

RHEFINE

Rhetoric for Innovative Education

Rhetorical Research & Didactics

Zagreb, February 24th -25th, 2022



BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

www.rhefine.eu

KA2: Strategic Partnerships for Higher Education
2020-1-PL01-KA203-082274

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Publisher / Izdavač

Department of Phonetics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
University of Zagreb
Odsjek za fonetiku, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

For the publisher / Za izdavača

Domagoj Tončinić

Erasmus+ RHEFINE hybrid Conference / Erasmus+ RHEFINE međunarodna
konferencija održana hibridno
Zagreb, February 24th – 25th, 2022 / U Zagrebu od 24. do 25. veljače, 2022.

Editors / Urednice

Diana Tomić
Elenmari Pletikos Olof
Jelena Vlašić Duić

The authors are responsible for language editing. / Jezična je redaktura autorska.

Graphic design / Grafičko oblikovanje

Jordan Bićanić

e-book ISBN: ISBN 978-953-175-983-0
RHEFINE (knjiga sažetaka) e-izdanje

rhefine.eu

bit.ly/RHEFINE_conference_materials

Project partners:



Table of Contents

KEYNOTE LECTURES

Kris Rutten

The rhetoric of cultural literacy 4

Gabrijela Kišiček

Speech delivery in rhetorical scholarship A Historical Overview 4

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Petra Aczél

Future-Proofing Rhetorical Education 6

Sanja Kišiček

Creating a Collaborative Student Centered Culture in Higher Education 7

Zdravka Biočina

Epideictic oratory as educational tool 8

Maria Zaleska

Rhetorical deliberation as a problem solving tool 9

Kristine Marie Berg

Rhetorical citizenship for a polarized world 10

Iglia Kassabova

The rhetoric of the protests in Bulgaria 2013-2020: visual and verbal messages 11

Kristijan Sedak, Paula Galić & Antea Brkić

Interpersonal Communication Channels in Persuasion 12

Ivanka Mavrodieva, Iglia Kassabova, Stefan Serezliev, Yovka Tisheva, Georgi Petkov & Todor S. Simeonov

Rhetorical traditions on Rhetoric in Bulgarian Universitates 13

Ewa Modrzejewska & Agnieszka Szurek

The integration of rhetoric into the curricula of the Faculty of Polish Studies 14

Foteini Egglezou

The use of common topics in teaching creative writing 15

Ivana Bašić

Evidential and epistemic rhetorical strategies of constructing knowledge in academic discourse 16

Elenmari Pletikos Olof & Mihaela Matešić

Analogy – a rhetorical figure in conveying knowledge 17

Ivanka Mavrodieva, Iglia Kassabova, Stefan Serezliev, Yovka Tisheva, Georgi Petkov & Todor S. Simeonov

Rhetorical analysis of speeches and presentations 18

Ana Vlah & Michael Burke	
Teaching the enthymeme: The importance of rhetorical reasoning in higher education	19
Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Kinga Rogowska	
Structured Classroom Debate as a Genre for Teaching Rhetoric	20
Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Aleksandra Łukowska	
Improvisation at Rhetoric Workshops as a Way of Teaching Communication Skills....	21
Tena Žganec & Ines Carović	
Rhetorical characteristics of video blogs.....	22
Diana Tomić & Jelena Vlašić Duić	
Rhetorician & Phonetician: a long way back and a great way ahead	23
WORKSHOPS	
Ana Vlah & Diana Tomić	
Rhetorical Listening.....	24
Sanja Kišiček	
Collegial Dialogue for Culture of Collaboration.....	24
Elenmari Pletikos Olof & Jelena Vlašić Duić	
Speech Skills	24
Conference Program.....	25
Conference address book	27

The order of abstracts follows the conference program.

KEYNOTE LECTURES

Abstracts

Kris Rutten

Kris.rutten@ugent.be

Department of Educational Studies of Ghent University

The rhetoric of cultural literacy

In this lecture I will explore how cultural literacy (i.e. the importance of knowledge about culture and the arts) is rhetorically constructed within contemporary cultural policy and practice. During my lecture I will explore the rhetorical construction of (1) the specific content of cultural literacy, about (2) the potential functions of cultural literacy and about (3) the specific role of cultural institutions as mediators of cultural literacy today. Based on this analysis, I will discuss the educational implications of a rhetorical approach toward cultural literacy.

Gabrijela Kišiček

gkisicek@ffzg.hr

Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, University of Zagreb

Speech delivery in rhetorical scholarship A Historical Overview

Throughout the history, rhetors and rhetoricians considered spoken discourse more effective and more persuasive than written composition. Thus, ancient rhetoric was concerned about how speeches ought to be delivered: the proper management of the voice, bodily movement, and gestures. This chapter is exploring the importance of the fifth rhetorical canon, both in classical and contemporary rhetorical education. We argue that speech delivery can influence the persuasion power of the speaker and contribute to speaker's ethos, have impact on creating pathos but it can also influence the strength of the argument i.e. be important part of logos. Although Aristotle considered delivery to be "vulgar matter" associated with actors and performing artists more than rhetoricians, he nevertheless paid some attention to it (Rhetoric III

1402b-1404a). He wrote that delivery "was a matter of how the voice should be used in expressing each emotion." Further on, persuading by passion was in Aristotle's focus because things do not seem the same when moved by various passions. Consequently, this becomes important for persuasion because, according to Aristotle "people tend to take up passions expressed by a speaker" (cf. III.7 1408a16-25, 1408b10-20, III.16 1417a36-b7). So, speech delivery has far more important role in the persuasion process than merely aesthetical, ornamental or as some might even say, superficial.

This chapter will explore notions of speech delivery from its first account in *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, across Cicero and Quintilian to contemporary times and recent papers which explore importance of speech delivery from rhetorical and argumentative perspective.

