

PowerPoint and the Evolution of Electronic Eloquence: Evidence from the Contemporary Business Presentation

Dale Cyphert

The electronic age is said to have brought a reconfiguration of rhetorical norms and of eloquence in public address. The ubiquitous use of presentation software suggests this evolution might be observed in the "state of the art" discourse in the business environment. This project examines professional expectations with respect to PowerPoint over its thirty year history to locate the direction of eloquence in both the business community and the larger public sphere.

Despite a fair amount of disciplinary angst, presentation technology has become a part of the landscape in public speaking (Cyphert, 2007). Theoretical attention to the impact of media on contemporary public address has often been couched in critical terms (Jamieson, 1998; Postman, 1985; Slayden & Whillock, 1999), and the popular press has certainly documented negativity on the part of bored and disgusted audiences (Jackson, 2001; Jaffe, 2000; Nunberg, 1999; Tufte, 2003a, 2003b). The reality is, however, that as software, laptops and portable projection equipment have become easily and cheaply available, computer enhanced presentations have become a baseline expectation of formal presentations, especially in business (Ganzel, 2000) and increasingly in legal (Feigenson & Dunn, 2003) and civic venues as well (Parker, 2001). Ten years ago, a quarter of speakers in one survey claimed to use projection equipment for “most” of their presentations, with more than 40% claiming to use multimedia on occasion (Hanke, 1999), and the PowerPoint software is now ubiquitous. Microsoft Office Suite, which includes PowerPoint as a bundled element, boasted 120 million registered users at the turn of the century (Ricadela, 2000) with an estimated 96% market penetration (McCracken, 2000; Rankin & Hoas, 2001), despite continuing challenges from open-source competitors (“Rivals set their sights on Microsoft Office: Can they topple the giant?,” 2007). The question is no longer whether public speaking is done with presentation software; it is time to move on to such questions as how, when, and why it is used, and to what rhetorical ends.

A reasonable place to begin is with Kathleen Hall Jamieson’s careful analysis of emerging norms of eloquence as we entered an age of electronic media (1998). She was not altogether pleased with the effect on public discourse, but offered the argument that media-conditioned audiences respond to “an alliance among self-disclosure, conversation, visual dramatization and verbal distillation” (1998 66). We might suppose that these trends, which she identified in the national political arena, would also be reflected, albeit at a less polished level, in everyday public address. Such a trend has not, however, been documented.

One study of professional best practices identified several areas of agreement that do conform to Jamieson’s formula for electronic eloquence. Across a variety of venues, topics, and audiences, users of presentation software were urged to use its visual capabilities to establish a clear and consistent visual identity, utilize images and graphics to communicate visually whenever possible, and to control the flow of information presented to the audience in order to better focus their attention on the message. PowerPoint was framed as a tool that was ideally used to enhance one’s connection and rapport with an audience by creating flexible decks that could be used responsively as the speech situation developed (Cyphert, 2001). Still, the existence of advice consistent with media norms does not guarantee that speakers actually incorporate those principles in their day-to-day rhetoric.

Those who use presentation software regularly have long argued that viewers of presentation software, familiar with the visual style of television and film, have come to expect a similar experience in other mediated venues (Simons, 1998). They are also adamant that most speakers do not do a particularly good job of using presentation software to emulate that style. Microsoft estimates that its PowerPoint users take advantage of only about 10 to 20 percent of the software’s technical capability (Simons, 1998), and in fact, the technology has been widely

condemned because it allows mediocre speakers to wallow in their mediocrity; “PowerPoint’s reliability has lulled more than a few presenters and planners into creative complacency, resulting in audiovisual presentations that too often are monotonous, static, even boring” (Carey, 1999 47).

The argument has been made that instruction ought to assist students in meeting the expectations of contemporary audiences (Cyphert, 2007; Frobish, 2000), but it is not clear, at this point, whether the mere availability of a new technology (i.e. PowerPoint) might somehow encourage the uptake of emergent rhetorical norms independently of their explicit instruction. Certainly, Jameson’s principles seem to inform the last decade’s most highly acclaimed examples of software-supported public address. Lawyers bringing suits against Vioxx manufacturer, Merck & Company, made headlines with the highly visual narrative of their closing arguments (Curran, 2006; Hoffman, 2006; Parloff, 2005a, 2005b). Al Gore set a new standard of presentation media with his visually arresting slide show, *An Inconvenient Truth* (Gallo, 2006; Rosteck & Frentz, 2009). These presentations were prepared by highly paid consultants, however, who cater to a market of high profile business executives,¹ and the question remains as to the practices of everyday speakers.

