4 Introduction to Best Practices

In this chapter we will review some approaches to the teaching of writing that either feature argumentation or may be most readily adapted to feature argumentation. While those who focus on, say, liberatory rhetoric in their writing classes may not think of themselves as proponents of argument pedagogy, their approach lends itself to an argument focus and indeed requires some attention to strategies of argument to be successful. Any approach that both facilitates the teaching of argument and involves an innovative approach to teaching writing will be included here under best practices. But before reviewing those practices, we offer the following brief overview of principles basic to any successful writing course and of the practices themselves.

What Works in Teaching Writing

As we have previously suggested on several occasions, few researchers in the field of rhetoric and composition continue to focus their energies on empirical evaluation of classroom practices. In denominating a particular approach a best practice, thus, we are not so much commenting on the pedagogy necessarily associated with the practice or the results achieved by the practice. In fact, we know little about the results obtained from these practices other than those reported anecdotally by their proponents. We favor some practices over others mostly because they resonate with our own rationale for teaching writing in the first place and because they don't conflict with basic principles of teaching that in our view underlie any sound writing class.

In articulating our rationale for teaching writing and our principles of instruction, we would cite two works that have particularly influenced our thinking. The first, James Crosswhite's *The Rhetoric of Reason: Writing and the Attractions of Argument,* offers an extended philosophical brief for grounding writing courses in argumentation.

Drawing on the work of a wide range of philosophers including Plato, Aristotle, Heidegger, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, Levinas, Cavell, Habermas, Schrag, and Gadamer, Crosswhite develops the concept of a "rhetoric of reason" and positions it as an alternative to the radical skepticism of deconstruction as exemplified by Derrida and de Man. (In process, Crosswhite also points out places where Derrida may serve as a support as well as foil for a rhetoric of reason). The book recommends itself to teachers for a number of reasons. It makes a strong case for the efficacy and importance of general education in contemporary American higher education, it establishes a framework for understanding argument primarily as an act, a means of addressing practical problems and making choices, as opposed to a set of propositions, and it sets out a way for squaring non-essentialist views of truth and identity with a sense of responsibility for one's choices. Crosswhite's book addresses a number of the theoretical, philosophical, and pedagogical issues touched on briefly in this book in a much more comprehensive way. While there are distinct points of difference between our viewpoint and that of Crosswhite's (in particular we demur from the book's starkly pessimistic conclusion), it offers something of a macro-view of our rationale for the teaching of argument in writing classes.

George Hillocks's *Teaching Writing as Reflective Practice,* meanwhile, offers a more fine grained, micro-view of our pedagogical philosophy. While Hillocks and his methods for understanding writing instruction are currently out of season among many in the field of rhetoric and composition, the conclusions he draws from his work and his humane application of the principles he derives from it remain relevant to our enterprise. As noted earlier, many who scorn Hillocks's work and methods continue to hold assumptions about how best to teach writing that are grounded in and most readily justified by his work. Indeed, over the years when explaining and defending the function of our writing programs ("Why don't you stress grammar and the 'fundamentals' of writing more in your courses?"), and securing resources for those programs from upper administrators, academics whose backgrounds are largely in the sciences and social sciences, Hillocks's work resonates in a particularly powerful way. At the risk of oversimplifying that work, we enumerate the following principles of classroom practice derived largely from that work or from the extension of his principles to our own situations.

1. *Active learning is much more effective than passive learning.* Some of the entailments of this principle include the following:

   a. *Keep lecturing (what Hillocks refers to as "presentational mode" of teaching) to a minimum.* If you must lecture, and there are times when most of us feel such a need, keep it short, fifteen minutes or less. As much as possible ensure that your lecture grows out of your students' questions rather than an a priori agenda based on your need to "cover" all relevant material.

   b. *Build the course as much as possible around inquiry rather than the assimilation of information or free expression.* In the case of argument-focused classes this may well mean more attention given over to local issues that allow students to deal with primary as well as secondary sources. Inquiry-based learning focuses on "basic strategies of inquiry [that] appear in every field" (100) rather than specialized strategies of inquiry. In the case of an argument-based course, an inquiry approach would stress the following: making an inventory of prior knowledge and assumptions about an issue; forming a hypothesis, a "warranted assertion," or tentative major claim; testing that tentative claim by gathering new information through reading, questioning, surveying, and so forth, and by critical discussion of one's claim with peers in the class.

   c. *Stress peer group learning and independent study in the classroom.* Inquiry is something that should be going on inside as well as outside the class. Hillocks uses the term "environmental teaching" to designate "teaching that creates environments to induce and support active learning of complex strategies that students are not capable of using on their own" (55).