The main goal is to emphasize importance of speech delivery and the need to include it into systematic rhetorical education.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Abstracts

Petra Aczél

petra.aczel@uni-corvinus.hu

Corvinus University of Budapest

Future-Proofing Rhetorical Education

In the context of global changes in human communication the teaching of rhetoric apparently faces three main challenges. One concerns its connection to the verbal domain. Rhetoric has long been considered the 'docens and utens', the theory and practice of verbal messages. Nevertheless, in the present era visuality has overpowered the reign of words in almost every field of social communication, with rhetorical didactics remaining a painful exception.

The second regards the traditionally product-centered view of rhetorical education. The rhetorical speech itself still seems to be the ultimate goal of courses in rhetoric, while the speakers and their relation to their audiences (that is, the communities they belong to, the societies they are a part of, the people they represent and are responsible for) stay almost untouched during rhetorical teaching. Rhetorical didactics in general work to prepare for the 'speak for/ speak against' dichotomy while the aspects of the 'speak with'-mode are less practiced. Finally, the third challenge applies to the blending media of rhetoric. Students of rhetorical education could be well prepared for exclusively face-to-face situations and may lack skills to speak out, motivate, argue, explain, discuss online, or in hybrid communicative spaces at the same time.

The present essay aims to reflect these challenges from the point of view of rhetorical sensitivity. A concept introduced half a century ago, rhetorical sensitivity can serve as the key in the fundamental transformation of middle- and higher-level educational programs of rhetoric. By means of rhetorical sensitivity we assume that the teaching of rhetoric should be skill-oriented and should aim to build rhetorical literacy applicable to all codes and modes of communication. The paper will introduce rhetorical teaching methods and modules and so will endeavor to steer the wheel of this two-millennia-old faculty to the demands of our future.

Sanja Kišiček

sanja.kisicek@ffzg.hr, sanja.kisicek@gmail.com

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Creating a Collaborative Student Centered Culture in Higher Education

Teaching and learning in HE has the utmost potential for creating an inclusive, collaborative and growth oriented student-centered teaching and learning environment. However, the academic arena often looks quite different, stuck in the traditional and rigid educational paradigm. This chapter outlines five class components, skills and strategies conducive to developing such an open culture.

The components with examples of good practice are outlined in this order: 1. Building Community – to create a sense of belonging, the communication within needs to be grounded in collaboration and collegiality; 2. Public Speaking – to create a safe atmosphere for public appearance and self-presentation that will later cater to career needs, the students need to get as many chances to practice impromptu speaking, as well as presenting and giving a pitch; 3. Ed Tech – to augment teaching and learning with technology in ways that were unimaginable prior to the existence of educational technology and tools as we know today, we need to stay on top of the trends; 4. Planning for Success – in order to demonstrate student-centered teaching, educators must deeply dive into unit planning going backwards, with the learning outcomes in mind; and finally 5. Alternative Assessment – to upgrade assessment from receiving results and reacting towards reflecting upon one's own progress, routines of self- and peer- assessment must be established, supported by rubric-rooted grading as well as visible thinking and visible learning routines.

Some of the following methods for building such a classroom culture consisting of the abovementioned five components are described in this chapter: leading a collegial dialogue to communicate and collaborate effectively; giving and receiving peer feedback to collaboratively construct meaning; practicing instructional peer coaching to support cognition; implementing speaking and listening activities to develop an ear for understanding; crafting different types of questions to support inquiry-based learning; participating in facilitation protocols to promote problem solving; implementing peer observation protocols to reflect on practice; design an authentic assessment with an achievement rubric to support reflective learning; collaboratively reflect on examples of student work to moderate summative assessment.

Zdravka Biočina

zbiocina@zsem.hr

Zagreb School of Economics and Management

Epidictic oratory as educational tool

Throughout history, the term epideictic oratory stood primarily for praise and blame, and secondarily for display (Chase, 1961). This paper wants to examine a further potential of epideictic, especially in the field of education and activism of college students of non-communication programs. Students that are not studying communication sciences have communication courses in their curriculum with the goal of preparing them for communication in their professional career. Zanola (2016) points out that public speaking studies and programs should be targeted for the audience they are taught to and not standardized or copied from models which are suitable to a non-business context, such as politics or law. In other words, those courses should prepare them for various contexts they will experience in their career but also for various speaking forms. Furthermore, Hodson (2014) sees education as a key component that can spur engagement among youth through the promotion of democratic activism.

There are several reasons for choosing acceptance speeches of Nobel laureates. Firstly, because they are given by scientists who are not vocal professionals such as actors or musicians, so students can relate more with them regarding speech performance. Moreover, ceremonial speeches are a great way for students to perfect their public speaking skills since they heavily depend on speech performance. An additional reason is that ceremonial speeches are a good way to teach students how to express themselves metaphorically. The third reason is the activist potential of the Nobel rhetoric which has already, to some extent, been explored. Biočina (2019) analysed acceptance speeches of Nobel laureates in literature (N=6) and economics (N=10) and showed that as many as 15 laureates didn't hold a typical acceptance speech (content wise) but used the opportunity and attention to express some sort of criticism towards the Nobel prize. Several ways of refusing the Nobel Prize were noted, some of them already mentioned by Salazar (2009): refusal by not coming, sending someone on their behalf, and giving the speech but not thanking the Nobel Foundation or the Committee. The corpus will be expanded with banquet speeches from other Nobel prizes winners (for peace and chemistry) and an analysis of speech performances will be included. Exposing students to a diverse set of speakers and speaking styles can help them become better speakers but also better citizens.

