



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Making messages memorable: the influence of rhetorical techniques on information retention

Wackers, M.J.Y.

Citation

Wackers, M. J. Y. (2021, June 24). *Making messages memorable: the influence of rhetorical techniques on information retention*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3185773>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3185773>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/3185773> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Wackers, M.J.Y.

Title: Making messages memorable: the influence of rhetorical techniques on information retention

Issue date: 2021-06-24

3. Organisation and elaboration techniques in public-speaking practice

“I will summarise what we have found.” This is how a communication scholar announced the summary of his research presentation at a conference on applied linguistics. This seems like an effective strategy to influence audience information retention: summarising your presentation in the conclusion is one of the most frequently advised retention techniques, as chapter 2 shows. However, how exactly speakers should formulate the summary seldom is described in public-speaking textbooks. Chapter 2 shows that retention advice in public-speaking textbooks is not always supported with concrete examples and that examples are selective—either of well-known or experienced speakers (a professional speaker), or taken from daily speech practice (from a speaking professional). Furthermore, chapter 2 indicates that textbook descriptions of rhetorical retention techniques leave room for discussion: characteristics of techniques vary between textbooks, references to academic sources are scarce and some contradictory advice was found. In order to evaluate possible retention effects of rhetorical techniques, knowledge of public-speaking advice alone is therefore not sufficient. To paint a more complete picture of how information retention by the audience can be affected, public-speaking practice needs to be taken into account as well. How are rhetorical retention techniques that are recommended in textbooks applied by speakers in a public-speaking situation?

An analysis of public-speaking practice will result in systematically collected examples from rhetorical retention techniques used by speakers in specific public-speaking contexts. This is of added value for two reasons. First, the results of such an analysis put the textbook advice into perspective. For example, it can indicate similarities and discrepancies between public-speaking advice and practice. It can show whether speakers indeed apply frequently recommended techniques and whether the public-speaking context influences speakers’ preferences for particular retention techniques. Furthermore, such an analysis can provide insight into the behaviour of speakers and their choices in the style and formulation of retention techniques. The analysis offers (new) examples of techniques in a particular context that can be used to both evaluate and complement textbook advice.

Secondly, an analysis of public-speaking practice serves as a preparatory step for investigating retention effects. It establishes which techniques or strategies further (experimental) research into retention effects could focus on. Discrepancies between advice and practice or observed variants of retention techniques can serve as starting points for effect studies. Moreover, a clearer insight into textual and stylistic features of retention techniques in practice contributes to the design of more ecologically valid research. It enables scholars to design example presentations or texts based on (the relationship between) advice and practice.

The current chapter therefore aims to answer the following question:¹⁹³

How do speakers apply advised organisation and elaboration retention techniques in public-speaking practice?

To this end, I investigate the use of retention techniques in presentations and speeches from a variety of speakers in three different contexts: research presentations, political speeches and TED talks, which include presentations and speeches from professional speakers and speaking professionals.¹⁹⁴ I focus on a selection of retention techniques that are linked to organisation and elaboration (further explained in Section 3.1).

The study in this chapter has an explorative character: it intends to describe usage of a variety of techniques, instead of zooming in on a specific phenomenon. Rhetorical research, and more specifically rhetorical criticism, often focuses on a single case study: a particular speech or presentation is analysed with its specific context in mind, limited to on one or a few particular rhetorical strategies or means of persuasion (cf. Zarefsky, 2008). While such an approach generally leads to valuable insights, the current study aims to obtain a broader perspective of the use of rhetorical retention techniques. The method of the rhetorical analysis that is applied in this chapter therefore differs from ‘standard’ rhetorical criticism. It departs from defining textual features of a selection of organisation and elaboration techniques. Next, these features are used to detect and label these techniques in presentation texts of scholars, politicians and TED speakers. Then, the quantitative and qualitative usage of the techniques by these three different types of speakers are compared and interpreted in the context of their rhetorical situation (see Section 3.3 for an extensive description of the method).

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 3.1 discusses the selection of retention techniques for this analysis; it explains which techniques that are linked to organisation and elaboration were included and why visualisation techniques were not taken into account. Next, Section 3.2 details how three corpora of speech texts were constructed. Each of these corpora contains a collection of presentations or speeches from a specific type of speaker: (1) scholars who give research presentations, usually geared at informing the audience, (2) Dutch political party leaders that give political speeches, usually focused on persuasion, and (3) speakers at TED(x) events who give TED talks, usually aimed to inspire (a purpose that is in between informing and persuading and often involves a call to action for the audience). The method of analysis is described in Section 3.3: it explains how the selected retention techniques

¹⁹³ This chapter is partly based on the following publications: Wackers, De Jong & Andeweg (2016a), Wackers, De Jong & Andeweg (2016b) and Wackers (2021). See the Overview of author’s publications for the complete references.

¹⁹⁴ For professional speakers such as politicians, presenting is an important part of their daily job. Speaking professionals are speakers who occasionally present as part of their job, such as scholars. This distinction will be further explained in this section, when the characteristic ‘type of speaker’ is addressed.

are defined and labelled in the presentation texts, and it accounts for the reliability of the analysis. After that, Sections 3.4 and 3.5 present the quantitative and qualitative results for the organisation and elaboration techniques, respectively. These sections cover the frequency of the selected techniques in the three corpora, and discuss examples of various ways of usage by the types of speakers. The discussion in Section 3.6 presents the characteristic use of the selected organisation and elaboration techniques by scholars, politicians and TED speakers in practice, and shows how such practice relates to textbook advice.

3.1 Selection of retention techniques

The analysis of public-speaking textbooks described in chapter 2 led to 77 techniques that are said to enhance the audience's information retention. For an effective and meaningful rhetorical analysis of public-speaking practice, the number of techniques needs to be narrowed down. Therefore, the current analysis focuses on a limited number of retention techniques. This section explains the selection process of the retention techniques. First Section 3.1.1 presents general criteria and considerations for the selection of techniques. Next, Section 3.1.2 discusses the selected organisation techniques, after which Section 3.1.3 zooms in on the elaboration techniques.

3.1.1 Considerations for selecting techniques

The following point of departure was formulated for the selection of techniques: it should be a reflection of the main retention advice in public-speaking textbooks, while allowing for a feasible analysis of the presentations in the corpora. This means that the selection leans on the main conclusions about retention advice in public-speaking textbooks (see chapter 2); it particularly focuses on frequently advised techniques and, where possible, on techniques whose descriptions in textbooks indicated variations or even contradictions. At the same time, the focus on feasibility means that only a limited number of techniques should be included in the analysis, and that multiple analysts should be able to detect the use of these techniques in the presentation texts.

Based on this point of departure, I made the following decisions in selecting the techniques. Based on the classification of retention techniques made in Section 2.8.1, I decided to focus on organisation and elaboration techniques and not to include visualisation techniques, to keep the analysis text-based. This decision was not straightforward, since 'visual aids' form the most frequently recommended category of retention techniques in the overall corpus of public-speaking textbooks (see Section 2.4.2). Visualisation techniques were not included for the following complementary reasons, mainly related to feasibility:¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁵ In a follow-up of the current study, the use of visual aids could certainly be taken into account. Visual aids are the most frequently advised rhetorical retention technique (see Section 2.5.1), so they would be suitable for a more detailed study. Theories on dual coding (Clark & Paivio, 1991) and multimedia learning (Mayer, 2009) provide valuable insights into how we process textual and visual information, and the interplay between these two. Such study requires

1. *Large number of visualisation techniques leads to narrow focus on visuals.*
As shown in Section 2.5.1, the category ‘visual aids’ consists of various retention techniques such as ‘presentation media’ (e.g. slides), ‘graphics and video’, and ‘objects (props)’. Due to the number of visual techniques, a focus on visual retention techniques means that organisation and elaboration techniques cannot be taken into account for feasibility reasons. For an explorative study into the use of retention techniques in practice, such a sole focus on visual techniques was considered too narrow: it would not reflect the variety in retention techniques that was found in textbooks.
2. *Lack of available visual material to be analysed.*¹⁹⁶
The analysis of visual aids requires the recordings or files of those visual aids (e.g. PowerPoint-slides or other visuals). This limits the presentation genres that can be selected. Of the corpora of presentations that I used for the analysis, which were selected based on the different types of speakers, recordings were available for the TED talks and research presentations, but not (immediately) for the political speeches. An added complicating factor is the fact that political speeches often do not include visual support, which makes a proper comparison of visualisation techniques between the corpora challenging.
3. *Personal research experience with textual and stylistic analysis.*
Finally, my personal background and affinity is with linguistic, stylistic and text-related research. An analysis of visual aids would require a method derived from the fields of visual rhetoric and argumentation, and/or studies on multimodal communication and multimedia instruction (cf. Mayer, 2009; Mayer & Fiorella, 2014)—disciplines in which I am less trained and informed.

As a next step, I selected a limited number of organisation and elaboration techniques that reflected the main retention advice and appeared to be reliably detectable in presentation texts. Based on this criterion, frequently advised techniques such as ‘chunking’ and ‘systematic order’ were not included. These two techniques concern the selection and clear order of (a limited number of) main points, which seem part of the speaker’s preparatory work for the presentation. Therefore, they are not easily distinguished in a presentation text; it can be challenging and to some extent subjective to reliably assess whether the chosen order is ‘systematic’ and how a speaker selected ‘chunks’ based on the available material. Furthermore, techniques

a method of analysis that relies on visual rhetoric and argumentation, and/or multimodal communication studies (see for example Mayer, 2009). Hertz (2015) already analysed the use of the PowerPoint slides that the scholars applied in the research presentation corpus that is used in the current study. Although she did not specifically focus on retention techniques, this could be a useful starting point.

¹⁹⁶ For the same reason, delivery skills (e.g. non-verbal communication) could not taken into account in the analysis either. Moreover, delivery skills did not have priority as they were not frequently connected to retention in public-speaking textbooks.

were left out that were too broadly defined in the textbooks or appeared to form an umbrella category for various techniques, such as ‘repetition’, ‘imagery’, ‘connecting to the audience’ and ‘audience participation’ (see sections 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 2.5.11 and 2.5.16).

The final selection consists of seven techniques: five organisation techniques, which are further explained in section 3.1.2, and two elaboration techniques, which are discussed in section 3.1.3. The characteristics of these techniques appear to be recognisable in presentation and speech texts, for example because they are commonly found in specific parts of a speech (e.g. the introduction or conclusion). The operationalisation of these textual features in the labelling procedure is detailed in section 3.3.

3.1.2 Selected retention techniques linked to organisation

Five organisation techniques were selected: *partitio*, ‘announcement of the conclusion’, ‘summary’, ‘circle technique’ and ‘transition’. These techniques have in common that they are regularly advised as retention technique or are linked to frequent retention advice in textbooks. They are generally used to shape a presentation on a higher hierarchical level (i.e. focusing more on the overall speech structure than on more detailed organisation levels, such as sentence structure). Table 3.1 gives an overview of the selected organisation techniques and their descriptions. For the descriptions of the techniques, the public-speaking textbooks and—if available—rhetorical resources into the specific techniques were consulted; Jeanne Fahnestock’s *Rhetorical Style, The Uses of Language in Persuasion* (2011) proved to be a useful resource, due to its comprehensive (historical) overview of rhetorical figures and their varieties. Below table 3.1, I discuss the way in which the techniques relate to the main point of departure for the selection (reflecting retention advice while allowing for a feasible analysis).

Table 3.1: Overview of the selected organisation techniques. The first four techniques are presented in the order in which they are commonly found in presentations and speeches, from introduction to conclusion. The fifth technique, 'transition', can appear throughout the entire presentation.

Technique	Description
1. <i>Partitio</i> (see Section 2.5.23)	At the end of the introduction of the speech, the speaker gives an overview of the speech or presentation structure (the main points to be addressed). (Andeweg & De Jong, 2008)
2. Announcement of the conclusion	The speaker explicitly announces the final part of the presentation (e.g. "I will wrap up..." , "to conclude..."). (Andeweg et al., 2008)
3. Summary (see Section 2.5.3)	In the conclusion of the speech, the speaker recapitulates or restates the main points. (Andeweg & De Jong, 2008)
4. Circle technique (see Section 2.5.13)	In the conclusion of the speech, the speaker refers to an example or phrase that was used in the introduction of the speech. (Andeweg et al., 2008)
5. Transition	The speaker explicitly marks the transition to a new part or topic of the speech, for example using a transition sentence ("First I will discuss the method of research. For this method... etc."). (Andeweg & De Haan, 2009).

Partitio

According to Fahnestock (2011, p. 384) "the *partitio* [...] defines the key issue and forecasts the coming parts, on the assumption that listeners will retain these parts longer if they expect them." The *partitio* is among the twenty-five most frequently recommended retention techniques that were found in textbooks, and it reflects the trend that organisation is seen as an important retention principle (see Section 2.4.2). It is closely linked to the regularly advised retention techniques 'chunking' and 'systematic order': the *partitio* can be seen as a way for the speaker to inform the audience about key points (chunks) or a systematic order of the speech. Because it is linked to the introduction of a presentation and involves the announcement of main points in the presentation, the *partitio* appears to be recognisable in a presentation text. Although most textbook authors agree on the retention value of the *partitio*, a warning that it can be counterproductive was also found (see Section 2.5.23).

Announcement of the conclusion

The 'announcement of the conclusion' is a structure marker that signals the concluding part of the speech, such as "in conclusion" or "to wrap up". Such a specific transition sentence that signals the conclusion is recommended in 5% of the overall corpus (four English-language textbooks), which means that it is not among the twenty most frequently mentioned techniques in the English-language and Dutch-

language public-speaking textbooks.¹⁹⁷ The authors generally agree that such an announcing sentence raises the audience's attention. The conclusion is considered to be the most important part of the speech connected to retention in modern public-speaking textbooks (see Section 2.4.2) and ancient rhetoric (see Section 2.1.3). From this perspective, the announcement of the conclusion is clearly related to the main retention advice that was found. Moreover, it requires an explicit structure marker, which means that it is recognisable in a presentation text. Next to the four recommendations on the announcement of the conclusion found in the textbooks, a warning against its use is issued by Laskowski (2001). He believes that "most audiences tune you out the second they hear these phrases" and adds: "Don't say what you're going to say, just say it" (p. 186).

Summary

The 'summary' is considered to be one of the most important retention techniques (see Section 2.5.3), both in modern public-speaking textbooks and ancient rhetoric. Moreover, the summary is seen as a characteristic element of the conclusion (*peroratio* in ancient-rhetorical terms), which is the most important part of the speech that is related to retention. As Fahnestock (2011, p. 384) states: "the *peroratio* [...] was designed to include a recapitulation of the key parts in order to mass their persuasive force." The summary is clearly linked to the conclusion and it refers to the main points of the presentation, which makes it plausible that summaries in presentation texts are recognisable. In textbook descriptions of the summary, two main types are recommended: the outline summary and main point summary (see Section 2.5.3). The outline summary can be seen as a 'reflective *partitio*': in the conclusion, the presentation topics are indicated. The main point summary is different: it does not only indicate the main points, but it also concisely restates their key information. It is unclear whether both of the summary types are regularly found in public-speaking practice.

Circle technique

The 'circle technique' is regularly advised in English-language and Dutch-language textbooks (see Section 2.5.13). It is a specific form of repetition in the conclusion of the speech, which consists of a reference to elements that were used in the introduction. The circle technique may be announced by an explicit structure marker such as "I already said in the introduction". Textbook authors believe that it raises the audience's attention and that listeners appreciate its use (it creates a 'sense of closure').¹⁹⁸ It is clearly connected to the introduction and the conclusion part of a

¹⁹⁷ The announcement of the conclusion is advised as a retention technique by Kenny (1982), Lucas (1989), Gaulke (1997) and Osborn & Osborn (1997). Laskowski (2001) advises against its use (*vitium*). A more elaborate discussion of the announcement of the conclusion can be found in Section 4.1.1 on the experimental study on the *announcement of the conclusion* and *circle technique*. See Appendix A.8 for an overview of all textbook fragments related to retention.

¹⁹⁸ See Section 4.1.1 for a more elaborate discussion of this technique, as a preparation to the experimental study that was partly aimed at the effects of the circle technique.

presentation; in a presentation text, the use of a circle technique is marked by a reference to the introduction that is provided in the concluding part of the speech.

Transition

The transition is connected to retention in the classical text *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, in which the *transitio* is described as “the figure which briefly recalls what has been said, and likewise briefly sets forth what is to follow next” (IV, 26.35; see Section 2.1.2). This way, a speaker can use a transition for “shepherding the reader from one section to another” (Fahnestock, 2001, p. 386)¹⁹⁹ and reminding the audience of the higher-order structure throughout the speech. The transition is considered to be a retention technique in almost 9% of the modern public-speaking textbooks studied (six English-language textbooks, one Dutch-language textbook).²⁰⁰ This means that it does not belong to the twenty most frequently advised retention techniques in the sub-corpora of textbooks; however, the transition is linked to higher-order organisational techniques such as ‘systematic order’ and ‘chunking’. For example, when describing the retention technique ‘systematic order’, Claasen-Van Wirdum et al. (1992, p. 255) state that a speaker should provide enough reference words and connecting sentences to allow the main points to “stick better” and prevent the audience from losing track. Verderber (2000, p. 113) summarises: “So, in a speech, if we forecast main points, then state each main point, and use transitions from one point to the next, not only are audiences more likely to follow, they are also more likely to remember the organisation.” In this analysis, I have also considered longer previews of parts of the speech (similar to Verderber’s forecasting statements or Fahnestock’s *praeparatio* (2011, p. 385)) to be a transition. The transition seems recognisable in presentation texts, as it often involves structure markers and references to parts of the speech.

3.1.3 Selection of retention techniques linked to elaboration

Two elaboration techniques were selected: ‘anecdote’ and ‘question’. Retention techniques linked to elaboration are most frequently advised in the English-language textbooks (see Section 2.8.1); this also goes for the anecdote and the rhetorical question (see Sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.17, respectively). Because of the explorative character of the current analysis, I decided not to focus on the rhetorical question alone but to include a broader category of question techniques that can be divided into four question types: ‘rhetorical question’, *quaestio*, *subiectio* and ‘direct/literal question’ (cf. Braet, 2007; Fahnestock, 2011). Table 3.2 presents the elaboration techniques and their descriptions that were used as a point of departure for the current analysis. Below table 3.2, I motivate the selection of elaboration techniques (they reflect retention advice, while allowing for a feasible analysis).

¹⁹⁹ The transition belongs to what Fahnestock (2011, p. 384) calls “figures of discourse management”. These are especially important for “an audience that cannot turn the page” (p. 384), which applies to audiences in an oral communication setting.

²⁰⁰ *English-language sub-corpus*: Ross (1980), Cook (1989), Osborn & Osborn (1997), Gurak (2000), Verderber (2000), Booher (2003); *Dutch-language sub-corpus*: Gerritsen (2008). See Appendix A.8 for an overview of all textbook fragments related to retention.

Table 3.2: Descriptions of the selected elaboration techniques ‘anecdote’ and ‘question’.

Technique	Description
Anecdote (see Section 2.5.2)	An anecdote is a short story that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is brief (it usually is an isolated short story within a longer talk, not a longer narrative within the overall presentation) • contains (elements of) a narrative structure, such as an orientation (time or place), a sequence of events / complication, an evaluation and a coda (not all elements are required) • contains one or more story characters • can be humorous, vivid, and relevant (in relation to the presentation’s main message or a main point in the core of the presentation). (cf. Labov, 2003; Andeweg, De Jong & Hoeken, 1998; Andeweg & De Jong, 2005)
Question	
Rhetorical question (see Section 2.5.17)	A question in which the answer is implicit within the question. (Fahnestock, 2011; Braet, 2007; Ahluwalia & Burnkrant, 2004). It is often a statement that takes the shape of a question, for example to express emotions.
<i>Quaestio</i>	An uninterrupted series of two or more (often rhetorical) questions (Braet, 2007); a “pileup of rhetorical questions” (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 299; Fahnestock refers to this question type as <i>pysma</i>).
<i>Subiectio</i>	A question that the speaker proposes and immediately answers. It can be used to express emotions as opposed to making a statement, or to mark the structure of a speech (e.g. as a transition to a new topic) (Braet, 2007; Fahnestock, 2011). Fahnestock (2011, p. 299) refers to this question type as <i>rogatio</i> or <i>anthypophora</i> .
Direct / literal question	A “genuine question when the speaker wants an answer” (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 304—there classified as <i>interrogatio</i>). The question can be directed to all audience members or to a specific person/agent in the audience or elsewhere; it can also prepare the audience for an answer that will be provided later in the speech (e.g. in the case of a research question).

Anecdote

Together with the techniques ‘visual aids’, ‘summary’ and ‘repetition’, the anecdote is most often recommended in the English-language textbooks as a technique to influence retention. Interestingly, Dutch-language textbooks refer to its memorable qualities much less frequently. Textbook authors usually see the anecdote as a specific

type of narrative, as explained in Section 2.5.2. It is related to the classical figure *demonstratio*, which entailed the lively description of an event “that supposedly has occurred” (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 335).²⁰¹ The idea that narratives can positively affect retention is not only found in public-speaking textbooks; studies also show that narratives can increase recall, for example when used as a learning strategy (Bower & Clark, 1969) or when contrasted with expository text (Graesser et al., 1980). This suggests that narrative figures such as the anecdote stimulate the encoding processes of elaboration and mental visualisation, for example by linking new information to existing knowledge and creating a mental picture of a sequence of events (e.g. by relating it to schemas—see Section 1.2). According to Dahlstrom (2014, p. 13615): “... narratives seem to offer intrinsic benefits in each of the four main steps of processing information: motivation and interest, allocating cognitive resources, elaboration, and transfer into long-term memory.”