2. *Transparency is as important to good teaching as it is to good government.* Make clear your expectations and goals for each class, and for every assignment—papers and inquiry activities alike. Encourage the wide sharing of drafts and activities throughout the process. When possible, present earlier student responses to the assignment to clarify expectations and criteria. Offer feedback that is specific and at the same time global (e.g., tell them they have not offered sufficient evidence in support of a particular reason, or their warrant for the reason is unacceptable to their audience v. "There's faulty parallelism in sentence three.").

3. *Set high expectations and create mindful processes that help students realize those expectations.* One of the theoretical mainstays in Hillocks's approach is Vygotsky, in particular his notion of the "zone of proximal development" (ZPD). The ZPD defines the area between one's actual capabilities and those potential capabilities that are achievable with thoughtful guidance. In this case, "thoughtful guidance" would include classroom activities; in particular, opportunities for invention work both oral and written, intermediate peer and teacher feedback on written work, and sequences of drafts based on that feedback.

4. *Practice what you preach; be a learner in the classroom.* Hillocks encourages teachers to practice an inquiry-based approach to their own classroom. In communicating your objectives to students prior to undertaking an assignment or activity, you are in effect offering an hypothesis about what will work in achieving your end. Pay attention to what actually happens and test your hypothesis. When something does not work, figure out why and rethink your assumptions.

5. *Accommodate students' different learning styles and intelligences as best you can.* Use multiple channels for gathering, assimilating and presenting information. If you don't have a computer-mediated classroom, do what you can to encourage the use of visual media and computers outside the classroom.

6. *Play to your strengths as a teacher.* (This is not so much from Hillocks as from our own experiences.) Just as we do what we can to accommodate our students' diversity, we need to respect our own uniqueness. Some of us are indeed brilliant lecturers—though in our experience, fewer than think so. Some of us structure wonderful group assignments and activities. Some of us are marvelous working with students one on one. Whatever you do best as a teacher, whatever made teaching exciting for you in the first place, find a way to use your strengths.

Best Practices

What follows is by no means an exhaustive list of ways to incorporate argument into the classroom. It is a compilation of best practices. First and foremost, this section is meant to help teachers use argument as a means of engaging the world. Anyone who has ever taught a class that asks students to write arguments knows that there is no one "best" way

to go about structuring the class. There are many ways, and we seek to enumerate a number of them.

For instructors who are new to the field of argument, this section offers a map of the pedagogical terrain. For more experienced instructors, it offers a reserve of ideas on how to re-structure existing classes. If we implore our students to constantly question their assumptions about their arguments, we must also be willing to question our assumptions about how we teach argument.

The entries that follow represent an eclectic approach to rhetoric and argument as different means of viewing the world and not as ends that can be achieved by merely exercising some formula (although at times scholars who advocate for their use do suggest very formulaic processes). Some best practices emanate from the desire of instructors to help their students move beyond the isolated position of self and locate themselves within the larger context. These identity-based social endeavors include liberatory rhetoric, feminist argument and service learning.

Liberatory rhetoric is an educational movement that arose as a reaction against passive student models of education. It was instrumental in bringing to the forefront issues of representation in the classroom and acknowledging that education is not a neutral process—ideology is always being transferred along with knowledge. When incorporated into the argument classroom, liberatory rhetoric openly politicizes the classroom, places the culture at the center of discussion, and calls on students to critically question the course content and the experiences that they bring to the table as well as the ideologies that they hold as writers. Writing is a vehicle that is used in multiple ways to prepare students to engage critically with the world around them.

Feminist argument also challenges the status quo. By seeking to replace the zero sum, winner/loser construction of argument with a more ethical approach, feminists call us to use less aggressive and more cooperative strategies, especially focusing on the importance of listening, understanding, and dialogue in argumentative exchange. In the classroom, feminist approaches to argument can be implemented incrementally and don't require wholesale adoption.