Maria Zaleska

m.zaleska@uw.edu.pl

University of Warsaw

Rhetorical deliberation as a problem solving tool

„People only solve the problem they give themselves to solve” (Flower and Hayes 1980). Therefore, in the chapter I argue that in addition to the cognitive skills involved in the actual performance of a rhetorical task, metacognitive skills need to be considered much more broadly both by rhetoricians and by practitioners. Metacognition and metalanguage influence how people perceive the rhetorical genus deliberativum and, therefore, how they are able to imagine its potential as a means of collaborative problem solving in deliberative activities such as debate. This chapter sets both theoretical and practical goals. From a theoretical perspective, the description of genus deliberativum in terms of problem solving tool offers new insights on the definition of rhetoric as „looking for what can be persuasive in any situation”. The use of a theoretical framework that embraces cognition and metacognition draws attention to the fact that previous accounts focus mainly only on cognitive skills, involved in the actual performance of a rhetorical task by students, while metacognition turns out to be underresearched. For the purposes of this chapter, metacognition is understood less as knowledge of cognition or knowledge about cognition and more as regulation of cognition (i.e. planning for learning rhetorical abilities, monitoring of execution of a rhetorical task, and self-evaluation after a rhetorical task is completed). Part of metacognition is metalanguage competence. Metalanguage helps students understand what rhetorical deliberation is. Metalinguistic cues make it possible to distinguish, within deliberation, between the process on the one hand and the product on the other. Moreover, in the context of problem solving activities, they allow distinguishing deliberation based on curiosity (*curiositas*) or on will (*voluntas*). From a practical point of view, on the example of activities involving the rhetorical genus deliberativum, the chapter will discuss how to implement training in metacognition as a tool to improve the student’s problem solving skills.

Kristine Marie Berg

Kristinebe@hum.ku.dk

University of Copenhagen, Department of Communication, Section of Rhetoric

Rhetorical citizenship for a polarized world

This article describes, discusses and evaluates Danish organization The Bridge Builders' training program "The Bridge Builder education" as a form of propaedeutic rhetorical citizenship (Villadsen, 2019) designed especially for a politically polarized society. The Bridge Builders, established by opinion maker, author, former member of the Danish parliament, Özlem Cekic, aims at strengthening the democratic dialogue in Denmark and one of their newest activities is "The Bridge Builder education", which will tour Denmark in 2022 and train participants to communicate better with people with whom they disagree deeply. The participants will be trained in basic rhetorical theory (e.g. argumentation (Kock 2013) and the topics (Pontoppidan, Gabrielsen & Jønch-Clausen, (2010)) and basic conflict mediation techniques and will be presented with Cekic' personal experiences of meeting with people who have sent her hateful messages (see Cekic 2018). Based on the training the participants will be supervised to plan and carry out their own difficult dialogues with people they hold disagreements with. First training takes place in January and this article will investigate and evaluate the process through readings of the teaching material, interviews with organizers and participants, as well as through a participatory lens as the author of the article contributes to the training program with a shorter section on rhetorical argumentation.

Brobyggerne, the Bridge Builders: <https://brobyggerne.dk>

Cekic, Ö. (2018). Why I have coffee with people who send me hate mail, Ted talk:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rQy4gPjUY-s>

Kock, C. E. J. (2013). Defining Rhetorical Argumentation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 46(4), 437-464.

Pontoppidan, C., Gabrielsen, J., & Jønch-Clausen, H. (2010). Topik: et retorisk bidrag til den kritiske journalistik. *N O R D I C O M - Information*, 32(1), 47-59.

http://www.nordicom.gu.se/common/publ_pdf/305_pontoppidan_gabrielsen_clausen.pdf

Villadsen, L. S. (2019). Samtalesaloner som propædeutisk retorisk medborgerskab. *Rhetorica Scandinavica*.

Iglia Kassabova

iglika.kassabova@gmail.com

Institute of Rhetoric and Communications

The rhetoric of the protests in Bulgaria 2013-2020: visual and verbal messages

Politics and rhetoric often go together. Especially in the modern world, when the flexibility of online social networks makes them suitable platforms for sharing civil and political appeals. From video-recorded speeches to images as part of the visual rhetoric – rhetorical persuasion in the virtual environment promotes the freedom to express feelings and ideas.

Empirical research based on critical political protests of the recent political past in Bulgaria illustrates the rhetorical tools incorporated in the verbal and visual messages. The representational images encourage the viewers to have a particular outlook towards the protesters and impressive creativity. However, we need to have political, historical, cultural and semiotical contexts to understand their connotation.

The use of language and images as a symbolic means of inducing persuasion among the society is analysed by both informative and emotional aspects of the messages, as the second more inflammatory kind of message is preferred by citizens and e-citizens passionately supporting causes. Some of the messages use humour, irony and sarcasm as rhetorical tools; others deal with comparisons, metaphors and exaggerations.

Exemplary messages in posters, infographics, cartoons, memes, gifs and posts are presented and analysed as part of the research. The messages are classified based on the understanding of the classical rhetoricians that there are three fundamental means of persuasion – rational, emotional and ethical, and their manifestation in a modern digital context.

Kristijan Sedak, Paula Galić & Antea Brkić

kristijan.sedak@unicath.hr, pgalic@unicath.hr, abrki1@unicath.hr

Catholic University of Croatia, Department of Communication Sciences

Interpersonal Communication Channels in Persuasion

The mass media have a great influence on political processes. The only alternative is social networks and interpersonal communication. The advantage of face-to-face communication is that it is possible to build stronger connections, be more persuasive and see body language. There is a great distrust of information related to political processes. Persuasiveness also depends on the source of information. The success of persuasion through interpersonal communication channels depends on several factors. The aim of this research was to find out the connection of use of individual interpersonal communication channels (personal contact with a political candidate, contact with a familiar person from the surroundings, accidental contact with an unknown person) and election decision with regard to the socio-demographic characteristics of voters. The survey was conducted in December 2019, in the last week before the 1st round of the presidential election. A standardized questionnaire conducted by IPSOS was used. A total of 982 adult respondents of average age 49 years (18 - 89) were included, of which 52% were women. Most research participants came from urban backgrounds, mostly with high school education. The sample was also representative regarding to the political preferences. In addition to sociodemographic questions, the questionnaire contained closed questions concerning the frequency of use of interpersonal communications channels when informing on political issues as well as on trust in some of these channels. Quantitative research based on data collected by the standardized questionnaire analyzed the difference in reach and trust according to certain types of interpersonal communication channels of voters in the Republic of Croatia and the correlation with the election decision of certain socio-demographic conditioned groups of voters. The results show that voters have the most trust in contact with a familiar person ($\bar{x} = 3.56$), and the least in the case of accidental contact with an unknown person ($\bar{x} = 2.75$). There is a positive, incomplete correlation between the frequency of use and trust of the researched interpersonal communication channels among the respondents.