As a type of story, it can be assumed that anecdotes will contain one or more of the following narrative elements: a main character, time, place, temporal organisation of events and a termination or coda (Labov, 2003). These narrative elements can serve as points of reference for recognising anecdotes in presentation texts, just as the feature ‘brevity’ (the idea that the anecdote is a short, uninterrupted story). The characteristics humour, vividness, and relevance (to the main message or a main point) are seen as optional, as not all textbook authors attribute them to the anecdote. In the current analysis, they were therefore not required for recognising anecdotes in a presentation text.²⁰²

Questions

The most important question type is the rhetorical question, which is regularly advised in the English-language textbooks (see Section 2.5.17). The use of questions is

²⁰¹ The anecdote seems to have more in common with the *demonstratio* than the *descriptio*, which is another figure that appears to be closely related. Fahnestock defines the *descriptio* as “visualising consequences that have yet to occur and may not occur” (2011, p. 335). The anecdote is about retelling an event that has already taken place.

²⁰² The narrative features of anecdotes that are distinguished in public-speaking textbooks have been the topic of various studies into the persuasive effect of narratives in texts. For example, the extent to which a reader can identify with the main character of a narrative can positively influence persuasion (De Graaf et al., 2012; Hoeken et al., 2016); driving mechanisms for persuasion via identification are a higher perceived similarity of the reader with the main character, and the use of a first-person perspective (Hoeken et al., 2016; De Graaf et al., 2016). The narrative feature ‘vividness’ appears to be closely related to the notions of ‘transportation’ and ‘absorption’, which entail that readers can be transported into a story and experience the emotions and events as if they were in the shoes of the main character (Green & Donahue, 2009). The ‘transportability’ of a narrative relies on craftsmanship in style and the quality of the story (Green & Donahue, 2009). Based on these studies, the use of a vivid, well-crafted anecdote in a presentation that enables identification of the audience with the main character could possibly influence retention via increased elaboration. However, it should be noted that these studies focused on persuasion (not retention) in documents (not presentations).

generally viewed as a strategy to stimulate audience participation (see Section 2.5.16), both explicitly (audience members answer a direct question) and implicitly (audience members mentally answer a (rhetorical) question). Andeweg and De Jong (2004) attribute the following functions to questions: they can activate the audience, draw attention, increase involvement and enhance the information processing. These functions can stimulate elaboration; as Atkinson explains, questions motivate the audience to think of a response, which will “make them sit up and start wondering what's coming next”, even if audience members “know that they are not actually going to have to answer the speaker's question” (2004, p. 192).

As table 3.2 shows, four question types were included in the analysis: rhetorical question, *quaestio*, *subiectio* and direct question. These question types are sometimes labelled differently in rhetorical literature.²⁰³ They are not mutually exclusive; their descriptions of the question types show some overlap, as the following discussion of these four question types shows.

The ‘rhetorical question’ or *erotema* is the most common type of question that is distinguished in rhetorical manuals (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 298). According to Fahnestock, “...strictly speaking, the rhetorical question is not a question at all, but a statement intoned or punctuated as a question” (2011, p. 299). Various studies have focused on how rhetorical questions are processed and can stimulate elaboration. Slot (1993), for example, analyses rhetorical questions as indirect speech acts: as they are not meant to be answered, their use violates the sincerity condition of a direct speech act. Ahluwalia and Burnkrant (2004) consider the rhetorical question to be a stylistic deviation from an assertion and found that the salience of such a deviation can influence the way in which a rhetorical question is processed. Petty, Cacioppo and Heesacker (1981) report that rhetorical questions enhanced thinking for messages with a low personal relevance, but disrupted thinking for messages with a high personal relevance. Abioye (2011, p. 295) found that newspaper articles with rhetorical questions were preferred over articles with conventional statements and concludes that using rhetorical questions is “a strategy used in marshalling evidence, facts and information in one’s mind”, which “equally allows readers to participate in the ‘discussion’, so to say, by questioning their opinion.” Finally, a rhetorical question positioned prior to an argument appears to influence the persuasiveness of such argument (Howard, 1990; Hoeken & Anderiesse, 1992).

The *quaestio*, multiple questions in a row (also known as *pysma*), often consists of rhetorical questions. When speakers apply a series of rhetorical questions, they may aim for an amplified effect of a single rhetorical question (Braet, 2007). However, a *quaestio* does not necessarily exclusively consist of rhetorical questions. In the situation of a political speech, a speaker may ask multiple direct questions to—for example—a minister, which could either be answered immediately or be left until

²⁰³ In this study, the Latin names for question types as described in Braet (2007) are used as labels; as explained in the current section, these question types are also known under various other names (Fahnestock, 2011, pp. 298–300).

another debate. The *quaestio* is sometimes used in the *partitio*, in which case the speech structure is announced by posing the main questions that the speech will answer. These questions in a *partitio* usually correspond to key points of the speech (e.g.: “What is X? How is it used? How can we improve its design?”). Here, organisation and elaboration functions overlap.

The *subiecto* or *rogatio* can also combine elaboration and organisation effects. Usually, the *subiectio* is not a rhetorical question, as it is immediately answered by the speaker. This way, Fahnestock argues, “it is useful for managing issue construction and flow of support in arguments and arranging the subtopics in expository texts” (2011, p. 299). She refers to examples of *subiectios* as “single-voiced-dialogues”, which can make a text “highly interactive” (elaboration function). At the same time, *subiectios* can have a “text-forming function” (organisation function): “by asking and then answering questions, the speaker or writer can foreground the organisation of the discourse” (p. 299). When the *subiectio* is used as an organisational technique (discourse marker), it seems to be a specific type of *transitio* (see Section 3.1.2).

Finally, the ‘direct question’. Speakers intend for direct questions to be answered, either by (a specific person in) the audience, or by the speaker at a later stage (for example in the case of a research question). With a direct question, speakers can interact with the audience and they can encourage listeners to participate. It is related to the figure of *interrogatio*, as distinguished by Peacham in the *Garden of Eloquence* (1593, as referred to by Fahnestock (2011, p. 304)).²⁰⁴

3.2 Construction of corpora research presentations, political speeches and TED talks

To analyse the usage of the selected organisation and elaboration techniques, three speech corpora were constructed that reflect different types of speakers in public-speaking practice: scholars, politicians and TED speakers. Each corpus consists of sixteen speeches or presentations, of which the available texts were analysed. The current section describes the construction of these corpora based on six characteristics: context, type of speaker, audience, main purpose, source text, and length. The characteristics ‘context’, ‘type of speaker’, ‘audience’ and ‘main purpose’ give insight into the rhetorical (retention) situation of the speeches and presentations (see Section 1.3). The characteristics ‘source text’ and ‘length’ provide information on the nature of the texts within a corpus.

Table 3.3 presents an overview of the three corpora and their respective characteristics. Each of these characteristics is described more extensively in

²⁰⁴ Fahnestock (2011, p. 304) explains that besides a “genuine question when the speaker wants an answer”, according to Peacham an *interrogatio* could also be a “question where there is no desire for answer” but that “would make our speech more sharp and vehement” (Peacham as cited by Fahnestock, 2011, p. 304). This form of the *interrogatio* is not considered in this study.

subsections 3.2.1 to 3.2.5. Appendix B.1 contains an overview of all speeches in the corpus, including their length in number of words.

Table 3.3: Overview of the main characteristics of the speech/presentation corpora.

Corpus characteristics	Research presentations (N=16)	Political speeches (N=16)	TED talks (N=16)
<i>Context</i>	Dutch-Flemish conference on (applied) communication, rhetoric and argumentation in 2008	Annual governmental policy debates between 2010 and 2013 in Dutch Parliament	Most popular TED talks online, as determined on April 1, 2015
<i>Type of speaker</i>	Speaking professionals	Professional speakers	Speaking professionals and professional speakers
<i>Audience (direct/indirect and estimated size)</i>	<i>Direct:</i> fellow scholars / experts (between 10 and 50) <i>Indirect:</i> not applicable	<i>Direct:</i> members of parliament and the government, audience on the public stands (+/- 200-250 people) <i>Indirect:</i> electorate, (up to a few million people)	<i>Direct:</i> live audience at the venue, usually with a mixed background (100 up to 1000 people) <i>Indirect:</i> all the online viewers (up to several millions)
<i>Main purpose*</i>	To inform	To persuade	To inspire (inform, persuade and call to action)
<i>Source text</i>	Transcriptions of video recordings	Text used as recorded in the Proceedings of the Dutch Parliament	Text published online on www.ted.com
<i>Mean number of words (sd); shortest / longest presentation in number of words</i>	3419 (402) Shortest: 2592 Longest: 3969	2555 (1548) Shortest: 226 Longest: 5438	2861 (901) Shortest: 914 Longest: 4285
<i>Total corpus length (number of words)</i>	54,704	40,832	45,768

*The main purpose as stated here does not rule out the existence of other (secondary) purposes; e.g.: a researcher or a TED speaker might also intend to persuade the audience to a certain extent or of a certain aspect of their presentation. Here, the type of goal that appeared to represent the purpose of the overall presentations in the sub-corpus was selected as 'main purpose'.

3.2.1 Context

The Research Presentation Corpus consists of sixteen presentations that were held at the triennial ‘VIOT conference’ for Dutch and Flemish communication scientists, rhetoricians and argumentation theorists.²⁰⁵ The presentations fit into a fixed format of about twenty minutes, followed by a short discussion. The discussions after the presentations were taken into account in this analysis. The construction of this corpus has also been described by Hertz (2015, p. 99).

The Political Speech Corpus comprises sixteen speeches given by the leaders of four large Dutch political parties during the annual governmental policy debates between 2010 and 2013. These debates evolve around the policy that the government has proposed for the upcoming year. Political parties have the opportunity to criticise the policy, propose amendments and debate each other’s points of view. The speech that each party leader gives during these debates is considered to be one of the most important speeches of the year. In the corpus used for the current analysis, the speeches of the following four parties that played an important role between 2010 and 2013 were selected: the Liberal party (VVD) of prime minister Mark Rutte (part of the government coalition in all selected years), the Party for Freedom (PVV) of Geert Wilders (both government support and opposition in the selected period), the Labour Party/Social Democrats (PvdA, first an opposition party, later part of government coalition) and the Liberal Democrats (D66, four years in the opposition).

The TED Talk Corpus consists of the sixteen most popular (most viewed) talks online on TED.com, as measured on April 1st, 2015. These talks were selected from the playlist of the twenty-five most popular TED talks of all time. In that playlist, the number of views per talk is indicated. The earliest talk in the selection was held in 2004, the most recent talks were given in 2012. Most talks (six) took place in 2009.²⁰⁶ The popularity of the talks is an indicator of a positive reception, although the current analysis did not include the extent to which viewers appreciated the talks. Six talks were presented by scholars, the remaining speakers were popular science writers, authors of fiction, and consultants.

3.2.2 Type of speaker

In the three corpora, the speakers can be characterised as either speaking professionals, professional speakers or a combination of these two categories. According to Andeweg and De Jong (2004, p. 236), speaking professionals are speakers who need to present “quite regularly” as part of their profession, whereas for

²⁰⁵ A collection of papers of each VIOT conference is published in conference proceedings (in Dutch). These volumes present a cross-section of three years of research into applied communication, rhetoric and argumentation in The Netherlands and Flanders, and they are recommended for anyone interested in Dutch and Flemish studies within the aforementioned disciplines.

²⁰⁶ On March 1st, 2019, fourteen of the sixteen selected speeches were still in the playlist ‘25 most popular talks’ on ted.com. This shows that the selected talks remain quite popular over time. The fact that they are included in such a playlist possibly contributes to their ongoing popularity.

professional speakers giving a speech is part of their “essential professional skills”: presenting is an activity they carry out several times a week.²⁰⁷

The scholars in the corpus of research presentations can be qualified as speaking professionals: it can be assumed that scholars present quite regularly (particularly if their job also included lecturing), but not necessarily every week. It is customary for scholars to attend a few academic conferences a year that are relevant to their topic of research.

The politicians in the Political Speech Corpus are professional speakers. At the time of their speech, they were all leaders of their political party in the national parliament. Such a position requires giving some form of presentation almost on a daily basis, ranging from a contribution to parliamentary debate, via a media interview to a speech at a party congress. Seven different speakers are part of the Political Speech Corpus.²⁰⁸

The speakers in the TED corpus can best be described as a mix of speaking professionals and professional speakers. TED speakers are usually selected based on the quality of the idea they would like to share (TED, 2018a). Quite often, scholars—speaking professionals—give a TED talk to make a complex scientific idea more accessible to a wider audience. However, some of the TED speakers can be more easily qualified as professional speakers who regularly give speeches, such as well-known publicists, (management) coaches or writers.

Furthermore, the way TED speakers generally prepare for their talk needs to be considered as well: because of the popularity of the event and possibility of a large online outreach TED talks are generally extensively prepared. TED talks usually are rehearsed various times and speakers often receive training and coaching (TED, 2018a), whereas research presentations at conferences are usually only rehearsed a few times or even not at all (cf. Romanelli et al., 2014, who compare TED talks and academic lectures). Moreover, the online list of most popular TED talks contains talks both held at the global annual TED conference and talks held at local TEDx events.²⁰⁹ Speakers for the global TED events include professional speakers, such as former presidents or CEOs of multinationals (TED, 2018a), whereas the locally organised TEDx events will generally include speaking professionals (TED, 2018b). Still, even though a scholar might usually be categorised as a speaking professional, scholars who are invited to give a TED(x) talk will generally prepare the talk as if they are professional speakers—or at least more thoroughly than the average academic lecture or conference talk.

²⁰⁷ Andeweg and De Jong (2004) based these labels on the distinction between ‘writing professionals’ and ‘professional writers’ introduced by Janssen, Jansen & Jansen (2000, p. 212).

²⁰⁸ Due to changes in the party leadership in parliament in the period 2010-2013, three party leaders of the Liberal Party and two party leaders of the Labour Party are included. No changes in the party leadership of the Freedom Party and Liberal Democrats took place. Appendix B.1 presents an overview of speakers in the Political Speech Corpus.

²⁰⁹ TEDx events are locally organised events based on the philosophy and guidelines of the TED organisation (TED, 2018c).

3.2.3 Audience

The composition of the audience could prompt speakers to select rhetorical techniques that they consider to be suited for the specific audience and occasion. The presentations in the three corpora are held to audiences that differ in features such as knowledge of and interest in the topic. For the political speeches and TED talks, a distinction between a direct and indirect audience can be made.

The audience for the research presentations usually consists of fellow scholars, who are often experts in the same discipline as the speaker or in a discipline that is closely related. The scholars can therefore assume that the listeners have a basic knowledge of the presentation topic. Furthermore, the listeners' attitude towards the topic is likely to be positive, as they usually attend a conference within their area of interest and expertise. Still, factors such as the time of day and fatigue could influence this attitude.

The political speeches are held in the Dutch parliament. The direct audience consists of members of parliament and the government (prime-minister, ministers and state secretaries). Leaders of the opposition parties often use the annual policy debates to try and influence the proposed policy for the coming year. In their contributions, they can emphasise the topics that they would like to see adapted and they can incite other parties to support their proposals. However, a part of the audience is formed by the electorate, which is not present in parliament and will learn about the policy debates via (social) media. The annual policy debates usually generate considerable media attention. The party leaders will keep in mind that the electorate will most likely see snippets of the debates in various media, which calls for concise and concrete phrases that are easily understood beyond the parliamentary context. Furthermore, the political speakers may try to attract the electorate's attention by addressing issues that voters will be interested in, especially when elections are in sight.

TED talks are generally held in front of an engaged, interested audience (Romanelli et al., 2014) that has bought a ticket or is invited to the event. The audience members can have various backgrounds (differences in expertise, profession, education, etc.). Listeners to a TED talk are not necessarily knowledgeable on the presentation's topic, which means that the speaker is more likely to apply rhetorical techniques that engage the audience in the topic and enable them to understand it. Next to the audience that is physically present at the actual event, TED speakers also need to consider the online audience that will view the video of the talk, which is made available sometime after the event. This circumstance may influence the rhetorical techniques that a speaker applies: online viewers can decide more easily to stop watching, so it appears even more important to draw their attention and engage them throughout the presentation.

3.2.4 Main purpose

Following from the difference in audience composition, the main purpose of the corpora differs as well. The 'main' purpose is distinguished here, because a mixture of secondary purposes can be ascribed to the presentations in the corpora. For example, although scholars mainly intend to inform and TED speaker mainly aim to inspire, as they may to a certain extent also intend to persuade the audience of a certain

aspect of their presentation. The type of goal that appeared to represent the overall purpose of the presentations in the sub-corpus was selected as ‘main purpose’. From Bitzer’s perspective on the features of the rhetorical situation (1968), the distinction between main purpose and secondary purposes can be related to the act of formulating a fitting response to the rhetorical situation. Does the situation and audience call for an informative or a persuasive purpose, or a combination of those aims?

The research presentations are mainly aimed at informing the audience about recent studies. Academic conferences are places to share knowledge and become up to date with recent developments in a particular field. Next to their the main purpose to inform the audience, scholars can also aim to persuade the audience; for example, scholars sometimes want to justify their research approach or validate the choices that they made in the research process. Here, I consider persuasion to be a secondary purpose of research presentations.

The political speeches chiefly focus on persuading fellow members of parliament present and the electorate (cf. Van Leeuwen, 2015, p. 93). The context of the speeches in the Political Speech Corpus, the annual policy debates in the Dutch parliament, appears to be particularly geared at persuasion. The leaders of each political party aim to show to what extent they agree and disagree with the proposed governmental policy. In the case of coalition parties, political leaders are inclined to defend the proposed governmental policy, whereas opposition parties tend to disagree with the proposed policy and put forward adapted or new proposals. To some extent, politicians may be required to inform the audience about the proposed policy, but this purpose seems secondary to the purpose of persuasion.

The TED talks are aimed at inspiring the (broader) audience. As the TED organisation states, their mission is to “spread ideas”, make them “accessible” and to “spark conversation” (TED, 2018d). ‘To inspire’ is a somewhat ambiguous purpose.²¹⁰ Scotto di Carlo (2014, p. 592), who focuses on how TED talks can be a genre to popularise science, refers to it as the “hybridity” of TED talks: the purpose of inspiring appears to comprise both informative and persuasive elements. It contains informative elements, as transferring knowledge is usually needed to some extent in a TED talk. According to the TEDx Speaker Guide (2018),²¹¹ the idea worth spreading of a talk could be something (completely) new to the audience, or it could offer a fresh perspective on an existing issue. At the same time, in order to “spark a conversation” or perhaps even encourage the audience to take action, TED speakers need to persuade the audience of the urgency and importance of the topic. Still, persuasion does not seem to be the main purpose; an audience does not have to agree with a speaker to be triggered to talk about a subject.

²¹⁰ Charteris-Black (2018) sees ‘to inspire’ as a possible purpose for a political speech; he states, for example, that political speeches can “inspire through the power of creative language” (p. xv) and how the rhetorical purpose of a Barack Obama speech was to “motivate and inspire” (p. 52).

²¹¹ The TEDx Speaker Guide (2018) is a document that contains guidelines for speakers who are invited to give a TEDx talk.

Despite of the difference in main purposes, it is plausible that retention is a (secondary) purpose for speakers in all the corpora. In order to inform, persuade and inspire an audience, a certain extent of knowledge transfer and retention of information appears to be indispensable.

3.2.5 Source text and length

Source text. Only the texts of the speeches and presentations were used. As explained in Section 3.1.1, the analysis was aimed at organisation and elaboration techniques that can be recognised by textual indicators (e.g. linguistic and stylistic features). Delivery aspects and visual aids (gestures, voice, expression) were not taken into account. The nature of the texts varies to some extent. The texts of the research presentations were transcribed from video recordings, which means that they contain conversational cues such as gap fillers (“uh...”), and mispronunciations or mistakes. The texts from both the political speeches and the TED talks were slightly edited to make them more easily readable. The political speeches were taken from the Proceedings of the Dutch Parliament (exclusive of interruptions by other speakers), in which parliamentary clerks register transcripts of the debates. The clerks work for the Reporting and Editing Service (Dienst Verslag en Redactie, DVR), which uses specific guidelines from the Parliamentary Language Guide to edit the transcripts (De Jong & Van Leeuwen, 2011).²¹² The texts of the presentations in the TED corpus were obtained from the TED website (www.ted.com). These speech texts are as close to the spoken word on the video as possible, but they can be slightly edited to make them more easily readable; they do not contain conversational cues such as pauses.²¹³ These differences in source text are marginal and they are therefore not expected to influence the quality of the results of the analysis to a great extent.

Length. The average length of a single speech and the total number of words within a corpus differ between the corpora. The research presentations are the longest on average and do not vary much in length between one another. This is due to the fixed

²¹² De Jong & Van Leeuwen (2011) give a few examples of text revisions made by the DVR. The clerks make long-winded sentences more concise and complete enumerations that are announced but are not finished (“On the one hand...” without “on the other hand”). Arguably, these revisions could somewhat influence the results of the analysis regarding structural techniques. The motive for adaptations made in the texts can be to clarify the texts in case comprehensibility problems might occur. This means that it is imaginable that the texts of the political speeches in the corpus are slightly more structured than the actual spoken texts; it is unlikely that the texts in the corpus are less explicitly structured than the actual spoken texts.

