Additional Cross-Tutor Education Workshop Descriptions

Table of Contents:

Approaches to Argument

Tutoring Science Communication

Where Does This Idea Go? Tackling Arrangement in the Tutoring Session

Sound and Sensibility: Cultivating Voice(s) in Writing and Speaking Tutorials

Approaches to Argument

While the Hume Center offers communication support for any rhetorical situation--websites, speeches, internship applications--many of the students who visit the center seek support and feedback on their arguments, whether written or oral or both. Our "Approaches to Argument" workshop therefore invited a deeper discussion of types of argument so that tutors might introduce them to student writers. In planning this workshop, Sarah and Erica identified two types of arguments the workshop would examine closely: Toulminian and invitational rhetorics. We did not see these as contrasting approaches to argument, simply different approaches that could be used in varied rhetorical situations. We also wanted to encourage tutors to consider types of arguments as part of the analysis of the rhetorical situation undertaken with their tutees: what did they want from their audience? How do they identify their writerly or speaking persona? How do others participating in this conversation conceptualize and engage with argument to reach their goals?

The workshop goals included collectively interrogating the genre of argument, considering multiple approaches to arguments, and identifying ways to bring these different types of argument into tutoring sessions. We began as we usually begin our cross-tutor education workshops: with reflection. We prompted tutors to consider:

- What does argument mean to you as a writer and a speaker and within your home discipline?
- What does argument usually mean to your tutees?

After tutors had a moment to reflect and engage in small group discussion, we shared our discussion points with the larger group, noting differing disciplinary conventions alongside the

varied conceptions of argument, from those of first-year writers and speakers to dissertating PhDs.

We then turned to a discussion of Toulmin because we felt many tutors would be familiar with his conception of argument. As revised by Wayne Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, Toulminian argument is a conversation with listeners or readers (see handout). After identifying the components of argument--claim, reason, evidence, warrant, response--we focused on examples of each component and articulated the questions tutors might pose to tutees to help them develop or complete their arguments. This relatively familiar approach to argument helped tutors see continuities between spoken and written argument.

The second part of the workshop focused on invitational rhetorics, as defined by Sonja K. Foss and Cindy L. Griffin. We addressed the goals of invitational rhetorics, which develop notions of argument because they work to

- Increase the audience's potential contribution;
- Expand possible solutions to problem;
- Aid in invention; and
- Allow for disengagement from hegemonic discourse and thus hegemonic practices.

Ultimately, change from invitational rhetorics is a result of new understanding by ***both*** the rhetor and the audience, rather than a persuasion that occurs ***solely*** in the audience. Examples of invitational rhetorics include non-verbal statements and rhetorical refusals.

As a group, we watched excerpts from Bryan Stevenson's 2012 TED talk entitled "We need to talk about an injustice," in which he discusses the US's unjust criminal system, specifically the death penalty. Although he does not identify his argument style as such, Stevenson offers an example of how invitational rhetorics, such as listening and openness, signaled non-verbally, can assist in discussing the challenge of the racialized US justice system and ultimately, in naming concrete actions to bring justice to the system and strengthen our collective national character. As we discussed the clips, tutors came to a number of conclusions: invitational and Toulminian rhetorics might be combined as Stevenson's presentation uses both. We also discussed what listening and openness might look like on the page, in writing, and how tutors might use a discussion of delivery strategies to inspire writers to expand their argument repertoires.

Overall, tutors responded well to the workshop, finding the conception of argument as a conversation--as answers to a series of questions--highly applicable to their tutoring practices.Tutors also wanted to teach and implement more invitational rhetorics, finding it an ethical approach, but acknowledged that this approach is not as highly valued in academic discourse, particularly in graduate-level writing and speaking.

Tutoring Science Communication

Two experienced oral communication tutors who are PhD candidates, one in neuroscience and the other in genetics, led the two-hour workshop "Tutoring Science Communication." Many of our students come in with projects that need to communicate scientific research yet most of our tutors are not scientists. The workshop showed generalist tutors how to help writers and speakers find a narrative within their scientific research and make it accessible to a reading or a listening audience.

The workshop opened by establishing exigency: why are we interested in teaching science communication effectively? While the tutors came up with an array of answers related to the ethical and policy implications of science, implicitly the question also asked *who* can effectively teach science communication? The workshop leaders then went on to problematize the idea of specialist, arguing that even a disciplinary expert may need the researcher to explain more than the researcher thinks she will need to. In other words, non specialist does not necessarily mean non scientist. The generalist tutor is a great proxy for a curious audience.