Ivanka Mavrodieva, Iglia Kassabova, Stefan Serezliev, Yovka Tisheva, Georgi Petkov & Todor S. Simeonov

i.mavrodieva@gmail.com

Institute of Rhetoric and Communications

Rhetorical traditions on Rhetoric in Bulgarian Universities

The chapter includes a description and presentation of tradition concerning rhetoric in the academic sphere in Bulgaria. The traditions of rhetoric learning in different universities in Bulgaria in the first two decades of the 21st century include teaching in three levels: Bachelor, Master, and PhD. There are also some programs and good practices about training in rhetoric, presentation skills, business communication and negotiations organized by private companies and non-governmental organizations. At the Bachelor's degree level, rhetoric is taught in various specializations and faculties: Public Administration, Political Science, European studies, Public and Information Systems, Business Management, Public Relations, Actors, Lawyers, Journalists, Tourism, etc. There are programs in the Master's degree and rhetorical education that has intersections with Public Relations and Media in the specialties of European Studies, Human Resource Management and Media Management. The applied elements are an inseparable part of programs have and lecturers try to find a balance between theoretical knowledge and the improvement and development of rhetorical skills. Different universities apply different methods according to the programs and normative regulations.

Ewa Modrzejewska & Agnieszka Szurek

e.modrzejewska@uw.edu.pl, agnieszka.szurek@uw.edu.pl

Univerity of Warsaw

The integration of rhetoric into the curricula of the Faculty of Polish Studies

Traces of rhetoric have always been present in the teaching tradition of the Faculty of Polish Studies at the University of Warsaw. However, it was not until recent years that rhetoric has been introduced to the curricula in a more systematic way.

In our paper we focus on how rhetoric has been embedded into the curricula of some courses in the Philology for Media and Translation Studies specializations. We also show examples of teaching practices and other initiatives, such as the summer doctoral school on new rhetoric (2021) and academic student project: Data - Rhetoric - Design HUB (2019/2020) that aimed at collaborative work on data analysis and presentation between students representing humanities, informatics, and art design.

Foteini Egglezou

fegglezou@yahoo.gr

Hellenic Institute of Rhetorical and Communication Studies (HIRCS)

The use of common topics in teaching creative writing

The trip to rhetorical topics (plural: *topoi*/*τόποι* in Greek) started during antiquity. Since the era of Aristotle, of Cicero, of Quintilian. It consists of a long and adventurous trip which lasts until today. Topics stand somewhere between the land of formal logic and of persuasion. They are well known as 'argumentative matrices' and are closely related to the production of premises and formal arguments. Is this the only truth about them? The modern return of rhetorical studies and the association of rhetoric with the notion of creativity in language use: a) reveal the faded -by the patina of time-relation of rhetorical topics to the invention of ideas and, consequently, to the imaginative operation, b) remind that during antiquity the poetic production was considered as a result of 'mimesis' which was influenced by the production of arguments and c) pinpoint the creative value of common topics such as definition, comparison, relationship, testimony etc. in teaching creative writing. In our era, the trip to rhetorical topics has not ended yet. In this paper, we are searching the rhetorical topics on the cusp between logic and imagination, at the point where the certainty of the familiar meets the uncertainty of the unknown. The aim of this paper is twofold: to examine the main aspects and functions of the system of topics and to give emphasis to the use of common topics as a modern, useful, adaptive and applicable tool in classroom for improving both essential components of students creativity such as fluency, flexibility and originality of ideas as well as their creative writing skills in various literary forms.

Ivana Bašić

basici@ffzg.hr

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Evidential and epistemic rhetorical strategies of constructing knowledge in academic discourse

In this talk I wish to propose an approach to the study and teaching of the rhetoric of academic communication that is informed by the concepts of evidentiality and epistemic stance. In its wider sense, evidentiality concerns any linguistic ways of marking how we know what we are talking about, namely the source of information and/or the mode of acquiring it. Evidentiality is considered to be a particularly fitting framework for analyzing academic communication since a major feature of academic discourse is its firm foundation in scientific epistemology, where knowledge is based on evidence acquired by means of processes and methodologies agreed on and accepted by a specific disciplinary community. The talk will outline three types of knowledge that are conventionally communicated in academic discourse - personally acquired knowledge, factual knowledge and knowledge acquired from other scholars in the specific field. These types of knowledge are rhetorically constructed by means of several principal types of reporting: reporting from the personal authorial perspective, reporting from an impersonal perspective, reporting from the perspective of the research process and reporting from other authors' perspectives. On top of reporting from various perspectives, a salient feature of academic discourse is the epistemic rhetorical strategy of hedging or boosting claims. I will demonstrate that all of the listed linguistic modes of presenting information in academic discourse are used as evidential and epistemic rhetorical strategies whose ultimate goal is to present the information as reliable and ensure its acceptance by the academic community at which it is addressed. This is a dynamic, community-specific and discipline-specific communicative process in which knowledge is constructed through negotiation and interaction between the author of the text and the academic community that challenges or accepts the presented claims and ultimately decides whether the text is to be approved as academic knowledge.