²¹³ TED talks are transcribed by volunteers around the world (TED, 2018e). TED offers online resources with tips and guidelines for transcription (TED, 2018e; TED Translators, 2018a). The online Wiki environment of the TED Translators (2018a) community offers some more insight into transcription guidelines. The English Style Guide of the TED Translators (2018b) community indicates that “the style should not be cleaned up too much, in order to prevent the subtitles from sounding unnecessarily formal and more like written language than speech”. This suggests that the transcripts do not differ too much from the actual spoken words.

format of the research conference: the presentations last about twenty minutes, and are followed by a short question and answer session that was not taken into account in the analysis. The corpus of political speeches has a higher standard deviation of speech length; this is because the amount of time allotted to each party leader depends on the number of seats a party holds in parliament.²¹⁴ The average length of a TED talk resembles that of a political speech, but the standard deviation in the TED Talk Corpus is not as high as it is in the Political Speech Corpus. The TED format requires talks to have a duration of approximately 6 minutes up to a maximum of about 18 minutes, with steps of three minutes in between (categories of 9, 12, and 15 minutes).

The variation in length of the political speeches and—to a lesser extent—of the TED talks needs to be taken into account when interpreting quantitative results. Speakers in the corpus might have different preferences regarding rhetorical techniques, which means that rhetorical techniques are not likely to be evenly distributed over speakers in the first place. A large variation in speech length might contribute to observed differences between speakers, as a short speech length limits speakers in applying rhetorical techniques. It is imaginable that some selected techniques are not that suitable for a short speech, such as a detailed anecdote or an extensive summary.

Despite of the differences between the corpora, I believe that the texts are suitable for the current analysis, which is based on rhetorical techniques whose features are recognisable in a presentation or speech text. At the same time, it should be noted that some factors that could possibly amplify a retention effect, such as visual aids and delivery by the presenter, were not analysed (see Section 3.1.1).

3.3 Method of analysis

Now that the selection of retention techniques and the corpora of presentation texts for the analysis of public-speaking practice have been explained, this section turns to the method of analysis. Section 3.3.1 makes clear how the organisation and elaboration techniques were operationalised for the analysis of presentation texts; it details which textual indicators were used to recognise and label the techniques. Next, Section 3.3.2 walks through the labelling procedure and Section 3.3.3 accounts for the reliability of the analysis.

²¹⁴ Regarding the length of the Political Speech Corpus, the speeches from 2012 are atypical; that year the annual policy debates followed shortly after the parliamentary elections. A new government coalition was in the process of being formed, which means that no policy for the following year could be presented. The contributions of the party leaders in 2012 were more concise than the speeches that were given in the other three years in the corpus, particularly Political Speeches #9 and #10 from the Liberal Party leader and the Labour party leader (the two winners of the election who were exploring the formation of a coalition together)—see Appendix B.1.

3.3.1 Operationalisation of retention techniques for text-based analysis

As a first step of the method, textual indicators of the techniques were determined that serve as point of reference for analysts. These indicators formed the basis of a labelling instruction for multiple analysts. The operationalisation of the organisation techniques is discussed first, followed by that of the elaboration techniques.

Organisation techniques

Table 3.4 presents the selected organisation techniques and their textual indicators.

Table 3.4: Textual indicators of the selected organisation techniques, used to recognise and label the techniques in the speech and presentation texts of scholars, politicians and TED speakers.

Technique	Textual indicators (operationalisation of the analysis)
<i>Partitio</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears in the introduction of the presentation / speech, and • signalled by a reference to the speech structure (e.g.: "I will first tell you how... and then I will...")
Announcement of the conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears at the start of the conclusion of the presentation / speech, and • Signalled by structure markers such as "to wrap up" or "to conclude".
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears in the conclusion of the presentation / speech, and • Signalled by a structure marker that indicates an overview of main points will follow, such as "to summarise".
Circle technique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears in the conclusion of the presentation / speech • A reference to the introduction is included in the conclusion ("As I said in the introduction...") or • A repetition of specific words (only) used in the introduction (e.g. reference to main character used in the opening anecdote of the speech)
Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of explicit structure markers such as "first, second, third", "next", "furthermore", etc. • A reference to the previous topic that was addressed (e.g.: "Now that we have discussed...") • A preview of the topic that is addressed next (e.g.: "Now, let's move on and take a look at...")

Following from the textual indicators described in table 3.4, the techniques *partitio*, 'announcement of the conclusion', 'summary' and 'circle technique' have in common

that they can only occur once in every speech and are connected to a particular part of the speech (the introduction or conclusion). For the text analysis this means that, for example, a structure overview occurring after the introduction will not be labelled as a *partitio*; similarly, a so-called ‘internal summary’ that a speaker might give prior to the conclusion (see Section 2.5.3) will not be labelled as a summary. As the ‘announcement of the conclusion’ is found at the start of the conclusion, it also serves as an indicator for marking the ‘conclusion’ as a part of the speech. The first four organisation techniques are strictly connected to a part of the speech, which follows from their descriptions in textbooks, ancient rhetoric and related rhetorical studies (see Sections 2.5 and 3.1.2). The ‘transition’ differs from the other four organisation techniques in two ways: it is not connected to a specific part of the speech, and multiple instances of the transition can occur throughout the speech.²¹⁵

All organisation techniques in table 3.4 are signalled by specific structure markers. The structure markers in the table are examples to which the labelling of techniques was not limited. In case of the circle technique, not only a reference to the ‘introduction’ or the beginning of the speech was included, but also a less explicit reference, such as a repetition of an example that was provided in the introduction, was taken into account (see Section 2.5.13 for textbook advice about the circle technique). In order to label a text fragment without a reference to the introduction as a circle technique, it is required that the words or the information that the speaker repeats is clearly relatable to the introduction part of the speech and does not regularly recur (e.g. as a theme or storyline) throughout the presentation text. The transition can be recognised by structure markers that indicate an enumeration, by a link to the previous topic or by a preview to the next topic(s). These structure markers are not all required. This way, structure overviews or summaries that do not occur in the introduction or conclusion can be seen as (elaborate) transitions.

An advantage of taking these structure markers as points of reference is that they leave less room for interpretation when labelling the techniques. A disadvantage of the focus on explicit structure markers is that more subtle, less clearly marked variants of these techniques are not taken into account. However, if such a more subtle usage of organisation techniques is not easily recognised by analysts, then it may not be noticed by listeners during a presentation either.

Elaboration techniques

Table 3.5 presents the selected elaboration techniques and their textual indicators. The category ‘questions (general indicators)’ shows the textual indicators that apply to all four question types and that were used to determine whether a question was applied, prior to specifying the question type.

²¹⁵ The ‘transition’ most likely occurs in the core part of the speech, in between the introduction and conclusion, to connect the key points. However, it is not always explicitly described as such in textbooks.

Table 3.5: textual indicators of the selected elaboration techniques, used to recognise and label the techniques in the speech and presentation texts of scholars, politicians and TED speakers.

Technique	Textual indicators (operationalisation of the analysis)
Anecdote (see Section 2.5.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presence of one or more story characters • A (change of) story perspective in the text (e.g.: from general information or to an 'I' / first-person perspective) • The presence of elements of a narrative structure, such as orientation, a sequence of events and a wrap-up • The story is uninterrupted and does not comprise more than half of the presentation's length
Question (general indicators)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presence of a question mark • Inversion (reversed order of subject and verb, mainly applicable to the Dutch language) • Question words (e.g.: who, what, which, when, where, how)
Rhetorical question (see Section 2.5.17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is not addressed to the audience or a particular person • The question can be rephrased as a statement • The question is targeted at general knowledge / information the audience is familiar with • The question contains a negation ('Isn't it true that...?') • Question tags such as "isn't it", "don't you think", "right" • Elliptic phrases posed as a question ("Clear or not?")
<i>Quaestio</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple questions in a row are asked (two or more) • The series of questions is not interrupted by other sentences
<i>Subiectio</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The answer is given immediately after the question has been posed (in the following sentence) • The answer is related to the question (e.g. starts with a conjunction such as 'because' repeats information from the question)
Direct / literal question	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audience or a specific person is addressed (e.g. "have you" ..., "who here has...", "madam, can you...?") • The question is not (immediately) answered by the speaker • The question cannot (easily) be rephrased as a statement • The question is aimed at specific information (facts or figures), ideas or opinions (e.g. in the case of research questions and questionnaire questions)

Anecdote. The most prominent indicators of anecdotes in the presentation texts are narrative elements. A story usually has one or more main characters, which are often introduced at its start. A linguistic or stylistic cue for the use of an anecdote is a change

in perspective. An anecdote is often recounted from the first person-perspective (if it is a personal anecdote of the speaker) or from a more descriptive third-person perspective ('she/he' or 'they'). Next to that, an orientation of time and place is often given at the start of the story. After that, a sequence of events unfolds, with a wrap-up (e.g. a punch line or moral). The end of the anecdote can be indicated with a transition from the 'story perspective' to the 'main speech perspective'. Finally, the anecdote is usually considered to be a short, rounded off story within a speech; therefore it should not be interrupted and should not account for more than half of the presentation's length.²¹⁶ For a text fragment to be labelled as anecdote, not all indicators are required to be present; however, it is likely that a combination of indicators is needed.²¹⁷ As explained in Section 3.1.2, the characteristics 'humour', 'vividness' and 'relevance' are not taken into account in the labelling process.

Question. Before labelling specific types of questions, the first step was to identify the use of questions (in general) in the text. Three indicators were used to recognise questions: a question mark, inversion and the use of question words. A question mark in the text usually is a solid indication that a question is used. However, as presentation texts are transcribed based on audio/video footage, the use of a question mark to some extent is based on the transcriber's interpretation (see Section 3.2.5 for details on the source texts). Furthermore, sometimes question marks are not used to indicate questions, for example when questions are part of a longer sentence or text fragment. In such cases, the other two indicators could serve as a safety net for recognising questions. The indicator 'inversion' is mainly applicable to the speech texts in the Dutch language; in English, questions can also be formulated via the auxiliary verb 'to do'.

Rhetorical questions are recognised by interpreting the question's contents: does the author expect a reply from the audience? In case no one in particular is addressed and the contents can also be phrased as a statement, the question likely is rhetorical. This assumption is also based on the idea that a presentation traditionally is a monologue; a speaker who would like a response from the audience will have to make an effort (cf. Fahnestock, 2011, p. 299). Other indicators are question tags such as "isn't it?" (cf. Frank, 1990), the presence of a negation (Petty et al., 1981) and elliptical statements intoned as a question.

The indicators for labelling *quaestios* and *subiectios* are quite straightforward. A text fragment that is labelled as a *quaestio* should meet two clear requirements: at least two questions in a row are asked, and these questions are not interrupted by an assertion. A *subiectio* should always be immediately answered by the speaker. In case it is not immediately clear whether the statement that follows the

²¹⁶ A narrative that comprises more than half of the speech length can hardly be seen as an anecdote, but seems to be another type of narrative (a longer story).

²¹⁷ For example, a change to a first-person perspective alone does not necessarily signal the start of an anecdote; it could just as well be a self-reference of the speaker in another context (e.g. in a proposition: "Today, I will tell you..."). However, such a change in perspective is an indicator to inspect a text fragment more closely.

question indeed is intended as an answer, causal conjunctions ('because') or words repeated from the question are indicators of a link to the question.

The most important indicator for a 'direct or literal question' is the presence of an addressee (either the audience—'you'—or a specific person). Furthermore, direct questions are not answered by the speaker and usually cannot be easily rephrased as a statement. For example: 'who of you came here by train?' is not easily rephrased into a statement without losing its essential meaning or without the use of a verb that indicates that a question or a request ("I would like to ask / inquire...").

3.3.2 Labelling procedure

The second step of the method involved labelling the techniques in the presentation texts of the three corpora. To be able to distinguish the selected retention techniques in the presentation texts, a labelling instruction was developed that was used by multiple analysts (or: raters). The complete instruction can be found in Appendix B.3. The procedure for labelling the techniques in the presentation texts consisted of the following steps.

1. *Upload of presentation texts in Atlas.ti and creation of labels*
The speech and presentation texts from the corpora were uploaded into the data analysis software Atlas.ti. This software enables the creation of labels, which can be linked to a specific part of the text. After the attribution of labels, Atlas.ti can provide an overview of all text fragments with a particular label. Labels were created for all of the selected techniques and the generic 'question'.
2. *Scan of presentation text*
Each presentation text was first read completely. This way, the analyst could obtain a first impression of the topic and basic structure of the text, which could help to detect techniques upon a second reading. TED talks were viewed as well as read.
3. *Determination of the introduction and conclusion of the presentation*
For the organisational techniques that depend on their position in the speech (*partitio* in the introduction, 'circle technique' and 'summary' in the conclusion), the introduction and conclusion of each presentation text was determined based on textual indicators. The ending of the introduction and start of the conclusion are marked by indicators in the speech structure (e.g. for the introduction: the purpose of the speech, a *partitio* or outline, and a transition to a new topic; for the conclusion: an announcement of the conclusion, a transition to a new topic, and a circle technique/reference to speech purpose) and in text format (e.g. via a heading or a blank line) (cf. Andeweg & De Jong, 2004, pp. 329–330; Andeweg & De Jong, 2008). See Appendix B.3.

4. *Attribution of labels to techniques*

Next, the presentation text was closely read from the beginning until the end. The labelling instruction was used to detect possible occurrences of the selected retention techniques. The instruction contained the descriptions and textual indicators of techniques as described in tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 and 3.5, together with examples of text fragments that did or did not meet the criteria. The inter-rater reliability was determined for the organisation and elaboration techniques separately, after which the labels of some presentation texts were revisited (see Section 3.3.3 for more information on the reliability). As a final step, all text fragments in Atlas.ti that were related to a particular label were scrutinised and compared in order to filter out any text fragments that did not meet the labelling instruction.

5. *Quantitative and qualitative analysis*

After completion of the labelling process, the results were quantitatively and qualitatively analysed. First, the frequency of each technique per corpus was determined on three levels: the total number of occurrences, the average occurrence per speech and the average occurrence per thousand words (for the technique ‘anecdote’, the average length was determined as well). The length of the overall corpus was taken into account in the process of determining the average occurrence per thousand words; this may present a more nuanced picture of the frequency of a retention technique within a specific corpus.

Next, the labelled examples of each technique were scrutinised to gain insight into the style, formulation and form of the techniques on a detailed level. Similarities and differences in usage within and between text corpora were noted; examples that showed similarities in usage were categorised. This qualitative analysis aimed to show the use of retention techniques in practice, to pinpoint variations of the techniques (possibly between types of speakers), and to enable a comparison of practical use to textbook advice.

3.3.3 Reliability of the analysis

The texts from all corpora were systematically analysed via the data analysis software Atlas.ti, adhering to the aforementioned labelling instruction. To evaluate the effectiveness of this instruction and the reliability of the results of the analysis, the inter-rater reliability was determined. A total of six raters were involved, four of which were master students of Discourse studies (Rhetoric and Argumentation) at Leiden University. Each rater focused on different retention techniques (organisation or elaboration techniques) and analysed different corpora (scholars and politicians, or TED speakers) in their master thesis projects. For these practical reasons, the determination of inter-rater reliability was segmented: each round of analysis involved two raters, a focus on specific corpora (either scholars and politicians or TED talks) and either organisation or elaboration techniques. Appendix B.4 contains an overview of the process and all the scores obtained.

Procedure. Prior to each reliability analysis, the raters participated in a brief instruction session on the labelling procedure, which included an explanation of the labelling instruction and a discussion of example fragments related to each technique. Based on this discussion, the labelling instructions were further clarified.

After that, a number of presentation texts (in most cases eight) were randomly selected from the texts that had not served as example in the instruction session. Next, the raters independently analysed these speeches and labelled text fragments, after which the agreement between raters was determined with Cohen's kappa.

The reliability scores showed a substantial agreement ($\kappa = .69$, $p < .001$) up to a good agreement ($\kappa = .91$, $p < .001$) (cf. Landis & Koch, 1977). Table 3.6 presents an overview of the scores.

Table 3.6: Overview of the reliability scores per type of technique and corpus.

Techniques	Corpus (type of speaker)	Reliability score
Organisation techniques	Scholars and politicians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $\kappa = .68$ ($p < .001$) for all techniques $\kappa = .91$, ($p < .001$) excluding <i>transition</i>
Organisation techniques	TED speakers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $K = .82$ ($p < .001$) for <i>partitio</i>, announcement of conclusion, circle technique and summary $\kappa = .87$ ($p < .001$) for the <i>transition</i> (second round of analysis focused on this technique only, after discussion between raters)
Elaboration techniques	Scholars, politicians	$\kappa = .69$ ($p < .001$) for all techniques
Elaboration techniques	TED speakers	$\kappa = .79$ ($p < .001$) for all techniques

The raters obtained the highest reliability for text fragments of organisation techniques that could only occur once every presentation text (according to their definition in Section 3.1.2) and were required to be in the introduction (*partitio*) or in the conclusion of the presentation (announcement of the conclusion, circle technique, summary). The determination of transitions, anecdotes and questions, which could occur multiple times throughout the presentation text, proved to be more challenging. In some cases, a second analysis was needed based on a revised labelling instruction for these techniques in order to achieve acceptable scores. This revised instruction,

which contained more detailed descriptions and examples of distinct features of a specific technique, was then used to analyse all presentation texts (Appendix B.3 contains the final version of the labelling instruction). After the determination of the inter-rater reliability, the remaining presentation texts were analysed by a single researcher.

3.4 Results organisation techniques

How did the scholars, politicians and TED speakers apply the organisation techniques? First, Section 3.4.1 presents the frequency of the techniques per corpus. This quantitative overview provides insight into the overall use of the techniques and can indicate general trends in the use of the organisation techniques per type of speaker. Next, Sections 3.4.2 to 3.4.5 have a qualitative character; they contain examples of the organisation techniques that were found in the three corpora and they offer insight into variations in content, structure and style of each of the techniques on a more detailed level. This way, the quantitative and qualitative approaches are complementary. All the examples that are taken from the speech and presentation texts contain references to their specific presentation number, which corresponds to the overview in Appendix B.1. Section 3.4.2 zooms in on the *partitio*, after which the announcement of the conclusion and summary are the focus of Section 3.4.3. The circle technique takes the stage in Section 3.4.4, after which Section 3.4.5 evolves around the use of transitions.

3.4.1 Frequency of organisation techniques per corpus

How often do the organisation techniques occur in each corpus? Table 3.7 presents the frequency of the organisation techniques per type of speaker. The first four techniques could only be labelled once in every presentation; the frequency of the transition, which could occur throughout the presentation text, is expressed in average occurrence per speech and per thousand words of the (sub-)corpus.

Table 3.7: Overview of the frequency of organisation techniques per corpus.

Organisation technique	Scholars (N=16)	Politicians (N=16)	TED speakers (N=16)
<i>Partitio</i>	8	1	4
Announcement of the conclusion	10	5	7
Summary	9	0	4
Circle technique	2	7	0
Transition (average per speech / per 1000 words)	5 per speech / 1.5 per 1000 words	2 per speech / 0.7 per 1000 words	3 per speech / 1.0 per 1000 words

Per type of speaker, the frequency of organisation techniques as shown in table 3.7 is discussed. Scholars apply nearly all organisation techniques most often: they use eight *partitios*, ten announcements of the conclusions, nine summaries, and on average, they use more transitions than the politicians and TED speakers. Only the circle technique is applied more frequently by another type of speaker (the politicians). The scholars' preference for organisation techniques is in agreement with their main purpose to inform their audience. Speakers who aim to inform their audience usually rely on establishing a clear structure. The (complex) research topic and audience might also call for such an emphasis on structure: fellow scholars are not only interested in the final conclusion, but also in the various steps that were taken in the study. Researchers in the audience may also expect that characteristic elements of a research presentation are clearly marked (e.g. the research question, method, results, and discussion). Although scholars comparatively use the largest number of organisation techniques, with their informative purpose in mind it is noteworthy that about half the number of presentations do not contain a *partitio* and summary, and that six scholars do not announce the conclusion.

The politicians appear not to prefer explicitly marked organisation techniques: of the three types of speakers, they use the smallest number of announcements of the conclusion (five), *partitios* (one) and summaries (none). Furthermore, they apply about half as many transitions as the scholars. However, the politicians deploy the circle technique, which is not necessarily accompanied by a structure marker, more often than the scholars and the TED speakers. This seems to be more in agreement with their main purpose to persuade. The focus of the speech is probably not on structure alone; with the varied composition of their audience in mind, politicians may want to have a number of rhetorical irons in the fire.

In general, the frequency of organisation techniques used by TED speakers is in between that of the scholars and politicians (four *partitios*, seven announcements of the conclusion, four summaries, and an average use of transition sentences compared to the scholars and the politicians). This appears to be in agreement with their inspirational purpose, which is described as a mix of an informative and a persuasive objective (see Section 3.2.4). Of the organisation techniques they apply, the TED speakers most often selected the announcement of the conclusion (in almost half the number of talks). *Partitios* and summaries are relatively rare; they are applied in 25% of the talks. This might be a consequence of the focus on the 'idea worth spreading', which is often considered to be more important than emphasising the main points or steps leading to that idea.