A Review of Mundane Presentations

Any causal relationship among the capabilities of new communication technology, eloquent examples of early adopters, the influence of rhetorical criticism, and the impact of explicit training will undoubtedly prove to be complex and subtle. The first step might be to ascertain whether everyday users of presentation software. Some ten years after Jamieson identified emerging norms, with ten years of professional best practices advice, and having been exposed to several highly publicized examples of excellence, we might ask whether typical users have moved beyond default bullet points and supplied templates toward a visually-oriented, rapport-building use of the medium.

Methodology

A search was made for preserved examples of presentation slides. Google was used as a search engine in order to locate slides in active use rather than private postings never seen by live audiences, and only results from English language websites were reviewed. Archive locations were limited to .com sites in order to avoid educational uses in favor of business practice. Within that subset, those that provided instruction about PowerPoint use, software details (including any shows prepared by Microsoft), PowerPoint products and add-ons, or instructional PowerPoints prepared for sale many were eliminated. The final screen identified the occasion for which the .ppt file had been originally created, insuring that the slides had been designed to support a live presentation and not as a kiosk or website training tool. Finally, the sample was limited so that only one presentation from any single company was included. Twenty eight acceptable samples of speakers’ slides were located (See Appendix).

The sample decks were examined for the specifics of practitioner-developed best practices (Cyphert, 2001) as well as Jamieson’s more general categories of electronic eloquence. To the

¹ Vioxx lawyers worked with Cliff Atkinson of Social Media, and Al Gore worked with Duarte Design.

extent that narrative or self-disclosure can be discerned, those elements are recorded as well, but with the recognition that significant elements might be delivered orally or physically, quite independently of the visuals, and that the use of PowerPoints interactive features can be difficult to judge outside the speech context. Quantitative findings are thus reported only with respect to the first three elements of professional best practices, identity creation, visualization, and information focus techniques.

Best Practices

Identity

A baseline standard of professional PowerPoint use involves the customization of slide templates to reflect a unique look, and ideally one that serves to establish a corporate identity. Simply clicking on a design from the software's library marks a speaker as lazy, unprofessional and disinterested, while customized backgrounds say "my identity is important and I am different from my competitors" (Wilder "Two" 30). A good presentation will, at a minimum, use colors that have some connection with a company's logo or product ("You Have" A17). If time and resources are warranted, a background can be designed to incorporate a company's logo, representative photos or drawings, or visual signifiers of organizational activities. For some contexts, the creation of a clear, positive identity is considered crucial to an effective presentation. A sales presentation, for instance, "demands a customized background" (Wilder "Customizing"30).

In general, the speaker is expected to create a single look that establishes a visual identity and to use it for multiple presentations, perhaps varying it only slightly to accommodate varying lighting or media requirements. Another option, however, is to customize slide backgrounds, colors and visuals for each audience. As one consultant put it, "when you create a look to represent them, clients know you spent time, energy and money on them" (Wilder "Customizing" 30).

As measures of identity creation, therefore, decks were evaluated on three elements, 1) the use of a custom design or background, rather than an identifiable Microsoft supplied design template, 2) speaker or company identification through the use of a logo, photo or color palette, and 3) design customized for a particular audience or venue for scores ranging from 0 to 3 on this element.

Visualization

The assumption of practitioners had been that "multimedia viewers have a subconscious expectation that images should come at them like television commercials—up to 200 cuts in 30 seconds" (Britz A22). Yet, as a best practice, speakers are warned, "too many graphics will overwhelm your audience" ("You Have" A17). Images are powerful, but should be selected to accomplish specific purposes: help an audience to visualize a projected or desired outcome that doesn't yet exist (Hill "Classy"), increase memorability of specific information ("You Have" A17), or take advantage of narrative potential (Endicott "When" 29; Wilder "For Added" 32). The overuse of media is an ever present danger, although such guidelines as "twenty slides is plenty for a 25-minute presentation" ("You Have" A10) seem to be somewhat arbitrary judgments of how much is too much.

The use of visual images in the decks was evaluated in terms of 1) the proportion of slides devoted to graphical or visual images², 2) the proportion of visuals that were representational images rather than charts, graphs or numeric tables, and 3) the proportion of bullet point slides, not counting menu slides or SEC required disclosure statements, but including all-text slides in single block).³ A visibility score was constructed by taking the proportion of graphics and visuals to the number of slides, adding a bonus factor for the number of representational images, subtracting the proportion of pure bullet point slides. This places graphically designed but text-based slides as a zero point between bullet points and fully visual slides. The results are thus expressed as a % of visibility, with -100% representing a presentation that consists completely of bullet point slides, and +100% indicating a graph or image on every slide.