Elenmari Pletikos Olof* & Mihaela Matešić**

epletikos@ffzg.hr, mihaela.matesic@ffri.uniri.hr

*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

**University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Analogy – a rhetorical figure in conveying knowledge

Analogy is a rhetorical figure, a form of comparison that draws a parallel between two unlike things having several common qualities. To distinguish an analogy from metaphor and simile, the comparison is generally punctuated by an explicit inference warranted by the two things being compared (basic formula A is to B as C is to D). Analogy is used to help explain a principle or idea and to create effective understanding, and thus it has a strong persuasive power. We analyse the use of analogy in teaching process explaining its strengths and weaknesses. In explaining a new topic within the teaching process the analogy is valuable because it employs the principle “from the known to the unknown”. Additionally, its metaphorical character attracts attention, strengthens motivation, improves memory. However, the analogy is not only a figurative comparison – it is also a kind of a logical reasoning, and this is where its weaknesses come into the spotlight. Analogy can be weak or false and it can be analysed as a logical fallacy when inference based on analogy is too different from the argument. The teaching experience also testifies the weakness of the analogy when students memorize analogical example as a fact, not as an auxiliary tool in understanding new concepts. On an audio corpus of university lectures, we analyse how often analogy is used as explanatory tool and which source domains are mostly used in the classroom. Based on a questionnaire we explain the attitudes of university teachers towards analogy and how much they consciously use it in explaining content. It is certainly a cognitive effort to find a good analogy. The question is how to evaluate if source and target domains are close enough or too far away, which brings us to the challenge whether the analogy is a clarifying or a deceptive tool for conveying knowledge.

Ana Vlah* & Michael Burke**

a.vlah@uu.nl, m.burke@ucr.nl

*Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Utrecht University

**Department of Arts & Humanities, University College Roosevelt

Teaching the enthymeme: The importance of rhetorical reasoning in higher education

Rhetorical education can be seen as training of future rhetoricians, but also as training on rhetorical topics and methods of everyone who might find it useful, for example those who produce or receive media content. In this chapter we will observe enthymeme as an umbrella term in rhetorical curricula, since it covers several important lessons: rhetorical reasoning is logical, dialogical and for the audience; rhetoricians find it important to establish understanding; rhetoric is not only about spoken or written text – it also gives attention to other modes.

To give a complete lecture (or a series of lectures) on enthymeme, a few ideas must be explained. First, to examine the structure of enthymeme, it is important to introduce students to logic and reasoning, of which syllogisms are the base. Second, enthymemes are syllogisms with unstated premise, and by choosing them, rhetors assume that the listeners (audience) will add the missing premises. However, that is successful only if audience is willing to unpack the meaning. It shows rhetor's virtue and eloquence, and creates possibilities to be implicit. Third, audience is central to rhetoric; a rhetor fosters engagement by giving their audience a task, which puts them in a dialogue. Problems in communication might arise when interlocutors cannot recognize and accept the premises – because they lack information to comprehend, don't share linguistic or other needed background, or simply disagree, which is important to have on mind. Finally, enthymeme can also be visual and digital: the proofs, premises in enthymemes, can be non-verbal, i.e., images and videos, but also text on social media and links in digital context (across media platforms).

Students in higher education should be taught about enthymemic reasoning in their rhetoric classes, and given a place to practice. That will equip them with the critical reasoning life skills that they will need to detect and challenge flawed arguments and fake news in their future interaction with the world.

Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Kinga Rogowska

a.budzynska@uw.edu.pl, kj.rogowska2@uw.edu.pl

University of Warsaw

Structured Classroom Debate as a Genre for Teaching Rhetoric

The article presents structured classroom debate (SCD) as a didactic tool in rhetorical education. Our goal is to show SCD as a one-of-a-kind secondary speech genre (in Bakhtin's understanding of speech genres) that absorbed several primary speech genres and altered them to match the generic needs.

Researchers see SCDs as pedagogically beneficial and adaptable to an array of courses. They engage students in course material while promoting active learning; they help develop valuable skills such as critical thinking, conducting research, public speaking, and more. However, this article focuses on rhetorical skills and building appropriate and advanced argumentation.

The method of analysis used in the article is rhetorical generic criticism. This method will help to show the unique interactions ingrained in debates on the example of three debate formats (Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Karl Popper Debate, and British Parliamentary Debate). It will highlight the didactic value of various argumentations in the different forms of speeches (affirmative, rebuttal, summarizing) present in the analyzed formats.

We based the analysis on three different sources: the descriptions of the formats available in debate-centered literature, the rules of debate formats applied during tournaments, and recordings and transcriptions of debates from contests and rhetorical workshops.

Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Aleksandra Łukowska

a.budzynska@uw.edu.pl, a.lukowska@uw.edu.pl

University of Warsaw

Improvisation at Rhetoric Workshops as a Way of Teaching Communication Skills

The aim of the article is to present how the theatrical improvisation (improv) exercises can be used in rhetorical workshops. Rhetoric and improvisation may seem divergent, as rhetorical art involves a multi-stage, thorough preparation of a text, addressed to a specific audience and aiming for a specific effect. Improvisation, on the other hand, is a spontaneous activity of creating fictional reality with the use of words, which for this short moment of the performance connects the improvisers and the audience. The improviser, unlike the rhetor, does not make any attempts to shape the attitudes of the audience, to maintain or change their point of view on any issue. Their aim is to engage the audience and invite to a playful game. Improv revolves around the idea of artistic improbability, unlike the rhetoric, in which the domain in argumentation is probability and the ability to express arguments in a speech (Aristotle).

The article presents typical improvisational exercises that can be found in improv textbooks (Adams 2007, Halpern, Close and Johnson 1994, Johnstone, Spolin 1963, Salinsky and Frances-White 2013, Carrane and Allen 2006), which develop rhetorical competences in the area of *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, *actio*.

Three spheres of rhetorical persuasion will be analyzed: *ethos/logos/pathos*. As they must be reevaluated in improvisation, we will show how the triad of values functions in this field and how it can be creatively used in rhetorical practices to strengthen students' communication skills.