The next entry, service learning, sees language as a social activity that is at once interpretative and constructive. In much the same way that liberatory rhetoric aims to help students become self-actualized, service learning seeks to foster an early appreciation for civic engage-

ment. In many cases, this manifests itself in a linking of writing classes with on-site, project-based interactions with local businesses or organizations; however, this is not a necessity for service learning. Prolonged engagement with and research on a local issue could be substituted. Service learning offers students an embedded way of experiencing rhetorical situations with real exigencies and constraints to consider. It also exposes students to a side of academia that is not walled in by disciplinarity.

Much like service learning, Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) has as its goal the softening of disciplinary boundaries. It holds as its central principle that students learn more when they grapple with course content in writing. For instructors who are not in the field of English, WAC provides a rationale for why writing should be utilized across the disciplines. WAC posits that argument is the cornerstone of a university education. Disciplines are distinguished primarily by the forms of argument and rules of evidence they favor. In fields not traditionally viewed as writing intensive, writing activities can be used to reinforce disciplinary principles and acquaint students with the methods of inquiry that are validated by their field.

The rapid increase of technological possibility has forced teachers to reassess the role and impact of writing technologies on argument. Computers and writing is an incorporation of a new writing technology into the field of argument. Since contemporary students have been reared at the keyboard, it is important to take into account the literacies that they are bringing to the classroom. The technology can also expand the bounds of what is meant by writing, especially when hypertextual writing is used in the classroom to re-envision argument. Advances in technology have also impacted research methods. The reliability of sources and authorial ownership of ideas are among the issues fraught with controversy.

Visual rhetoric also focuses on ways that technologies are impacting our lives. Visual rhetoric attempts to broaden discussions of argument to include consideration of the visual images that increasingly accompany or displace words. Even though visual images are more memorable and thus more resonant than words, their impact often goes unremarked. There are embedded messages in visual media, and recognizing those messages require us to rethink the way we process information. Through exploration of production and consumption of

visual texts, students can become more aware of the subtle ways that images convey persuasive messages.

Why should argument, and to a greater extent rhetoric, be deemed worthy of this level of attention in the classroom? We should teach rhetoric to protect ourselves from rhetoric. Persuasive messages are all around us. They make up the amalgam of our collective selves. The better we—and our students—are able to identify the messages that we receive for what they are, points of view and not as monolithic truths, we will better be able to function in the world of "Babel after the fall." This best practices section will be most useful if it is used as a jumping-off point to further exploration of what these theoretical, pedagogical positions have to offer in the context of a particular class. These summaries of practices highlight the diversity among practitioners. Texts that best demonstrate how these practices intermingle with argument have been included in the "for further reading" sections that follow each best practices topic; those of particular relevancy have been annotated for you.

Liberatory Rhetoric

The concept of liberatory rhetoric, also commonly referred to as critical pedagogy or critical rhetoric, has been defined in composition studies in a number of ways. The idea of liberatory pedagogy springs from the work of Paulo Freire. Freire, a Brazilian educator, believed that the "banking system of education"—a model of education that depicts students as empty vessels needing to be filled by knowledgeable teachers (*Pedagogy* 72)—contributed to political oppression by conditioning people not to question. The central role of a liberatory rhetoric is to help students recognize the inherently political nature of education. This approach assumes that the world is unjust and that the various means by which power is accrued, maintained, and distributed are unmarked and often unremarked. Thus, education is not neutral; teachers and students possess assumptions, expectations, and values of the "dominant ideology" that often go unaddressed in the classroom (Shor and Friere 13). Because political opinions are intentionally and unintentionally transferred from teacher to student during the learning process, students need to assume responsibility for understanding the enculturating nature of educational systems for interrogating the assumptions behind received knowledge. Freire's *Pedagogy of the*

Oppressed grew out of work with illiterate Brazilian peasants, a truly oppressed group, and located the space for a true liberatory education in grassroots efforts—outside of the control state sponsors of literacy. Consequently, Freire's ideas must be modified with the needs of contemporary American college writing students in mind.

Throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s, Friere's work was influential in the field of rhetoric and composition, as teachers tried to incorporate progressive theory into the seemingly apolitical work of writing instruction (Bizzell 319). The most useful component of Friere's theory for teachers of argument is his stress on critically examining problematic interactions on a local level (Shor, *When* 46). Instead of focusing on the abstract dialectical interactions of ideas, values, and concepts, Freire calls for a focus on "generative themes," the focal points of discussion that ground the abstract. The subject matter comes directly from the everyday artifacts of the specific community within the given culture (Freire 97). In the case of Freire's Brazilian peasants, this meant starting with the perceptions of drinking water rather than the concept of social justice.

For contemporary American teachers of writing, Freire's generative themes might involve sustained interaction with issues that interest students, such as tuition increases or representations of race on television. Such focus allows students to act upon ideas rather than passively consuming the ideas of another and fosters an environment where education is about self-actualization. As Ann Berthoff argues in "The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand," it is important to "[teach] composition as a mode of thinking and a way of learning" and to "avail ourselves of that incomparable resource, the minds of our students . . ." (41). Stated another way, "subjectivity is a synonym for motivation . . . material that is of subjective concern is by definition important to those studying it" (Shor, *Freire* 24). Thus emphasis on critical thought about local issues will likely eliminate uncritical rehashing of hackneyed topics, such as abortion and the death penalty, and tap into the imaginations of students as a starting place for rhetorical invention (Berthoff 42).

Liberatory rhetoric is not without its critics. Some scholars question whether overtly politicizing the classroom necessarily empowers students. Elizabeth Ellsworth's "Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering?: Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy," offers a comprehensive critique of liberatory pedagogy. Central to her

argument is the belief that most courses touting liberatory goals have unstated political agendas behind the call for "critical consciousness," thus also creating an environment where a particular political ideology is advanced at the expense of others. David Lazere questions another premise of liberatory rhetoric, asserting that

> leftists err grievously in rejecting . . . a restored emphasis on basic skills and knowledge which might be a force for liberation—not oppression—if administered with commonsense, openness and to cultural pluralisms, and an application of basics toward critical thinking, particularly about sociopolitical issues, rather than rote memorizing. (9)

Lazere's qualm is relevant; if one is to overcome the systematic power of society, presumably, s/he must be able to use the discourse of power properly to communicate with whomever has authority. Even ardent supporters of liberatory rhetoric see potential problems with its proposed ends. Patricia Bizzell, for example, is critical of the suggestion that the awareness of inequality "automatically also awakens a desire for progressive political change" (320). Acknowledging the agency of students necessarily affords them the power to remain static, especially if they realize that their own privilege is challenged when the status quo is upset.

   Despite the divergent views about the worth of liberatory pedagogy, many scholars still see value in locating ideological struggle in the writing classroom. However, in practice, liberatory rhetoric can take multiple shapes depending on the instructor and course materials. Ira Shor begins with everyday artifacts since these are within the "generative universe" of students. This can best be exemplified with his "World's Biggest Hamburger" activity (Shor, *Critical* 162-69). On one occasion, Shor took a hamburger to class for students to examine using the three-step Description-Diagnosis-Reconstruction method:

> The burger is the nexus of so many daily realities . . . It's not only the king of fast foods, the lunch/snack/dinner quickie meal, but it's also the source of wages for many students who work in the burger chains . . . So, I was able to hold in my hand a weighty interstice of mass experience . . . I brought a burger to class and interfered with a major uncritical flow of mass

> culture . . . Close up, on reflection, many of the stu-
> dents found the hamburger repulsive . . . When I read
> back to the class a composite of their descriptions, the
> burger took a strongly negative shape. I next asked
> people to attempt a Diagnosis of this object. The ob-
> vious problem suggested by our work so far was: If
> the burger is unattractive, why do we eat so many of
> them? Why are there so many fast food restaurants?
> Why are so many things put on top of hamburgers?
> Are they nutritious? What did we do for restaurants
> before the fast-food empires began pushing burgers?
> (169)

After the students more fully considered the hamburger as a problem-
atic theme of inquiry, they were charged with the task of reconstruct-
ing it—different classes approached this in different ways. One created
healthy alternatives, while another recreated the entire production and
distribution process to unveil the complex relation of food to culture.
It is Shor's contention that activities of this sort are powerful because
they cast everyday objects in unusual roles, which allows students the
opportunity to re-envision the ordinary. Teachers of argument should
consider exercises of this kind because they are overtly argumentative.
Students will inevitably have differences of opinion about the nature
of ordinary artifacts in their lives; if framed properly, they can see that
their attempts to describe, diagnose and reconstruct are actually per-
sonal constructs bound together with political positions (169).