Focus

Focus involves the use of graphics to cue an audience to attend more fully to specific information, ideas or conclusions. “Think like a billboard designer...,” says one consultant, “every piece of information you want to convey doesn’t have to be displayed on the screen” (“You Have” A17). The point is not to simply display everything that the speaker says, but to make the entire message more memorable by causing an audience to remember a clearly outstanding item in the visual field (Hanke). Words are often used in the form of a title, which should give the specific point or idea being made, functioning like a headline to be both informative and dynamic (Heimes). In fact, a visual display of information without any explicit verbal summary of its purpose within the overall presentation is generally considered unacceptable. One author claims “the most common mistake is to simply put a chart showing sales or earnings into a presentation without identifying the reason for its existence” (Fine 40). Instead, an explicit summary title will “turn data into information” (Wilder "Reader's" 36). In order to create an acceptably focused title, a speaker is required to “keep boiling information down to the essential (Schatz 34), which is presumed to involve the direct transmission of information. In contemporary presentations, “the flowery and subtle have no place on a slide” (Schatz 34). Each visual should make one point, which should “jump out” at the audience (Heimes).

Within each segment of the speech, furthermore, a speaker is expected to carefully order the material and to visually guide the audience through the ideas. Much as verbal signposting functions in a completely verbal presentation, graphic design is expected to perform a functional role in helping the audience follow the logic of the presentation. Comprehension and retention improve dramatically with correctly used color, which “can help audience members sort out the various elements of a slide” (Hanke). A speaker should bring in points or data one piece at a time, fading them once they have been covered so that the audience focuses on “specific pieces of

² The total number of slides was taken from the file data, with the result that the score is inflated where animated graphics were created with multiple slides.

³ Illustrative visuals, those not tied to a specific information point, were counted separately from information-carrying graphics. However, this involved some judgment and the types were collapsed into a report of visuals. Current work is being done with the data and multiple raters will be used to clarify categorization and improve data reliability.

information” (Schatz 35). Alternatively, a speaker can use graphic pointers that call attention to specific aspects of charts or data, which then disappear or move when going on to the next point (Schatz 35).

Interestingly, the use of visuals to guide the audience is framed as much by absences of stimuli as it is by the introduction of stimuli. A fundamental design principle is visual simplicity. The excessive use of text is a major error made by novice speakers, along with gratuitous clip art or sound effects (Endicott "Forging" 27). Speakers are urged to never present more than four points on a single slide, or more than four or five words per point. The aim is to create a unified visual display rather than a typographic version of the verbal flow. While a reader apprehends a text a word at a time, the speaker's audience tends to see the slide as a single graphic object (Schatz 34), and any words must be carefully incorporated into the overall visual field. The audience should be allowed to see only those elements that support the specific point being made. Presenters are urged to remove from charts or graphs any words or numbers that are repeated or that don't need to be seen or discussed (Wilder "Chart" 30). Speakers should guide the eye to the main point with arrows, animation or color, but remove all extraneous elements of the display, using a single data series and removing redundant words, scales or data point labels, grid lines, footnotes or other details that detract from the point being made (Fine; Wilder "Simplify" 32).

The pacing of visual stimuli is important as well. Because “listeners need time absorb” what they are given, the speaker should take care to “let the information accumulate by revealing pieces of information one slide at a time”(“You Have” A17). A black slide or blank screen can be inserted “as a means of arresting the emotional flow of the presentation” (Hanke "Psychology" 49). An audience will remember material best when it has an opportunity to digest a new slide for a few seconds before the speaker adds vocal information, especially if visuals are complex (Hanke "Psychology" 49). On the other hand, media-savvy audiences who have learned to expect the rich visual stimuli of television can find a single slide left on view for an extended period to be monotonous and distracting. Thus visuals can have greater impact if the screen is blacked out periodically, focusing the audience's attention back on the speaker (“You Have” A22).

Transitions from one visual to the next should be handled thoughtfully. “When presented with a new slide, our eyes gravitate toward geometric shapes, rows of bullets and other graphic elements before we read the text.... Our eyes seek out the simplest, most obvious shapes first, then moving to the more complex shapes and patterns and finally to the text” (Hanke 51). The presenter should insure, therefore, that the overall shape of the visual guides the audience's attention exactly as required to make the desired point. Because a Western reading audience is habituated to seek new information from left to right, the speaker is encouraged to use builds that move in from the left side to catch the audience's eye. Nevertheless, the audience can't read the text while it's moving and is simultaneously distracted from the speaker as well (Schatz 35). Animation should not be inserted arbitrarily. Instead, builds should be used only if speakers “plan to say a sentence or two about each” (Wilder "Simplify" 32).

Focus is also maintained with consistency in design styles. Different text effects, symbols and graphics can draw attention to key words or ideas but should *only* be used when special emphasis is desired (Heimes). Otherwise, changes in design elements or content sends “mixed

messages” that should be avoided (Heimes). Visual variety is expected to gain and maintain audience attention: “It’s best to use some text slides, some with pictures, some with charts and some with shapes,” changing the every fourth slide or so, (Wilder "A Consistent" 30) and insuring that no fewer than half the visuals contain some sort of graphic to maintain interest of audience (Hanke "Psychology" 51). Nevertheless, “the key to a successful presentation is a little bit of variety, not a lot” (Wilder "A Consistent" 30), and “too many bells and whistles can leave your audience remembering only the bells and whistles.” Speakers are consistently urged to “err on the conservative side” (“You Have” A18).