Adams, Kenn, 2007. *How to Improvise a Full-Length Play. The Art of Spontaneous Theater*, New York: Allworth Press.

Carrane, Jimmy, Liz Allen, 2013. *Improvising Better. A Guide for the Working Improviser*, Portsmouth: Hainemann.

Halpern, Charna, Del Close, Kim H. Johnson, 1994. *Truth in comedy. The manual of improvisation*, Colorado Springs: Merriweather Publishing Ltd.

Johnstone, Keith. *Improv. Improvisation and the Theatre*, New York: Routledge.

Salinsky, Tom, Deborah Frances-White, 2013. *The Improv Handbook. The Ultimate Guide to Improvising in Comedy, Theatre, and Beyond*, New York: Bloomsbury.

Spolin, Viola, 1963. *Improvisation for the Theater*, Northwestern University Press.

Tena Žganec* & Ines Carović**

tena.zganec8@gmail.com, icarovic@ffzg.hr

*Govornička akademija Demosten

**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Rhetorical characteristics of video blogs

Video blogs (vlogs) are brief, informal video speeches, composed casually and shared online. But despite their seemingly everyday and ordinary tone, many media commentators have described video blogs as one of the most transformative and revolutionary of all new media forms. Scholars from various fields have been researching the phenomenon of video blogs since they appeared in early 2000s, but despite the fact that video blog is undoubtedly a public speech, there is not much research on the rhetorical aspects of vlogs.

This research represents the analysis of introductions and conclusions of Croatian videoblogs and its main purpose was to determine the rhetorical specificities of a vlog as a widespread, but still not quite defined form of new media. A total of 28 vlogs from 9 different vlog channels was selected for the analysis. The analysis has shown that vlog combines elements of traditional public speech and rhetorical genres of electronic media, while the language and speech style used in vlogs are similar to those used in casual dialogic conversation. It was also found that the main Function of vlogs in general is creating the impression of conversation to encourage online interaction with the audience. Therefore, vlog is a hybrid rhetorical form which is essentially monologic, but has a dialogic purpose. Conclusions of the analysis can be used in working with vloggers on the quality of their speech, since their impact on viewers is growing, but also in schools since video is a very adaptable medium and vlogs could be used in various useful ways in school classes.

Diana Tomić & Jelena Vlašić Duić

dtomic@ffzg.hr, jvduic@ffzg.hr

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Rhetorician & Phonetician: a long way back and a great way ahead

Although the Croatian rhetorical tradition is strongly linked to the Department of Phonetics, the question of the relation between a phonetician and the rhetorician is often raised. This presentation is an attempt to answer that question. The direct connection is the delivery aspect in the speechmaking process. This talk does not explore the historical perspective of delivery teaching competencies, since this was presented during RHEFINE participation on Erasmus Days Event (Tomić & Vlašić Duić, 2021), but examines the delivery instruction content in the contemporary public speaking textbooks. The criteria for the assessment of the delivery chapters will be discussed as well as a non-phonetic competencies for the instruction of delivery during the speech making process. Although the development of the speech teacher profession has shown the need for the phonetic knowledge even the beginning of the 20th century, it seems that the majority textbooks does not support improvement of the delivery instruction content. The claim that phonetic knowledge is not only required as a part of rhetorical didactics but also in rhetorical research is undoubtedly supported by several analyses of showing how, not only for preparation of the delivery, but also for the analysis of speeches from the public sphere, phonetic knowledge employed as analytic tools is an important and inevitable.

WORKSHOPS

Rhetorical Listening

Trainers: Ana Vlah & Diana Tomić

a.vlah@uu.nl, dtomic@ffzg.hr

The aim of this workshop is to explore listening through interdisciplinary perspectives. Hearing, listening, active listening and rhetorical listening are abilities, skills and concepts which define communication or even wider, our ability to understand the world around us. Warm-up activities will remind us or give us insight in biologically predetermined skills (hearing and listening), while unpacking of the higher-end abilities of active and rhetorical listening will provide better insight in the other and less addressed end of rhetorical and communicative practice.

Collegial Dialogue for Culture of Collaboration

Trainer: Sanja Kišiček

Sanja.kisicek@gmail.com

The aim of this workshop is two-fold: to introduce instructional peer coaching to academia educators and to improve communication skills through a structured type of collegial dialogue. Reciprocal instructional peer coaching that rests on collegial dialogue is a means of professional development that takes place in-house where stakeholders benefit from learning with and from one another in a safe, inclusive and encouraging environment. Involving techniques of active listening, asking the right type of questions, and timely and valid giving and receiving feedback, this conversation protocol overcomes communication issues which often hinder progress in an academic professional environment. The workshop entails the break-down of collegial dialogue steps and the practical implementation through role play.

Speech Skills

Trainers: Elenmari Pletikos Olof & Jelena Vlašić Duić

epletikos@ffzg.hr, jvduic@ffzg.hr

The aim of this workshop is to introduce participants with exercises for improvement of speech skills which are usually done before speech delivery. The exercises include voice and diction exercises as well as delivery. Voice exercises include breathing and phonation, finding the optimal tone, adjusting loudness to the space and the audience, and balancing the timbre. Diction exercises move and control the speech organs, especially the tongue and lips practicing oral motor control, tempo and fluency. Speech interpretation exercises raise awareness of the importance of intonation, rhythm, pauses and other prosodic elements in structuring linguistic information, and carrying a lot of other meanings such as emotional state, attitude towards the text and audience.

