a truer representation of the rhetorical situation. In relationship to the research presented here, performances within the presentations demonstrate how students take control over their arguments by embodying specific roles.

Students engaging in these activities perform a type of response and collaborate to give response, and they ultimately garner more authority over their writing because they have tested it out, (or played it out) before a group of their peers. These practices not only give students the literal opportunity to "speak first," as Fife and O'Neil suggest, but to speak to each other as a method of response. Students' presentations of their writing can take the place of or supplement teacher's textual commentary. Many of the concepts that teachers spend time textually teaching students on the page of their drafts could be taught through students' oral presentations of their writing. The presentation provides a rehearsal of the students' final papers.

Performing Beyond the Writing Classroom

Conversely, just as performance can inform response, the interdisciplinary nature of performance studies also can inform disciplines across the university. If we are to

accept Richard Schechner's claim that performance is "twice behaved behavior," then the many and varied ways that behavior is replayed and reseen through writing and art need to be explored. These many and varied ways of replaying and reseeing behaviors connect performance across the disciplines of composition, rhetoric, speech, theatre, history, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, political science, as well as marketing and business.

Democratic learning and social inquiry are goals most teachers of writing and performance studies share. Interdisciplinary courses in the University could easily reinforce this shared value. For example, viewing, understanding, and even writing about literal performances which take as their subject matter or are in response to political events connect performance studies to composition, history, rhetoric, theatre, and anthropology. Students could read, view and write about social theatre and techniques associated with it. For example, Joseph Roach's work with history and memory in diaries and journals explores how the memory and the act of writing performs a type of history. Della Pollock's work on oral history, links orality with literacy and explores how performances and oral histories intersect. In my writing classes, I have offered students extra credit for attending university productions of plays and having them write an analysis of how the play makes an argument not only through its content, the dialogue the actors speak, but also the dramatic elements such as sound, movement, lighting, staging, props, etc. Rhetoric and theatre hold similar conditions for an audience's participation. It is not difficult then to imagine a seminar in writing or theatre which asks students to analyze and critique performances from a rhetorical standpoint.

In a first-year writing course which investigated “literacy” as a concept of importance, I asked students to “write” or “compile” a history of a family member as a way of discussing oral histories as well as performance of history. Students in this class were required to record an interview or talk with a relative or someone older than they were about a memorable experience with education or literacy in their lives and then write about the experience of their interviewee as well as their experience, and the difficulties of writing about history. Students both achieved a knowledge of history of literacy in someone’s life as well as understood the complexities of performing and analyzing as a researcher. Students were able to also understand their subject positions in relationship to the subject and the research produced. In performance studies, the act of writing this oral history of someone else’s life is a performance of that life. Students also understood the complexities of a history as told through the eyes (and pens) of another and asked questions about the validity of primary sources and contextualizing sources. Students in the first year writing course then explore the connections between orality, literacy, history, and performance. Approaches such as the one I have described could easily work in a history course, anthropology, sociology, or communications class.

Performance as a descriptor, metaphor, and model has cropped-up in the Business sector as well. This connection between the humanities and business can also be explored across the disciplines. There is a small but growing body of work in performance studies which explores this connection. Looking at rhetoric, performance, business, and marketing, Mairya Wickstron’s *Performing Consumers* (2006) investigates branding and consumer culture arguing that embodiment is capital in the “brandsapes” of the United States. In our media saturated environment, consumers embody brand loyalty. I have

used both the PBS *Frontline Series: Merchants of Cool* (2002) and *The Persuaders* (2004) documentaries in my classes. These documentaries explore the media's manipulation and creation of a typical consumer through marketing techniques to polling and Rovian neologisms. Likewise, Morgan Spurlock's Academy Award nominated, *Super Size Me* (2004) about McDonalds' marketing and consumption provides a source to approach the topic of how brand is seamlessly woven into our culture and how the brand or marketer's purpose is to have the consumer identify so closely with the brand that it becomes part of their identity.

In marketing, *embodiment* is a common term which describes "the prototype, or example of the invention." Embodiment is a tool for invention. Steve Sato and Tony Salvador explore performance as a method for creating products and marketing in "Methods and Tools: Playacting and Focus Groups: Theatre Techniques for Creating Quick Intense Immersive and Engaging Focus Group Sessions" (1999). Marketing researchers create a prototype of their product, or an "embodiment" of it, out of everyday materials and use the prototype to imagine ways in which the product will be used. For example, a marketer of the palm pilot would perhaps walk around with a palm-sized block of wood and imagine uses for the product and revise the prototype based on its embodiment. Embodiment works here as a prop, a physical invention technique, one which helps the marketer imagine potential audiences, or buyers/users of the product. This extension of the concept of embodiment and performance, like the students' embodiment of rhetorical persuasive methods, depends on invention and the aesthetic. Like Jenna, who used her aesthetic performances to create an angle to approach the audience (she used a picture of Iliescu), embodiment helps to facilitate invention. These

are examples of theories which could potentially be explored in a writing and rhetoric class for those entering into the business world—as so many university students are planning to do. This example presents the relationship between students embodying rhetorical techniques and rhetoric used in everyday life. Performance becomes in and of itself a way of knowing that can be used in an interdisciplinary course or writing/speaking across the disciplines.

Performing as Citizens

As students move out of the writing classroom and beyond the academy, the larger purpose of students' engagement with language, their roles as writers and speakers comes into question. The tradition of the writing class as well as communication and speech classes, as well as strands of theatre have at their focus a social and democratic goal. After having surveyed writing instruction in American colleges in the twentieth century, composition scholar James Berlin writes in *Rhetoric and Reality* (1987), “We have begun to see that writing courses [...] prepare students for citizenship in a democracy, for assuming political responsibilities, whether as leaders or simply as active participants” (188-89). Berlin points to a rich history of the role of the writing class as preparation for participation in democracy and citizenship.

Democratic educators and, historically, writing and speech teachers (Cohen 1994) claim that education should prepare students by helping them to know their own minds, develop a set of values, and judge and act according to those standards (Dewey 1938, Grossman, Wilson, and Shulman 1989; Krisberg 1992; Nolan, 1995). Yet, current debates about education reveal that as a society of educators and citizens, we are unsure if

education is actually preparing its students for such participation (Deetz 1992; Staton 1996). Integrating performance-based assignments in the writing classroom is one way for students to take on real roles as writers and speakers which prepare them to account for their positions both inside and outside the classroom.

By nature of the assignments in this writing class, students investigated issues of civic importance from the economy to aid for third world countries. Performances have demonstrated students' assuming positions, physical and political ones on the topics on which they speak and how they account for those positions in relationship to their audience. But the topics students spoke on and wrote about are of secondary importance to the modeling, practice and assumption of real roles as speakers and writers.

Students took on authoritative positions through the act of performance. These positions of authorship, expertise, identification with others and resisting convention are important positions considering that these are the types of positions that people assume day to day when they are participating in the world around them as citizens. The act of performance reveals a social function that is made evident by giving students a forum from which they can garner authority.

The concept of audience cannot be ignored as both an integral part of the performance situation as well as the rhetorical one. The concept of audience, central to both performance and rhetoric, also plays a key role in community building and citizenship in the writing classroom. Students performed for their peers; their roles, to some extent were constructed by the very nature of being before an audience. Using performance- related assignments such as the presentation provides ways for students to

active participants in the writing class as they learn as an audience and learn to communicate for and with audience.

Teaching writing is a difficult process. A process that at times is exhausting to teachers and frustrating for students. My research suggests that when we allow students the opportunities through performance to learn abstract rhetorical concepts such as voice, authority, identity, and audience, artistic proofs, and invention, students not only embody these concepts, but also participate more fully as citizens in the writing classroom.

-Conclusion-

What this study of integrating performance-based practices into the composition classroom demonstrates is that a performance-based analysis and approach heightens sensitivity to aesthetics in non-mimetic works. Rhetoric and poetic are two divisions of discourse that have long been separated in the History of Rhetoric, in the production and analysis of texts and, by consequence, in the writing classroom. Attention to aesthetics in art has been studied and theorized about separately from non-mimetic works. This study ultimately argues that aesthetics should be re-approached through the heuristic of performance to enhance students' writing.

Performance facilitates sensitivity in the production and analysis of texts as demonstrated not only in the performative features of students' presentations, but also in students' reflective writings on their oral and written performances. The aesthetic qualities which rhetoric has distinguished from performance and the aesthetic need to be joined together in order to render a more accurate account of the rhetorical situation and thus restore performance to the canon of delivery.

In *Learning and Teaching the Ways of Knowing* (1985) Elliot Eisner argues that an "absence of attention to the aesthetic in the school curriculum is an absence of opportunities to cultivate our sensibilities . . . [and to refine] our consciousness The aesthetic modulate[s] form so that it can, in turn, modulate our experience" (25).

Drawing from Eisner's work and writing about this absence of attention to the aesthetic in colleges and universities, Elizabeth Chiseri -Strater's *Academic Literacies* (1992) makes a similar claim about non-textual literacies which can serve students' writing

across the disciplines and argued for an “expanded definition of what it means to know through aesthetic experiences.” She writes:

The ability of . . . students to respond to their worlds in terms of art, music and dance as well as in writing made me challenge the verbocentric and propositional knowledge that dominates our classrooms. . . . Are there perhaps other ways to tapping students’ responses to course content that do not rely exclusively on the written word? (150).

Similarly, Lunsford and Fishman’s aforementioned article, “Performing Writing, Performing Literacy” (2005) investigates performance-practices outside the classroom to broaden the concept of literacy in writing instruction and propose that performance is one of the many “nonacademic knowledges that students possess” (226). Conversely, if students draw from performance practices and activities which exist for them outside the classroom, as Lunsford and Fishman detail, then incorporating performance-based practices into the writing classroom, too, draws upon students’ ways of knowing that are not necessarily dependent upon a text. This is not to say that all students are adept artists or poets or skilled at the “arts.” My research alone represents a broad range of students’ facilities with oral presentations and performances. What I am suggesting is that the aesthetic performance allows students alternative ways to enter academic and civic conversations, to interact with an audience of peers, and to become the expert, instead of the novice.

Based on the argument that Fishman and Lunsford present, as well as the research rendered in this dissertation, it is my contention that composition can (and should) draw from performance studies to inform our understanding of how students approach writing.

When Composition draws from performance, Composition can more fully account for spoken, textual, and physical qualities associated with writing. Performance considers students' approaches to writing not as a mere textual act—one that must be taught through texts exclusively—but one which is inextricably linked with orality and aesthetic qualities related to performance such as voice, tone, gesture, physicality, and the interaction with audience. The writer as speaker interacts with a literal audience through multi-media: the text, voice, and the body, render a fuller perspective of the rhetorical situation.