No circle techniques were found in the corpus of TED talks. While that result suggests that TED speakers do not prefer to emphasise the structure by referring to an introductory example in the conclusion, such an interpretation should be nuanced. The presentation texts of the TED talks presented a few doubtful cases regarding the labelling of circle techniques. For example, in at least four TED talk texts, an example or sentence from the introduction was restated not only in the conclusion, but also in the core part of the speech. In these cases, such a repetitive phrase or example rather served as a theme or storyline throughout the presentation. This means that it could

not be labelled as a circle technique according to the (strict) definition that was used in the current study, which involves a specific case of repetition in the concluding part of the speech of information mentioned in the introduction only. At the same time, the lack of circle techniques does not mean that TED speakers in the corpus did not tie their stories together—to the contrary.²¹⁸

The results in table 3.7 show some general trends; in the following sections, the usage of organisational retention techniques on the level of style, content and formulation will be explained with examples from the analysed corpora.

3.4.2 Partitio: “tell them what you are going to tell them”

With a *partitio*, a preview of the presentation structure that is provided in the introduction, speakers can foreground the presentation’s key points (see Section 2.5.23). This allows listeners to prepare themselves for the contents and structure of the speech. In the three corpora, the *partitio* is preferred by scholars: in half the number of research presentations (eight) an overview of the presentation structure was detected. Four TED speakers used a *partitio* (a quarter of the corpus), whereas the politicians used the smallest number of *partitios* (only one was labelled).

The style and form of the *partitios* reflect the quantitative distribution: scholars use the most extensive *partitios*, TED speakers seem to prefer briefer *partitios* (although some scholars do so too), and the only *partitio* detected in the corpus of political speeches was rather short and did not contain clear references to the speech structure. Based on the examples, I will distinguish between two *partitio* variants: the informative and the indicative *partitio*.

Informative *partitio*

In the informative *partitios* that were found, the speaker explains the purpose of the presentation (*propositio*, see Section 2.5.25) and describes each key point in the order in which they will appear in the speech. Not only is the key point or argument mentioned, but the speaker also shares some important information related to these key points; sometimes, the speaker also motivates the chosen structure. These ingredients can make the informative *partitio* an extensive type of structure overview, as shown in example 3.1 (research presentation):

Example 3.1 – structure markers in *italics*

And *what I want to do today is* [uh] give an impression of the type of stylistic research I have in mind in the next few years [click]. In doing so, *I want to pose two central questions: the first is* how style can be

²¹⁸ An example of such a repetitive theme or main thread was found in TED Talk #12, which starts with a story about a suitcase full of books. This suitcase full of books appears to represent the character of introvert people (metaphorical use) and recurs as a theme in the core part and the conclusion of the speech. Therefore, it is not labelled as a circle technique (a specific form of repetition), but it could be qualified as another repetitive organisation strategy. This study did not take into account the broader retention technique or category ‘repetition’ (see Section 3.1.1).

systematically analysed, where I first sketch the [click b] context, [uh] how style, yes how style is analysed in the most important traditions in which speeches are an important object of study. And next [click b] I want to say something about my own approach, for which a hand-out is passed, has been passed round. Has every received it, in the back as well? Okay, because otherwise I have, here Connie, maybe you can hand out something, there are plenty. *And in the second part of my presentation I would like to* argue that style does not only lie within notable [uh] tropes and figures but also in unnoticed grammatical constructions and phenomena, that are underexposed in most style analyses [click b] and that I would like to illustrate with an example by Geert Wilders in last year's debate on Islamic activism, in which he called minister Vogelaar 'nuts'. (Research Presentation #9)²¹⁹

In this informative *partitio*, the speaker starts with the purpose statement of the presentation ("what I want to do today is..."). Next, the speaker moves into an explanation of a rather complex structure, which consists of two questions that are addressed in the presentation. These questions each have one or more sub-points or examples. The *partitio* is briefly interrupted by a remark on the handout that is being passed around. It is informative in the sense that it already provides insight into an important argument: "in the second part of my presentation I would like to argue that style does not only lie within notable tropes and figures but also in unnoticed grammatical constructions and phenomena, that are underexposed in most style analyses...". Example 3.1 is the longest *partitio* that was found in the corpus (185 words, in a total presentation length of 2592 words). The second longest *partitio*, which is almost as long as example 3.1, is an informative *partitio* from the Research Presentations Corpus as well.

However, not all informative *partitios* are extensive. Example 3.2 shows a more concise informative *partitio* from the corpus of TED talks.

Example 3.2 – structure markers in italics

What I'm going to do today is I'm going to show you what the research says about why we're all liars, how you can become a liespotter and

²¹⁹ Research Presentation #9: "En wat ik vandaag wil doen is [eeh] een indruk geven van het type stijlonderzoek wat ik voor ogen heb in de komende jaren [klik]. Daarbij wil ik twee vragen [eeh] centraal stellen: de eerste is hoe stijl systematisch kan worden geanalyseerd en daarbij schets ik eerst [klik b] context, [eeh] hoe stijl, hoe ja hoe stijl wordt geanalyseerd in de belangrijkste tradities waarbinnen [eeh] toespraken een belangrijk object van studie zijn. En vervolgens [klik b] wil ik iets zeggen over mijn eigen aanpak, daarvoor gaat een, is een hand-out rondgegaan. Heeft iedereen die gekregen, ook achterin? Oké, want ik heb anders, hier Connie, misschien kun jij nog iets doorgeven, er zijn er genoeg. En in het tweede deel van mijn presentatie wil ik graag betogen dat stijl niet alleen in opvallende [eeh] tropen en figuren zit, maar ook in onopvallende grammaticale constructies en verschijnselen, die in de meeste stijlanalyses onderbelicht blijven [klik b] en dat wil ik dan graag illustreren aan de hand van een voorbeeld van Geert Wilders in het debat over Islamitisch activisme van vorig jaar, waarin hij minister Vogelaar 'knettergek' noemde."

why you might want to go the extra mile and go from liespotting to truth seeking, and ultimately to trust building. (TED Talk #16)

This *partitio* contains 49 words, in which both the structure of the talk is exposed (three main points will be addressed) and the main argument is put forward (the final point: “why you...trust building”). A notable difference with example 3.1 is that the speaker uses metacommunication to a lesser extent. The informative *partitio* in example 3.2 lines up the main points that will be addressed without explicitly referring to specific parts of the presentation, which was done in example 3.1 (“in the second part of my presentation...”).

Indicative *partitio*

In the indicative *partitios*, speakers only refer to the main points in abstract, generic terms. Example 3.3 gives an impression of such an indicative *partitio*.²²⁰

Example 3.3 – structure markers in italics

[click] [uh] *I will briefly explain* the purpose of the project to you, and the theoretical perspectives we use, to tackle these actually, it is mostly about behaviour and communication about behaviour *and then I will tell you about* a research plan. [uh]... (Research Presentation #16)²²¹

Here, the speaker gives a more abstract overview of the speech content, only providing generic labels of the main points that will be addressed (“purpose”, “research plan”). For example, the speaker announces that the theoretical perspectives that will be discussed are “mainly about behaviour and communication about behaviour”, without specifically mentioning which perspectives will be used. Contrary to the informative *partitios* in examples 3.1 and 3.2, this structure overview does not give any insight into the purpose or main argument of the presentation itself. It does, however, prepare the audience for the general structure that it can expect in the remainder of the presentation.

Example 3.4, from the TED Talk Corpus, shows an indicative *partitio* that does reveal some more about the purpose of the talk, but that remains a bit more abstract about the structure of the talk:

²²⁰ The subtype of the indicative *partitio* shows a close resemblance with the elaborate transition, which will be discussed in Section 3.4.5. The main difference is that a *partitio*—by definition—is bound to the introduction of a speech and deals with the structure of the overall speech, whereas the elaborate transition sentence can be about any part in the core of the speech and does not necessarily cover the entire speech. Still, it requires insight into the speech structure and a demarcation of the introduction to clearly distinguish between these two variants of retention techniques.

²²¹ Research Presentation #16: “[klik] [Eeh] ik ga het doel van het project aan jullie kort uitleggen, en de theoretische invalshoeken die wij gebruiken, om die te tackelen eigenlijk, het gaat vooral over gedrag en communicatie over gedrag en dan ga ik jullie vertellen over een onderzoeksplan. [Eeh]...”

Example 3.4 – structure markers in italics

So I'm a researcher-storyteller, *and I'm going to talk to you today—* we're talking about expanding perception—*and so I want to talk to you and tell* some stories about a piece of my research that fundamentally expanded my perception and really actually changed the way that I live and love and work and parent. (TED Talk #4)

In example 3.4, the topic of the talk is addressed by the TED speaker in a side-note (“we’re talking about expanding perceptions”) and then she focuses on the fact that she will tell “some stories” that did indeed expand her perceptions. The listeners do not know how many stories they can expect and what these stories will be about, but they do already have an indication of the outcome of the stories. Still, the speaker uses rather abstract descriptions. The speaker appears to intentionally use a rather abstract *partitio*, as other elements of this *partitio* indicate that she has a high sense of structure: the speaker announces that she will tell “stories”, which is related to the reference to herself as a “researcher-storyteller”, and these stories are—not coincidentally—about the topic of the talk (“expanding perceptions”).

3.4.3 Announcement of the conclusion and summary: “tell them what you have told them”

“Tell them what you have told them”: this is a piece of advice that is regularly given in public-speaking textbooks to enhance retention. The conclusion is the part of a speech that is preferred by textbook authors for providing a recapitulation. Therefore, the summary is closely related to the announcement of the conclusion. In fact, in the research presentations and the TED talks, all summaries that were labelled were preceded by a structure marker that announced the conclusion. Therefore, the two techniques are both discussed in this section.

Announcement of the conclusion

At first sight the announcements of the conclusion that were found in the presentation texts do not vary a great deal. Because of its nature and purpose, the announcement of the conclusion is not the most eligible technique for stylistic variation; its aim is to clearly mark the final part of the presentation. Upon closer inspection, two variants can be distinguished, clear and vague announcements, which mainly differ in the decisiveness with which the speaker marks the start of the conclusion.

Clear announcement. Clear announcements of the conclusion leave no room for doubt: the meaning of the message is transparent, the audience knows what will happen. Scholars use the most explicit references such as ‘conclusion’ or ‘closing statement’. Examples 3.6a, b and c show ways in which scholars apply a clear structure marker for the final part of the presentation:

Examples 3.6 a, b and c

- a) And with that I have actually already reached my conclusion...
(Research Presentation #9)²²²
- b) So, what are the conclusions? (Research Presentation #12)²²³
- c) What do we conclude from this? (Research Presentation #13)²²⁴

These statements and questions are straightforward: the conclusion will be presented to the audience. The use of the explicit reference to the concluding part of the speech aligns with the format of research presentations, in which a (preliminary) conclusion of the study is usually drawn at the end of the talk. Affirmative statements and questions are both used as announcements.

The politicians more often refer to the act of “wrapping up” or “concluding” than to conclusion as a part of the speech. Example 3.7a shows a characteristic announcing marker that was found in the corpus of political speeches, whereas example 3.7b presents a more uncommon variant that was found.

Examples 3.7a and b

- a) Madam Speaker, I will wrap up. (Political Speech #2)²²⁵
- b) As I already stated, I can talk briefly and conclude swiftly: [...].
(Political Speech #15)²²⁶

Example 3.7a contain the characteristic address “Madam Speaker”, a convention in the parliamentary context, which sometimes even serves as a structure marker by itself (it indicates that the speaker will continue the speech, in particular after an interruption). Both announcements in examples 3.7a and b are clear about what to expect: the final words or a conclusion. Example 3.7b is perhaps the most creative version found of the announcement of the conclusion in all three the corpora—it deviates from the standard reference to “conclusion” or “wrap-up”.

Finally, TED speakers use their own characteristic phrases for announcing the conclusion, which are different from the ones that are used by the scholars and politicians. Examples 3.8a, b and c are three variants of the most common announcing marker used by the TED speakers:

Examples 3.8 a, b and c

- a) The last thing I'm going to leave you with is this. (TED Talk #2)
- b) The lesson I want to leave you with, from these data, is... (TED Talk #11)
- c) So, as a last thought, ... (TED Talk #6)

²²² Research Presentation #9: “En daarbij kom ik eigenlijk [klik] al aan mijn conclusie.”

²²³ Research Presentation#12: “Dus, wat zijn de conclusies?”

²²⁴ Research Presentation #13: “Wat concluderen we hieruit?”

²²⁵ Political Speech #2: “Voorzitter, ik rond af.”

²²⁶ Political Speech #15: “Ik zei het al: ik kan kort spreken en snel concluderen: [...].”

Of the seven announcements of the conclusion in the TED Talk Corpus, five are variants of the phrase “the last thing I would like to leave you with”.²²⁷ It is clear that the wrap-up will follow, but the speakers avoid mentioning “conclusion”. Instead, they less explicitly signal that they are about to wrap up than in examples 3.7a and b. They do so by indicating the “last thing” or “thought” and involve the audience by addressing it (“you”).

Vague announcement. Some announcements of the conclusion were less clearly formulated. All these cases were found in the Research Presentations Corpus, such as examples 3.9a, b and c:

Example 3.9a, b and c

- a) Well, then the bit more general conclusion of both experiments... (Research Presentation #5)²²⁸
- b) Well, yes and in conclusion [...] these studies are not I [uh] already started by saying that... (Research Presentation #7)²²⁹
- c) Good, well yes the conclusion... (Research Presentation #15)²³⁰

Examples 3.9a, b and c all contain references to the conclusion of the presentation, but these are accompanied by vague descriptors such as “bit more general”. Compared to examples 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8, the announcements in 3.9 appear to be less assertively formulated. More hesitantly phrased sentences such as “Good, well yes the conclusion” (3.9c) perhaps most strikingly contrast with the bold “The last thing I want to leave you with” used by TED speakers, which unambiguously manages the audience’s expectations. It must be noted that the transcription method of the research presentations differed from that of the presentation texts of the politicians and TED speakers; the research presentations were transcribed in a detailed, exact manner—resembling conversation analysis—which means that they are more likely to show hesitations and mispronunciations on the micro-level of formulation.

A special case in the category of announcements of the conclusion is the so-called ‘false’ announcement of the conclusion, found in Research Presentation #8. The speaker announced the conclusion with “I’ll briefly wrap up”, after which the conclusion still lasted for another 267 words—about 7% of the total speech length. The length of closing statements did not fulfil the promise of a “brief” wrap-up. Section 2.6.3 in the previous chapter discusses how textbook authors warn against the use of such a “postponed ending”.

²²⁷ The other two announcing statements are “I end now with...” and “Let me wrap up”. See Appendix B.5 for an overview of all the text fragments labelled in the three corpora.

²²⁸ Research Presentation #5: “Nou dan een beetje algemenere conclusie van beide experimenten.”

²²⁹ Research Presentation #7: “Nou ja en tot slot [...] deze deze onderzoeken staan niet ik [eeh] begon al met te zeggen dat...”

²³⁰ Research Presentation #15: “Goed, ja nou de conclusie.”

Summary

Unlike the announcement of the conclusion, the summary comes in a variety of flavours and appearances. Two main reference points are used to describe the various instances that were found: (1) the length of the summaries, and (2) their content, structure, and style.

Length. The summaries in the speech corpora considerably varied in length. Particularly the research presentations, which had a comparable overall length, contained both concise and elaborate summaries. To illustrate this, example 3.10 presents a brief summary, while example 3.11 shows the longest summary that was found.

Example 3.10– structure markers in *italics*

I will summarise what more we have found: a significant difference appears to exist between perception of understanding and real understanding, and clear relationships exist between perception of understanding, appreciation, tendency to discussion of and attitude towards safe sex. (Research Presentation #14)²³¹

Example 3.11 – structure markers in *italics*

What are our conclusions? Well, *first of all* that there is a match between the contents of the heuristics we used and the knowledge of the experts. [uh]. *Two aspects* are involved. *First, it is an [uh] advantage*, because at least it indicates that people who want to pay attention to [uh] ‘comprehensibility’ and ‘navigation’, that they can indeed use these heuristics to evaluate because these reasonably cover that knowledge, *but at the same time one of the advantages that the use of heuristics [uh] can have is* that they focus your [uh] attention to the [uh] newest state-of-the-art knowledge. And for this target group anyway, which were [uh] communication [uh] [uh] alumni, [uh] they apparently already had this knowledge in their own [uh] package so there it did not have the use of the [uh] heuristic content-wise not of added value. What happened here of course is that people [uh] [uh] saw the heuristic and then immediately had to work with it, and [uh] to learn how to work with it and efficiently do so, [uh] that probably cost time and [uh] in this case [uh] it worked out negatively, but that does not mean [uh] it should always be negative. Probably with more [uh] [uh] time to practise, with more [uh] experience, you can [uh] learn how to work with it more efficiently. [uh] *And [uh] also an [uh] aspect of what we saw here is that* there is a [uh] much stronger focus on the topic of heuristics. *So if you [uh] want to focus in ‘comprehensibility’, or really want [uh] want to evaluate one topic, then it can indeed help to work*

²³¹ Research Presentation #14: “Ik vat samen wat we verder gevonden hebben. Er blijkt een flink verschil tussen gepercipieerd begrip en werkelijk begrip, en er zijn duidelijke relaties tussen gepercipieerd begrip, waardering, geneigdheid tot discussie en attitude tegenover veilig vrijen.”

with such a heuristic, because you [uh] will not pay as much [uh] attention to other things. And those were my [uh] [uh] stories.
(Research Presentation #6)²³²

On the one hand, the summary in example 3.10 consists of a single sentence (albeit a long one). On the other hand, example 3.11 takes up a little over 10% of the overall speech length; it is the longest, but not the only elaborate summary in the corpus. Despite their difference in length, both examples contain features of a summary, such as an explicit attention marker and an occurrence in the conclusion. Textbooks authors do not offer a clear-cut advice on the summary's ideal (relative) length (see Section 2.5.3); some authors do point out that it should not be too redundant, which does not appear to concur with formulating an extensive summary.

Content, structure and style. What information do speakers include in the summary and how do they organise and formulate it? Examples 3.12 (research presentation) and 3.13 (TED talk) present summaries in which the speakers aim to focus on the main points of the presentation and present the content in a structured way (structure markers indicated in italics). These summaries can be qualified as informative, resembling the distinction between indicative and informative *partitios* in Section 3.4.2.

Example 3.12– structure markers in italics

And with that *I have actually [click] reached my conclusion. In my project, I do indeed want to look at how, right, how those various means*

²³²Research Presentation #6: “Wat zijn onze conclusies? Nou, ten eerste dat er een match is tussen de inhoud van de heuristieken die we hebben gebruikt en de kennis van de experts. [eeh] Dat heeft twee aspecten. Ten eerste is dat een [eeh] voordeel, omdat dat in ieder geval aangeeft dat mensen die willen letten op [eeh] ‘begrijpelijkheid’ en ‘navigatie’, dat zij dat zij inderdaad deze heuristieken kunnen gebruiken om daarmee te evalueren want dan dekken ze redelijk die kennis af, maar tegelijkertijd één van de voordelen die het gebruik van heuristiek [eeh] kan hebben is dat het je [eeh] aandacht vestigt op de meeste [eeh] nieuwe state-of-the-art kennis. En in ieder geval bij deze doelgroep, namelijk communicatie [eeh] [eeh] alumni, [eeh] die hadden blijkbaar die kennis al in hun eigen [eeh] pakket dus daar had het niet echt het gebruik van de [eeh] heuristiek qua inhoud niet echt een toegevoegde waarde. [eeh] Wat we ook zagen dus is die [eeh] daling in het aantal probleemdetecties in de heuristische evaluatie. [eeh] Wat hier natuurlijk gebeurde was dat mensen [eeh] [eeh] de heuristiek zagen en vervolgens d’r meteen mee moesten gaan werken, en [eeh] om zeg maar daarmee te leren werken en om dat efficiënt te gaan doen, [eeh] dat kostte waarschijnlijk tijd en [eeh] in dit geval [eeh] werkte dat negatief, maar dat wil niet zeggen [eeh] dat het altijd negatief hoeft te zijn. Waarschijnlijk met meer [eeh] [eeh] oefentijd, met meer [eeh] ervaring, kun je d’r waarschijnlijk efficiënter mee [eeh] leren werken. [eeh] En [eeh] ook een [eeh] aspect wat we hier zagen was dat er een [eeh] veel sterkere focus is op het onderwerp van de heuristiek. Dus als je [eeh] je echt wil richten op ‘begrijpelijkheid’, of echt wil [eeh] op één onderwerp wil gaan evalueren, dan kan het dus inderdaad helpen om met zo’n heuristiek te werken, omdat je dan zeg maar andere dingen [eeh] daar minder op gaat [eeh] letten. En dat waren mijn [eeh] [eeh] verhalen.”

of style together lead to a certain [uh] yes, to a certain image for a speaker. *Thus*, I want to do that [uh] with such a checklist, *because with that you can* obtain a broader perspective on stylistic means that can be relevant [uh] in your analysis. *Because that can bring you to*, to stylistic phenomena that upon first reading, or if you only look at notable aspects, then you also miss aspects, such as that complementation construction. Or well, actually the lack of it, well it is the question whether you find that if you only work top-down and not bottom-up. Well, *the second point [uh] that style also is in unnoticed linguistic elements [uh]*, I have tried to illustrate with [uh] complementation with Wilders, or more so the lack thereof. And more implicitly, *but an important point*, that stylistic analysis becomes particularly interesting by making a comparison. For example by [uh] comparing speakers with each other or by making a comparison with alternative formulations. (Research Presentation #9)²³³

The summary in example 3.12 reflects the structure of the *partitio* in the same presentation (see example 3.1 in Section 3.4.2), which (classical) rhetoricians would consider to be a clear and structured strategy. The speaker refers to two main points that were already announced in the *partitio* (e.g. “well the second point [uh] that style also has [uh] is in the unnoticeable linguistic elements, I have tried to illustrate with... [etc.]” and then briefly explains these.