Conference Program	
Zagreb (GMT+1)	Thursday, Feb 24th, 2022
8:00-9:00	Registration
9:00-9:30	Conference Opening - hall: D1
9:30-10:00	Welcome Breakfast <i>Room: A208</i>
10:00-11:00	KEYNOTE: Kris Rutten: "The rhetoric of cultural literacy" ONLINE talk (chair: Diana Tomić) hall: D1 ZOOM Link https://bit.ly/RHEFINE_Zoom
11:00-12:30	Session 1 - Rhetoric in educational context (chair: Anita Runjić Stoilova) hall: D1 hybrid ZOOM Link https://bit.ly/RHEFINE_Zoom
11:00-11:20	Petra Aczél: Future-Proofing Rhetorical Education (ONLINE)
11:20-11:40	Sanja Kišiček: Creating a Collaborative Student Centered Culture in Higher Education
11:40-12:00	Zdravka Biočina: Epideictic oratory as educational tool
12:00-12:20	Maria Zaleska: Educational hidden agenda of the debate. A meta-cognitive account (ONLINE)
12:30-13:30	Lunch Break (library hall)
13:30-15:30	Session 2 - Impact and influence of rhetoric in society (chair: Alma Vančura) hall: D1 hybrid ZOOM Link https://bit.ly/RHEFINE_Zoom
13:30-13:50	Kristine Marie Berg: Rhetorical citizenship for a polarised world: Presentation and examination of a course in "bridge building" (ONLINE)
13:50-14:10	Iglika Kassabova: The rhetoric of the protests in Bulgaria 2013-2020: visual and verbal messages (ONLINE)
14:10-14:30	Kristijan Sedak, Paula Galić & Antea Brkić: Interpersonal Communication Channels in Persuasion
14:30-14:50	Ivanka Mavrodieva, Iglika Kassabova, Stefan Serezliev, Yovka Tisheva, Georgi Petkov & Todor S. Simeonov: Rhetorical traditions on Rhetoric in Bulgarian Universities (ONLINE)
14:50-15:10	Ewa Modrzejewska & Agnieszka Szurek: The integration of rhetoric into the curricula of the Faculty of Polish Studies
15:30-16:00	Health Break <i>Room: A208 and walk around the venue</i>
16:00-17:30	Round table: Rhetorical Curricula <i>Room: A209</i>
17:30-18:30	RHEFINE BookClub <i>Room: A209</i>

Zagreb (GMT+1)	Friday, Feb 25th, 2022
9:00-10:00	KEYNOTE: Gabrijela Kišiček: "Speech delivery in rhetorical scholarship: A Historical Overview" ON-SITE (chair: Jelena Vlašić Duić) Hall D1
10:00-11:30	Session 3 - Application of rhetoric in various edu-contexts (chairs: Davor Nikolić & Agnieszka Szurek) hall: D1 hybrid ZOOM Link https://bit.ly/RHEFINE_Zoom
10:00-10:20	Foteini Egglezou: The use of common topics in teaching creative writing (ONLINE)
10:20-10:40	Ivana Bašić: Evidential rhetorical strategies of constructing knowledge in academic discourse
10:40-11:00	Elenmari Pletikos Olof & Mihaela Matešić: Analogy – a rhetorical figure in conveying knowledge
11:00-11:20	Ivanka Mavrodieva, Igljka Kassabova, Stefan Serezliev, Yovka Tisheva, Georgi Petkov & Todor S. Simeonov: Rhetorical analysis of speeches and presentations (ONLINE)
11:30 -12:00	Health Break - Room: A208 and walk around the venue
12:00-13:30	Workshops (parallel sessions)
Room: A209	Rhetorical Listening (trainers: Ana Vlah & Diana Tomić)
Room: A218	Collegial Dialogue for Culture of Collaboration (trainer: Sanja Kišiček)
Room: A214	Speech Skills (trainers: Jelena Vlašić Duić & Elenmari Pletikos Olof)
13:30-14:30	Lunch Break (library hall)
14:30-16:30	Session 4 - Contemporary trends in rhetorical classroom (chairs: Ewa Modrzejewska & Mihaela Matešić) hall: D1 hybrid ZOOM Link https://bit.ly/RHEFINE_Zoom
14:30-14:50	Ana Vlah & Michael Burke: Teaching the Enthymeme
14:50-15:10	Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Kinga Rogowska: Structured Classroom Debate as a Genre for Teaching Rhetoric
15:10-15:30	Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Aleksandra Łukowska: Improvisation at Rhetoric Workshops as a Way of Teaching Communication Skills (ONLINE)
15:30-15:50	Tena Žganec & Ines Carović: Rhetorical characteristics of video blogs
15:50-16:10	Diana Tomić & Jelena Vlašić Duić: Rhetorician & Phonetician: a long way back and a great way ahead
16:10-16:30	Overall discussion and final conclusion.
16:30-17:00	Closing Ceremony

CONFERENCE ADDRESS BOOK

Name/Ime	Surname/Prezime	e-mail	Affiliation/Institucija	Country/Zemlja
Petra	Aczél	petra.aczel@uni-corvinus.hu	Corvinus University of Budapest	Hungary
Alena	Andrlová Fidlerová	alena.fidlerova@ff.cuni.cz	Charles University, Prague	Czechia
Ana	Babić	Ana@translector.eu	Translector	Croatia
Sandra	Balaban	sandrabalaban68@gmail.com	Banjalucafarm Plus	Bosnia & Herzegovina
Tomislava	Balić	tbalic@suvag.hr	Poliklinika SUVAG	Croatia
Ivana	Bašić	basici@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Adrijana	Baus	adrijana.baus@gmail.com	OŠ Bogumila Tonija, Samobor	Croatia
Kristine Marie	Berg	kristinebe@hum.ku.dk	University of Copenhagen, Dept. of Communication, Section of Rhetoric	Denmark
Jasna	Bićanić	jasna.bicanic2@gmail.com	Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet	Croatia
Zdravka	Biočina	zbiočina@windowslive.com	Zagreb School of Economics and Management	Croatia
Nikolina	Borčić	nikolina.borcic@vern.hr	VERN University	Croatia
Darija	Božac Marjanović	express.agencija@gmail.com	Regional Express	Croatia
Ana	Brajković	ana.brajkovic33@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Antea	Brkić	abrkić1@unicath.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia

Name/Ime	Surname/Prezime	e-mail	Affiliation/Institucija	Country/Zemlja
Ines	Carović	carovic.ines@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Ivan	Crnjac	icrnjac@suvag.hr	SUVAG Polyclinic	Croatia
Paul	Dahlgren	paul.dahlgren@gsw.edu	Georgia Southwestern State University	USA
Kristina	Djaković	kdjakov@unipu.hr	Juraj Dobrila University of Pula	Croatia
Arnalda	Dobrić	adobric@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Topa-Bryniarska	Dominika	dominika.topa@gmail.com	University of Silesia in Katowice	Poland
Monika	Dražinić	drazinic.monika@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Ida	Dvorščak	ida.dvorscak@skole.hr	18. gimnazija, Zagreb	Croatia
Foteini	Egglezou	fegglezou@yahoo.gr	Hellenic Institute of Rhetorical and Communication Studies	Greece
Ivana	Franjčević	Ivana.franjcevic156@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Paula	Galić	pgalic@unicath.hr	Catholic University of Croatia	Croatia
Renata	Geld	geldrenata@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Agnieszka	Grazul-Luft	agnieszka.grazul@gmail.com	The Masovian State University in Płock	Poland
Marija	Grgošić	grgosic.marija@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia

Name/Ime	Surname/Prezime	e-mail	Affiliation/Institucija	Country/Zemlja
Marija	Gudan	mgudan@m.ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Dora	Habuš	dora.habus97@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Matea	Haičman	mhaicman@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Nikolina	Haramuštek	nikolinaharamustek1998@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Viktoria	Janković	viki.jank@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Gabrijela	Jezdec	gabrijela.jezdec00@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Neven	Jovanović	neven.jovanovic@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Iglika	Kassabova	iglika.kassabova@gmail.com	Institute of Rhetoric and Communications	Bulgaria
Ana	Katulić	anakatulic@gmail.com	Platforma	Croatia
Sanja	Kišiček	sanja.kisicek@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Gabrijela	Kišiček	gkisicek@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia

Name/Ime	Surname/Prezime	e-mail	Affiliation/Institucija	Country/Zemlja
Marta	Klemenčić	mklemenc3@m.ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Amelia	Kovačević	akovacevic@nsk.hr	National and University Library in Croatia	Croatia
Aleksandra	Łukowska	a.lukowska@uw.edu.pl	University of Warsaw	Poland
Sanja	Mataga	sanjamataga@gmail.com	OŠ Tituša Brezovačkog	Croatia
Mihaela	Matešić	mihaela.matesic@ffri.uniri.hr	University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	Croatia
Ivanka	Mavrodieva	i.mavrodieva@gmail.com	Institute of Rhetoric and Communications	Bulgaria
Irena	Mikulaco	irena.mikulaco@unipu.hr	Juraj Dobrila University of Pula	Croatia
Mateo	Miličević	milicevicmateo@yahoo.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Ewa	Modrzejewska	e.modrzejewska@uw.edu.pl	University of Warsaw	Poland
Mia-Đana	Mrkić	mia.mrkicc@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Dorja	Mučnjak	dmucnjak@nsk.hr	Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u Zagrebu	Croatia
Davor	Nikolić	dnikoli@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Anđela	Nikolić Margan	lina.margan@gmail.com	Poliklinika SUVAG	Croatia

Name/Ime	Surname/Prezime	e-mail	Affiliation/Institucija	Country/Zemlja
Elena	Palčić	palcicelena@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Elenmari	Pletikos Olof	epletikos@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Ádám	Pölcz	polcz.adam@tok.elte.hu	ELTE Eötvös Loránd University	Hungary
Jagoda	Poropat Darrer	jagoda.poropat@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Nika	Pulig	npulig@m.ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Matea	Rebselj	matearebselj@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	croatia
Kinga	Rogowska	kj.rogowska2@uw.edu.pl	University of Warsaw	Poland
Anita	Runjić Stoilova	arunjic@ffst.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split	Croatia
Kris	Rutten	Kris.rutten@ugent.be	Department of Educational Studies of Ghent University	Belgium
Mirela	Ruvić	mruvic@m.ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Kristijan	Sedak	kristijan.sedak@unicath.hr	Catholic University of Croatia	Croatia
Snježana	Srdanović Rogalo	Snjezana.srdanovic.rogalo@gmail.com	Govornička akademija Demosten	Croatia
Agnieszka	Szurek	agnieszka.szurek@uw.edu.pl	University of Warsaw	Poland
Mirela	Španjol Marković	mirela@ciceron.hr	Ciceron komunikacije	Croatia

Name/Ime	Surname/Prezime	e-mail	Affiliation/Institucija	Country/Zemlja
Ivan	Šprajc	isprajc@gmail.com	Ekonomska, trgovačka i ugostiteljska škola, Samobor	Croatia
Marija	Trapić	mtraptic@gmail.com	Škola primijenjene umjetnosti i dizajna, Zagreb	Croatia
Ankica	Trogrlić Matić	atrogrli@m.ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Alma	Vančura	almavancura@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Osijek	Croatia
Ana	Vidović Zorić	anvidovi@ffzg.hr	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Ana	Vlah	ana.vlah@outlook.com; a.vlah@uu.nl	Utrecht University	The Netherlands
Jelena	Vlašić Duić	jvduic@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Marija	Volarević	mavolarevic@gmail.com	VERN' University	Croatia
Tijana	Vukić	tijana.vukic@unipu.hr	Juraj Dobrila University of Pula	Croatia
Maria	Zaleska	m.zaleska@uw.edu.pl	University of Warsaw	Poland
Ana	Žagmešter	ana.zagmester@gmail.com	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	Croatia
Tena	Žganec	tena.zganec8@gmail.com	Govornička akademija Demosten	Croatia