Although the students that I studied were not overtly using their artistic abilities as a way of seeing writing, per say, what this project reveals is that the aesthetic and performance-related concepts involved in delivery can be used as a way for students to garner authority. Students in this study demonstrate how authority is garnered through the act of performance. Performance as a metaphor and an act allows composition theory and pedagogy to revise how the field has conceived of power and authority in the writing classroom. Giving students a “voice,” being aware of the “cultural-situatedness” of groups of people or of home or oral languages, and fostering “resistance” in the writing classroom are typical ways in which we have discussed authority in the writing classroom. Integrating performance helps composition theorists and teachers to answer questions about how to give students more control/authority/power in their writing when their traditional audience is the teacher and they are expected to write in a discourse with which they have little familiarity. Students take control over the subject matter, perform as experts, draw on their personal experiences, understand the complexities of empathizing and identifying with the audience and garner an authority through resistance.

Performances allowed students a method for connecting with the audience and to engage with the material on which they were presenting and writing. When students are allowed to perform their writing they take on roles which inform their writing. The writing classroom can provide a forum to tap into students' ways of knowing other than through the written word. In doing so, students perform as writers, speakers, and as citizens.

APPENDIX A:

TCU Composition Program Outcomes for ENGL 20803

Prerequisite: English 10803 and sophomore standing (24 sem. hrs.) Strategies for adjusting one's writing to a variety of tasks, genres, contexts, and audiences. The course also teaches research techniques, with an emphasis on identifying sources that are valuable to a given community and building an argument from them. Course activities include critical reading, collaborative writing and editing, and revising for style.

By the end of ENGL 20803, students should:

Rhetorical Knowledge

- Be able to identify and evaluate the components and complexities of a rhetorical situation
- Be able to recognize and produce familiar argumentative genres
- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation, including being able to move beyond formulaic structures.
- be able to produce an argument with a situation-appropriate focus, thesis, or controlling idea and recognize such in others' texts
- provide valid, reliable, and appropriate support for claims
- understand the constraints and possibilities inherent in different media (e.g. print, oral, and visual rhetoric)
- know conceptual terminology used in analyzing and producing arguments

Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing

- demonstrate the ability to connect their personal experiences, values, and beliefs with larger social conversations and contexts
- reflect on their experiences and development as critical readers and writers
- be able to find, evaluate, and analyze primary and secondary sources for appropriateness, timeliness, and validity
- be able to incorporate and synthesize source material (print, digital, primary) in their argumentative writing
- understand the consequences and implications of contemporary debate and argumentation for individuals and communities
- understand their role as citizens includes participation as critical consumers and producers of arguments

Processes

- develop strategies for producing complex texts
- understand writing as a recursive process that can lead to substantive changes through multiple revisions
- understand that argument construction requires ethical research, collaboration and feedback, and in-depth consideration of rhetorical situation
- be able to use inductive and deductive inquiry as rhetorical strategies
- be able to conduct primary and secondary research as appropriate to a particular rhetorical task

- make judgments about developing texts, based on stated criteria
- know, firsthand, the complex dynamics of collaborative work

Conventions

- Understand that different kinds of texts require different considerations of format and design
- be able to edit for style as well as conventions of Standard American English
- be able to summarize, paraphrase, and quote from sources using appropriate documentation style

APPENDIX B:

English 20803 Syllabus, Spring 2005: Social Critique of Textual, Oral and Visual Discourse

English 20803- Intermediate Composition: Social Critique of Textual, Oral, and Visual Discourse

Instructor: Loren Loving Marquez

Room: Meets SWR 138, MWF 2:00-2:50

Office: Reed 312, Desk 4

Office Phone: 817-257-7240

Office Hours: M: 11-12 Online, W 11-12 Office, and by appointment

E-mail: l.l.marquez@tcu.edu

Course Description

Historically, one's degree of participation in civic affairs had a direct correlation with his ability to speak and perform in the educational and civic arenas of government and law. Since Antiquity, education has taken as its mission to train future citizens to participate in government and legal arenas. (I say his because traditionally only men were given the opportunity to participate in the public sphere). In the spirit of communication and rhetoric, two fields that have shaped the college writing course, this class will ask students to focus on the canon of delivery, asking students not only to analyze textual, oral/aural, and visual delivery in public domains, but also to present or "deliver" their findings in presentations, skits, and mock debates, individually and collaboratively.

Required Texts and Materials

- ◆ *Lunsford, Andrea and John J. Ruszkeiwicz. Everything's an Argument. 3rd Ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.*
- ◆ Raimes, Ann. *Keys for Writers*. (KFW) 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin, 2001.
- ◆ Selected Readings provided by instructor.
- ◆ \$\$ for copying
- ◆ Access to a computer with connection to the Internet

Course Policies and Procedures

Attendance

Improvement in writing is a complex process that requires lots of practice and feedback from readers. Because of the workshop format of the course, regular attendance is

necessary to your success in this course. It is a Composition Program policy that in writing workshop courses, only official university absences are excused. Students representing TCU in a university-mandated activity that requires missing class should provide official documentation of schedules and turn in work in advance. Two **weeks of unexcused absences constitute grounds for failure of the course (6 absences)**. Missing more than three classes will affect your grade. Only Official University Absences documented in writing by an official of TCU before the time of the absence will not be counted against you. Absences due to illness, sleeping in, and long weekends are unexcused--they all count toward the two weeks' absences limit. If you leave class early, or repeatedly within one class period, you will be counted absent.

A word about tardies: Be on time for class. More than three tardies = an absence.

Late Papers: I DO NOT ACCEPT LATE PAPERS. If you have an **official university** absence, you will be required to let me know before said absence, and you will be required to turn in your paper no later than the next class period. If you are having difficulty with an assignment you need to see me **before** the due date.

Timely Completion of Assignments: All major writing assignments must be COMPLETED in order to earn credit for this course. Since papers will not be accepted more than one week late, any paper that has not been submitted by the deadline will receive a grade of NC (no credit) and the student will receive an F in the course

Academic Dishonesty

The following examples apply specifically to academic misconduct in composition courses:

Plagiarism: The appropriation, theft, purchase, or obtaining by any means another's work, and the unacknowledged submission or incorporation of that work as one's own offered for credit. Appropriation includes the quoting or paraphrasing of another's work without giving credit therefore.

Collusion: The unauthorized collaboration with another in preparing work offered for credit.

Fabrication and falsification: Unauthorized alteration or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise. Falsification involves altering information for use in any academic exercise. Fabrication involves inventing or counterfeiting information for use in any academic exercise.

Multiple Submission: The submission by the same individual of substantial portions of the same academic work (including oral reports) for credit more than once in the same or another class without authorization.

Complicity in academic misconduct: Helping another to commit an act of academic misconduct.

For more information regarding academic dishonesty, refer to page 51 of the *TCU Undergraduate Studies Bulletin*. All cases of suspected academic misconduct will be

referred to the Director of Composition. Sanctions imposed for cases of academic misconduct range from zero credit for the assignment to expulsion from the University.

Classroom Decorum:

The way that you conduct yourself in has direct bearing on your ethos as a student and on the climate of the class. I expect you to behave in a courteous and respectful way to your classmates. We will have conducting a lot of class discussions, peer workshops, and presentations, and I expect you to give your classmates full attention, participate in discussions, and be an active member of the class. Likewise, I expect you to behave in a respectful way to me as well. If you have a question about assignments, something covered in class, a comment you don't understand, or workload, you need to see me privately after class during office hours or set up a time for an appointment. If either of these conditions are broken, I reserve the right to ask you to leave class for the duration of that class period and count you as absent.

Assignments:

*All writing assignments, including drafts and writing assigned for responses or homework must be turned in as word processed documents.

Unit 1: Analysis of Social Critique in Textual Public Domain: Analysis of Recent Non-fiction Essay

Choose a recent article of substantial length from a magazine (can be popular magazine or even a scholarly journal) which is advocating a certain position. Write a 5 – 7 page analysis paper in which you discuss the article's content, backing up the article's claim with two secondary sources, organization, style and grammar, and finally evaluate the article based on your analysis. Approximate Due Date: Feb 14th Beginning of class.

Presentation: You will be asked to present on your article analysis

Unit 2: Professional Rewrite Rebuttal

Choose a recent newspaper or magazine article concerning a topic of your choice and refute the argument using secondary research as if you were going to publish your findings in the same magazine you found the original argument. This means that you will have to summarize and analyze the original source, and you will also have to write a refutation, finding evidence that refutes the article's main claims and supporting claims, and evidence that supports your new claim. (four outside sources required) 5 pages. Approximate Due Date March 7th beginning of class.

Unit 3 : Collaborative Rhetorical Case Study

This paper is a class project that requires the class as a whole to select a controversial current, cultural event and identify a number of primary texts—editorials, opinion pieces, letters to the editor, political cartoons, websites, ads, photographs, transcripts, periodicals

and text documents--that present arguments about the issue. After selecting a topic, you will be required to identify the different stakeholders participating in the event and as a class, write a synopsis of all sides of the argument and analyze documents that back up each stakeholder's position. The class will divide into groups based on facet and positions of the argument. You will determine what positions are being taken, what kinds of arguments are being made for each position, and who is representing the various positions. You will analyze the evidence being offered in support of each position in order to find out what points need to be considered in any attempt to find common ground. (10-12 page collaborative paper, plus oral presentation, and collaborative project reflection 1 full -2 pages). Approximate Due Date April 18th

Presentation: Your culminating project will be a presentation of your case in the form of a debate, where the other members of the class will present their findings in order to come up with some sort of "common ground" about the event in question. This presentation should include some use of images or other media in addition to print/speech. Be as creative as you wish while keep in mind your objective: to persuade skeptical readers/listeners of both the existence of a problem and your side of the argument. Since learning to collaborate effectively is one of the objectives of the assignments, you will need to keep track of your contributions to the group project and be prepared to explain your contribution as well as the contributions of the other group members when you submit your portfolio. It is possible that group members may not receive the same grade for the Collaborative Proposal

Unit 4 Rhetoric of Visuality: Analysis of Documentary Film

This assignment requires you to pick a current documentary film (produced in the last ten years) and analyze how it is making an argument through the use of visuality, sound, film shots, footage, etc. You will identify the argument of the documentary, analyze how the film uses certain techniques as building evidence to support the argument. You should also use at least one secondary source to back-up your analysis of the film. Finally, you will be asked to evaluate how effective this documentary makes the argument. 4-6 pages
Approximate Due Date May 9th

Presentation: You will be asked to present an analysis of your documentary film.

Drafts

Because the work of revision is essential to your progress as a writer, the drafting process will be counted as fulfilling the assignment. You will receive NO CREDIT for the final paper unless you have turned in the required amount of preceding drafts that meet the page requirement. This means that I will have had to read and comment on a draft before you turn in any final paper. If you miss a peer workshop where a draft is due, I will deduct five points from your final paper grade.