Some elements of focus involve the speed with which a speaker introduces each slide, which could not be gauged from the decks alone, but the decks could be scored on their inclusion of features designed to focus audience attention: 1) menu slides, 2) organizationally relevant titles or headers, 3) animation or other mechanisms to control the flow of information to the audience,⁴ 4) transitions, pause slides, or other indications of mindful attention to information flow, and 5) design consistency. The results are expressed as a focus score ranging from 0 to 5.

Connections

Best practice clearly involves the use of PowerPoint to enhance rather than hinder the speaker’s ability to create a connection with the audience. While “today’s electronic presentations have opened up a new range of presenting possibilities, particularly in the areas of flexibility and audience interaction” (Endicott "Hyperlinks" 29), the leading complaint is that poor speakers hide in the dark, clicking through pre-arranged slides without creating any connection with the audience. In an excellent performance, “slides support a presenter; they should not replace the audience’s personal interaction with the presenter” who “adds the humor, digressions, passion and eloquence” (Schatz 34).

Speakers are urged, at the very minimum, to remain the focus of attention, moving around and using gestures, standing in the light away from the computer, using a remote mouse or pointer, and positioning equipment to see the image without turning away from the audience (“You Have” A10; Torok). The potential competition from the screen itself must always be countered, and speakers are urged to explicitly direct the audience’s attention, gesturing at the screen to direct an audience’s gaze there and standing still while using moving text to capture its attention. Conversely, a speaker should move around to bring attention back to him or herself (Torok), perhaps blanking out the screen entirely. For audiences accustomed to reading from left to right, a speaker who stands on its left can take advantage of the audience’s natural eye movement. It will follow a gesture to the screen, but naturally return back to the speaker as soon as it has finished reading any text (Torok).

Further, visual elements of a presentation should be designed to support rather than compete with the speaker. Simplicity and clarity of the graphic design are more than just aesthetic considerations. “When we first look at a slide, our eyes quickly scan the entire image to get an immediate sense of what we’re looking at. The faster we can figure out what the slide is saying,

⁴ While it is not generally possible to discern this after slides were converted to .pdf files for on line archive, it was assumed not to be there unless obvious clues (i.e. overlapping images or multiple slides of the same graphic with sequentially added elements)

the better we're able to turn our focus back to the presenter" (Hanke "Psychology" 49; also Heimes; Schatz). Importantly, animation is not a guarantor of connection with the audience. "Carelessly used motion and sound can sometimes falsely suggest interactivity" and should be used sparingly to focus attention rather than dilute it (Schatz 35). Similarly, transitions between slides tend to break the flow of the speaker's interaction with the audience (35).

The real interactive power of presentation software comes with its dynamic software features, including branches, hidden slides and buttons that allow flexible responsiveness and interactivity with an audience. With the ability to prepare slides that can be used in virtually any order, a presentation can be tailored to different audiences, offering support information, examples or arguments that are geared for each one. Slides can be prepared to reinforce a point with an audience that demands additional evidence, or to respond to its questions. If time is short, or if an audience does not raise an objection, the slides can be ignored without ever posing a distraction to the audience (Schatz 33). The ability to create a presentation that consists of flexibly hyperlinked options allows the speaker to abandon completely the traditional linear speech organization. A linear progression of slides implies a rank order of ideas that might not be accurate, and forcing information into a narrative format can compromise it (Schatz 33). The eloquent contemporary speaker is expected instead to prepare material and present it in an interactive exchange with the audience, an organizational format that is much closer to the "petal" model of non-Western speaking than to the traditional linear outline taught in the basic course.

Of course, the sophistication of software-supported public speaking poses a contradiction in its potential for mystery. A "well rehearsed orchestration of interactive elements can leave audiences spell-bound. But as soon as a link doesn't do what it's supposed to, the cloak of seamlessness disappears, exposing our technology and methods" (Endicott "Hyperlinks" 29). The resulting technical apprehension can create a barrier between an audience and an inexperienced speaker, but the development of contemporary rhetorical competence involves preparing for technical difficulties. "Don't hide behind your slides," urges Betsy Fasbinder, partner in New Leaf Communications. "Connect with people. Laugh at yourself. Open your body. Smile. Tell stories" ("You Have" A22). Speakers are urged to be ready to speak without the hardware or have a backup system if the presentation absolutely requires it (Torok). The most eloquent are ready to take the audience "behind the presentation curtain," maintaining the connection with the audience by turning the moment into an interactive opportunity (Endicott "Hyperlinks" 29). Still, the competent speaker is now one who has included technical aspects of venue as part of the preparation process. Colors must be checked for projection accuracy, equipment tested for intrusive automatic programs, processing power verified, and backup media prepared ("You Have" A17; Torok).