With this premise established, the workshop gave tutors four clear strategies for tutoring science communication. First, ask the writer or speaker to name their A.G.E.: Audience, Goal, and Environment (what we might call the rhetorical situation, i.e., genre, timing, format). Then minimize the number of goals; start simple, they counseled. Second, encourage the writer or speaker to storyboard, a process that requires the writer or speaker to work with sticky notes to distill an argument to a couple key points. From these, a rhetor can "dive" into the data, with the audience's level of knowledge determining the depth of the dive. Third, ask them to draw their findings. Thinking visually often helps writers and speakers "see" relationships. Finally, ask them to tell you what the research means. In making these suggestions, the leaders of the workshop gave the tutors insight into how science communication is often prepared. The process typically begins with scientists writing up the methods and figures *before* the results, discussion, introduction and abstract. In addition to this rich presentation of rhetorical concepts and tutoring techniques, the workshop leaders gave tutors a chance to practice the strategies. For example, we all created a storyboard of our current research and then shared it with a partner who asked us questions to help us hone our goal and narrative arc. Because time allowed, we were also able to discuss the benefits of the tutoring technique. Tutors noted that storyboarding forced them to think linearly, but that it helped them define their body of evidence and see the

relevance of a particular point to the larger argument.

Time permitted discussion of the distinction between oral and written science communication as well. The group decided that preparing a talk--and following this process and tutoring strategies--would help a scientist identify high points that might ultimately also shape a paper but that convention would likely dictate the form of the written research. This workshop nevertheless showed tutors that composing an argument-in-process with spoken delivery in mind might help writers as well as speakers do two important things: prioritize and elaborate selectively.

Where Does This Idea Go? Tackling Arrangement in the Tutoring Session

Our academic technology specialist (ATS), a Phd in Composition and Rhetoric, developed a cross-training workshop on arrangement, a rhetorical challenge that both writers and speakers frequently bring to our center. Because she's an expert on writing tools, she invited the tutors to consider how composing technologies impact arrangement and why.

Her workshop opened with a moment of reflection and empathy building, as tutors articulated what has challenged them as they organize their thoughts. In short, tutors recognized that organization is as much a process of selecting ideas as it is arranging them. Tutors also named many of the strategies they've used in the past to organize ideas, from sorting mechanisms based in conceptions of argument to assignment constraints such as word count. Finally, tutors reflected on the tools they use to help arrange ideas, with most relying on traditional outlines and some using sticky notes to brainstorm and outline non-linearly. The ATS summarized what we'd discovered: arrangement is informed by context, shaping our arguments from the moment we begin composing.

She further theorized our thinking about arrangement by referencing Susan Delagrange's "Wunderkammer, Cornell, and the Visual Canon of Arrangement." Together we looked at visual metaphors for arrangement and considered their implications for our writing and speaking. For example, if we think of arrangement as building with blocks, we're suggesting that we may not yet know what we're going to produce; a cabin may turn into high rise apartment building, but not necessarily. By contrast, if we think of arrangement as knitting, the pattern is already set; we know, for example, that we're creating a hat. And if we think of arrangement as a cabinet of curiosities, a Renaissance invention that defined knowledge gathering and sorting, we're recognizing that in our digital age, we have more information than we've ever had before, and that it's our job as writers and speakers to create structures, to gather and organize knowledge in our minds, which become like cabinets. Through these metaphors, the ATS helped us see that ideation is mediated by a structural framework, whether rhetorical or technological.

We turned then to a slide deck in progress, one provided by a student who had come to the center with an oral presentation that she was having trouble organizing. The ATS divided us into small groups and assigned each a particular technology: a digital mind mapping tool, the

whiteboard, slideware, or post-it notes. She acknowledged that in an actual tutoring session, we would want to match the tool to the tutee's writing or speaking concern, stage in process, and composing preference, but she also wanted the tutors to consider the affordances and limitations of a new technology. Digital mind mapping tools such as Lucidchart and Scapple, for example, help students generate ideas and then see connections between them; they also can be saved as versions, from a very rough draft to a close to finished outline. Moreover, digital toolsare on students' computers, where their work is; language generated in a digital mind mapping tool may be easily cut and paste into a word doc. But a student may resist learning a new technology within a relatively brief tutoring session, so we generated tutoring talk that would invite but not coerce a student to experiment with a new technology.