Writing/Reading Responses

You will be asked to produce over the course of the semester five reading responses which are unit-end reflections on what you have learned from the preceding unit focusing on the connection between the presentation/performance in class and the writing that you have done to fulfill the textual assignment. These are required after each unit.

Presentations:

Reading and writing are closely connected to speaking, and one way in which to develop your writing and to be able to give better feedback to your peers is to be able to articulate and support your argument orally as well as textually. All together, presentations in this class are worth a total of 20%, (that is equivalent to one unit assignment, so take them seriously!)

Evaluation

We will discuss grading criteria for each of the major assignments in class. If you have concerns about how to fulfill a particular assignment, please see me before the paper is due. If you have concerns about the grade you received on a paper, **please schedule an appointment to see me no less than 24 hours after the paper is returned.** Be sure you have read my comments carefully and also have prepared a one page written argument as to why you have fulfilled the criteria for the assignment and how you respond to the comments I have written on your paper.

In this course, your grade will be made up of the three individually written papers, one collaborative paper, presentations, and responses. Each of your papers will be given a letter grade, which can be converted numerically, as follows:

A+ = 97
 A = 94
 A- = 91
 B+ = 87
 B = 84
 B- = 81
 C+ = 77
 C = 74
 C- = 71
 D+ = 67
 D = 64
 D- = 61
 F = 54

Given the grade breakdown below, you can calculate your grade, but if you have questions about your standing, please ask me. Final grades will be distributed as follows: A = 90-100; B = 80-89; C = 70-79; D = 60-69.9; F = 0-59.9. Please remember: if you do not complete all major assignments for this course, or you have excessive absences, you will not receive credit for this course.

Grade Breakdown

- Article Analysis: 20%
- Rebuttal Essay 20%
- Collaborative Rhetorical Case Study 15%
- Documentary Film Analysis: 20%
- Writing Responses: 5 % (Approx 5 responses)
- Article Analysis Presentation: 5 %
- Works in progress Presentation (collaborative assignment): 5%
- Collaborative Debate 5 %
- Documentary Film Presentation: 5 %

We will discuss grading criteria for each of the major assignments in the class. If you have concerns about how to fulfill a particular assignment, please see me **before** the paper is due. If you have concerns about the grade you received on a paper, please schedule an appointment to see me no less than 24 hours after the paper is returned. Be sure you have read my comments carefully, and be prepared to discuss how your paper fits the criteria given for that assignment.

Revision Portfolio

You may choose to revise the article analysis or the rebuttal paper for a higher grade. Revised papers must demonstrate significant improvement, not only in grammar and mechanics but content as well. All revised papers must include one additional (new) source. A student who wishes to turn in a revised copy of one or both those papers must also write a detailed process memo documenting the changes that were made. In order to submit a revised paper, a student must turn in the following documents: 1: the original, graded paper; 2: the original comment/evaluation sheet; 3: a detailed process memo; and, of course 4: the revised paper. If any of the documents are not included, the revision will not be accepted. Revision papers will receive a maximum of a one letter grade improvement. If no significant revisions have been made, the paper will not earn a better grade. No late revisions will be accepted. I will take revised papers up to three weeks after you have received them back with my comments.

Additional Resources

Conferences

We will schedule at least one individual conference during the semester where you will bring your questions and concerns about a particular paper.

The Writing Center

The William L. Adams Writing Center is an academic support service available to all TCU students. Writing specialists and peer tutors are available for one-on-one tutorials from 8 to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday in the Rickel Building Second Floor (the Rec Center). They are also available from 6 to 9 p.m. in the library computer lab on Sunday

through Thursday evenings. Drop-ins are welcome. Students may also make an appointment by calling 257-7221.

* Visiting the writing center at any stage of the writing process is valuable: to brainstorm ideas, to help with writer's block, drafting, or revisions.

ADA

TCU complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 regarding students with disabilities. The University shall provide reasonable accommodations for each eligible student who a) has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits a major life activity, b) has a record or history of such an impairment, or c) is regarded as having such an impairment. Eligible students should contact the Coordinator for Students with Disabilities as soon as possible in the academic term for which they are seeking accommodations. Each eligible student is responsible for presenting relevant, verifiable, professional documentation and/or assessment reports to the Coordinator for Students with Disabilities. For more information consult the *TCU Undergraduate Studies Bulletin*, Pg. 28).

APPENDIX C:**Unit One Writing Assignment****Unit 1: Textual Analysis and Social Critique of a Current Periodical:**Writing:

Choose a recent article of substantial length from a newspaper, magazine, or scholarly journal which advocates a certain position. Write a 5 – 7 page analysis paper in which you argue how the author uses rhetorical strategies to convey the social significance of the argument. Support your claim *about* the author's argument by considering the article's content and selection of material, organization (including lay-out, use of visuals, and style), word choice, and use of Aristotelian appeals. Based on your analysis, how does the author effectively or ineffectively present the argument? Three secondary sources are required.

APPENDIX D:

Presentation Guidelines for Article Analysis

Presentation:

Individually, you will be asked to give a five (no more than seven) minute presentation on your rhetorical findings of the article you have been analyzing for unit one. You will be responsible for demonstrating to me and the class how you analyzed this document in order to deduct your thesis.

Presenters:

The day before your presentation:

1. Bring copies of your article for the class.

Your Presentation Should Include:

1. a **brief** summary of the article.
2. Your thesis about the article.
3. certain points of your analysis that led to your thesis.
4. How through this analysis you gained insight about the social commentary being made about this specific topic in the public domain.

Audience:

You should leave the student's presentation with an understanding of both the argument of the article, and the student's thesis *about* the article. You should also get a sense of how their analysis led them to their thesis and what this analysis and thesis say about the function of the article in the public, textual domain.

You will be responsible for viewing and writing at least one comment and at least one question to the presenter. The comments should be helpful in the way that they lead the presenter to think about the analysis of the text in greater detail. The question should also follow this general criterion.

Tips:

1. Practice and time your presentation before you give it to the class.
2. Consider the time carefully.
 - a. You are expected to use the entire five minutes. Five minutes doesn't seem like a long time, but it can to your audience. Consider ways to connect with your audience.

- b. On the other hand, taking too long to get to your point is irritating to an audience. I will ask you to stop at seven minutes and will deduct points from your presentation grade for not following the guidelines.
 - c. Remember you will usually take a shorter amount of time in front of the class than what you planned. Speak slowly. It may feel unnatural to you, but you need to give the class time to process what you are saying.
3. Be creative within the allotted guidelines. You have freedom to make this presentation do what you want it to do.

APPENDIX E:**Unit 2 Assignment Sheet****Unit 2: Professional Rewrite/Rebuttal**Writing:

Choose a recent newspaper or magazine editorial/opinion piece concerning a topic of your choice and refute the argument using secondary research as if you were going to publish your findings in the same source from where you selected the editorial. Based on your summary and analysis of the editorial, you will identify the *stasis* of the article in order to develop points for refutation. You must also support your points of opposition with at least *four* secondary sources. 7–9 pages.

APPENDIX F:**Unit 3 Writing Assignment Sheet****Unit 3: Rhetoric of Visuality: Documentary Film Analysis****Writing:**

Building on your knowledge from the textual analysis and the rebuttal unit, this assignment requires you to choose a current documentary film (produced in the last ten years) and analyze how it makes an argument through the use of visuality, sound, film shots, footage, etc. You will identify the argument of the documentary, analyze how the film uses certain techniques to support its argument, and evaluate how effective this documentary is in putting forth its social commentary. You should use at least two secondary sources to back-up your analysis of the film. 5 – 7 pages.

APPENDIX G:

Presentation Guidelines Documentary Film

Presentation:

Individually, you will be asked to give a **seven (no more than nine)** minute presentation on your visual, rhetorical findings of the documentary you have been analyzing. You will be responsible for demonstrating to me and the class how you analyzed this documentary in order to deduct your thesis.

Presenters:

Your Presentation Should Include:

1. a **brief** summary of the documentary film.
2. Your thesis about the film.
3. a scene (or segmentation) from the film that best demonstrates your thesis.
4. An analysis of scene that demonstrates your thesis

Audience:

Every student should listen to and make notes concerning their peers' presentations. You are required to evaluate one student in the class anonymously based on the above criteria and the rubric. You will turn in this evaluation **to me only** (I have changed this from the schedule). You can post this under doc share film unit online, and do not share with the class, at the latest one class period after the person you have evaluated has presented. I will keep your confidence, and I will take your evaluation into consideration by averaging it with my own evaluation when I assign the final grade.

You are also required to attend class every day of presentations. For each class you miss there is an automatic 10 point penalty deducted from your presentation grade.

Tips:

1. Practice and time your presentation before you give it to the class.
2. Consider the time carefully.
 - a. You are expected to use the entire seven minutes. Seven minutes doesn't seem like a long time, but it can to your audience. Consider ways to connect with your audience.
 - b. On the other hand, taking too long to get to your point is irritating to an audience. I will ask you to stop at seven minutes and will deduct points from your presentation grade for not following the guidelines.

c. Remember you will usually take a shorter amount of time in front of the class than what you planned. Speak slowly. It may feel unnatural to you, but you need to give the class time to process what you are saying.

3. Be creative within the allotted guidelines. You have freedom to make this presentation do what you want it to do.

APPENDIX H:

The Dynamite Napoleon Dynamite Project:

The Dynamite *Napoleon Dynamite* Collaborative Project

Based on our brainstorming of cultural phenomena, the class has voted to study *Napoleon Dynamite*. As one who studies how discourse is shaped by and shapes our culture, I, too, am curious and questioning a phenomena that many of you may have in fact participated in, or at least paused for a moment yourselves to ask about. What is it about the film *Napoleon Dynamite* that is giving this film iconic status? Is it indeed art? Does it answer life's questions about growing up, or at least attempt to offer an answer? Why is everyone quoting this film? Who is watching this film? Who loves it? Who doesn't? Why?

ASSIGNMENT:

In your groups, choose an angle (remember stasis) from which to investigate the film, *Napoleon Dynamite* and formulate a thesis that you will prove in 10 page paper. To demonstrate and prove your thesis you should consider types of evidence that will build your case such as:

1. Describing and analyzing a film
2. Using secondary research on and about the film: editorial reviews, websites, film trailers, MTV's marketing of the film, websites which sell materials related to the film. (Textual and visual analysis)
3. Using primary research: finding interviews with the films star's or production team, the director's commentary, interviewing a *Napoleon* fanatic, surveying a select group on the film, observing, or recalling what you saw others doing, reacting to, while watching the movie: what did they laugh at, what did they look puzzled by?