Much of the best practice advice pertains to delivery elements not observable directly from the speakers' decks, although slides could be judged in terms of 1) simplicity and clarity of the slide design, and 2) indications of planned interaction (i.e. hidden slides, branches, etc.). A single score was assigned, from 0 indicating a cluttered, distracting design to 3 for both simplicity in design and some indication of planned interactivity.

Electronic Eloquence

To the extent that indicators are apparent in the slide design alone, these decks were reviewed for Jamieson’s framework of electronic eloquence. Narrative was noted on the basis of any apparent story arc, character driven content, or an explicit moral to the story of the presentation. Presumably self-disclosure would occur primarily during a speaker’s verbal release of personal information, but any indications on the slides were noted as part of the with the audience connection score. Specifics of visuality were captured in the visuality statistics noted above.

Findings

Two holistic observations were made from this sample. First the color palette used across all decks was relatively limited. The predominate color was IBM blue, hailed by marketing consultants at mid-century as the color with the strongest credibility, along with black, white, and a relatively few yellow, gold, or red accents. Secondly, the total number of slides varied from 16 to 115. Since the intended or actual duration of the presentations was not available, this data was not further analyzed. It should be noted, however, that several speakers used multiple slides rather than chart animation to build a graphic, and any work done with slide counts should take this into account.

Identity

Seventy nine percent of the sample used a slide design that was not readily identifiable as a Microsoft supplied template. Sixty-four percent used the speaker’s company logo as a visual identifier, and eleven percent incorporated a logo of the speech venue or audience’s organization. Overall, the presentations scored 1.54 out of a possible 3, with only one example incorporating all three possible identity elements.

Table 1: Identity

Speaker	Unique Design	Company Identity	Audience Identity	Score

Arehart	1	1		2
Gupta	1	1		2
Cavalinni	1	1		2
CSX	1	1	1	3
Graham	1	1		2
ICO	1	1		2
Boda	1	1		2
Meeker	1	1		2
Khosla	1			1
Simmons	1	1		2
Llamas	1		1	2
Foggia	1	1		2
Hawkins	1	1		2
Kaminsky	1	1		2
HR Block	1	1		2
Johnson Co.	1		1	2
Chipcase	1			1
Praxair	1	1		2
Lawrence		1		1
Spencer	1	1		2
Freedman	1			1
Haque	1			1
Leonard	1			1
Pilosov				0
Chao				0
Uurity		1		1
Abobda		1		1
Zyp				0
AVERAGE				1.54

Visualization

Although bullet point slides remain a large component of the typical presentation, comprising 42% of the total, they are outnumbered by visual images or graphics, which comprise 47% of the slides. This leaves 11% of the slides in the neutral category of designed text slides, most of which function as focusing tools, providing internal menus or signposts. Perhaps most significant is the wide range of visualization, with Zyp scoring at -95%, indicating that nearly all slides consisted of bullet points with no graphics at all, to the CSX presentation, which included graphics on 64% of the slides. Overall, the average score of -.093 suggests that while visuals are closely balanced with bullet points, the typical presentation could not be considered highly visual in the sense of Jameson's media-rich eloquence.

Table 2: Visualization

Speaker	Total slides	bullets only	graphic	image	Score
Arehart	42	22	14		-19%
Gupta	16	8	5	2	-6%
Cavalinni	50	30	16		-28%
CSX	22	1	13	2	64%
Graham	46	18	18		0%
ICO	37	24	6	1	-46%
Boda	19	4	13		47%
Meeker	72	5	46	1	58%
Khosla	115	9	42	12	39%
Simmons	36	15	16	4	14%
Llamas	42	39	1		-90%
Foggia	22	10	11		5%
Hawkins	49	18	17		-2%
Kaminsky	38	21	15		-16%
HR Block	25	12	6		-24%
Johnson Co.	65	15	46	1	49%
Chipcase	82	0	8	31	48%
Praxair	16	5	9	2	38%
Lawrence	28	23	2		-75%
Spencer	40	16	22	1	18%
Freedman	25	11	6		-20%
Haque	107	55	27		-26%
Leonard	54	42	6	3	-61%
Pilosov	31	24	2		-71%
Chao	59	20	32		20%
Uurity	54	27	23		-7%
Abobda	18	14	1		-72%
Zyp	39	37			-95%
AVERAGE					-0.093

Focus

Focus elements are relatively common in the sample presentations, although a single menu slide and design consistency are used twice as often as graphical signposts or animation tools. Very few presenters took advantage of the full range of tools recommended in the best practices

literature, and the overall score of average of 1.8 indicates that speakers are using less than half of the tools easily available to them.

