Tara Moses

COMM 1313-SEC013

Berry

February 29, 2016

SWP Self Critique

1. Extemporaneous Mode

My speech was very extemporaneous. I feel like I did a good job keeping my tone conversational, but I think maybe I might have been too extemporaneous. Next time I’m going to practice more. Maybe I’ll run through it and time myself like I did with the last two speeches. This speech, I improved from last time in that my cards were shorter so that I could let my voice do the talking instead of reading from my speaking notes.

2. Effective Use of Voice

I didn’t speak louder than the last speech like I should have. However, I think I talked slowly enough for people to understand me. I might have used too many vocal fillers. In this speech, I enunciated more and spoke slower than last time. Next speech, I’m going to consciously try to talk louder. I think I’ll write it on my speaking notes.

3. Effective Use of Body

This speech, I used the whole front of the room, which is better than last speech when I kind of hid behind the podium. I think I gestured a lot with my hands and cards, which is good. I probably could have made the gestures bigger, though. In the future, I’m going to gesture when I practice, and if I find something that really goes with my speech, I’ll note it on my cards. I also feel like I made good eye contact with a few people in the room, but I could make eye contact with more people.

4. Audience Analysis

My point (don’t procrastinate) was applicable to everyone in the room, since as people in college we all have things to do/grade. I could have chosen a more engaging topic, though. Saying not to procrastinate is kind of a cliché. I told a story that was so relatable, it ended up being boring because people basically knew the ending. This speech’s topic was better than the last speech, though. Nobody could really relate to or empathize with me last time, since I was eulogizing a person they barely knew. In the future, I’ll spend more time choosing my topic. I’ll probably run it by my friends to see if they’re actually interested.

5. Quality Introduction, Conclusions, and Transitions

I think my introduction did a good job of summarizing my speech before I got into the actual story. My conclusion blatantly stated my point. This is an improvement on the last speech, when my introduction wasn’t really there (I think I kind of just jumped into the eulogy). My transitions might have been a little jumpy, though. In the next speech, I’m going to write down a short transition word on my cards to make sure I don’t forget them.

6. Engaging Use of Language

I didn’t use very flowery language, which is something that all the best speeches on Wednesday (Erin) and Friday (Leslie) had in common. Next time, in order to help the audience connect with and care about my speech, I’ll add more detail in. In this speech, I added more detail than in the eulogy, because the story called for it. I feel like my word choice, although not super flowery, was enough to keep the audience engaged due to its relaxed nature.

7. Flow of Story

My story flowed pretty well; I didn’t end up going back while talking and adding more details in. This speech was better than the last one in that I think a chronological approach (this speech) did a better job making the story follow-able than a point-by-point approach like the eulogy. In the future, when I’m writing the speech, I’ll probably tell my story informally to a friend and see if they can follow it. In this speech, I could have organized it a little better.

8. Relationship between the Story and the Point

My story and point went hand in hand. However, I think I could have chosen a better story to prove my point. This was better than last time, when I chose a story that didn’t represent my eulogy very well. Next time, I’ll make sure my story and point are related, like this time.