In this unit you will have to:

1. Write a 10 page paper for your group, and 1 individual 1-2 page reflection on the roles you took on in your collaborative project.
2. Participate in a Work in Progress Presentation. Your group will have 10 -12 minutes to explain what you are working on, the difficulties and strengths of your paper and project so far, and to ask questions of your audience. If you have a short excerpt of your paper (1-2) pages you wish to share with the class for feedback, this would be great. You should and could use this time as a research forum, wherein all members share information they have gathered on the film. (You could even cite each other in your final papers!) The Works in Progress Presentation and the final presentation will count as 5% of your final grade. Have a clear goal or goals for your presentation.
3. Deliver a Final Presentation: You will be pros at this by now. In a 10-15 minute presentation, use your presentation skills to select the best possible way to present your material to the class. Be creative and remember all that you have learned about delivering your previous presentations in this class.

4. Be here for all of the class periods. If you are not here, or if you are not pulling your weight in your group, I will have to deduct points from individual final grades on this paper. That means that people in the same group will get different grades.

What you decide to write on, how you organize the paper, and how you divide-up tasks will be entirely up to your group. Remember your strengths and the strengths of others when deciding who will do what. Is one of you a good researcher? Is one of you good at analysis? Another with editing and proofreading? Work together.

The point of this assignment is to investigate a cultural phenomenon using the techniques you have studied and perfected in this class **AND** to have a light-hearted ending to a productive and wonderful semester. If the quality of work is superb, I expect to give everyone an A, so work hard. This collaborative project is 15% of your final grade.

Schedule:

April 11: Watch *Napoleon Dynamite* Gut reactions, Observations, Critique.
Brainstorming Activity

Homework: send me an email with two pieces of info: 1. name one person you would like to work with on this project. 2. Would you rather have **5 groups** (consisting of 3 groups of four and 2 groups of 3) OR **6 groups** (consisting of 6 groups of 3).

If you have this movie, or can get a copy, try to watch it.

April 13: Group Assignments and watching a portion of the film.

April 15: looking over editorial reviews of the film, discussions in group and in class.

April 18: Class time for project

April 20: Class time for project

April 22: Class time for project

April 25: Work in Progress Presentations

April 27: Work in Progress Presentations

April 29: Collaborative Teacher Conference (questions, show me a portion of the draft, etc)

May 2: Final Group Presentations

May 4: Final Presentations

May 9th: Paper due on my desk (Reed 312 desk 4) by 4:00 p.m.

APPENDIX I:**Article Analysis Presentation Rubric**Article Analysis Presentation Rubric:Content:

- a **brief** summary of the article.
- Your thesis about the article.
- certain points of your analysis that led to your thesis.
- How through this analysis you gained insight about the social commentary being made about this specific topic in the public domain.

Organization

- Main points of proposal demonstrated clearly.
- Presentation is organized, and rehearsed, transitions smoothly from point to point.
- Presenter has selected important, pertinent and memorable material to share.

Delivery

- Considers how to engage with audience.
- Voice is clear, projected, and words enunciated
- Makes eye-contact with the audience (not constantly reading from notes)

Time

- Presentation is between 5-7 minutes.

| | Unsatisfactory | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Content | | | | | |
| Organization | | | | | |
| Delivery | | | | | |
| Time | | | | | |

Comments:

APPENDIX J:

Sample Presentation Visual Aid

Ivins, Molly. "A Personal Account By Any Other Name Is..." *Fort Worth*

Star Telegram. 30 January 2005: E 14.

Summary:

Through the use of the example of the Republican's shift from using the term "private" accounts to "public" accounts to describe the proposed social security policy, Molly Ivins discusses the Right's manipulation of language to serve its own interests.

My Thesis about the article:

Ivins's argument relies on ethos: the ethos of the right, the left, and of certain right-leaning personnel to demonstrate the manipulation of the right over language that persuades the public.

Analysis:

- I concluded this through analyzing the word choice of Simms:
 - Dichotomy between liberal and conservative:
 - Liberal (epigraph) used language not to hurt people's feelings
 - Liberal (8th paragraph) use language amusement
 - Right-wing (9th paragraph) political correct language "menace free speech"
 - Republicans 4th paragraph) "march" lock-step change language to respond to public
- Her examples all are of right of center persons or Republicans who have manipulated language to gain political control.
 - John Leo (9th paragraph): Conservative columnist for townhall.com

- Karl Rove (11th paragraph): Famous Texan helped put Nixon in office, Former Bush and W's Chief Strategist, has followers called "RoveHoes." Founder of College Republicans
- Frank Lutz (11th paragraph): Paid to manipulate language and measure how general responds to language for Republicans.
 - Quote from a PBS Frontline Interview 2003: **"My job is to look for words that trigger emotions"**
- Richard Nixon (Conclusion 4th paragraph from the end) Watergate Scandale

Insight into social commentary in public domain:

"War on Words Shapes Debate: Semantics is the Key to Social Security"
 Jan 23 Sunday edition of the online Washington Post written by Mike Allen.
 Allen links this battle over words to the public's gathering of information in quick sound-bites, which leads to a more emotional response to the information.

- understand the importance of rhetoric and the influence not only of the media over the public's understanding of an issue but how certain interest groups capitalize on the emotions of the general public rather than catering to logic within the proposed policies.
- led me to have a more active intellectual engagement with the issues at hand and to be aware of spin within the media and political camps.

APPENDIX K:

Students' Written Reflections

Jenna's Written Reflection:

Presenting my analysis both helped me and did not help me compose my draft/final paper. Having to orally present my topic was not helpful because I had already written my draft the week before, so I was able to take information from my paper and simply cut and paste it to my power point presentation. I did have to change a few things around, though, such as listing examples instead of using the complete sentences, but this did not affect my paper. However, after adding a picture to my power point, I then discovered new information could be gleaned from the photograph that I could use in my paper. Noticing that Adriana Iliescu wore gaudy jewelry and dyed her hair black illustrated that she is trying to cling to her youth, which furthered my argument that she was too old to have a baby.

Writing on my topic, age limits for the use of reproductive technology, helped me form an opinion because I had never thought or heard about older individuals having children. The information presented by Doctor Arthur Caplan, the author of the article, helped me realize that the government should intervene and establish set regulations in the fertility clinics. I agree with him that people over a certain age should not be allowed to have babies because there are risks involved for both the parent and the child. Iliescu would have had triplets, but two of her children died because of her age. Older people wanting to have children when their bodies are saying 'No' do not seem to care for the welfare of their child. These adults do not understand that they will not be around for a large portion of their child's life.

As I was writing my paper, I took the role of novice. I had never been exposed to this topic, so I took the word of Caplan and various other authors who supported Caplan's argument. I rarely came across any sources that suggested there should not be age limits for the use of reproductive technology. Obviously, Iliescu felt that there should not be age limits, but the majority of people feel having a baby at her age, 66-years-old, is unethical. It is unethical not only because of the medical risks, but because it is equivalent to orphaning a child. The stance of Caplan became the stance of me. In other words, I was his pupil and he was my teacher.

As I was presenting, however, I took the role of expert. I was very familiar with my article by then and knew what I was talking about. Although I was a novice while writing my paper, I became the expert during my presentation because I think the audience would respond better to somebody who knew what they were talking about. After I completed my presentation to the class and was walking to my seat, a peer asked me what my major was. I told him and he then asked if I wanted to be a lawyer. Even though studying law is not in my future, his inquiries were complimentary because he implied that I did know what I was talking about.

Brett's Written Reflection

There have been many difficulties for me in this assignment so far. This is the case I believe because I have never done an assignment quite like this one. When we were asked to present our paper orally I thought that it would be a good tool for possibly learning the material better, but not so much making our actual paper better. As I look back on my presentation I did learn the contents of my article better, but didn't get out of

it what I needed to in order to make my paper better. On the flip side, as I took on the role of an active audience member I did learn some things that will make my paper better. By listening to the other's presentations, I got a better understanding of what our paper was to consist of. I picked up on a few things that I was missing in my paper, which will allow me to add into the final draft so I can reach the length requirement.

My position on this article has stayed the same throughout the entire time. I am very much in favor for letting Terri Schavio live if there is no official request made by her to do otherwise. I don't believe that her husband is acting on what he calls are sincere intentions and only trying to fulfill his wife's wishes. The author makes some very good observations on the husband's actions and words that led me to agree with him, taking the position that I have. Through having to present my presentation orally I was forced to find evidence for the position I was taking. All of the words and quotes that I found to solidify my position suddenly stood out more than any of the other information. This in fact made me feel stronger on the position that I was taking. Although, my position on the topic and the allegations on the husband are not 100% because he has not been charged with any kind of crime, I feel the author has presented his facts and opinions in a very convincing way.

While going through and analyzing this article I took the point of view of a novice. I didn't really have much prior knowledge of the specific story or the idea and controversy that surrounds assisted suicide. In one way I wish I had prior knowledge of the subject because it's always easier reading and analyzing a piece you have some familiarity with. On the other hand I am also thankful for just now being introduced to the topic because I was able to go into the article with an open mind.

Overall, I thought this was a pretty interesting assignment because I had never done one like this before and we were able to pick a topic that we had interest in. In hearing everyone's presentation I got to learn a lot of information covering a wide range of topics and gathered a better understanding of what my final paper should ultimately consist of.

Caitlin's Written Reflection

Presenting on my topic did not help me to write the paper; rather, writing the paper helped me with my presentation. I spent a lot of time on my draft, and tried to have most of my ideas down on paper in an organized fashion. I turned in the draft a full week before I gave my presentation, so I hadn't even started working on my presentation when the paper was turned in. When I began to work on my class presentation, it was surprisingly easy to decide what to say to the class, and how I should organize my ideas. I had already done this for the paper, so I didn't have any more material to gather or anything more to learn for the presentation. It came together rather easily. If I had been working on them simultaneously, things might have turned out differently. I could have possibly had more creative ideas within my paper, because I tend to use my creative processes when working on presentations. On the other hand, my presentation may have been a little too wordy if I had attempted to work in everything from my essay into the presentation. I feel that the way that I handled it was the best way for me in this case.

Writing and speaking on young teen sex has helped me gain a greater understanding of what is truly going on in America and helped to solidify my opinion on the subject. I, like the majority of the United States, was under the impression that teen sex was rampant. The media is so saturated with sexual content that I believed that teens

were having sex at a younger age and more often than ever before. This article taught me that this is not reality. Only 13% of young teens have had sexual intercourse, and the vast majority thinks it is necessary to be in love before engaging in sexual activity. This information came as a surprise. The entire piece helped to solidify my feelings that sex is something that should be shared between two people only in the bonds of marriage. Every story within the article that depicted young teens losing their virginity for stupid reasons reassured me in my stance. It was encouraging to see a full spread on abstinence programs. Although I do not believe that it is practical to have abstinence-*only* sex-ed classes, it is great to have programs like The Silver Ring Thing touring the nation, encouraging teens to wait for marriage to have sex. I actually wear a silver ring on my ring finger. Although I didn't get mine through this particular program, it serves the same purpose. I was thrilled to see the idea being made so popular through exposure in *People* magazine.