We decided that the whiteboard, like the digital mind mapping tools, may be best for students who can't see connections between their ideas and for whom a small computer screen may be limiting. Tutors further agreed that standing at the whiteboard together can get writers and speakers more engaged with their ideas and help them to disconnect from the words they've potentially been obsessing over and thus to re-articulate. But it can be tricky to save at a white board; ideas may be erased that become valuable in retrospect. For this reason, writing and oral communication tutors alike appreciate using sticky notes, as ideas that are written on paper may be moved into or out of the scene of discussion as salience is debated. Sticky notes can also be clustered and moved around.

Slideware itself can support arrangement, especially when a student has a sense for their argument but isn't yet sure which ideas are most important. Many oral communication tutors found that the titles of slides create an outline; they also would talk through a "road map" slide early in a tutoring session to create a plan. We further decided it can help both speakers and writers arrange ideas if the tutor asks them to limit their ideas to one per slide -- and then to work in the overview to see what can be eliminated and moved around, with the tutor facilitating discussion of the rhetorical purpose of each slide or group of slides. In other words, making a presentation often also helps writers develop their point.

In conclusion, we resolved to resist dependence on the same tool to support arrangement in every stage of the composing process, and instead to become mindful of our technology choices and to encourage our tutees' reflection on their arrangement strategies as well. And

while it may take time to open an account for a digital arrangement tool, and to teach it in a writing or speaking tutorial, we decided it could inspire play, making research and communication more fun.

Sound and Sensibility: Cultivating Voice(s) in Writing and Speaking Tutorials

In this workshop, the director of the Oral Communication Program, Doree Allen, invited tutors to think about the relationship between our pedagogy and individual voice. To emphasize the stakes of tutoring voice, she asked participants to imagine the full spectrum of voice necessary for expression (Linklater 2006). In other words, if we ignore voice in our writing and speaking tutoring, we are potentially diminishing the very humanity of our tutees.

Tutors were then asked to articulate what they mean when they use the term *voice*. Responses came quickly: style that doesn't interfere with good communication; distinctive language with a point of view; expression of personality and background -- what you've read, where you come from, your education. As Doree observed, voice is a kind of "signature" that carries across communities even as it adjusts or adapts to meet the expectations of diverse audiences. Other tutors, especially the oral communication tutors, recognized how strongly voice is linked with delivery and with confidence and integrity. For some, it was a more physical phenomenon, breath mediated by vocal awareness. For others, a "presence behind the words." All agreed voice is connected to political and cultural visibility and a complex phenomenon that must be attended to on the page and the stage if a writer or speaker expects to persuade their audience.

To help us think about how voice is marked in writing and outloud, Doree invited tutors to experience the same text as readers and then as listeners. We first read quietly to ourselves a 1933 Eudora Welty letter to the editors of *The New Yorker* and considered the features of the language that create a strong voice: the unexpected turn of phrase, the humor, and the independence from convention as Welty makes playful use of the genre of the application letter. We then listened to the same letter read out loud by Juliet Stevenson. Perhaps as expected, hearing it performed made us more attentive to the rhythm of the language, its musicality and intonation. We could hear the sound of Welty's privilege as well as her pain.

More aware of the complexities of voice, we then turned our attention to the tutorial and the ways we might cultivate the voice(s) of the writers and speakers who come to our centers. We considered the barriers that students seem to encounter in articulating their voice(s)--chiefly apprehension and a rigid sense of disciplinarity or genre--before considering what issues we might need to be sensitive to such as linguistic variation and cultural background. Tutors would not want to impose a prescriptive understanding of voice on anyone and instead must work to

cultivate the voice that suits the writer's or speaker's rhetorical purposes. In thinking about ways that tutoring talk might do this work, tutors agreed that hearing written work outloud or a spoken presentation played back to them would likely help writers and speakers hear themselves the ways others do, as strongly or weakly or unevenly voiced. And in continuing to ask writers and speakers to articulate their intentions and arguments outloud, tutors would likely help tutees hear the sound and signature of their own voices and to find ways to integrate it with their works in progress. This workshop facilitated the exploration of the emotional, physical, and cognitive dimensions of voice, recognizing that "the engaged voice [is] always changing," in the words of bell hooks (11).

Voice bibliography