While the summary in example 3.12 is rather extensive, example 3.13 from a TED speaker is both concise and informative:

Example 3.13

The last thing I'm going to leave you with is this. Tiny tweaks can lead to big changes. *So*, this is two minutes. Two minutes, two minutes, two minutes. Before you go into the next stressful evaluative situation, for two minutes, try doing this, in the elevator, in a bathroom stall, at your desk behind closed doors. That's what you want to do. Configure your brain to cope the best in that situation. Get your testosterone up. Get

²³³ Research Presentation #9: “En daarbij kom ik eigenlijk [klik] al aan mijn conclusie. Ik wil in mijn project juist ook gaan kijken naar hoe hè, hoe die verschillende stijlmiddelen gezamenlijk tot een bepaald [eeh] ja, tot een bepaald beeld leiden bij een spreker. Dat wil ik dus gaan doen [eeh] aan de hand van zo'n checklist, omdat je daardoor een breder perspectief kunt krijgen op stilistische middelen die relevant kunnen zijn [eeh] in je analyse. Omdat je daardoor ook op, op stilistische verschijnselen kunt komen die je bij eerste lezing, of als je alleen maar kijkt naar zaken die opvallen, dan dan mis je ook zaken, zoals die complementatieconstructie. Nou ja, juist het ontbreken daarvan, nou ja het is de vraag of je dat vindt als je als je alleen maar topdown werkt, en niet ook bottom-up. Nou het tweede punt [eeh] dat stijl ook in onopvallende linguïstische elementen heeft [eeh] zit, heb ik proberen te illustreren aan [eeh] complementatie bij Wilders, of juist het ontbreken daarvan. En meer impliciet, maar wel een belangrijk punt, denk ik, dat stijlanalyse met name interessant wordt door middel van een vergelijking te maken. Bijvoorbeeld door [eeh] sprekers met elkaar te vergelijken of door een vergelijking te maken met alternatieve formuleringen.”

your cortisol down. Don't leave that situation feeling like, oh, I didn't show them who I am. Leave that situation feeling like, I really feel like I got to say who I am and show who I am. (TED Talk #2)

This summary contains less explicit structure markers than example 3.12, apart from the opening announcement. Instead, the speaker appears to apply repetitive stylistic devices to point out the main points to the audience: “two minutes” is repeated three times, and the short, concise sentences have a similar grammatical structure (*parallelism*). The restated main points reflect the overall speech content.²³⁴ This way of summarising is in line with some textbook advice that was mentioned in Section 2.5.3: the summary should bring the main points to the attention of the audience without repeating the exact words used in the core part of the speech.²³⁵

Compared to the informative summaries in examples 3.12 and 3.13, examples 3.10 and 3.11 can be qualified as indicative summaries. The conciseness of example 3.10's summary probably makes it easier for the audience to digest, but at the same time leads to a more superficial restatement of the main points (what do the “significant difference” and the “clear relationships” that are mentioned actually mean?). Far from concise, example 3.11 is longest summary in found in all three the corpora.²³⁶ Its structure might leave the audience confused. At the start, the first conclusion is clearly announced with “first of all”, but immediately after it is divided into “two aspects”—this could be an example of over-structuring: would the hierarchy

²³⁴ The “two minutes” in example 3.13 is a repetitive structuring mechanism in TED talk #2, appearing in the introduction, core part and conclusion of the talk. It is an example of how some TED speakers apply storylines based on main threads or themes that run throughout the talk. This phenomenon was not systematically taken into account in this analysis (see Section 3.4.1).

²³⁵ Contrary to example 3.13, some TED speakers do rely on clear structure markers in their summary. An example can be found in TED Talk #9: “*Let me wrap up.* There is a mismatch between what science knows and what business does. Here is what science knows. *One:* Those 20th century rewards, those motivators we think are a natural part of business, do work, but only in a surprisingly narrow band of circumstances. *Two:* Those if-then rewards often destroy creativity. *Three:* The secret to high performance isn't rewards and punishments, but that unseen intrinsic drive—the drive to do things for their own sake. The drive to do things cause they matter.”

²³⁶ Based on example 3.11 alone, it might seem as of the speaker is not summarising the presentation but presenting the main results. However, the presentation text shows results that were already elaborately discussed prior to the text fragment shown in example 3.11. Therefore, the text fragment was considered a summary: it is part of the conclusion of the presentation and appears to summarise the main results, using structure markers. This fragment is also an example of a point of confusion that occurred during the analysis of research presentations: it is not always clear whether a speaker refers to the conclusion of the presentation or the main conclusion(s) of the research. In a research presentation, the research conclusions usually coincide with the concluding part of the presentation, but this is not necessarily the case (e.g. in case two or more studies are presented). In this analysis, a reference to ‘conclusion’ in the final part of the presentation was considered to be a reference to the concluding part of the presentation.

be clear to the audience? The remainder of the summary does not contain any explicit reference to (at least) a second conclusion. Instead, the speaker uses vague descriptions such as “another aspect that we saw was...”, which rather makes this summary an accumulation of various ‘aspects’.

3.4.4 Circle technique: close the loop

The circle technique was found in almost half the number of political speeches, which makes it the most frequently used organisation technique in the corpus of political speeches. In contrast, it is the least frequently used organisation technique used by scholars and TED speakers. The circle technique less overtly refers to the presentation’s structure, which sets it apart from the other selected organisation techniques that rely on more concrete signalling phrases. Still, the circle technique can be explicitly marked as well. The following examples show two main ways in which the circle technique is applied in the presentations: with and without a structure marker that refers to the introduction part of the speech.

Circle technique with structure marker

The clearest instances of circle techniques in the conclusion of a speech are exact repetitions of phrases used in the introduction, accompanied by a reference to the introduction or beginning of the speech, as shown in example 3.14 (political speech).

Example 3.14 – structure marker in *italics*

[introduction]: To the cabinet applies: it knows the price of everything, but of nothing its value. What are we fighting our way through the crisis for?

[...]

[conclusion]: Mr. Speaker, the Rutte cabinet knows the price of everything, but of nothing its value, *I said in the beginning*. (Political Speech #6)²³⁷

Here, the statement that was used in the introduction is repeated in the conclusion. On top of that, the phrase “I said in the beginning” reminds the audience of the fact that it is a repetition and therewith marks the circle technique. In example 3.14, the repeated phrase coincides with the start of the conclusion. The phrase seems to be carefully crafted: it contains a sharp contrast and almost reads like a paradox. This suggests that it is an intentional circle technique, which is used as a less explicit announcement of the conclusion; it is an alternative for phrases that refer to the concluding part of the presentation or the act of “wrapping up”.

Example 3.15 (research presentation) shows another circle technique that is clearly marked. It is one of the two circle techniques found in the corpus of research presentations.

²³⁷ Political Speech #6: “[introduction]: Voor het kabinet geldt: zij kent van alles de prijs, maar van niets de waarde. Waarvoor vechten wij ons door de crisis? [...] [conclusion]: Voorzitter. Het kabinet-Rutte kent van alles de prijs en van niets de waarde, zei ik in het begin.”

Example 3.15 – structure marker in italics

[introduction]: So in my project I focus on five methods, with which you can evaluate a website among the users. Today, I will not treat all five of them.

[...]

[conclusion]: Well, yes, and in conclusion... these studies do not I *[uh] already started by saying that* I have five methods [uh] in my PhD research. (Research Presentation #7)²³⁸

Other than in example 3.14, the circle technique in example 3.15 is not only accompanied by a structure marker (I already started by saying...), but is also preceded by an announcement of the conclusion (“in conclusion”): an accumulation of signals that indicate that the presentation is about to end. Compared to example 3.14, the repeated phrase is more abstract (“five methods”) and stylistically less polished.

Circle technique without structure marker

Not all circle techniques that were found in the corpus are marked with a reference to the opening part of the speech (e.g. “introduction”, “start” or “beginning”), as example 3.16 shows. The example is taken from a research presentation about a study into the influence of new media use on children’s language skills (spelling and grammar).

Example 3.16

[introduction] And we have carried out an online questionnaire [...], in which attitudes towards language [eh] [eh] related to new media were questioned. And I will not elaborate on that, but I would like to show a few results. For example, to demonstrate *why there is a question mark in the title of my presentation* [click]. *The parents don't worry as much as we had thought.*

[...]

[conclusion]: *But for now I tend to remove the question mark behind 'worried parents'; the parents are right not to feel concerned.* (Research Presentation #13)²³⁹

²³⁸ Research Presentation #7: “[introduction]: Nou ik kijk dus in mijn project naar vijf methoden, waarmee je de website kunt evalueren onder de gebruikers. [eeh] Ik ga ze vandaag niet alle vijf [eeh] behandelen [...] [conclusion]: Nou ja en tot slot [...] deze deze onderzoeken staan niet ik [eeh] begon al met te zeggen dat ik vijf methoden [eeh] in mijn promotieproject onderzoek.”

²³⁹ Research Presentation #13: “[introduction]: En we hebben een enquête via het web uitgevoerd [...], waarin attitudes over taalgebruik [eeh] [eeh] in relatie tot nieuwe media bevestigd werden. En ik ga daar niet heel uitgebreid op in, maar ik wil een paar resultaten laten zien. Onder andere om te demonstreren waarom er een vraagteken in de titel van mijn presentatie staat [klik], en het valt wel mee met die zorgen van die ouders. [...] [conclusion]: Maar vooralsnog ben ik geneigd om de vraagteken achter bezorgde ouders te gaan wegnemen, de ouders hebben gelijk dat ze zich niet bezorgd voelen.”

In the introduction, the speaker announces that he will demonstrate why there is a question mark in the presentation's title; as promised, he refers to that question mark in the conclusion, but he does so without mentioning the "beginning" or "introduction" of the presentation. This appears to be a reference that would have been picked up by attentive listeners, but it is questionable whether all audience members would have been aware of such a more subtle use of the circle technique.

Two other examples of such a more subtle reference to the introduction are found in the Political Speech Corpus (3.17 and 3.18):

Example 3.17

[introduction]: We are on the threshold of historical events. I belong to the generation that grew up in the shadow of the *Berlin wall*. No one could imagine that one day, this socialist wall would fall. But it fell!
[...]

[conclusion]: I will wrap up. [...]. We will continue to demolish our *Berlin Walls* and make The Netherlands a better place for, as we call them, Henk and Ingrid [the Freedom Party's equivalent for the Average Joe and Jane]. (Political Speech #7)²⁴⁰

Example 3.18

[introduction]: *Almost one million voters* have given us their confidence. *Nearly one million people voted for our ideals* and our ideas about the European Union, mass immigration, health care and safety. [...]

[conclusion]: On behalf of her *nearly one million voters* my party, the Party for Freedom, will pursue a tough opposition.
(Political Speech #11)²⁴¹

In the introduction of Political Speech #7 (example 3.17), the Freedom Party leader refers to the Berlin Wall as an example of a historical event that no one had imagined. He links it to the political situation at the time of the speech (2011), hinting at similar, seemingly unimaginable events that—according to him—were about to happen. In the conclusion the speaker stages the Berlin Wall once more, thereby implying that he has closed the circle. Political Speech #11 (example 3.18), again by the Freedom Party leader, contains the phrase "almost/nearly 1 million voters" only three times in the speech: twice in the introduction and once in the conclusion. By re-using this phrase

²⁴⁰ Political Speech #7: "[introduction] Wij staan aan de vooravond van historische gebeurtenissen. Ik ben nog van de generatie die opgroeide in de schaduw van de Berlijnse muur. Dat die socialistische muur op een dag zou vallen, kon niemand zich voorstellen. Maar hij viel! [...] [conclusion] Wij gaan door met het slopen van onze Berlijnse muren en het beter maken van Nederland voor, zoals wij ze noemen, Henk en Ingrid."

²⁴¹ Political Speech #11: "[introduction] Bijna 1 miljoen kiezers hebben ons hun vertrouwen gegeven. Bijna 1 miljoen mensen kozen voor onze idealen en onze ideeën over de Europese Unie, de massa-immigratie, de zorg en de veiligheid. [...] [conclusion] Mijn partij, de Partij voor de Vrijheid, zal namens haar bijna 1 miljoen kiezers een harde oppositie gaan voeren."

in the conclusion, the speaker sends a subtle signal to the audience that he is closing the loop —just as he did in Political Speech #7.

The references to the speech introduction in examples 3.17 and 3.18 are less explicit than the circle techniques with a structure marker, e.g. “as I said in the beginning”. A risk of using such less explicit and more subtle circle techniques is that they are not noticed by (a significant number of) listeners, which means that such a circle technique would be less effective as a structure marker. However, listeners that do pick up a subtle reference to the introduction might be pleased to have discovered such a ‘clue’, which could lead to a higher ‘sense of closure’ (see textbook advice in Section 2.5.13). By subtly reminding the listener of the speech structure, such variant of a circle technique could have both an organisational and an elaborative effect.

3.4.5 Transitions: connect the dots

The *partitio* prepares the audience for what is to come, and the summary brings the key points to mind once more. In between, speakers need to connect these key points. To do so, they can use transitions. In Section 3.1.2 the definition is provided of the ‘transition’ in this study, alongside some examples of transition types (cf. Fahnestock, 2011, pp. 384–386). The analysis of the three presentation corpora showed that speakers use quite a few variants of transition sentences, which I categorise in three main types: announcing the next topic(s), bridging topics and elaborate transition statements.

Announcing the next topic(s)

The most straightforward type of transition sentence is an announcement of the next topic. All three types of speakers in this study apply this type of transition. The announcing statements can be divided into three subtypes: the plain announcement, topic announcement and the structure announcement.

Plain announcement. Speakers who use plain announcements prepare the audience for the fact that a new (sub-)topic will be addressed, without sharing anything about its contents. Examples 3.19a, b and c present plain announcements from all three sub-corpora.

Examples 3.19a, b & c

- a) Well, let’s look at a [uh] a first [uh] [...] [click] fragment.
(Research Presentation #1)²⁴²
- b) Now I get to more important matters. (Political Speech #2)²⁴³
- c) And so here’s what I found. (TED Talk #4)

All three sentences announce a transition to a next topic, but they do not indicate that specific topic, nor do they refer to the previous topic. An audience that is aware of the presentation’s context, would probably be able to learn a bit more from these

²⁴² Research Presentation #1: “Nou, laten we eens naar een [eeh] een eerste [...] [klik] fragment [...] kijken.”

²⁴³ Political Speech #2: “Ik kom nu bij belangrijkere zaken.”

statements: in 3.19a the speaker probably had announced that fragments of a certain study object would be shown, example 3.19b suggests that the business that was discussed before was not that important, and example 3.19c probably elaborates on a study or question that the speaker discussed. Still, that context is needed to understand a possible connection between topics.

Example 3.20 (TED talk) shows a particular plain announcement, which can be called a ‘meta announcement’:

Example 3.20

So before I get started, what I'm going to do is I'm going to clarify my goal for you. (TED Talk #16)

Similar to the announcement of the conclusion, the speaker here anticipates an element of the presentation—in this case, the goal. The purpose and the conclusion appear to be such important parts of the speech that speakers occasionally prepare the audience for these elements.

Topic announcement. The topic announcement not only announces the next topic, but also mentions the topic. Examples 3.21a, b and c provide examples for all three the corpora.

Examples 3.21a, b & c – structure markers in italics

- a) And [uh], so *that is important in a minute for* the results [click]. [...] *The results.* We had to divide into... (Research Presentation #12)²⁴⁴
- b) *Then I get to speak about* the housing market. [...] Madam Speaker. *I continue with* the housing market. Mr. Pechtold was already looking ahead to it. I wanted to say something about it but I see he wants to make a comment. We are not getting anywhere like this. [...] *Yes, now I really get to* the housing market, Mr. Pechtold. (Political Speech #1)²⁴⁵
- c) But *I want to jump up to shallow water now and look at* some creatures that are positively amazing. (TED Talk #10)

In these examples, the speaker specifically announces the topic that will be addressed next. All three examples are also exemplary for their corpus. Example 3.21a presents a content announcement that is regularly used by scholars: the topic is announced (and vaguely connected to the previous topic), the speaker clicks to a next slide and repeats

²⁴⁴ Research Presentation #12: “En [eeh], dus dat is even van belang ook dadelijk voor de resultaten [klik]. [...] De resultaten. We moesten splitsen naar...”

²⁴⁵ Political Speech #1: “Dan kom ik te spreken over de woningmarkt. [...] Voorzitter. Ik ga verder met de woningmarkt. De heer Pechtold liep er al op vooruit. Ik wilde er iets over zeggen, maar ik zie dat hij een opmerking wil maken. Zo schiet het niet op. [...] Ja, dan kom ik toch een keer aan de woningmarkt, mijnheer Pechtold.”

the topic (“the results”), most probably because it is the slide title. The use of slides appears to stimulate such a (repetitive) content announcement. Example 3.21b also contains a repetitive content announcement; this time, the context of the parliamentary speech in a debate seems to force the speaker to repeat the topic three times, as he is interrupted twice. Finally, example 3.21c is exemplary for the TED corpus, as the speaker seems to have put effort into crafting a stylistically compelling transition. The analogy of “jumping into shallow water” corresponds to the speech topic of the underwater world; after that, the topic is announced (“some creatures that are positively amazing”).

Two more examples of topic announcements are worth mentioning. First, the topic can sometimes precede the actual transition sentence, as example 3.22 shows. This does not appear to be the preferred order for most speakers, but some speakers apply it more often than others.

Example 3.22 – structure marker in italics

And at the same time very subtle practices of positioning can occur.

And these are what we will look at [click].

(Research Presentation #10)²⁴⁶

Second, some topic announcements already introduce the audience to the main idea or conclusion of the following part of the presentation, as is done in example 3.23:

Example 3.23 – structure marker in italics

[...] *I want to tell you a little story about* being an impostor and feeling like I’m not supposed to be here. (TED Talk #2)

Here, the speaker anticipates the main thought of the anecdote she is about to share, making the content announcement a statement which illustrates the story. This way, the speaker already provides the audience with a framework to interpret the story; from a speaker’s perspective, that could be a way to guide the audience along the intended storyline in order to prevent alternative interpretations of the story.

Structuring announcement. The category of structuring announcements comprises transitions in which the speaker foregrounds the structure of the next part of the speech or key point. These structuring announcements differ from a *partitio* in the sense that they aim to structure more on a micro-scale, instead of the macro-scale of the entire presentation. Examples 3.24a, b and c present structuring announcements from the three corpora.

Examples 3.24a, b and c – structure markers in italics

a) How we studied this: we performed an experiment. *Prior to the experiment we went through two* [uh] preparatory phases. [uh]

²⁴⁶ Research Presentation #10: “En daarbij kan tegelijkertijd sprake zijn van hele subtiele positioneringspraktijken. En daar gaan we naar kijken [klik].”

The first phase, well then we finally get to step one [mild laughter].
(Research Presentation #15)²⁴⁷

- b) Mr. Speaker. *I move to the contents of the agreement, although I already discussed a lot in interruptions. On four crucial points my party fought like a lion: care for the elderly, safety, social security and mass immigration. First the care for the elderly.* (Political Speech #3)²⁴⁸
- c) *We know three things about intelligence. One, it's diverse. [...] And the third thing about intelligence is, it's distinct.* (TED talk #1)

Example 3.24a shows a structuring announcement from a research presentation, in which the scholar goes over several steps of the study's methodology. Here, the speaker uses a three-stage structure marker: first, the general topic "experiment" is announced, then it becomes clear that there were two preparatory steps, and finally the first of those steps will be addressed. In this particular case, the speaker appears to mock the use of this complex structure a bit; the statement "well now we get to step one, finally" sparks some laughter, possibly because fellow scholars in the audience recognise the convention of extensively describing the methodology.

Example 3.24b presents a structuring announcement from a political speech, in which the speaker clearly introduces four "crucial points". He does not explicitly state that these points will be addressed, but as soon as he embarks on explaining the first point, "care for the elderly", it will be clear to the audience he will do so. This example is closely related to the figure of *dinumeratio*, "a numbered list of the individual points to come" (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 385). According to Fahnestock, politicians are fond of this figure.

Example 3.24c depicts another way of using a structuring announcement, which seems to be more preferred by TED speakers. The first sentence introduces the fact that we know three "things". These aspects are not yet introduced. Then the first one is mentioned, which will probably put the audience on the right track: the three aspects of intelligence will be discussed one by one. By not announcing the three aspects up front, but by introducing them one after the other, the speaker may have intended to make the audience curious: what will be the next feature? In fact, in TED Talk #1 the speaker dwells on the second feature of intelligence for quite some time and includes an anecdote, possibly leaving some audience members wondering whether he will get to the third feature. He does get to that feature after some time, and apparently feels the need to remind the audience of the speech structure by

²⁴⁷ Research Presentation #15: "Hoe we dit onderzocht hebben: we hebben een experiment gedaan. [Eeh] Voorafgaand aan het experiment hebben we twee [eeh] voorbereidende fases doorlopen. [Eeh] De eerste fase, nou dan komen we toch bij stap één uiteindelijk [licht gelach]."

²⁴⁸ Political Speech #3: "Voorzitter. Ik ga naar de inhoud van het gedoogakkoord, hoewel ik veel al in interrupties heb gedaan. Op vier cruciale punten heeft mijn partij gevochten als een leeuw: de ouderenzorg, de veiligheid, de sociale zekerheid en de massa-immigratie. Eerst de ouderenzorg."

restating the topic of the enumeration: “and the third thing we know *about intelligence...*”.