While writing my paper, I assumed the role of audience; yet during my presentation I assumed the role of expert. The main focus of my paper was on the fact that *People* magazine knew their audience and was able to cater to their needs. I am a devout reader of *People*, and thus a member of their audience. Therefore, when I discussed how the magazine targets both teens and adults, I was speaking from experience. I wrote my essay from the point of view of an audience member who loved the article and understood how the editors and authors had pulled me in to the story. I switched roles for the presentation, because the class became the audience, and I had to act as the expert. The class trusted me to know my information, and didn't expect me to give them faulty information. I had to completely understand my topic as well as the way

that People effectively got their message across to the public. Through so many hours of working on my essay and my presentation, I think it is fair to say that I became an expert, (or at least expert enough to write five pages on the topic).

Andrew's Written Reflection

Presenting on my topic in the classroom helped me. I realized that I need more examples as evidence to what I am stating about the article. While I was organizing my presentation I decided that I needed more quotes from the texts to help the audience understand what I was saying about the article. Presenting also helped me with the organization of my drafts. It is hard to take a bunch of information and compress it to fit a set amount of pages. The presentation assisted me in deciding what information was the most useful to the reader.

My opinion on the paper is still the same as it was prior to analyzing it. I believed that the President was doing a good job with the economy. Boskin, the author of the article, listed theories and examples that solidified my position. It did not sway me from off the fence. I suspect that readers who are on the fence would be more inclined to be in the “conservative” side. Speaking about the topic without inserting my opinion was extremely difficult. However, I think that it made me a better writer because I have to stay neutral in an analysis paper.

I was interested in the article at first because I believed that the Wall Street Journal would likely be a credible source for well-written article. Secondly, after reading the article I saw that Boskin is a very reliable source for information. Because of his small biography I chose the article knowing that I could use his background as an

example of his character, writing ability and knowledge over the topic. Boskin's background allows him to connect with his audience. In the presentation I had to illustrate to my audience how his was aimed at a group of certain people. My background as well was important to the composition of my paper. Since I am very interested in economics, I study it every day and my major is economics I was able to understand my article better than an average person who lacks any knowledge of the topic. This helped with my analysis and the basic understanding of the article. For the presentation it was difficult to argue my analysis well because not all of the people in the room might have known economic well. I learned from that experience that my paper must also be clear and understandable.

Overall, seeing other people's presentations helped me realize what I needed to add to my paper to give it more meaning. I was not the greatest presenter but I learned from my peers. One thing I learned is that the speaker must speak comfortably to the audience or they will get restless.

Michael' Written Reflection

I am hard pressed to find any ways in which the presentation of my analysis hindered the composition of my final paper. Certainly, there are some aspects of the presentation that did not advance the writing process. Generally, I simply condensed my paper in order to come up with five minutes of information that I could present to the class. I did not come up with any new ideas or insights about my article or the topic of poverty and hunger. Nevertheless, the presentation of my analysis aided me in the

composition of my final paper by forcing me to critically examine my first draft sooner than I otherwise would.

While putting together my oral presentation, I looked back at my first draft of the paper to get some ideas about what to discuss. Though this did help me finalize what I wanted to talk about during my presentation, it also allowed me to determine the strengths and weaknesses of my paper. I found certain points in my paper that I explained well. For instance, I felt that I did a satisfactory job of exploring the assumptions that my article made about American society. I incorporated my knowledge of American society and charity organizations to make inferences about the purpose of certain passages in the article. However, there were many other parts of my paper that I felt were a bit sub par. An example of this was the absence of any discussion about the publication that the article appeared in. My article came from The Economist, but aside from mentioning the magazine in the introduction, I never referred to the significance of that fact. In the final draft, I will spend some time exploring the significance of the source of the article. The Economist is famous for certain reasons, and I will discuss how the author of my article uses the credibility of the magazine to his advantage.

Additionally, by presenting my analysis, I began to think about the audience of my paper. While it is important to consider the education and comprehension levels of the audience, I concern myself more with the interest level of my audience. Since the audience for both my paper and my presentation is a college English class, there is no need to worry about the subject being beyond the audience. Maintaining the interest of the audience, though, is a tough task. When I put together my presentation, I tried to find pieces of information that thought might be interesting to my audience. For example, I

knew that simply presenting a great deal of data and figures would not hold the attention of my audience. Thus, I decided to connect as much of my analysis to American society as possible. Since my audience is composed of young, active members in American society, I felt that I could connect to my audience by making generalizations about the society that we live in.

Even though I know a fair amount about charity and the practicality of reducing poverty and hunger, I largely assumed the role of an audience member with regards to my topic. Certainly, the expert (Sachs) that my article focused on knows a great deal more than I do about the topic of the article. Thus, I felt that my paper would appear more credible if adhered to the information provided in the article and used a limited amount of my own information about the subject. I think that the audience can be influenced more by information provided by an expert than by me. Thus, I feel that the presentation served largely as a second draft of my paper. Since I am less eager to embarrass myself in a presentation than I am on paper, I think that the presentation helped to improve and flesh out many of my points.

D.W.'s Written Reflection

In what ways was presenting on your analysis helpful or unhelpful to your process of composing your draft/final paper?

- It was helpful
 - Helped me clarify some of my thoughts on the topic
 - Help me put my thoughts into words that might make better sense than what was on the paper
 - I got to see what was written on my draft so I could correct for that
 - It also allowed me to become just that much more familiar with my topic because I didn't want to look stupid or misinformed in front of the class

How has writing and speaking on this topic solidified or changed your position on this subject?

- Solidified

- Because the arguments that I had formed on my own were agreed upon by the class
 - This was evident through the reactions of the class, the camera man, and the professor
- I realized that what I was thinking actually did make sense
- I was already very informed about my topic because I do consider myself very sports savvy

While writing and presenting on your topic, did you assume the role(s) of expert, role of audience, role of novice to write/present on your topic?

- Expert
 - I assumed the role of the expert because I had done a lot of research on this specific topic
 - I also have watched a lot of sports and was very familiar with certain events or games that they might have been alluding to
- Also was audience when researching and finding article

On review of my presentation I think that I did a very good job in presenting the information in an unbiased manner. I have been asked to go through and evaluate certain criteria and how it affected me.

First, I believe that the presentation was very helpful to me for many different reasons. I had another opportunity to go through and make some of my own opinions about the article, “Behind The Thrill of Victory”, besides writing the paper. I also was able to put my thoughts into words that were very concise and easy to understand to the student audience. I had to realize that not everyone might understand the topic as well as myself so I had to go through and make everything crystal clear to allow the class to follow my presentation. Also before my presentation I got to go through my draft and see what mistakes I might have made along the way. I think this was a big advantage that the Monday presenters did not have. This was also another opportunity to go through and become that much more familiar with my topic. I know that when I went through this article for the first time in a while I noticed things I did not the other times I read it.

While the article was helpful to me, it also helped my arguments that were made in the paper.

By presenting my article summary I have become that much more solidified on my topic. Going into class that day I was nervous to see if the class might agree upon the conclusion that I had come upon. I consider myself better informed about sports than most and I thought that it could be a disadvantage for me because the class might not be able to relate to my topic as I could. To my elation they did. I did not receive any comments from my classmates that the professor told us to do. But that's okay with me. I knew everything went well because of the body language of my audience. I noticed that many of the guys in the class were very interested in what I had to say because they might have been interested in sports. I also noticed that the cameraman was shaking his head as if he was agreeing with what I had to say. I obviously noticed the teacher looking down and writing down notes whenever I came to key parts of my presentation. Through this I came to realize that my arguments that I presented in my paper actually made sense to more people than just myself. Besides solidifying my stance on the topic, I took a certain role while presenting it.

Finally, while writing and presenting my topic I took the role of expert. I know it might come off as arrogant when you say you're an expert but I just consider myself informed about my topic. I know that no one in the class beside myself had done any research on the topic besides maybe reading my article. I had gone through tons of articles for secondary sources before coming to class. I felt that knew a lot of the information that was out there that related to my topic. Other than just the facts presented in the article I know information about sports because I have played them, watched them,

and cheered for teams. I felt that I might have life experiences that were relevant to the topic because they were talked about in the article itself. I took the role of audience when I first was researching the topic to become more informed and when I was choosing an article to write about. I felt that it was necessary to put yourself in the normal persons shoes when presenting, who might not know that much about my topic. I tried to keep this in mind while presenting because I did not want to become too precise about my facts. I did not want to confuse or disinterest my fellow classmates because I did want them to listen and I also wanted to know how they felt about my topic.

In conclusion, I feel that I have gained a lot through the writing and presenting of this article. I come out of this experience more informed about an issue facing the nation. I felt this entire process had been beneficial to the writing process. I also feel that reflecting back on the experience, as a whole is a good way of drawing the project to a close.

David's Written Reflection

Having to give an oral presentation of my argument did not have much of an effect on my thesis and overall analysis. However, while writing down my ideas in a formal manner my approach to the paper underwent a lot of change. I believe that this was a result in the change of audience. When giving my presentation orally my audience consisted of my peers. It was much easier to express my ideas to my peers than to put them on paper. It was something that was very natural and I was used to doing. However, when writing my analysis down on paper I felt that it was much harder for me to prove a point. Backing up my arguments with factual evidence became much more

difficult, and much more important. I felt that while writing the paper I was much more prone to altering my opinion based on what I could prove, or what I thought a teacher would want to hear, and not on what my true opinion was. When writing in a formal manner I also believe that it is important to sound credible and support all of your claims with evidence. Whether that evidence is from an outside source or from your own analysis is irrelevant, but everyone should be able to back up his or her own opinions. I found that when writing formally all of my ideas seemed to shrink. For some reason everything becomes much more precise on paper than it is in my head. I suppose this is only natural for most anybody. However, this is what I found to be the most frustrating part between transitioning my ideas from the oral presentation to the paper. As a result of a lack of paper length, and not substance, I felt forced to analyze the article more than I already had. Sounds great if you're the teacher...however, the result of forced analysis wasn't necessarily a good thing for proving my thesis. The only thing it forced was more words. Which seemed to be lacking in substance. While so much of the paper seemed to be rich in content, the parts of it that were forced on the page seemed to be far less developed. Eventually, after completing the "deep intellectual" analysis of a paper in Newsweek seemed to be pointless. In the end, Newsweek is a business. They are in the business of selling magazines. They're going to do whatever they can to try and sell magazines. So while trying analyze the magazine article "Diet and Genes" on a deeper level I kept coming back to the same conclusion. The only underlying motive Newsweek and it authors' have is to make money. So, while articles in Newsweek are great for social commentary it is hard to argue that they attempt to do anything else but entertain their readers. Next time I am given an assignment like this I think I will pick something

that was written by an author who had a deep personal motive for writing. An article that is rich in personal experience and strongly opinionated would have made this assignment much easier, and much more honest.