Table 3: Focus

Connections

It is admittedly difficult to gauge efforts to develop rapport with the audience from the presentation decks alone, but given the low incidence of use with respect to focus tools, it is not surprising to find virtually no evidence of hidden or branching slides used as a way of establishing interactive connections with an audience.

Speaker	menus	signposting	animation	transitions	design consistency	Score
Arehart	1	1	1		1	4
Gupta	1	1			1	3
Cavalinni	1	1		1	1	4
CSX					1	1
Graham	1		1			2
ICO	1	1				2
Boda	1				1	2
Meeker	1					1
Khosla	1		1		1	3
Simmons						0
Llamas	1				1	2
Foggia			1		1	2
Hawkins				1	1	2
Kaminsky					1	1
HR Block	1					1
Johnson Co.	1					1
Chipcase		1			1	2
Praxair	1					1
Lawrence		1			1	2
Spencer		1				1
Freedman	1		1			2
Haque	1				1	2
Leonard		1			1	2
Pilosov	1		1		1	3
Chao	1		1			2
Urity	1					1
Abobda	1					1
Zyp	1					1
AVERAGE						1.8

Table 4: Connections

Speaker	simplicity	branches	Score
Arehart			0
Gupta	1		1
Cavalinni			0
CSX	1		1
Graham			0
ICO			0
Boda			0
Meeker			0
Khosla	1		1
Simmons			0
Llamas			0
Foggia			0
Hawkins			0
Kaminsky			0
HR Block			0
Johnson Co.			0
Chipcase	1		1
Praxair			0
Lawrence			0
Spencer			0
Freedman			0
Haque			0
Leonard			0
Pilosov	1		1
Chao		1	1
Uurity			0
Abobda			0
Zyp			0
AVERAGE			0.21

Narrative and Self-Disclosure

Five of the presentations included a story line, two involving a mystery solved, two including a narrative to illustrate a point being made, and one maintaining a narrative arc throughout the presentation that included both characters and a moral. A sixth presentation

included a character in the person of a child able to accomplish the targeted action, but without an accompanying story line. Only one presentation included a self-disclosure element within the slide deck, and that was a relatively low-impact explanation of how the sources were vetted prior to giving the presentation.

Works Cited

- Carey, R. (1999, October). Spice it Up. *Successful Meetings*, 47-50.
- Curran, J. (2006, 3 Apr). Closing arguments offered in Vioxx trial. *Businessweek Online* Retrieved 18 Apr, 2006, from http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D8GOQ5580.htm?campaign_id=apn_home_down&chan=db
- Cyphert, D. (2001, 31 Mar). *Best Practices? A Survey of PowerPoint Tips for the Road Warrior*. Paper presented at the Association for Business Communication Midwest/Eastern/Southeastern Regional Conference, Kansas City, MO.
- Cyphert, D. (2007). Presentation technology in the age of electronic eloquence: From visual aid to visual rhetoric. *Communication Education*, 56(2), 168-192.
- Feigenson, N., & Dunn, M. A. (2003). New Visual Technologies in Court: Directions for Research. *Law and Human Behavior*, 27(1), 109-.
- Frobish, T. (2000). Jamieson meets Lucas: Eloquence and pedagogical model(s) in *The art of public speaking*. *Communication Education*, 49(3), 239-252.
- Gallo, C. (2006). Al Gore's convenient presentation. *Business Week*.
- Ganzel, R. (2000, Feb). Power pointless. *Presentation*, 14, 53-58.
- Hanke, J. (1999, June). Survey Offers Glimpse of the Average Presenter. *Presentations*, 13, 13.
- Hoffman, C. (2006, 19 Apr). Making a (Power) Point of Not Being Tiresome. *Los Angeles Times* latimes.com. Retrieved 25 Apr, 2006, from <http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-powerpoint19apr19,0,5705385,full.story>
- Jackson, J. (2001). PowerPointless. Retrieved 29 Dec, 2005
- Jaffe, G. (2000, 26 April). What's Your Point, Lieutenant? Just Cut to the Pie Charts: The Pentagon Declares War on Electric Slide Shows that Make Briefings a Pain. *Wall Street Journal*, p. 1,
- Jamieson, K. H. (1998). *Eloquence in an electronic age: The transformation of political speechmaking*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCracken, H. (2000, 5 Oct 2000). The Suite Hereafter: Sneak Peek at the Next Microsoft Office. *PC World* Retrieved 25 Jan, 2001, from <http://www.pcworld.com>
- Nunberg, G. (1999, 20 Dec). The trouble with PowerPoint. *Fortune*, 140, 330-334.

Parker, I. (2001, 28 May). Absolute PowerPoint: Can a software package edit our thoughts? *The New Yorker*, 87-93.

Parloff, R. (2005a, 8 Aug 2005). The Preacher Who's Raising Hell with Merck. *Fortune*, 152, 20.