Such a ‘suspense-building’ function of a structuring announcement is found more often in the TED Talk Corpus; example 3.25 presents another case:

Example 3.25

So let me give you a famous example, a famous failure and a famous success of the law of diffusion of innovation. (TED Talk #3)

The speaker does not yet reveal what the famous example, failure and success entail, but the audience can anticipate these three topics to be discussed. Some information is shared with the listeners, possibly enough to spark their curiosity, but the announcement remains rather abstract. Furthermore, the structuring announcement is stylistically well shaped: a list of three is used, including repetitive elements, which allegedly gives the audience an impression of completeness (cf. Atkinson, 2004). The transition in example 3.25 appears to be carefully prepared.

Bridging topics

“The figure which briefly recalls what has been said, and likewise sets forth what is to follow next”: that is the *transitio*, according to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (in Fahnestock, 2011, p. 386). The category of bridging topics resembles this description; it comprises transitions that connect the previous point to the next. By doing this, a speaker can emphasise the coherence in the storyline.²⁴⁹ Examples 3.26a and b contain bridging transitions from the corpora of research presentations and the political speeches. No such transitions were found in the TED Talk Corpus.

Examples 3.26a & b – structure markers in italics

- a) So, the preliminary conclusion is very simple: an adapted advertisement is not necessarily always more persuasive [...] *And the question of course is whether it indeed can be fed, but the answer to that is found with Elizabeth.*
[change of speakers: Piet hands over to Elizabeth] [click]
As for Piet's story, [uh] a meta-analysis was performed on [uh] quite a number of these [uh] studies in which research was conducted on the effectiveness or the effect of adapting value appeals. (Research Presentation #4)²⁵⁰

²⁴⁹ Andeweg and De Jong (2004, p. 163) discuss a similar technique: a ‘bridging device’ (‘bruggetje’ in Dutch). They refer to it as a ‘limited’ variant of the *partitio*, possibly because their study is aimed at introductory techniques.

²⁵⁰ Research Presentation #4: “De tussentijdse conclusie is dus heel eenvoudig: een aangepaste advertentie is niet noodzakelijk altijd overtuigender [...] En de vraag is natuurlijk of dat inderdaad kunnen verder voedsel geven, maar daarop is het antwoord te zoeken bij Elizabeth. [sprekerswisseling Piet en Elizabeth][klik] Aansluitend op het verhaal van [eeh] van Piet, [eeh] is er een [eeh] meta-analyse uitgevoerd over [eeh] een flink aantal van die [eeh]

- b) Mr. Speaker. I continue my argument. *I have just indicated why we considered it necessary to agree with that agreement. A similar breakthrough is needed on the housing market. That too takes political courage.* (Political Speech #6)²⁵¹

The bridging transition in example 3.26a most clearly refers to the previous point; the speaker gives a preliminary conclusion. Then, he connects a new question to this conclusion (using “obviously”) and indicates that his colleague will provide the answer, before giving the floor to her. Such a change in speakers is not uncommon in the Research Presentations Corpus, and it poses an additional challenge to the speakers. Here, the wrap-up of the previous part and the transition into the new part with a new speaker is carried out quite smoothly. The new speaker even adds “as for Piet’s story”, to stress the link between the two parts.

A less extensively formulated bridging transition is seen in example 3.26b, from the corpus of political speeches. The reference to the previous point is clearly marked by “I have just indicated...”. The speaker continues discussing the housing market, using the similarity with the previous issue as a subtle announcement of the new topic: “a similar breakthrough is needed on the housing market”. The audience will have to work out that “agreeing with the agreement” apparently was a “breakthrough” in order to understand this as a smooth transition.

Elaborate transitions (forecasting statements)

The final type of transitions is the elaborate transition or forecasting statement. This category was only found in the corpus of research presentations. It is related to the figure of *praeparatio*, a “forecasting statement [...] where the rhetor not only announces the coming sections but also explains ahead of time their purpose and sometimes even their intended effect” (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 385). Examples 3.27a and b are elaborate transitions that are used by scholars.

Examples 3.27a & b – structure markers in italics

- a) [uh] What I notice when you [uh] look at literature [uh] in which eye tracking occurs in this context, is that it does not focus as much on problems that occur during collection and [uh] analyses of the material. [uh] *Later, I would like to elaborate on a few problems that I ran into myself and also, yes, especially show the importance of more discussion on [uh] yes problems that [uh] can arise and solutions we can find for them.* [click] [...] [uh] *First I want to tell a bit more about the combination between eye tracking and think-*

studies waarin onderzoek is verricht naar de effectiviteit of het effect van aanpassing van waarde-appèls.”

²⁵¹ Political Speech #6: “Voorzitter. Ik vervolg mijn betoog. Ik heb zo-even aangegeven waarom wij het noodzakelijk vonden om met dat akkoord akkoord te gaan. Eenzelfde doorbraak is nodig op de woningmarkt. Ook dat vergt politieke moed.”

aloud method, because I also use this combination in my research.
(Research Presentation #7)²⁵²

- b) Okay, *today I will tell you a bit more about* this phase, the beta phase. [click] It is endlessly captivating, and I will [laughter] highlight two validations. [uh] Which ones, *you will see later*. And we ask ourselves three important questions: is the proposed procedure, as recorded in gamma, is it feasible? Is it efficient? And, does that procedure enable us to [uh] test criteria? Can we properly work with it? (Research Presentation #8)²⁵³

Both of the examples are almost like a *partitio*; however, they are not part of the introduction of the presentation. They do not refer to the overall speech, but present an overview of a specific topic treated in the core of the presentation.²⁵⁴ In both of the examples, speakers also forecast a topic or key point that will be addressed later in the speech: “Later, I would like to elaborate on a few problems...” (3.27a) and “Which ones, you will see later” (3.27b). This way, they already signal the importance of these upcoming topics and their connection with the forthcoming topic. After their forecasting statement, both speakers indicate what they will discuss first. Similar to example 3.24a, which contains a structuring announcement, examples 3.27a and b reflect the need for scholars to extensively structure the presentation, which is possibly related to their explanations of research methodologies and results.

3.5 Results elaboration techniques

How do speakers apply anecdotes and questions in their presentations and speeches? This section answers that question by discussing the frequency of these elaboration techniques in Section 3.5.1, before zooming in on the use of anecdotes in Section 3.5.2 and on the application of questions in Section 3.5.3.

²⁵² Research Presentation #7: “[eeh] Wat mij opvalt als je [eeh] literatuur bekijkt [eeh] waarin eyetracking in deze context [eeh] voorkomt, is dat er heel weinig ingegaan wordt op [eeh] problemen die zich voordoen tijdens afnames en [eeh] tijdens [eeh] analyses van het materiaal. [eeh] Ik wil straks graag ingaan op een aantal problemen waar ik zelf tegenaan ben gelopen en ook ja, vooral het belang laten zien *va dat er meer discussie komt over [eeh] ja problemen die zich [eeh] voor kunnen doen en oplossingen die we daarvoor kunnen vinden. [klik] [...] [eeh] Eerst wil ik iets meer vertellen over de combinatie tussen eyetracking en de hardopdenkmethode, omdat ik die combinatie ook in mijn eigen onderzoek [eeh] gebruik.”

²⁵³ Research Presentation #8: “Oké, vandaag ga ik jullie iets meer vertellen over deze fase, de bèta-fase. [klik] Die is eindeloos boeiend, en ik ga daar [gelach] twee validaties uitlichten. [Eeh] Je zult straks zien welke. En we stellen ons drie belangrijke vragen: is de voorgestelde procedure, zoals die is vastgelegd in gamma, is die werkbaar? Is ze efficiënt? En, stelt die procedure ons in staat [eeh] om criteria af te toetsen? Kunnen we d'r ook goed mee aan de slag?”

²⁵⁴ It can be argued that the *partitio* is a specific type of transition, namely the (elaborate) transition that usually constitutes the final part of the speech's introduction and forecasts structure on the level of the main parts of a speech (higher-order structure).

3.5.1 Results: frequency of anecdotes and questions

Table 3.8 shows the frequency of anecdotes and the different types of questions analysed within the two corpora.²⁵⁵ Since the length of the corpora differs, the frequencies of the rhetorical techniques are expressed in several ways: the total occurrence, the average per presentation/speech and the average occurrence per thousand words are presented. The standard deviation is presented in parentheses.

Table 3.8: Frequency of anecdotes and questions (accumulated and per rhetorical technique).

Elaborative retention techniques	Scholars (N=16)	Politicians (N=16)	TED speakers (N=16)
Anecdote			
Total occurrences	5	12	22
Average per presentation / speech (Sd)	0.3 (0.6)	0.8 (1.3)	1.4 (1.7)
Average length in words (Sd)	81 (35)	103 (47)	256 (195)
Percentage (%) of the speech length (Sd)	1.8 (2.8)	1.1 (2.4)	8.2 (9.1)
Average occurrence per 1000 words	0.1	0.3	0.5
Question: total			
Total occurrences	192	143	282
Average per presentation / speech (Sd)	12.0 (6.5)	8.9 (9.0)	17.6 (13.5)
Average occurrence per 1000 words	4.0	3.5	6.2
Rhetorical question			
Total occurrences	20	39	117
Average per presentation / speech (Sd)	1.25 (1.57)	2.44 (3.85)	7.3 (4.9)
Average occurrence per 1000 words	0.5	1.0	2.6
Quaestio			
Total occurrences	35	46	63
Average per presentation / speech (Sd)	2.2 (1.6)	2.9 (3.3)	3.9 (4.0)
Average occurrence per 1000 words	0.7	1.1	1.4
Subiectio			
Total occurrences	69	17	90
Average per presentation / speech (Sd)	4.31 (3.40)	1.06 (1.39)	5.6 (5.1)
Average occurrence per 1000 words	1.4	0.4	2.0
Direct / literal question			
Total occurrences	68	41	12
Average per presentation / speech (Sd)	4.3 (3.1)	2.6 (2.3)	0.8 (2.8)
Average occurrence per 1000 words	1.4	1.0	0.3

²⁵⁵ The frequencies in table 3.8 serve as a point of departure to explore differences between the three types of speakers. The results have not been subjected to a detailed statistical analysis; the reason for this is that too many variables play a part to properly interpret results of such an analysis (see the characteristics of each corpus described in Section 3.2).

In general, TED speakers use the two elaboration techniques most frequently. They use more and on average longer anecdotes than politicians and researchers; this difference is most clear when the anecdote length is expressed in percentage of speech length (on average 8.2% of the TED talks compared to 1.8% and 1.2 % of the research presentations and political speeches, respectively). Scholars use the smallest number of and shortest anecdotes (five anecdotes with an average length of 81 words). Politicians are in between with a number of twelve anecdotes; they do apply much shorter anecdotes than TED speakers, though (103 words on average, compared to 256 words for the TED speakers).

Questions are also most frequently applied by *TED speakers*, most notably accounted for by their frequent use of rhetorical questions (117 in total) compared to the scholars and politicians (twenty and thirty-nine, respectively). Table 3.7 also shows that TED speakers use more *subiectios* and *quaestios* than scholars and politicians. Although TED speakers overall most often use questions, they apply the smallest number of direct or literal questions (twelve, compared to sixty-eight by scholars and forty-one by politicians).

Scholars select direct or literal questions more often than other question types. This can be explained by their regular use of research questions and the more informal context of research presentations (a relatively small audience attends the conference presentations). Scholars are least fond of the rhetorical questions and *quaestios*. Politicians least often apply questions, mainly due to the small number of *subiectios* that they use compared to the scholars and TED speakers; for the other three question types, the politicians obtain average scores (neither the largest nor the smallest number).

The number of elaboration figures applied by the three types of speakers to some extent reflects their main purposes and the rhetorical situation. *TED speakers* intend to inspire and therefore try to involve the audience as much as possible with rhetorical questions, *quaestios* and the most extensive anecdotes. From this perspective, it is remarkable they use the smallest number of direct questions. Possibly, this is because TED talks are usually held in a more theatrical setting to a relatively large audience, which makes involving the audience with a direct question more challenging.

Scholars mostly focus on organisation and structure in their informative presentations (see Section 3.4); this might account for the fact that they have less attention for the two elaboration techniques. The question types they regularly use (direct question and *subiectio*) can be related to the content or organisation of the presentation, while the rhetorical question and *quaestio* seem to appeal more to pathos.

Politicians could perhaps have been expected to use more anecdotes and questions, based on their persuasive purpose and the fact they used the smallest number of organisation techniques. The relatively small number of *subiectios* used by politicians can be explained by the fact that this question type is regularly used as an organisational device (see Section 3.5.3). The anecdote is a relatively complex

technique which can contain quite a few ingredients; it requires some time to properly develop in a speech. The rhetorical situation of the politicians, an annual debate with limited speaking time, might have prompted them to opt for other (elaboration) techniques instead.

When interpreting the use of elaboration techniques, the preference of individual speakers for specific techniques needs to be taken into account. Table 3.7 shows a large standard deviation in the usage of various techniques within the corpora. For example, the Political Speech Corpus contains an average of 8.9 words per speech, with a standard deviation of 9.0. This suggests that some politicians regularly use questions, whereas other political speakers do not tend to do so. This can be due to individual preferences of speakers, but the context may also explain such a difference between speakers: opposition party leaders are more likely to ask questions about the governmental policy than coalition party leaders. Furthermore, the difference in speech length due to a variety in speaking time might play a role (see Section 3.2.5). Similarly, some TED speakers frequently use anecdotes (e.g. five anecdotes were found in TED Talk #1), whereas other TED speakers do not use any anecdotes. The fact that these techniques are not evenly distributed over speakers makes clear that genre definitions are not set in stone, and that the role of individual speakers in the rhetorical situation should not be underestimated.

3.5.2 Anecdotes: vivid and relevant stories

The quantitative results showed that TED speakers used more and significantly longer anecdotes than the politicians and scholars. This section zooms in on linguistic and stylistic features of the anecdotes found in the corpora, based on three features that textbook authors regularly attribute to the anecdote (see Section 2.5.2): narrative elements, vividness and relevance.²⁵⁶ Vividness and relevance were not considered to be distinctive features for determining anecdotes in the presentation texts (see Section 3.1.3), but they are used in this section to interpret variances in language and style in the selected examples from the presentation corpora.

Narrative elements

The presence of a main character, the perspective from which the story is told, a development in events: these elements all indicate the presence of a narrative structure. Examples 3.28 (TED talk), 3.29 (political speech) and 3.30 (research

²⁵⁶ Two characteristics are not taken into account in this section: ‘brevity’ is already touched upon in Section 3.4.1, as this section showed that the anecdotes of the TED speakers were the longest, on average; ‘humour’ was considered to be too complex to discuss as a particular characteristic, as it would require a more thorough analysis based on humour theories and the audience’s response. Still, humoristic elements in the examples are occasionally highlighted in this section as an additional noteworthy feature. Vividness and relevance were not included as indicators to recognise anecdotes in the presentation texts, but were considered valuable characteristics in the qualitative descriptions of the techniques in this section. The vividness and relevance have been evaluated by comparing the examples of anecdotes that were found in the three corpora of speeches.

presentation) present anecdotes from the speech corpora that contain these narrative elements in a different manner.

Example 3.28

So at the end of my first year at Harvard, a student who had not talked in class the entire semester, who I had said, “Look, you’ve gotta participate or else you’re going to fail”, came into my office. I really didn’t know her at all. She came in totally defeated, and she said, “I’m not supposed to be here”.

And that was the moment for me. Because two things happened. One was that I realized, oh my gosh, I don’t feel like that anymore. I don’t feel that anymore, but she does, and I get that feeling. And the second was, she is supposed to be here! Like, she can fake it, she can become it. So I was like, “Yes, you are! You are supposed to be here! And tomorrow you’re going to fake it, you’re going to make yourself powerful, and, you know—[Applause] “And you’re going to go into the classroom, and you are going to give the best comment ever.” You know? And she gave the best comment ever, and people turned around and were like, oh my God, I didn’t even notice her sitting there. [Laughter]

She comes back to me months later, and I realized that she had not just faked it till she made it, she had actually faked it till she became it. So she had changed. And so I want to say to you, don’t fake it till you make it. Fake it till you become it. Do it enough until you actually become it and internalize. (TED Talk #2)

Example 3.29

Even in the summer, I was available to exchange thoughts. Suddenly I found myself at the beach with a colleague, instead of with my children. I was well prepared for the meeting with colleague Samsom [Labour party leader]. I had used enough sunscreen to avoid getting red. It was a much discussed walk on the beach, without any results. As far as I’m concerned: no hard feelings. (Political Speech #16)²⁵⁷

Example 3.30

Standardisation is always applied for a number of reasons and most of these reasons have nothing to do with language but all with economy. For example that cost-saving element, the clear brand image they want to show, the fact that they control the communication activity are all important things the marketing people keep themselves occupied with. A characteristic example to illustrate this: this morning on the train to

²⁵⁷ Political Speech #16: “Zelfs in de zomer was ik beschikbaar voor overleg. Daar zat ik ineens met een collega aan het strand in plaats van met mijn kinderen. Ik had mij op de ontmoeting met collega Samsom goed voorbereid. Ik had mij goed ingesmeerd om niet rood te worden. Het is een veelbesproken strandwandeling geworden, zonder resultaat. Wat mij betreft: zand erover.”

Amsterdam I stopped at the familiar train stations, you'll know them. At the first station in Roosendaal I see this Coca Cola advertisement with the well-known Santa Claus and the perfectly understandable message "Merry Christmas". So Coca Cola does not need to adapt its message, they keep it nice and standard. (Research Presentation #4)²⁵⁸

In the anecdotes that were found, the speaker usually is the main character; hence, the anecdotes are often told from a first-person perspective. This also goes for the examples 3.28, 3.29 and 3.30. However, they differ in the ways in which the narratives unfold and in which the main characters are described.

Example 3.28 from the TED Talk Corpus is longest and most detailed, which means that the audience has more time to become familiar with the story. The main character is the speaker herself in her position as a lecturer of social psychology. The audience learns more about the main character than in the other two examples, as the TED speaker explains her emotions and the motivation for her actions in the situation described (e.g. "One was that I realized, oh my gosh, I don't feel like that anymore. I don't feel that anymore, but she does, and I get that feeling"). Moreover, example 3.28 contains a second character that the audience might recognise or familiarise with—the student. Interestingly enough, in the story the speaker identifies herself with the student—she recognises the student's situation and realises that she has now moved on. The anecdote describes how the student is going through a process that the speaker or main character has experienced before, which adds an additional layer to the identification process. Furthermore, the anecdote shows a narrative development: there is a point of departure, where the student feels insecure and "defeated", which culminates into a final situation in which she is more powerful and secure. This is combined with an indication of time: in between the "end of my first year at Harvard" and "months later", the student's transformation has taken place. The location is also mentioned, albeit not described in detail: Harvard, the speaker's or lecturer's office, and the classroom.

Example 3.29 from the Political Speech Corpus is not as long as example 3.28, which means that the audience does not have that much time to identify with the main character. However, perhaps this anecdote by the Liberal Democrats' party leader about his willingness to help out the coalition parties does not have to be that lengthy: the party leader is well-known in this public-speaking context and he can assume that the audience, both the colleagues in parliament and the electorate, is familiar with him as a main character. In the speech text, the change to the first-person

²⁵⁸ Research Presentation #14: "Standaardiseren gebeurt altijd om een aantal redenen en de meeste van die redenen hebben niks met taal te maken maar wel met economie. Bijvoorbeeld dat kostenbesparend element, het duidelijke merkimage wat men wil uitdragen, het feit dat men controle heeft over de communicatieactiviteit, dat zijn de belangrijke dingen waar marketingmensen mee bezig zijn. Zuivere voorbeeld om dit te illustreren: vanmorgen op de trein naar Amsterdam stop ik uiteraard in de bekende stations. Bij 't allereerste in Roosendaal zie ik daar een affiche staan van Coca-Cola met daarop de oude Kerstman met daarop de perfect begrijpelijke boodschap 'Merry Christmas'. Dus Coca-Cola heeft het niet nodig om zijn boodschap aan te passen, zij houden 't lekker standaard."

perspective marks the start of the anecdote; from a more general discussion about ‘we, the party’ and ‘you, the government/other parties’ prior to this anecdote, the presentation text switches to ‘I’ in the example. Furthermore, a narrative unfolds in which a setting is painted (the beach), an event is described (a meeting) and a wrap-up sentence is used. Next to that, it is humoristic in the Dutch political context (“avoid getting red” refers to not becoming too closely related to the Labour party; “no hard feelings” in the Dutch text literally reads “let’s cover it with sand”, referring to the context of a walk on the beach). Together with the clear presence of narrative elements and its brevity, example 3.29 is a well-crafted, rich example of an anecdote.

Finally, example 3.30 from the research presentations contains a clear change to a first-person perspective (“this morning... I stopped...”), but provides little detail about the main character. This gives the audience less opportunity to get acquainted with the speaker; however, just as with the political example (3.30), the audience (colleagues or fellow researchers) might already experience a higher perceived similarity with the main character in the first place. Still, based on the anecdote text itself, the political example of example 3.29 appears to contain more features that could incite elaboration, for example via identification and transportation processes (for more on these processes, see footnote 202 in Section 3.1.3). Regarding other narrative elements, example 3.30 contains an indication of time („this morning“) and a location the audience can easily imagine: a train, and a railway station in The Netherlands. However, it hardly contains a narrative development: the main character stops at several train stations, and at a particular train station his attention is drawn to an advertisement. The story development in examples 3.28 and 3.29 therefore appear to be more suited to draw an audience to the narrative.