Alex's Written Reflection

Presenting my analysis did not have an effect on the composition of my paper. While constructing my analysis I refrained from thinking about the fact that I was to present the material, and simply got all my thoughts down. When the time came to organize these thoughts in a way that I could present them, I perhaps regretted not going about the construction of my analysis while thinking in terms of verbal communication. After the presentation took place, I felt like I had a better grasp of my article. Something about the process of rehearsing, and composing a presentation made the ideas I had about my article become more concrete in my head.

I thought that when beginning my paper was that I shouldn't worry about the fact that I will be orally presenting this information. My logic here relies on the idea that the less I had to worry about while constructing my paper, the better. If I could simply type the best paper I could free of outside variables that might have changed my writing, I thought I could write a good piece. While I do believe I accomplished my task in creating a good analysis, as I now look back on the process, I realize it might have been valuable to consider what elements I would have needed to incorporate in a 5-7 minute presentation. By doing this I may have been able to put together a more effective presentation.

For example in my paper I spent a lot of time demonstrating how I developed my thesis. Most of my effort went into trying to explain how I came up with the author's

argument. Explaining this verbally was much harder for me. I'm a big fan of putting my thoughts down where I can see them. It works for me. My point being that, if I were to have thought about the presentation while writing the paper, I might not have emphasized my struggle to find the argument so much, seeing as how that was the hardest thing to communicate verbally. I might have stressed the author's word choice more, or gotten into the Aristotelian appeals of the article.

If I were to repeat this process all over again I don't think I would change the way I did it. I would still write the paper with no consideration for the presentation. My reasoning behind this is that even though I could have made it easier on myself by including things in my paper that would be easier to convey verbally, I would have been leaving myself less time to stress the thing I thought were truly the most important. By allowing myself to be freeing myself of the inhibition of knowing I eventually had to present the information, I let myself include in my paper and presentation the material I thought was most important.

Writing on this article was a valuable experience. I gained a lot of knowledge on the topic of the current state of affairs in Iraq as well as becoming familiar with one of the current candidates in the recent elections. The article did little to sway my opinion on any issue, however it succeeded in educating me about the state of affairs in Iraq, which as I touched on in my analysis, was *one* of the intentions of the article.

As far as assuming roles when I wrote and presented this I really can't decide what I assumed the most. I think it's always important to assume the role of your audience while analyzing information like this, so you can more effectively communicate you're ideas.

I really enjoyed this whole process, as well as hearing and reading about the articles of my classmates. Getting substance from these articles was much easier than it would have been had we not been given the presentations.

Works Cited

- Alexander, Jonathan. "Transgender Rhetorics: (Re)Composing Narratives of the Gendered Body" *College Composition and Communication* 57.1 (Sept. 2005). 80-93.
- Anderson, Gary, Kathryn Herr, and Ann Nihelm. *Studying Your Own School: A Researcher's Guide*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin P, 1994.
- Anderson, Ken. and Theodore Clevenger Jr. "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos." *Speech Monographs* 30 (1963): 59-78.
- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. R. Roberts. New York: Random House, 1954.
- Augustine, Dorothy and W. Ross Winterowd. "Speech Acts and the Reader-Writer Transaction." *Convergences: Transactions in Reading and Writing*. Ed. Bruce T. Petersen. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 127-48.
- Austin, John L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Eds. J.O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962.
- Bakhtin, Michel. *Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- . *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *The New St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing*. Eds. Robert Connors and Cheryl Glenn. Boston: St. Martin's P, 1999. 443-57.
- . "The Study of Error." *College Composition and Communication*. 31.3 (1980): 253-

69. Rpt. in *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. 4th ed. Eds. Edward P.J. Corbett, Nancy Meyers, and Gary Tate. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 258–72.
- Bauman, Richard. *Verbal Art as Performance*. 1977. Rowley: Waveland, 1984.
- Bazerman, Charles. "Reading Student Texts: Proteus Grabbing Proteus." *Encountering Student Texts: Interpretive Issues in Reading Student Writing*. Eds. Bruce Lawson, Susan Sterr Ryan, and W. Ross Winterword. Urbana: NCTE, 1989.
- Beach, Richard. "Writing Ourselves and Others" Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED141831.
- Beach, Richard, and JoAnne Liebman Kleine. "The Writing/Reading Relationship: Becoming One's Own Best Reader." *Convergences: Transactions in Reading and Writing*. Ed. Bruce Petersen. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1986: 64–81.
- Bereiter, Carl and Marlene. Scardamalia. "From Conversation to Composition." *Advances in Instructional Psychology Vol. 2*. Robert. Glasner Ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum, 1982. 1–64.
- Berlin, James A. "Comment and Response." *College English* 51 (1989): 770–77.
- . *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- . *Rhetoric, Poetics, and Cultures: Refiguring College English Studies*. Urbana: NCTE, 1996.
- Berthoff, Ann. "From Dialogue to Dialectic to Dialogue." Goswami and Stillman. 75–86.
- Bial, Henry, Introduction. *Performance Studies: A Reader*. Bial 1–4.
- . Preface to Part II: "What is Performance?" *Performance Studies: A Reader*.

- Bial 57–58.
- ., ed. *The Performance Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Bizzaro, Patrick. “The Concept of Control in Historical Perspective.” *College Composition and Communication* 48.2 (1997): 269–72.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. Eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. 2nd edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.
- Black, Edwin. *Rhetorical Questions: Studies of Public Discourse*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Black, Kathleen. “Audience Analysis and Persuasive Writing at the College Level” *Research in the Teaching of English* 23.3 (Oct 1989): 231–53.
- Blau, Herbert. “Universals of Performance: or Amortizing Play.” *By Means of Performance: Intercultural Studies of Theatre and Ritual*. Ed. Richard Schechner and Willa Appel. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1990. 250–72
- Bowen, Elbert R., Otis J. Aggertt, and William E. Rickert. *Communicative Reading*. 4th ed. New York: MacMillan, 1978.
- Bowling for Columbine*. Dir. Michael Moore. MGM Distribution, 2002.
- Brannon, Lil, and Cy Knoblauch. “On Students’ Rights to Their Own Texts: A Model for Teacher Response.” *College Composition and Communication*. 33.2 (1982): 157–66.
- Brereton John. *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College 1885- 1925: A Documentary History*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburg P, 1995.
- Briggs, Charles. *Competence and Performance: The Creativity Tradition in Mexicano Verbal Art*. U of Penn P Conduct and Communications Series, 1980. 1–24.

- Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *College English* 46.7 (1984): 635–52.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Cleveland: Meridian, 1962.
- . *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.
- . *A Rhetoric of Motives*. 1950. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.
- Burkland, Jill, and Nancy Grimm. "Motivating Through Responding." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 5.2. (Fall 1996): 237–46.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . *Gender Trouble and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Bywater, Ingram, ed. *The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle*. New York: Random House, 1984.
- Caillois, Roger. *Man, Play, and Games*. Trans. Meyer Barash. New York: Free P of Glencoe, 1961.
- Caplan, Arthur L. "How Old Is Too Old to Have a Baby? Fertility Clinics Should Implement Age Limits." *The American Journal of Bioethics*. *Bioethics.net*. 24 Jan 2005 <[http:// www.bioethics.net/articles.php?viewCat=2&articleId=178](http://www.bioethics.net/articles.php?viewCat=2&articleId=178)>.
- Carlson, Marvin. *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- . *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Case, Sue-Ellen. "Performing Lesbians in the Space of Technology: Part I." *Theatre Journal* 47.1 (1995): 1–18.

- Chafe, Wallace and Deborah Tannen. "The Relation Between Written and Spoken Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 16 (1987): 383–407.
- Chandler, Jean. "Positive Control." *College Composition and Communication* 48.2 (1997): 273–74.
- Chase, Geoffrey. "Accommodation, Resistance and the Politics of Students Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 39.1 (1988): 12–22.
- Cherry, Roger. "Ethos Versus Persona: Self-Representation in Written Discourse." In *Voice and Writing*. Ed. Peter Elbow. Davis: Hermagoras P, 1994 85–105.
- Chiseri-Strater, Elizabeth. *Academic Literacies: The Public and Private Discourse of University Students*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1991.
- Cicero. *De Inventione*. London: Harvard U P, 1949.
- Cicero "From Of Oratory." *The Rhetorical Tradition* Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: St. Martin's, 1990. 200–50.
- Clark, Gregory. *Dialogue, Dialectic and Conversation: A Social Perspective on the Function of Writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.
- Cleary, Linda. "Fostering the Fragile Inclination to Write: Praise and Criticism in the Writing Classroom." *English Journal* 79.2 (Feb 1990): 22–28.
- Clevenger, Theodore. *Audience Analysis*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.
- Collins, James. "Speaking, Writing and Teaching for Meaning." *Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships*. Eds. Barry M. Kroll and Robert J. Vann Urbana: NCTE, 1981. 198–214.
- Comprone, Joseph "Kenneth Burke and the Teaching of Writing" *College Composition and Communication* 29.1 (Dec 1978): 336–40.

- Connors, Robert J. *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh, 1997.
- Connors, Robert, Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford. *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984.
- Cohen, Herman. *The History of Speech Communication: The Emergence of a Discipline 1914-1945*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1994.
- Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, and Susan L. Lytle. "Research on Teaching and Teacher Research: Issues that Divide" *Educational Researcher* 19.2 (1990): 2–11.
- . "The Teacher Research Movement a Decade Later." *Educational Researcher* 28.7 (1999): 15–25.
- Corbett, Edward P.J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1971.
- Daiker, Donald. "Introduction: The New Geography of Composition." *Composition in the 21st Century: Crisis and Change*. Eds. Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1996. 1–7.
- Daiute, Colette. "Psycholinguistic Foundations of the Writing Process." *Research in the Teaching of English* 15 (1981): 5–22.
- Danis, M. Francine. "The Voice in the Margins: Paper-Marking as Conversation." *Freshman English News* 15.3 (1987): 18–20.
- Deetz, Stanley. *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1992.
- Delpit, Lisa. "Skills and Other Dilemmas of a Progressive Black Educator" *Harvard Educational Review* 56.4 (1986): 379–385.