Parloff, R. (2005b, 15 July). Stark Choices at the First Vioxx Trial. *Fortune*.

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. New York: Viking.

Rankin, E. L., & Hoaas, D. J. (2001). The Use of PowerPoint and Student Performance. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 29(1), 113.

Ricadela, A. (2000, 4 September 2000). Microsoft's Challenge: Ensuring Office's Future Success. Retrieved 25 Jan, 2001, from <http://www.informationweek.com>

Rivals set their sights on Microsoft Office: Can they topple the giant? (2007). *Journal*. Retrieved from <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1795>

Rosteck, T., & Frentz, T. S. (2009). Myth and multiple readings in environmental rhetoric: The case of *An Inconvenient Truth*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 95(1), 1-19.

Simons, T. (1998, November). Playing catch-up with the software of the millennium. *Presentations*.

Slayden, D., & Whillock, R. K. (Eds.). (1999). *Soundbite culture: The death of discourse in a wired world*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tufte, E. R. (2003a). *The cognitive style of PowerPoint* (monograph). Chesire, CT: Graphics Press LLC.

Tufte, E. R. (2003b, Sep 2003). PowerPoint is Evil: Power Corrupts. PowerPoint Corrupts Absolutely. Issue 11.09. Retrieved 29 Dec, 2005

Appendix

This manuscript is being submitted to the American Communication Journal [http://www.acjournal.org/], an electronic journal devoted to work in mediated communication. The article, including screen shots, tables, and appendices provided here, will be submitted in html with tables linked directly to the presentation files.

Presentations, left to right, top to bottom on the screen shot, are described below.

Haque, Umair

Business strategy consulting firm

2005, Spring

The New Economics of Media: Micromedia, Connected Consumption, and the Snowball Effect

www.bubblegeneration.com/resources/mediaeconomics.ppt; [file](#)

Kaminsky, Dan, Director of Penetration Testing, IOActive, Inc

Computer security consulting firm

2008

www.doxpara.com/DMK_Neut_toor.ppt; [file](#)

Khosla, Vinod Khosla Ventures

Venture capital, strategic consulting firm

2008, May to the World Bank

Mostly Convenient Truths: From a Technology Optimist

<http://www.khoslaventures.com/presentations/WorldBank.ppt>; [file](#)

Abobda, Bernard, Drizzle

Internet access provider

2003, June 4, WFA Public Access Group

Virtual Access Points

www.drizzle.com/~aboba/IEEE/virtual-APs.ppt; [file](#)

Cavallini, Donna F. Principal, InfoFirst LLC and Pacifici, Sabrina I., owner/publisher, LLRX

Marketing consultant and legal research resources provider

Presentation date, audience not located

www.llrx.com/features/gotci.ppt; [file](#)

Mike Freedman, NYU, Kobbi Nissim, MSR, Benny Pinkas, HP Labs

IT solutions

2004, Eurocrypt

www.zurich.ibm.com/eurocrypt2004/slides/session1talk1.ppt; [file](#)

Spencer, Stephan, founder & president, Netconcepts

Internet marketing solutions

SEO Mistakes Most Bloggers Make

2008

www.netconcepts.com/learn/seo-mistakes.ppt; [file](#)

Gupta, Shanit, Principal Consultant, Foundstone Professional Services
Internet security consultants

2008, August 7, Black Hat Conference

www.blackhat.com/presentations/bh-usa-08/Gupta/BH_US_08_Gupta_Got_Citrix_Hack_IT.pdf;
[file](#)

Graham, Robert, Founder & CEO, and David Maynor, Founder & CTO, Errata Security
Cybersecurity consulting firm

2007, Black Hat Conference, Washington DC

www.erratasec.com/BH_DC_07_Data_seepage.ppt; [file](#)

Pilosov, Alex, President of Pilosoft and Tony Kapela, 5Nines Data

Internet ip and hosting provider and internet testing service

2008, 10 Aug; Defcon 16, Las Vegas NV

eng.5ninesdata.com/~tkapela/iphd-2.ppt; [file](#)

Meeker, Mary, Joseph, David, and Thaker, Anant, Morgan Stanley

Investment management firm

2008, March 18

Internet Trends

<http://www.morganstanley.com/institutional/techresearch/pdfs/InternetTrends031808.pdf>; [file](#)

Simmons, Mark, Simmons & Company

Investment bank specializing in the energy industry

2004, 9 Sep, The Hudson Institute

Twilight in the Desert: The Fading of Saudi Arabia's Oil

<http://www.simmonsco-intl.com/files/Hudson%20Institute%20September.pdf>; [file](#)

Llamas, Ignacio, NVIDIA and Thibieroz, Nicolas, AMD

software and peripherals; chip manufacturer

2008, February; Game Developers Conference '08

DirectX 10 Performance

developer.download.nvidia.com/presentations/2008/GDC/GDC08-D3DDay-Performance.pdf; [file](#)