The speech corpora also contain anecdotes in which the speaker is not (consistently) the main character—see examples 3.31 (TED talk) and 3.32 (research presentation).

Example 3.31

In 1999, in the state of Israel, a man began hiccupping. And this was one of those cases that went on and on. He tried everything his friends suggested. Nothing seemed to help. Days went by. At a certain point, the man, still hiccupping, had sex with his wife. And lo and behold, the hiccups went away. He told his doctor, who published a case report in a Canadian medical journal under the title, “Sexual Intercourse as a Potential Treatment for Intractable Hiccups.” (TED Talk #10)

Example 3.32

Behaviour predicts behaviour. Everyone who takes the elevator to the office in the morning will probably know the phenomenon that in the rare occasion you need to be on another floor, nine out of ten times you still get off on your own floor by accident. Or just the fact that whenever I am in the elevator, I automatically push that button, okay, in the Erasmus building it is outside of the elevator, that button of the floor I normally go to (mild laughter), because only seeing these buttons already evokes the response “eight”, and there you are again, whereas

you actually had to go to, well, the fifth. After a few weeks, a habit has been ingrained. (Research Presentation #16)²⁵⁹

In example 3.31, the main character is an unknown man. The audience does become familiar with this character all too well, which might hinder the identification process. However, the narrative development is very clearly described: there is a place, time, and a sequence of events in which a problem is solved and a peculiar conclusion is drawn.

In example 3.32 it is more difficult to distinguish a main character. The fragment moves from a more general “everyone” in the first sentence via a first-person perspective to a second-person perspective (“you”) in the end. This could hinder the audience from perceiving similarity with a main character, although audience members might recognise themselves in the situation portrayed. The narrative development is less clear than in example 3.32; however, it can be argued that this short story shows some sort of development from an opening scene to a new or changed situation. Still, clear temporal indicators are absent, the story is not that detailed, and a reference to a specific location (Erasmus building) that might be known to the audience is only provided halfway through the anecdote. Example 3.32 could be deemed as an example of a more abstract anecdote, which less explicitly meets (some of) the anecdote features that are described in Section 3.1.3. As a side-note, it illustrates the analytical challenges raters come across when trying to detect anecdotes in presentation texts: example 3.32 is somewhere in the grey area between ‘anecdote’ and ‘(personal) example’.

Vividness

Vivid narratives are often associated with concrete and detailed descriptions (see Section 2.5.2). The anecdotes in the TED corpus contain the most vivid stylistic and linguistic elements. On average, they are longer than the anecdotes by scholars and politicians, which suggests that the TED speakers take more time to share details and paint a lively picture. Examples of vivid anecdotes are also found in the political corpus, whereas the research presentations contain anecdotes that are somewhat less lively. Examples 3.33 (TED talk), 3.34 (political speech) and 3.35 (research presentation) illustrate differences in vividness between the corpora.

Example 3.33

So, I'll start with this: a couple years ago, an event planner called me because I was going to do a speaking event. And she called, and she

²⁵⁹ Research Presentation #16: “Gedrag voorspelt gedrag. Iedereen die met de lift iedere ochtend naar z'n kantoor gaat, zal ook wel het verschijnsel kennen dat als je een keer op een andere verdieping moet zijn, dat je negen van de tien keer toch per ongeluk op je eigen verdieping uitstapt. Of gewoon het feit, als ik in de lift sta, dan druk ik automatisch op dat knopje, nou ja, in het Erasmusgebouw buiten de lift dan, op het knopje van de verdieping waar je altijd heen moet [licht gelach], want gewoon het zien van die knopjes, roept de respons op: ‘acht’, en daar sta je weer terwijl je eigenlijk, nou naar de vijfde moest. [Eeh] Gewoonte slijt in na een aantal weken.”

said, "I'm really struggling with how to write about you on the little flyer." And I thought, "Well, what's the struggle?" And she said, "Well, I saw you speak, and I'm going to call you a researcher, I think, but I'm afraid if I call you a researcher, no one will come, because they'll think you're boring and irrelevant". [Laughter] And I was like, "Okay". And she said, "But the thing I liked about your talk is you're a storyteller. So I think what I'll do is just call you a storyteller." And of course, the academic, insecure part of me was like, "You're going to call me a what?" And she said, "I'm going to call you a storyteller." And I was like, "Why not magic pixie?" [Laughter] I was like, "Let me think about this for a second." I tried to call deep on my courage. And I thought, you know, I am a storyteller. I'm a qualitative researcher. I collect stories; that's what I do. And maybe stories are just data with a soul. And maybe I'm just a storyteller. And so I said, "You know what? Why don't you just say I'm a researcher-storyteller." And she went, "Ha ha. There's no such thing." (Laughter)

So I'm a researcher-storyteller, and I'm going to talk to you today -- we're talking about expanding perception -- and so I want to talk to you and tell some stories about a piece of my research that fundamentally expanded my perception and really actually changed the way that I live and love and work and parent. (TED Talk #4)

Example 3.34

Last Saturday I visited Heerenveen [town in the north of The Netherlands]. A man opens the door. His daughter is standing behind him. An animated conversation unfolds, because he keeps track of everything: Politiek 24 [a political TV channel], the news bulletins, the newspapers, but they scare him. You know, he says, at night I cannot even bear to watch Pauw and Witteman [late night talk show], fearing another politician being interviewed...

[Hilarity]

You neither? I cannot bear to watch fearing another politician is on who is telling everything needs to change. I don't want it anymore, he says. I don't want everything to change, I just want it to become better. I understood him so well. Seldom were expectations about what politics can realise so much at odds with the opportunities we actually have. (Political Speech #14)²⁶⁰

²⁶⁰ Political Speech #14: "Een man doet open. Zij dochter staat achter hem. Er volgt een geanimeerd gesprek, want hij volgt alles, Politiek 24, het journaal, de kranten, maar hij wordt er bang van. Weet u, zegt hij, ik durf 's avonds niet eens meer naar Pauw & Witteman [late night talkshow] te kijken, uit angst dat er weer een politicus zit... [Hilariteit] Jullie ook niet? Ik durf niet meer te kijken uit angst dat er weer een politicus zit die zegt dat het allemaal anders moet. Ik wil het niet meer, zegt hij. Ik wil niet dat alles verandert; ik wil gewoon dat het beter wordt. Ik snapte hem zo goed. Zelden stonden de verwachtingen over wat de politiek tot stand kan brengen zo op gespannen voet met de mogelijkheden die wij eigenlijk hebben."

Example 3.35

And I think it is a beautiful sequence of turns. I showed it to my students once and I told them I [uh] had printed this and hung it over my desk, because to me it was a kind of little poem, a poetic chord, in fact [mild laughter], and they looked very puzzled and surprised, as if to say: “she is completely professionally deformed”. But I think it is a very beautiful [uh] [uh], beautiful little poem, actually. Well, I added that I have also hung the ordinary pictures of my kids over my desk [laughter], and then I slowly started to turn into a normal [uh] person again [laughter]. But it is a [uh], yeah, sequence of turns that is needed to eventually mutually reach such a, yeah, mutual understanding. (Research Presentation #10)²⁶¹

Example 3.33 shows an anecdote in which the TED speaker—a lecturer in social work and writer—recounts a telephone conversation she had. She uses direct speech, which could increase proximity: the audience might experience the anecdote as if overhearing the conversation. The speaker taps into an informal style register, close to everyday conversation, with phrases such as “I was like...”, and “and she went...”. Example 3.34 from the political corpus also contains direct speech. While campaigning, the Labour Party leader (the speaker) engages in an animated conversation with a man. The man is quoted, which can give the audience the feeling that they are witnessing the talk. In fact, there is an audience response: the members of parliament self-consciously feel addressed by the man’s confession. The Labour party leader briefly interrupts the quote to address the audience and make fun of it (“you neither?”), after which he picks up where he left off. The description of the situation has triggered a response from the audience—at least the direct audience in parliament.

In example 3.35, from the research presentations, the speaker describes a conversation she, as a lecturer, had with her students. Although some of the descriptions in this anecdote are quite detailed and set the scene, such as the “puzzled and surprised” looks of the students, she rather uses indirect speech to describe her conversation with the students (“I told them...”, and “I added that...”). This could make the audience feel less directly involved, compared to the anecdotes from the TED speaker and politician (examples 3.33 and 3.34, respectively).

²⁶¹ Research Presentation #10: “En ik vind het een hele mooie reeks van beurten. Ik liet het een keer aan studenten zien, en vertelde daarbij [eeh] dat ik dit had uitgeprint en boven mijn bureau had gehangen omdat ik het een soort gedichtje vond, een mooi poëtisch akkoord in feite [licht gelach], en ze keken daar heel wazig en verbaasd bij, van ‘die is helemaal beroepsgedeformeerd’ [gelach]. Maar ik vind het een heel mooi [eeh] [eeh], mooi gedichtje eigenlijk. Nou, ik heb hen toen daarbij verteld dat ik ook gewoon foto’s van mijn kinderen boven mijn bureau heb hangen [gelach], toen werd ik weer een wat normaler [eeh] mens [gelach]. Maar het is een [eeh], ja, een opeenvolging van beurten die nodig zijn om uiteindelijk gezamenlijk tot zo’n, ja tot gezamenlijk begrip te komen.”

More than in the other two corpora, the TED corpus contains anecdotes that are more closely related to the concepts of *evidentia* and *enargeia*, in which a situation is depicted vividly to the audience's mind's eye. This is illustrated by example 3.36 from a TED talk given by a well-known author.

Example 3.36

I had this encounter recently where I met the extraordinary American poet Ruth Stone, who's now in her 90s, but she's been a poet her entire life and she told me that when she was growing up in rural Virginia, she would be out working in the fields, and she said she would feel and hear a poem coming at her from over the landscape. And she said it was like a thunderous train of air. And it would come barreling down at her over the landscape. And she felt it coming, because it would shake the earth under her feet. She knew that she had only one thing to do at that point, and that was to, in her words, "run like hell." And she would run like hell to the house and she would be getting chased by this poem, and the whole deal was that she had to get to a piece of paper and a pencil fast enough so that when it thundered through her, she could collect it and grab it on the page. (TED Talk #16)

Here, the speaker paints a scene with words, using metaphors and imagery to try and make the audience part of the dramatic situation. She carefully chooses words that express emotions, experiences and movement. Such linguistic and stylistic features are in line with the "craftsmanship" and "stylistic techniques" that Green and Donahue (2009, p. 246) relate to enhanced transportation into the narrative. The speaker is a novelist and storytelling can be seen as her profession, which makes her a professional speaker in this respect.

Relevance

A speaker can stress the relevance of an anecdote by clearly embedding it in the speech or even by explicitly connecting it to the speech purpose or main message. In the TED corpus the anecdote's relevance appears to be mostly explicitly emphasised. The political speeches and research presentations also contain anecdotes of which the relevance is less clearly indicated.

The anecdotes in the TED talks often appear to illustrate key concepts or even the presentation's purpose, and the speaker usually emphasises the link between anecdote and key point explicitly. In example 3.28, the TED speaker uses the anecdote to stress the key message of her talk and explicitly stresses its importance by addressing the audience: "And so I want to say to you, don't fake it till you make it. Fake it till you become it." In example 3.33, the TED speaker links the anecdote about being a "researcher-storyteller" in the beginning of her talk to the purpose statement: "so I'm a researcher-storyteller, and I'm going to talk to you today [...] and so I want to talk to you and tell some stories about...". From a retention perspective, it is valuable to see that anecdotes are linked to both apparent main presentation messages and sub-points of the presentation (see Appendix B.2 for all presentation texts).

Examples 3.30 and 3.35 represent anecdotes from the Research Presentation Corpus which end with a final sentence that (more or less) expresses the relevance of the anecdote. In example 3.30, first the relevance is emphasised by the announcement “to illustrate this” and the final sentence ties the advertisement example to the principle of standardisation. In example 3.35 the final sentence could be interpreted as if the anecdote illustrates the concept “mutual understanding” mentioned, although the anecdote itself is more about the researcher’s admiration of the sequence of turns and the awkward yet funny situation that followed in class. For both these examples, the concepts illustrated do not appear to be key points but rather sub-points of the presentation.

Examples 3.29 and 3.34 show two anecdotes from the Political Speech Corpus that end with clear wrap-up statements. In example 3.29, the anecdote seems to underline a minor point in the overall speech: no hard feelings about the missed opportunities to form a coalition. Although the Liberal Democrats’ party leader uses these missed opportunities in his speech to confront the Labour Party (who were then part of the government) with the current government policy, it is not explicitly connected to that issue. Example 3.34 the final sentence expresses the relevance of the anecdote. The speaker transitions to the content part of the story, using the anecdote to emphasise the paradox politicians seemed to find themselves in. Still, they do not stress the significance of the anecdote as explicitly as the TED speakers do in examples 3.28 and 3.33.

Whether the relevance of the anecdote in the next example (3.37) would have been clear to the audience is questionable, although it appears that the speaker (Liberal Party leader) intends to underline the relevance in the final sentence:

Example 3.37

A childhood memory: when I was still at school, there were these lovely stickers, often stuck on a wooden shoe, with the slogan “Nuclear energy? No, thanks”. After thirty years, that strange taboo is gone too. (Political Speech #1)²⁶²

The Liberal Party supported nuclear energy at the time the speech was given. However, a listener who does not yet have a firm opinion on nuclear energy, probably part of the indirect audience (electorate), might be transported into the story by the first-person perspective and, following the story, agree with the slogan. Only in the wrap-up sentence does the speaker imply that he does not agree with this slogan, but he not explicitly distance himself—the ‘damage’ could have already been done by then. Although it is unclear if such an effect would indeed occur, the anecdote from example 3.37 at least raises the question whether it would affect retention differently

²⁶² Political Speech #1: “Toch een stukje jeugdsentiment: toen ik op school zat, had je van die mooie stickers, vaak op een klomp geplakt, met de tekst "kernenergie. Nee, bedankt!" Na dertig jaar is ook dat rare taboe weg.”

than an anecdote with a longer narrative in which the relevance is less ambiguously stated (e.g. example 3.34).

3.5.3 Questions: making the audience think

Section 3.5.1 showed that scholars, politicians and TED speakers preferred different question types. Do these preferences also reveal themselves in stylistic features of the presentations and the speeches? This section highlights the characteristic use of each question type by the three groups of speakers.

Rhetorical question

Two main variants of the rhetorical question are found in the corpora. The first variant can be described as a statement that takes the form of a question, often used to express emotions (see the description of the rhetorical question in table 3.2). Most of the times, an answer is implied in the question. In both the TED Talk Corpus and the Political Speech Corpus such questions are deployed, as examples 3.38a, b and c show.

Examples 3.38a, b & c

- a) How illustrative is it that the titles of the coalition agreement's twelve chapters the words environment, nature, sustainability and green do not surface? (Political Speech #4)²⁶³
- b) How many brain scientists have the opportunity to study their own brain from the inside out? (TED Talk #8)
- c) What kind of economic engine would keep churning if we believed that not getting what we want could make us just as happy as getting it? (TED Talk #3)

The speakers did not intend the questions in examples 3.38a, b and c to be answered. Instead, the questions already imply an answer that the audience might already have thought about. Example 3.38a could be read as: "the coalition agreement does not pay enough attention to environmental and sustainability matters", just as example 3.38b implies the statement that "few brain scientists have the opportunity to study their own brain from the inside out". The TED speaker who is quoted in example 3.38c does not expect that listeners propose a specific type of economic engine in response to the question.

Speakers might opt for the question form here because of the elaborative function: an audience will think of the most probable answer and in doing so might process the information mentioned in the question more thoroughly. Furthermore, the question form allows a speaker to use a more indirect approach compared to an affirmative statement, possibly to be less easily held accountable for its contents.

The second type of rhetorical question that regularly occurs takes up the form of a statement followed by a question tag, such as "isn't it" or "you know". In the Dutch

²⁶³ Political Speech #4: "Hoe tekenend is het dat in de titels van de twaalf hoofdstukken van het regeerakkoord de woorden milieu, natuur, duurzaamheid en groen niet zijn komen bovendrijven?"

corpora (scholars and politicians) the common question tags used are “ja” and “hè” (“right” and “isn’t it”). Examples 3.39 a, b and c present rhetorical questions that contain question tags:

Examples 3.39a, b & c

- a) So we are not saying that the old is very bad, and are not saying that the new is very good either, right? (Research Presentation #12)²⁶⁴
- b) But you like it there with the CDA [Christian Democrats], don’t you? (Political Speech #8)²⁶⁵
- c) And it’s significant, isn’t it? (TED Talk #16)

While the question in example 3.38 appears to amplify a statement, the question tags in examples 3.39a, b and c appear to mitigate the boldness of the preceding affirmative statement; more so than the examples in 3.38, they suggest the possibility of a dialogue or a response from the audience. The function of question tags as used in 3.39 a, b and c could be to “indicate rapport and solidarity” or mimic a conversational style (cf. Frank, 1990, p. 730).

Notably, the rhetorical question variant that included question tags comprises a rather large portion of the rhetorical questions in the TED Talk Corpus: 44 of the 117 rhetorical questions contain such tags. In the TED corpus, these question tags are sometimes transcribed as a stand-alone sentences following an affirmative sentence (e.g. “right”? “you know?”). The scholars use tags in almost half the number of rhetorical questions found (nine out of twenty). However, in the Political Speech Corpus only one question contained a tag. A possible explanation for the difference in frequency of question tags between the three corpora is the level of formality of the presentation context. TED talks and research presentations can be considered to be less formal than parliamentary speeches, which might be expressed in the use of ‘informal’ question tags.

Quaestio

The *quaestios* (multiple questions in a row) that are found in the three corpora can roughly be divided into two categories. The first type of *quaestios* seems to be situational or context-related and informative. *Quaestios* of this type usually do not consist of many rhetorical questions; instead, they are often composed of direct questions, as examples 3.40 a and b show:

²⁶⁴ Research Presentation #12: “En wij zeggen dus niet dat het oude heel slecht is, en wij zeggen ook niet dat het nieuwe heel goed is, ja?”

²⁶⁵ Political Speech #8: “Maar het bevalt goed daar bij het CDA, hè?”

Example 3.40a & b

- a) Is the proposed procedure, as recorded in gamma, is it feasible? Is it efficient? And, does that procedure enable us to [uh] test criteria? Can we properly work with it? (Research Presentation #8)²⁶⁶
- b) Prime minister, do you therewith quantify the text in your agreement and of this morning about the very substantial decrease as fifty percent? It seems to be Wilders's demand, but is it also an objective for minister Leers? (Political Speech #4)²⁶⁷

Example 3.40a is characteristic for the use of *quaestios* in research presentations. In such a case, the scholar usually poses a few questions in a row about various aspects of the research topic (in 3.40a about the procedure followed); often these aspects are dealt with step by step afterwards. Example 3.40b shows two direct questions in a political speech, in this case directed at the prime-minister. In the annual policy debates, such factual questions of the political party leaders to members of the cabinet regularly occur. Ministers and state secretaries often respond to these direct questions in a contribution that takes place in a later stage of the debate.

The second type of *quaestios* is in line with Fahnestock's description of a *quaestio*, being a "pileup of rhetorical questions" (2011, p. 299). Such a series of questions is aimed more at expressing and emphasising emotions, therewith creating a pathos effect. Examples 3.41a and b show such *quaestios*:

Example 3.41a & b

- a) What country will she live in? How will we make our money? What kind of companies will we work in? How will we care for the sick and elderly? How do we actually educate our children? What will our energy supply look like? In short: what do we all want to achieve these next few years? (Political Speech #14)²⁶⁸
- b) Aren't you afraid you're never going to have any success? Aren't you afraid the humiliation of rejection will kill you? Aren't you afraid that you're going to work your whole life at this craft and nothing's ever going to come of it and you're going to die on a scrap heap of broken dreams with your mouth filled with bitter ash of failure? (TED Talk #16)

²⁶⁶ Research Presentation #8: "Is de voorgestelde procedure, zoals die is vastgelegd in gamma, is die werkbaar? Is ze efficiënt? En, stelt die procedure ons in staat [eeh] om criteria af te toetsen? Kunnen we d'r ook goed mee aan de slag?"

²⁶⁷ Political Speech #4: "Minister-president, kwantificeert u daarmee de tekst in uw akkoord en van vanochtend over de zeer substantiële daling als 50%? Het lijkt een eis van Wilders, maar is het ook een resultaatsverplichting voor minister Leers?"

²⁶⁸ Political Speech #14: "In wat voor land leeft zij straks? Waar verdienen wij ons geld mee? In wat voor bedrijven werken we? Hoe zorgen we voor zieken en ouderen? Hoe onderwijzen wij eigenlijk onze kinderen? Hoe ziet onze energievoorziening eruit? Kortom: waar werken we met z'n allen eigenlijk naartoe in de komende jaren?"

In both 3.41a and b, the *quaestio* appears to be an enumeration, a list of a few points, formulated in a question format, possibly to emphasise the urgency of the matters or underline the point the speaker wants to make.

In example 3.41a, the Labour Party leader raises the main point that he wants to address in the final question: what to achieve in the near future? All the questions that lead towards this summarising final question indicate policy issues that need to be dealt with in the short term. A key message that could be derived from this *quaestio* is: much work on various policy terrains lies ahead of us. Questions seem to be particularly suitable to address such hypothetical situations; the urgency of the situation is emphasised by the repetitive question format. Furthermore, the speaker apparently enhances the pathos effect in the first question, in which he refers to a girl that he introduced in an anecdote earlier in his speech (“she” in example 3.41a). Of the three corpora, the politicians appear most eager to exploit the possible emotional effect of the *quaestio* and explore its limits, for example in terms of length. Several lengthy *quaestios* are found in the Political Speech Corpus; the longest of those covers about 8% of the total speech length and is used by the Labour Party leader, who is quoted in example 3.41a. The Labour Party leader is not alone in his preference for lengthy *quaestios*: the Liberal Democrats’ party leader also regularly applies this strategy.