- Dewey, John. *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier, 1938.
- Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford: "Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. ed. Victor Villanueva. Urbana: NCTE, 1997. 77–95.
- . "On Distinctions between Classical and Modern Rhetoric." *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*. Eds. Robert J. Connors, Lisa S. Ede, and Andrea A. Lunsford. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984. 98–114.
- Ehninger, Douglas. "On Systems of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 131-144. Rpt. in *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Ed. Theresa Enos and Stuart Brown. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994. 319–330.
- Elbow, Peter. "Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process." *College English* 45.4 (1983): 327-39.
- . Introduction. *Voice and Writing*. Ed. Peter Elbow. Davis: Hermagoras P, 1994: xi–xlvii.
- . *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*. New York: Oxford, 1981.
- Elliott, R.C. *The Literary Persona*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982.
- Emig, Janet. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. Urbana: NCTE, 1971.
- Enos, Richard. *Greek Rhetoric Before Aristotle*. Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1993.
- Enos, Richard L., and J. McClaran. "Audience and Image in Ciceronian Rome: Creation and Constrastings of the *vir Bonus* Personality." *Central States Speech Journal* 29 (1978): 98–106.
- Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal. *College*

- English* 48.6 (1986): 527–542.
- Farmer, Frank, ed. *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing*. Mahwah: Hermagoras P, 1998.
- Fahrenheit 911*. Dir. Michael Moore. DVD. IFC Films, 2004
- Fahrenhype 911*. Dir. Alan Peterson. DVD. Trinity Home Entertainment, 2004
- Faules, Don. “Joseph Villers Denney: English Scholar and Contributor in the Emergence of Speech Theory.” *Speech Teacher* 12 (1963): 105–109.
- Fenstermacher, Gary. "The Place of Practical Arguments in the Education of Teachers." *Teacher Change and the Staff Development Process: A Case in Reading Instruction*. Ed. Virginia Richardson. New York: Teachers College P, 1994. 23–42.
- Fife, Jane Mathison, and Peggy O’Neil. “Moving Beyond the Written Comment: Narrowing the Gap Between Response Practice and Research.” *College Composition and Communication* 53.2 (2001): 300–21.
- . “Re-seeing Research on Response (Response to Richard Straub). *College Composition and Communication* 48.2 (1997): 274–276.
- Fishman, Jenn, and Andrea Lunsford. "Performing Writing, Performing Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 57:2 (2005): 224–252.
- Fleckenstein, Kristie. “Writing Bodies: Somatic Mind in Composition Studies” *College English* 61.3 (Jan 1999): 281–306.
- Flower, Linda. “Writer Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing.” *College English* 41.1 (1979): 19–37.
- Flynn, Thomas R., and Dalia Judovitz., Eds. *Dialectic and Narrative*. Albany: SUNY P,

1993.

Freedman, Sarah Warshauer; with Cynthia Greenleaf; Melanie Sperling. "Response to Student Writing." (NCTE research report, No. 23). Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1987. [ERIC Document Reproduction Service](#) ED290148.

Fuller, David C. "Teacher Commentary that Communicates: Practicing What We Preach in the Writing Class." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 6.2 (1987): 307–317.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography Literature and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.

"Genes: What We Eat and What We Are Born With." *Time* 10 Jan 2005. 10-14.

George, Diana, and John Trimbur. "The 'Communication Battle,' or Whatever Happened to the 4th C?" *College Composition and Communication* 50.4 (1999): 682–98.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. "Revealing Silence: Rethinking Personal Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 53.2 (Dec. 2001): 203-223.

Gibson, Michel, Martha Marinara, Deborah Meem. "Bi, Butch, Bar Dyke: Pedagogical Performances of Class, Gender and Sexuality" *College Composition and Communication* 52.1 (Sept 2000): 69 – 95.

Gimblett-Kirshenblatt, Barbara. "Performance Studies." *Bial* 43-55.

Giroux, Henry A. *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. South Hadly: Bergin and Garvey, 1983.

Goffman, Erving. "On Face-Work." *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes* 18 (3): 213-231. Rpt. In [Interaction Ritual](#). New York: Anchor Books, 1963. 5–35.

- . *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1959.
- Golden, James L. "Plato Revisited: A Theory of Discourse for All Seasons." *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*, Eds. Robert Connors, Andrea Lunsford, and Lisa Ede. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984. 16–36.
- Goswami, Dixie, and Peter Stillman, eds. *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change*. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1987.
- Goswami, Dixie, and Richard Black. "The Teacher as Researcher." Goswami and Stillman 28–39.
- Greenhalgh, Anne M. "Voices in Response: A Postmodern Reading of Reader Response." *College Composition and Communication* 43.3 (1992): 401–10.
- Griffin, Claudius. W. "Theory of Responding to Student Writing: The State of the Art." *College Composition and Communication*. 33.3 (1982): 296–301.
- Grossman, Pam L., Stephan M. Wilson, and Laura. Stulman. "Teachers of Substance: Subject Matter, Knowledge for Teaching." *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher*. Ed. Maynard.C. Reynolds. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989. 23–36.
- Harding, Sandra. Introduction. *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*. Ed. Sandra Harding. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987. 1–14.
- Harris, Joseph. "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 40.1 (1989): 11–22.
- Harris, Muriel. *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference*. Urbana: NCTE, 1986.
- Hays, Janice N., Kathleen M. Brandt, and Kathryn H. Chantry. "The Impact of Friendly and Hostile Audiences on the Argumentative Writing of High School and College Students." *Research in the Teaching of English* 22.4 (1988): 379–387.

- Hawhee, Debra. *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2004.
- Hawisher, Gail E., and Michael A. Pemberton. "The Case for Teacher as Researcher in Computers and Composition Studies." *The Writing Instructor* 10.2 (1991): 77–88.
- Hentoff, Nat. "Lying about Terry Schiavo." *The Village Voice*. *Frontpage.com* <<http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=10715>>.
- Hodges, Elizabeth. "The Unheard Voices of Our Responses to Students' Writing." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 11.2 (1992): 203–18.
- Hollingsworth, Sandra. "Coming to View Teaching as Research: A Feminist Perspective on an Epistemological Pedagogy for Teacher Educators." American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Chicago. 24 Feb. 1990.
- . "Teachers as Researchers: Writing to Learn about Ourselves and Others." *The Quarterly of the National Writing Project and Center for the Study of Writing* 12.4 (1990): 10–18.
- Horvath, Brooke. "The Components of Written Response: A Practical Synthesis of Current Views." *Rhetoric Review* 2.2 (1984): 136–56.
- Howell, Wilbur Samuel. *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- . *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- Huberman, A. Michael. "Focus on Research Moving Mainstream: Taking a Closer Look at Teacher-Research." *Language Arts* 73.2 (1996): 124–40.
- Hull, Glynda. "The Editing process in Writing; A Performance Study of More Skilled

- and Less Skilled College Writers”” *Research in the Teaching of English* 21.1 (1987): 8–29.
- Hull, Glynda., Mike Rose, Kay.L. Fraser, and Marissa.Castellano, “Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse.” *College Composition and Communication* 42.3 (1991): 299–329.
- Hunt, Sandra.L., and Ann. Q. Staton. “The Communication of Educational Reform: A Nation at Risk.” *Communication Education* 45 (Oct. 1996): 271–92.
- Hymes, Dell. “Breakthrough Into Performance” *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. Eds. Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth S. Goldstein. The Hague: Mouton, 1975. 11–75.
- Ivins, Molly. “A Personal Account by Any Other Name Is. . .” *Fort Worth Star Telegram*. 30 January 2005: E 14.
- Jackson, Shannon. “Professing Performances: Disciplinary Genealogies.” *Bial* 32–42.
- Jameson, Frederic. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. 1981. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982.
- Johnson, Nan. “Ethos and the Aims of Rhetoric.” *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*. Eds. Robert Connors, Lisa S. Ede, and Andrea A. Lunsford. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984. 98–114.
- Josipovici, Gabriel. *Writing and the Body*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982.
- Kantor, Ken. “Learning from Teachers.” *The Writing Teacher as Researcher: Essays in the Theory and Practice of Class-based Research*. Eds. Donald Daiker and Max Morenberg. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1990. 61–69.
- Kennedy, George. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.

- . *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Kirsch, Gesa. and Patricia Sullivan Eds. *Methods and Methodology in Composition*.
Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1992
- Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Rhetoric in American Colleges: 1850-1900*. Arlington: Methodist
UP, 1989.
- Krauss, Rosalind. *The Originality of the Avant Garde and Other Modernist Myths*.
Cambridge: MIT P, 1985.
- Kreisberg, Seth. *Educating for Democracy and Community: Towards the Transformation
of Power in Our Schools*. Cambridge: Educators for Social Responsibility, 1992.
ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 374038.
- Kroll, Barry. "Developmental Relationships between Speaking and Writing." *Exploring
Speaking-Writing Relationships*. Eds. Barry M. Kroll and Robert J. Vann Urbana:
NCTE, 1981. 32–41.
- . "Writing for Readers: Three Perspectives on Audience." *College Composition and
Communication* 35.2 (1984): 172–82.
- LeFevre, Karen Burk. *Invention as a Social Act*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- Lunsford, Andrea, John Ruskiewicz and Keith Walters. *Everything's an Argument with
Readings*. New York: Bedford/St.Martins, 2004.
- McCroskey, James., and Thomas .J. Young. "Ethos and Credibility: The Construct and
Its Measurement After Three Decades." *Central States Speech Journal* 32 (1981):
24–34.
- McGann, Jerome. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- McGeary, Johanna, et. al. "The Candidate." *Time*. 31 Jan 2005: 30–32

- Merchants of Cool*. Dir. Barak Goodman. Cor. Douglas Rushkoff . *Frontline*. PBS
KERA, Fort Worth. 27 Feb 2001.
- Mier, Denise R. "Learning the Art of Management Through the Art of Oral Reading."
Communication Education 32 (July 1983): 293–302.
- Mirskin, Jerry. "Writing as a Process of Valuing." *College Composition and
Communication* 46.3 (1995): 387–410.
- Moffett, James. *Active Voice: A Writing Program Across the Curriculum*. Upper
Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1981.
- . *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Morgan, Norah, and Juliana Saxton. *Teaching Drama*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.
- Mortensen, Peter, and Gesa Kirsch. "On Authority in the Study of Writing." *College
Composition and Communication* 44.4 (1993): 556–572.
- Moxley, Joseph. "Responding to Student Writing: Goals, Methods, Alternatives."
Freshman English News 17 (Spring 1989): 3–4, 9–11.
- Murphy, James J. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint
Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1974.
- . *A Short History of Writing Instruction*. 2nd ed. Davis: Hermagoras, 1990.
- Murray, Donald. "Internal Revision: A Process of Discovery." *Research on Composing:
Points of Departure*. Eds. Charles Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.
85-103.
- Myerhoff, Barbara. *Remembered Lives: The Walk of Ritual Storytelling and Growing
Older*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992.
- Nack, William S. "Behind the Thrill of Victory: We Root Like Maniacs Because We Are

- Compelled by Our Instincts and Because It's Fun." *Time* 17 Jan 2005: 44-45.
- Napoleon Dynamite*. Dir. Jared Hess. Perf. John Hedder. Fox Searchlight, 2004.
- Newkirk, Thomas. "The First Five Minutes: Setting the Agenda in the Writing Conference." *Writing and Response: Theory, Practice, and Research*. Ed. Chris Anson. Urbana: NCTE, 1989. 317-31.
- Nolen, Susan Bobbitt. "Teaching for Autonomous Learning." *An Introduction to Teaching: Psychological Perspectives*. Ed. Charles Desforges. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995. 197-215.
- North, Stephen. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1987.
- Northwestern University. *The Graduate School Bulletin*. "Performance Studies." <http://www.nwu.edu/graduate/gulletin/programs/speech/spch-pfst.html>. 1997/1999.
- Ochsner, Robert S. *Physical Eloquence and the Biology of Writing*. SUNY Press, 1990.
- Ong, Walter. "Literacy and Orality in Our Times." *Composition and Literature: Bridging the Gap*. Ed. Winifred Horner. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1983. 84-96.
- . -. "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction." *PMLA* 90.1 (Jan. 1975): 9-21. Rpt. in *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Victor Villanueva. Urbana: NCTE, 1997. 55-76.
- Parker, Walter. "Curriculum for Democracy." *Democracy, Education and the Schools*. Ed. Roger Soder. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Education Series, 1996. 182-210.
- The Persuaders*. Dir. Barak Goodman and Rachel Dretzin. Cor. Douglas Rushkoff. *Frontline*. PBS KERA, Fort Worth. 9 Nov. 2003.