Chipchase, Jan, Mobile HCI Group, Nokia

telephone manufacturer (Finland)

2006, September 14th; UIAH, Finland

Literacy, Communication & Design

www.janchipchase.com/blog/presentations/JanChipchase_CommunicationLiteracyDesign_vFinal_External.ppt; [file](#)

Urity, Security Friday Co., Ltd (Japan)
Security technology research, consulting
2002, Feb 8; Windows Security Briefings
Cracking NTLMv2 Authentication
www.blackhat.com/presentations/win-usa-02/urity-winsec02.ppt; [file](#)

satellite communications
2006, July; Annual Meeting and Investor Presentation
ICO Global Communications ICO North America, Inc.
www.ico.com/about/dataroom/files/ICO_Investor_Presentation_7-13-2006.pdf; [file](#)

Hawkins, Jeff, IBM
Software sales and solutions
2006, May 10;
Hierarchical Temporal Memory (HTM)
www.almaden.ibm.com/institute/resources/2006/Almaden%20Institute%20Jeff%20Hawkins.ppt;
[file](#)

Chao, Philip A., Microsoft
Software research and development
2004, Dec 3; Globcom Tutorial
Practical Network Coding for the Internet and Wireless Networks
research.microsoft.com/~pachou/pubs/ChouTutorial04.ppt; [file](#)

Boda, Krisztina, and Matthew Stahl, OpenEye Scientific Software
software to the pharmaceutical industry for molecular modeling and cheminformatics
2008, March; OpenEye CUP IX, Santa Fe
title
<http://www.eyesopen.com/about/events/cups-2008/pdfs-CUP/CUP9-OEChemMCSS-Boda.pdf>;
[file](#)

Arehart, Charlie, CTO, New Atlanta Communications
Software development and solutions
title
Various ((CFUN 03 6/21-22/03, MX On The Rocks 3/20-21/03, CF Europe 5/29-30/03, MX Vegas 6/2-4/03); Deploying CFML w/BlueDragon
<http://www.systemmanage.com/presentations/index.cfm#cf>; [file](#)

Breeden, Richard, Chairman, H&R Block
Tax preparation services
2008, Sept 3; Fiscal 2009 First Quarter Earnings Conference Call
<http://phx.corporate-ir.net/phoenix.zhtml?c=76888&p=irol-audioarchives>; [file](#)

Lawrence, Rebecca, MPH, PMP, CPHIMS, Hayes Management Consulting

Healthcare information systems consultants

2004, March 12; IDX Western Region User Group

[http://www.hayesmanagement.com/pubs/presentations/03-04 WRUG ArtofNegotiation.pdf](http://www.hayesmanagement.com/pubs/presentations/03-04_WRUG_ArtofNegotiation.pdf); [file](#)

Leonard, Dr. Michael P., Professor of Surgery and Pediatrics, CHEO

Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario

Surgical Intervention for Vesicoureteric Reflux- Change Management

2008, Oct 15: (not clear that a presentation was involved)

<http://www.urologyrounds.com/files/PDF/oct-15-08.pdf>; [file](#)

Chuck McConnell, Vice President, Praxair

Manufacturer of industrial, process and specialty gases

OxyCoal Combustion Technology for CO2 Capture

2007, Dec 6; Energy and Resources Conference, The Chemists Club, NY

[http://www.praxair.com/praxair.nsf/0/B95B496FB5A6561C8525726C007E2A55/\\$file/PraxairEnergyResourcesConf-ChemistsClubNY-12-06-07.pdf](http://www.praxair.com/praxair.nsf/0/B95B496FB5A6561C8525726C007E2A55/$file/PraxairEnergyResourcesConf-ChemistsClubNY-12-06-07.pdf); [file](#)

David Foggia, MD, Ear, Nose & Throat Consultants of Nevada

2006, December; Southwest Medical Associates

Rhinosinusitis

<http://www.smalv.com/body.cfm?id=555557>; [file](#)

RDG Planning and Design

Architecture, design, strategic and urban planning

Johnston Merle Hay Road Redevelopment Study

2007, Aug 6; Johnston City Council Briefing

http://www.rdgusa.com/crp/johnston/JohnstonCouncilMtg_080607.pdf; [file](#)

Oscar Munoz, executive vice president and chief financial officer, CSX

transportation companies, providing rail, intermodal and rail-to-truck transload services

2007, Nov 6; Citigroup Transportation Conference

<http://library.corporate-ir.net/library/92/929/92932/items/268377/Citigroup11.06.07.pdf>; [file](#)

Zyp, Kris, Research & Development Associate, SitePen, Inc.

web applications developer

Advanced JSON: Persistence Mapping, RPCs, Cross-Domain and More

2007, Sept; AJAXWorld Conference

<http://www.json.com/2007/09/24/advanced-json-presentation/>; [file](#)