Example 3.41b from the TED corpus seems to serve a similar purpose. In her talk about creativity, the TED speaker uses this *quaestio* to exemplify questions that she receives about her profession as a novelist. The questions in 3.41b are about the fear of not being creative or not having inspiration. Instead of listing these points, she uses three questions to build a climax: the negative consequences go from rather abstract (never having any success) to a quite dramatic and vivid image of the future (dying on a “scrap heap of broken dreams with your mouth filled with bitter ash of failure”). Organised in the form of a *quaestio*, the combination of various rhetorical figures such as ‘metaphor’, ‘climax’ and *anaphora* (“aren’t you afraid...”) contributes to a maximal pathos effect.

Subiectio

The question type *subiectio*, in which a speaker poses a question and immediately answers it, is often used as an organising device to introduce the following key point or topic in the presentation. This way, the *subiectio* can also be seen as a special form of the transition (see Section 3.4.5). The *subiectio* seems to play a dual role here: the elaborative effect of the question type might strengthen its organising purpose. Examples 3.42 a, b and c contain such organising questions:

Example 3.42a, b & c

- a) How have we approached this [uh] research. [uh] We have used sixteen [uh] *pro [uh] communication experts [uh] [uh] for this study [...] (Research Presentation #6)²⁶⁹
- b) How can you become prime minister of all Dutch citizens this way? I name a few examples. First of all it is the question whether the percentages named by Wilders are the translation of the substantial decrease that was mentioned in the governmental agreement this morning. (Political Speech #4)²⁷⁰
- c) But the next question, of course, is, can power posing for a few minutes really change your life in meaningful ways? This is in the lab, it's this little task, it's just a couple of minutes. Where can you actually apply this? Which we cared about, of course. And so we think where you want to use this is evaluative situations, like social threat situations. (TED Talk #2)

Example 3.42a shows the way in which scholars regularly use *subiectios*. Instead of an announcing statement, e.g. “let’s look at the approach that we used”, the question “how have we approached this study?” is posed. After that, the speaker continues explaining the details of the approach. Sometimes, short organising questions that can be considered as interjections are used, such as in Research Presentation #5: “And then? Then, we tested comprehension”. Omitting this question would still make the content comprehensible. So, the question might serve both an organising and an elaborative function: the audience is prepared for the fact that a next step will be explained and is engaged—listeners might ask themselves what that next step would be.

Example 3.42b also shows that these transitioning questions can have both an organising and an elaborative function. The Labour party leader questions the right-wing Freedom Party leader’s abilities and ambitions to become prime minister. He does that first by asking a rhetorical question: “How can you become prime minister of all Dutch citizens this way?” The implicit answer is: “You cannot.” The audience needs the context to come up with this answer, as the Labour Party leader provides examples to support the idea that the Freedom Party leader cannot become prime minister. Here, the audience is asked to think along and formulate the answer to the question, in order to understand the following sequence in the speech.

Finally, example 3.42c shows the way in which a TED speaker uses two organising questions and a postponed answer, probably intended to stimulate the audience to think along and wonder what the next topic will be. The first question

²⁶⁹ Research Presentation #6: “Hoe hebben we dit [eeh] onderzoek aangepakt? [eeh] We hebben zestien [eeh] *proe [eeh] communicatie-experts [eeh] [eeh] gebruikt [eeh] voor dit onderzoek [...]”

²⁷⁰ Political Speech # 4: “Hoe kun je op deze wijze premier van alle Nederlanders worden? Ik noem een paar voorbeelden. Allereerst is het de vraag of de door Wilders genoemde percentages de vertaling zijn van de substantiële daling waarover in het regeerakkoord wordt gesproken of van de zeer substantiële daling die vanmorgen in de regeringsverklaring genoemd werd.”

explicitly uses structure markers: “the next question”. An answer is not yet provided; in fact, the speaker seems to present possible counterarguments to the applicability of her study: “This is in the lab, it’s this little task, it’s just a couple of minutes”. The answer to following question, “where can you apply this”, is postponed for a moment as well; first the audience is reassured and only then the topic is introduced: evaluative, social threat situations. These are then further discussed. Again, the speaker appears to use the elaborative function of questions here to create suspense and to organise the story on a micro-level.

The political speeches and TED talks also contained *subiectios* that did not appear to be aimed at emphasising the structure of the talk on a higher order level, but were rather used to exemplify a specific point—see example 3.43:

Example 3.43 (*subiectio* is in italics)

Sometimes you can give somebody all the facts and figures, and they say, “I know what all the facts and details say, but it just doesn't feel right.” *Why would we use that verb, it doesn't “feel” right? Because the part of the brain that controls decision-making doesn't control language.* The best we can muster up is, “I don't know. It just doesn't feel right”. (TED Talk #3)

Here, the question-answer structure of the *subiectio* does not appear to mark a new topic or key point in the speech structure, but rather appears to establish an elaborative effect regarding this topic: instead of an affirmative formulation (e.g. “we use that verb because...”) the speaker phrases a question, which might engage the audience to think about the answer.

Direct question

The final category of questions is formed by the direct questions. The clearest direct questions are those in which the speaker would like to receive an immediate response from the audience or a specific individual or group. Examples 3.44a-d show such questions directly aimed at the audience or a specific person:

Example 3.44a, b c & d

- a) I don't know if you share that experience? (Research Presentation #3)²⁷¹
- b) Has everyone received it [handout], so in the back as well? (Research Presentation #9)²⁷²
- c) Is the cabinet prepared to make sure that the police will be working more in the tough neighbourhoods where street terror occurs? (Political Speech #7)²⁷³
- d) Who here has been hurt in an intimate relationship? (TED talk #8)

²⁷¹ Research Presentation #3: “Ik weet niet of jullie die ervaring delen?” (Research presentation #3)

²⁷² Research Presentation #9: “Heeft iedereen die gekregen, ook achterin?”

²⁷³ Political Speech #7: “Is het kabinet bereid om ervoor te zorgen dat de politie meer gaat werken in de moeilijke wijken waar de straatterreur voorkomt?”

The questions in example 3.44a-d are aimed at directly engaging the audience, which could arguably have quite an elaborative effect: audience members do not only need to think of a possible answer, but are also asked to respond verbally or physically (e.g. by raising hands). This way, the direct question can be a means for establishing audience participation and connecting to the audience (see Sections 2.5.16 and 2.5.11).

Of these four direct questions, example 3.44d is phrased most directly and aimed at eliciting audience response. Example 3.44a is phrased more indirectly with the opening phrase “I don’t know if...”, which might make it more difficult for an audience to assess whether the question is actually meant to be responded to. Example 3.44c, from a political speech, is directly aimed at the cabinet; therefore, it might not seem relevant for a broader audience (electorate) at first glance. Still, the question also implicitly contains a point of view (“the police should work more in tough neighbourhoods where street terror occurs”)—from the perspective of the broader audience, it could also be interpreted as a rhetorical question disguised as a direct question. Example 3.44b shows that a direct question can sometimes be very practical and unrelated to the speech contents.

It should be noted that the context of the presentation corpora is also relevant for assessing the use of direct questions. The research presentations contain questions relevant to the study presented, such as the main research question and secondary research questions, and questions taken from research materials such as questionnaires. These questions are often quoted and follow from the nature of the contents and conventions of such academic presentations. The same goes for the political speeches: it is common practice in parliamentary debates, and certainly in the annual policy debates, to address the cabinet or prime minister—a question aimed at specific individuals, which is not often found in the other corpora. Although the TED talks contain the smallest number of direct questions of the three corpora, these questions are all aimed at the audience members that are present and phrased in such a way that they aim to maximise audience interaction. Still, it must be noted that almost all of these direct questions are found within a single TED talk (#16), in which the speaker apparently preferred this type of question.

3.6 Discussion

This chapter aims to answer the following question:

How do speakers apply advised organisation and elaboration retention techniques in public-speaking practice?

This question is answered from two perspectives. First, Section 3.6.1 discusses the relationship between the usage of retention techniques in public-speaking practice and the textbook advice that is described in chapter 2. Second, the characteristic use of these techniques by the types of speakers in this study, scholars, politicians and TED

speakers, is addressed in Section 3.6.2. Finally, Section 3.6.3 contains a reflection on the method and the next step in this study, connecting it to chapter 4.

3.6.1 Public-speaking practice compared to textbook advice

How do speakers use the recommended retention techniques in practice? Quantitatively, two observations stand out. Firstly, the rhetorical situation seems to determine the preference for organisational or elaborative retention techniques. Roughly speaking, scholars applied more organisation techniques, whereas politicians and TED speakers appeared to prefer the elaboration techniques (this general conclusion may not apply to some individual techniques). Secondly, the frequently advised retention techniques in public-speaking textbooks are used less frequently than expected in the presentation corpora.

The summary and anecdote, both very frequently advised retention techniques in the textbooks, are examples of this second observation. According to some textbook authors, the summary is strongly connected to informative speeches. Indeed, the analysis of the presentation corpora shows that scholars use summaries most often. However, it also shows that half the number of scholars analysed did not use a summary. And even though the politicians mainly aim at persuading their audience, it is remarkable they did not use any summary at all. The anecdote then: this technique is not specifically connected to a presentation genre by textbook authors. For a technique that can be used multiple times in a presentation, only the TED speakers apply it on average more than once per speech. Based on textbook advice, a higher frequency of these retention techniques in the presentation texts had been expected.

Qualitatively, the most important observation is the large variety in content, structure and style of the retention techniques in the presentations in this study. The rare examples in public-speaking textbooks of the way in which techniques are applied usually reflect ‘good’ speaking practice according to textbook authors. In practice, the analysis has shown a multitude of ways in which techniques can be applied in a speech. Three examples: first, summaries were found to be very concise on the one hand (two to three sentences), and quite long on the other hand (occasionally over 10% of the speech’s length). Some contained a few structure markers, whereas in other summaries the structure was explicitly indicated; sometimes, stylistically repetitive techniques were used instead of structure markers. Second, some anecdotes were rich, vivid stories that appear relevant to the overall speech topic, whereas other anecdotes only contained a few, rather vaguely described narrative elements. Third, different types of transitions were found, varying from mere announcements of the next topic and bridging sentences that show the connection between two topics to elaborate structure previews and preliminary conclusions.

Not all examples that were found in practice would ‘tick all the boxes’ to become a textbook example. Still, the mere existence of such a variety in appearance could be emphasised more clearly in textbook advice. Textbooks not often discuss the role of the rhetorical situation (speaker, purpose, audience) in considering a certain

variant and formulation of a technique, for instance whether to focus more on structure or on style. Furthermore, the question is whether variants of the same technique cause different retention effects. The answer to this question is needed to find out whether textbooks should indeed pay more attention to a variety of structures and formulations of a single technique.

3.6.2 Organisation and elaboration techniques by professional speakers and speaking professionals

The speaking professionals (scholars) and the professional speakers (politicians and, to a lesser extent, TED speakers) appear to select different retention techniques. How did they apply the organisation and elaboration techniques and to what extent can the rhetorical situation explain the choices that they made?

Scholars

The scholars in this study mainly selected organisational retention techniques, which is in agreement with the informative purpose of their presentations. They use more *partitios*, transitions, announcements of the conclusion and summaries than the politicians and TED speakers.

In doing so, they stick to the often advised maxim ‘tell them what you are going to tell them—tell them—tell them what you have told them’. In five out of eight cases an overview of the presentation’s structure (*partitio*) in a research presentation is followed by an explicitly marked summary in the conclusion. Furthermore, in formulating these organisation techniques the scholars appeared to use structure markers more than the politicians and TED speakers. The circle technique, which is not always accompanied by a structure marker, was less popular among scholars. In other words: it seems to be characteristic for scholars to use retention techniques that explicitly, almost didactically, emphasise the overall structure of a presentation. That said, it is remarkable that almost half the number of research presentations do not contain a *partitio* and a summary. This means that some researchers in these presentations with an informative purpose might have overlooked or purposely ignored an opportunity to influence retention.

The scholars do not apply elaborative retention techniques as much as the politicians and TED speakers. They used the smallest number of anecdotes, which did not always contain clear narrative elements, were quite short and could have been more vividly phrased compared to anecdotes that were found in the other corpora. Of the question types, scholars preferred the *subiectio*, which is often used for structural purposes next to its elaborative function.

The rhetorical situation probably influenced scholars’ preference for organisation techniques as a main retention strategy. In the use of *partitios*, explicit transitions and summaries it appeared that scholars often need to explain various stages or steps in a sometimes complex research methodology, which prompts them to use many structure markers. In some cases, sheer time pressure may have caused these ‘omissions’: transcripts show that some speakers had problems to end their presentations within the time allotted. This could be a reflection of the scholars being speaking professionals: they might not always have been able to meticulously prepare

their talk and the stakes might not be that high, speaking to a small group of (familiar) colleagues. This could also explain why a complex technique such as the anecdote, which requires some craftsmanship in style and story composition, is not applied that often and, if used, usually only contains a few of the anecdote ingredients that are recommended in textbooks.

Politicians

The politicians appeared to opt for retention techniques that are in agreement with their main purpose: persuading the audience; they preferred elaboration techniques over organisation techniques, although more emphasis on elaboration could have been expected.

Regarding the elaboration techniques, politicians used questions mostly in an elaborative way appealing to existing knowledge, for example by using a *quaestio* (series of questions). The *subiectio*, which is also often used with a structural purpose, is not a favourite question type of politicians. Anecdotes are found regularly, but perhaps not as often as expected: on average less than one anecdote per speech. Some anecdotes contain all the advised features and seem to be well prepared, but the corpus of political speeches also contains a few anecdotes that do not meet all the criteria set. Regarding organisation techniques, politicians are the champions of the circle technique. They use it more frequently than the scholars and TED speakers. This technique not so much emphasises the overall speech structure, but it has a less explicit structure effect, providing a 'sense of closure'. Politicians are not too fond of the "tell them" adage, so it seems: only one *partitio* was found and, remarkably, no summary at all was labelled. They used the smallest number of explicit transitions, although some politicians did apply some extensive structuring announcements in the core of their speech.

The rhetorical situation could have determined the politicians' decision to deploy more elaboration techniques than (explicit) organisation techniques. Next to getting their message across, an important purpose for political speakers is to guard and shape their image (ethos). The use of *partitios*, transition sentences and summaries could have a retention effect, but at the same time politicians might considered these techniques too 'didactic' and straightforward. Possibly, this negative side effect that might hinder their persuasive purpose, could be a reason for politicians to steer clear from retention techniques that explicitly emphasise the speech structure and opt for other retention techniques not involved in this study's analysis, such as metaphors and repetition figures (e.g. the anaphora). Although the politicians prefer elaboration techniques, they could have focused more on the anecdote; being professional speakers, they could invest in a narrative that can influence persuasion, retention and possibly enhance ethos. The context of the studied political speeches (annual parliamentary debates in The Netherlands) could be a reason for such anecdote use: the speeches were held in parliament to a direct audience of fellow members of parliament, who had the possibility of interrupting the speaker. These features of the rhetorical situation could stand in the way of the application of more

complex and lengthy techniques that require some preparatory work, such as the anecdote.²⁷⁴

TED speakers

The TED speakers tend to select retention techniques that are in agreement with their purpose to inspire (a mix of informative and persuasive elements). They focus mostly on elaboration techniques, using most anecdotes and questions of the three types of speakers analysed. They also stand out in the way they execute these techniques: TED speakers tend to spend time on crafting stylistically compelling phrases.

If the politicians are champions of the circle technique, then the TED speakers are real anecdote adepts. This elaborative retention technique is their favourite, which is not only supported by the number of anecdotes used, but also by their length and formulation. TED speakers often use personal stories that contain many narrative elements, are vividly recounted and are regularly relevant to the main idea or message of the talk. They prefer to use the rhetorical question, which can make the audience think about the topic and thereby enhance retention. They also use quite a few *subiectios* for what seems to be an elaborative purpose, and not necessarily for a structuring purpose.

TED speakers do not rely that heavily on organisation techniques as scholars do, nor do they leave them aside as much as the politicians do. The main difference between scholars' and TED speakers' use of organisation techniques resides in stylistic choices: TED speakers tend to use less structure markers and hardly ever refer to parts of the speech such as the conclusion explicitly. Instead of "to conclude", they prefer a phrase such as "I want to leave you with this" as an announcement for their conclusion. The few *partitios* and summaries used are usually concise in length and style. Finally, TED speakers seem to use vague, more indicative structure markers intentionally more often than scholars and politicians, possibly to create suspense in the storyline. For example, in transitions and *partitios* a TED speaker would announce "three stunning examples" without revealing their contents yet, which might spark the audience's curiosity and leaves an element of surprise in the storyline.

The rhetorical situation has likely influenced the TED speakers in their selection and application of retention techniques. TED speakers can be qualified as professional speakers compared to scholars (speaking professionals), especially when the presentation's occasion is taken into account. The TED talks could potentially be viewed by a large (online) audience, which increases the need for a thorough, intensive preparation of the overall presentation. The purpose to inspire appears to lead to the focus on narrative techniques such as the anecdote, as opposed to the more

²⁷⁴ In contrast, Atkins and Finlayson (2013) signal a rise of anecdote in political speeches from the mid-1990s. However, they studied anecdote use in a different political speech context and country: general election campaign speeches in the United Kingdom. Election speeches are usually aimed directly at voters, do not have to adhere to the rules of parliamentary debate (they are usually not interrupted) and are about a vision for the (country's) future rather than the nuts and bolts of next year's policy, which appears to be a public-speaking situation that is more suitable for narrative techniques such as the anecdote.

informative purpose of the scholars. Furthermore, the inspirational purpose could also explain the way in which TED speakers apply organisation techniques: they do want to inform to a certain extent, but the audience's expectation to listen to an attractive story and the high stakes of a TED event lead to a focus on stylistic craftsmanship.

3.6.3 Limitations and next step

Although the study reveals valuable insights into the use of recommended organisational and elaborative retention techniques, three main limitations of the chosen approach should be taken into account. First of all, a limited number of retention techniques advised in textbooks was selected. Therefore, results only apply to the use of these specific techniques; the speakers might have applied other retention strategies that were not taken into account, such as visualisation techniques.

Secondly, this study only took three collections of presentations into account. The research presentations were from a specific area in humanities and social sciences, and a specific cultural background (Dutch-Flemish). More academic disciplines should be taken into account to paint a more complete picture of organisation and elaboration retention techniques in research presentations. Differences in presentation behaviour between scholars from academic disciplines are not uncommon; Hertz (2015) for example showed that researchers from various backgrounds use visual aids, and in particular PowerPoint slides, differently (e.g. linguists used an average of thirty-five words on a slide, as opposed to fifty words for social scientists). Similarly, the selected political speeches, in the context of annual policy debates in parliament, are not representative of the genre 'political speech' as a whole. For example, analyses of political campaign speeches could provide insight into how politicians use retention techniques in a situation in which they can solely focus on discussing their own ideas and future policy, and are not restricted to responding to on detailed current governmental policy (as is the practice of the annual policy reviews in this dissertation)—see Atkins' and Finlayson's (2013) study on the use of the anecdote in British campaign speeches, for example. For the TED talks, talks at locally organised TEDx events could be analysed as opposed to the most popular online talks. Although all TEDx events need to adhere to certain general guidelines that are drafted by the global TED organisation, differences such as the size of the event (and thus direct audience), the location and the availability of speaker coaching can influence the preparation and the performance of the speakers.

Thirdly, the rather rigid focus on explicit textual features as used in this method is useful for detecting instances of the selected techniques with multiple researchers, but also might lead to the more subtle variants of a technique to be left out. For example: quite possibly, close-reading would reveal that some politicians do indeed appear to provide a kind of summary at the end of their talk. Still, it is questionable whether the audience would interpret such variants as they were intended by the speaker (cf. O'Keefe's findings on implicit versus explicit conclusions, 2002). Another example: no circle techniques were detected in TED talks. In some TED talks however, an introductory example was used as a storyline or theme throughout the speech and not in the conclusion alone (as is specific for a circle technique). In such

a situation no circle technique was labelled, but the speakers did intend to emphasise the speech structure by applying an organisation strategy. Furthermore, the inter-rater reliability was only applied to evaluate agreement on the presence of selected retention techniques in the corpus texts. The qualitative analyses in this chapter, which categorise subtypes of techniques and describe style and structure variations of examples that were found in the corpora, are analyses of a single researcher. As the study focused on obtaining a broad overview how seven retention techniques are used, no in-depth analyses of stylistic features such as vividness, concreteness or relevance were carried out. This way, it can serve as a starting point for such more fine-grained analyses.

The results of this analysis are valuable in three ways: first of all, they give insight into the broad spectrum of appearances and styles in which frequently advised retention techniques are used in practice, and show how this usage relates to textbook advice. Secondly, it shows that different types of speakers in various contexts select and apply these retention techniques, which indicates the role genre and rhetorical situation can play here. Thirdly, these results provide a point of departure for designing further research into audience information retention.

The next step in this thesis consists of experimental research into three techniques: the announcement of the conclusion, circle technique and summary. The insights into public-speaking practice compared to the textbook advice allow for a realistic experiment to be designed, in which the purpose, context and formulation choices can be taken into account.