Phelan, Peggy, and Jill Lane, eds. *The Ends of Performance*. New York: New York UP, 1998.

---. "Not Surviving Reading." *Narrative* 5.1 (1997): 77-87.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. "Cyrano's Nose: Variations on the Theme of Response." *Assessing Writing* 7 (2000): 91-110.

Pollock, Della, ed. *Exceptional Spaces: Essays in Performance and History*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1998.

---. "Performing Writing." *The Ends of Performance*. Phelan and Lee 73-103.

Probst, Robert. "Transactional Theory and Response to Student Writing." *Writing and Response: Theory, Practice, and Research*. Ed. Chris Anson. Urbana: NCTE, 1989.

Purves, Alan. C. "The Teacher as Reader: An Anatomy." *College English* 46.3 (1984): 259-65.

Quigley, Brooke L. "'Identification' as a Key Term in Kenneth Burke's Rhetorical Theory." *American Communication Journal* 1.3 (1998):13 November 2006
<<http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol1/iss3/burke/quigley.html>>.

Quintilian. *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: St. Martin's, 1990. 297-363.

Rafoth, Bennett. "Audience Adaptation in the Essays of Proficient and Non-proficient Freshman Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English* 19.3 (1985): 237-253.

Ray, Ruth. *The Practice of Theory: Teacher Research in Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 1993.

Redd-Boyd, Theresa M. and Wayne Slater. "The Effect of Audience Specification on

- Undergraduates' Attitudes, Strategies, Strategies, and Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English* 23.1 (1989): 77–108.
- Reid, Louis Arnaud. "The Arts, Knowledge, and Education." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 15.2 (1967): 119-132.
- Reynolds, John Frederick Ed. *Rhetorical Memory and Delivery*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 1993.
- Rose, Mike. "*Lives on the Boundary: The Struggles and Achievements of America's Underprepared*." New York: The Free Press. 1989.
- Rubin, Donald. and Bennett Rafoth. "Social Cognitive Ability as a Predictor of the Quality of Expository and Persuasive Writing among College Freshmen." *Written Communication* 3.2 (1986): 211–245.
- Rudduck, Jean, and David Hopkins, eds. *Research as a Basis for Teaching: Readings from the Work of Lawrence Sternhouse*. London: Heinemann, 1985.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. "Whatever It Takes." *The Economist: A Global Agenda Report Sponsored by the United Nations*. 18 Jan 2005. <www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/Economist01-18-05.pdf>.
- Sato, Steve and Tony Salvador. "Methods and Tools: Playacting and Focus Troupes: Theatre Techniques for Creating Quick Intense Immersive and Engaging Focus Group Sessions." *Interactions* 6.5 (Sept.-Oct. 1999): 35–41. *ACM Digital Library*.<<http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=312715&coll=portal&dl=ACM>>.
- Schafer, John. "The Linguistic Analysis of Spoken and Written Texts. In Barry Kroll and Roberta. Vann Eds. *Exploring Speaking and Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrasts* 1-31. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1981. 1–31.

- Schechner, Richard. *Between Theatre and Anthropology*. Philadelphia: U of Penn P, 1985.
- . *Essays on Performance Theory 1970-1976*. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1977.
- . *The Future of Ritual: Writings on Culture and Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . "Performance Studies: The Broad Spectrum Approach." Bial 7-9.
- . *Performance Theory*. New York: Routledge Classics, 2003.
- Scholes, Robert. *The Decline and Fall of English: Reconstructing English as a Discipline*. New Haven. Yale UP, 1998.
- . *Textual Power*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.
- Schraver, Karen A. "Teaching Writers to Anticipate Readers' Needs: A Classroom-Evaluated Pedagogy." *Written Communication* 9.2 (1992): 179–208.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, and Andrew Parker, eds. *Performativity and Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York: Oxford U P (1977).
- Singer, Milton. Ed. *Traditional India: Structure and Change*. Philadelphia: 1959.
- Skinner-Linnenberg, Virginia. *Dramatizing Writing: Incorporating Delivery into the Classroom*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.
- Smail, William M. *Quintilian on Education*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Sommers, Nancy. "Responding to Student Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 33.2 (1982): 148-56.

- Sperling, Melanie. "I Want to Talk to Each of You: Collaboration and the Teacher-Student Writing Conference." *Research in the Teaching of English* 24.3 (1990): 279-321.
- . "Revisiting the Writing-Speaking Connection: Challenge for Research in Writing" *Review of Educational Research* 66.1 (Spring 1996) 53-86.
- Sperling, Melanie and Sarah W. Freedman. "A Good Girl Writes Like a Good Girl: Written Response e and Clues to the Teaching/Learning Process. *Written Communication* 12.1(1997): 93-133.
- Straub, Richard. "The Concept of Control in Teacher Response: Defining the Varieties of 'Directive' and 'Facilitative' Commentary." *CCC* 47.2 (1996): 223-51.
- Super Size Me*. Dir. Morgan Spurlock. DVD. Hartsharp Video, 2004.
- Sweetser, Eve. "Blended Spaces and Performativity." Dept of Linguistics. UC Berkeley. 16 Jan. 2005 <<http://cogsci.ucsd.edu/~faucon/253/sweetser.pdf>>.
- Tauber, Michelle et al. "Young Teens and Sex." *People Magazine* 31 Jan 2005. 86-93.
- Threatt, Susan. "When Teachers Do Research... What Do They Do and Where Do They Belong?" Wyoming Conference on English. U of Wyoming, Laramie. 26 June 1990.
- Turner, Victor. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: PAJ Publications, 1982.
- Ulmer, Gregory. "The Object of Post-Criticism." *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. Port Townsend: Bay P, 1983. 83-110.
- Wallace, Karl E. Ed. *History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies*. New York: Appleton, 1954.

- Welch, Nancy. "One Student's Many Responses: Reading, Writing, and Responding with Bakhtin." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 13.2 (1993): 493–502.
- Wickstrom, Maurya. *Performing Consumers: Theatrical Identities in Consumer Cultures*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Will, George. "Diversity in Everything But Thought." *Fort Worth Star Telegram*. 28 Nov 2004.
- Worthen, Wade.B. "Disciplines of the Text: Sites of Performance." Bial 10-25.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. *Reflection in the Writing Classroom*. Logan, UT: Utah State U P, 1998.
- Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1970.
- Zeitlin, Froma I. *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1996.

VITA

Personal
Background Loren Loving Marquez
Born December 7, 1977, Richmond, Virginia
Daughter of Danny W. and Mary Jackson Loving
Married Paul Edward Marquez June 28, 2003
One child, Nathaniel Pierce

Education Diploma, West Point High School, West Point,
1996
Bachelor of Arts, English, Christopher Newport
University, Newport News, 2000
Master of Arts, English, Virginia Commonwealth
University, Richmond, 2002
Doctor of Philosophy, English, Texas Christian
University, Fort Worth, 2007

Experience Writing Center Tutor, Virginia Commonwealth
University, 2000-2001
Graduate Teaching Assistant, Virginia Commonwealth
University, 2001-2002
Lillian Radford Fellow in Composition and Rhetoric,
Texas Christian University, 2002-2003
Graduate Instructor of English, Texas Christian
University, 2003-2005
Assistant Director of Composition, Texas
Christian University, 2005-2006
Jim Corder Fellow, Texas Christian
University, 2006

Professional
Memberships Conference on College Composition and Communication
Modern Language Association
National Council of Teachers of English
Rhetoric Society of America

ABSTRACT

DRAMATIC CONSEQUENCES: INTEGRATING PERFORMANCE IN THE COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

by Loren Loving Marquez, Ph.D., 2007
Department of English
Texas Christian University

Dissertation Advisor: Ronald Pitcock, Assistant Professor of English

This dissertation is a teacher-research study of integrating a performance-based practice, students' oral presentations on their writing, into the writing classroom.

Drawing on Performance theory, this study demonstrates that a performance-based analysis and approach to the writing classroom heightens sensitivity to aesthetics in non-mimetic works and ultimately argues that aesthetics should be re-approached through the heuristic of Performance to enhance students' writing and to facilitate sensitivity in the production and analysis of texts.

Chapter One establishes the connection between composition and Performance studies by looking at four historical traditions which bring to light the oral, literate and performative dimensions of Composition and Rhetoric. The similar roots between Rhetoric and theatre, the canon of Delivery in Rhetorical History, elements of Performance in Composition history, and the connections between speaking and writing demonstrate how the presentation possesses performance-based elements that are infused within these traditions and directly correlate to the writing classroom. Chapter two explores the feminist and teacher research methodology which informs the design and implementation of the study of students' oral/visual presentations as performance-based acts. Chapter three analyzes eight students' oral/visual presentations and written

reflections on speaking and writing for their aesthetic performances. These performances demonstrate how students embodied authority in the writing classroom by taking on various “roles,” by performing as “experts,” by identifying with the audience, and resisting the assignment. Chapter four looks at the implications of integrating performance-based pedagogy in the writing classroom as they bear directly on how students understand ethos, audience, and other rhetorical strategies

Larger implications for this study reach beyond the classroom and across disciplinary divisions. Rhetoric and poetic are two divisions that have long been separated in the History of Rhetoric, in the production and analysis of texts and, by consequence, in the writing classroom. The aesthetic qualities of rhetoric, which rhetoric has distinguished from performance, need to be considered in order to render a more accurate account of the rhetorical situation and thus restore performance to the canon of delivery.