Another shape liberatory rhetoric takes is exemplified in James
A. Berlin's, *Rhetoric, Poetics, and Culture* under the heading "social
epistemic rhetoric." One assignment sequence

> begin(s) with an essay from the *Wall Street Journal*
> entitled "The Days of a Cowboy are Marked by Dan-
> ger, Drudgery, and Low Pay," by William Blundell .
> . . its codes are at once so varied and so accessible to
> students . . . Students first consider the context of the
> piece, exploring the characteristics of the readership
> of the newspaper and the historical events surround-
> ing the essay's production, particularly as indicated
> within the text. The purpose of this analysis is to de-
> cide which terms probably acted as key signifiers for

> the original readers . . . The meaning of *cowboss* is es-
> tablished by seeing it in binary opposition to both the
> cowboys who work for him and the owners who work
> away from the ranch in cities . . . [these] binaries sug-
> gest others, such as the opposition of nature-civiliza-
> tion . . . and cowboy-urban cowboy. Students begin
> to see that these binaries are arranged hierarchically,
> with one term privileged over the other. They also see
> how unstable these hierarchies can be . . . Students
> analyze, discuss, and write about the position of the
> key terms within these socially constructed narratives
> . . . [and] discover that the essay attempts to position
> the reader in the role of a certain kind of masculine
> subject. They can then explore their own complicity
> and resistance in responding to this role. (125-27)

This method suits Berlin's objective, which is to alert students to the way that "narratives"—the signifying practices that appear natural and not constructed—shape their lives. The writing associated with this sequence is focused on "the position on key terms within the socially constructed narrative code" (126). For example, while individuality and freedom are terms commonly associated with cowboys, the article also depicts cowboys as respectful of authority and submissive to the cowboss (126). Once the initial narrative structure is teased out, more thorough analysis of the same sort will allow students to situate each narrative within larger economical, social and political frameworks.

Robin Muksian Schutt suggests grounding course content in social spaces:

> The benefits of specific cases as text seem to have re-
> surfaced recently with the emerging concept of "con-
> tact zones," defined by Mary Louise Pratt as "those
> social spaces where cultures meet, clash and grapple
> with each other, often in contexts of highly asym-
> metrical relations of power" (34). In the case of E306,
> those social spaces were American courtrooms. But
> in many argument courses, no particular social spac-
> es (or events) can be "grappled" with since often none
> are clearly defined, creating confusion for students as
> to where they can enter a conversation. (126)

Schutt's solution to this problem is to group readings around the topic of the death penalty, which subsequently leads to discussions about the ways that courts dole out justice in our society. Students' writing exercises range from critical analysis of court documents with commentary on the success of the legal arguments, to writing about the perceptual impact of fictionalized accounts of death penalty issues in motion pictures on public opinion, and finally, critical analysis and essays addressing the impact of journalists on pubic opinions (129-30).

To be sure, there is no one way to incorporate liberatory rhetoric into the argument classroom. Although it is not without its inconsistencies, a program designed to prepare students for critical engagement with the world around them will expand their view of the possibilities for rhetorical inquiry. Once they begin to question authority, the realm of rhetorical invention will expand exponentially. Since much of the locus of discussion is on everyday artifacts, it will not be difficult to find discussion pieces or engage students in dialogue that asks them to critically question the assumptions that they hold.

Works Cited

Berlin, James. *Rhetoric, Poetics, and Cultures: Refiguring College English Studies.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor, 2003.

Berthoff, Ann. "The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand." *The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking.* Ed. Janice N. Hays, Phyllis A. Roth, Jon R. Ramsey, and Robert D. Foulke. Urbana: NCTE, 1983. 191-96.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Paulo Freire and What Education Can Do." *JAC* 17.3 (1997): 319-322.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy." *Harvard Educational Review* 59.3 (1989): 297-324.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum, 2000.

Freire, Paulo, and Donaldo P. Macedo. "A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race." *Harvard Educational Review* 65.2 (1995): 377-402.

Lazere, Donald. "Back to Basics: A Force for Oppression or Liberation?" *College English* 54.1 (1992): 17-21.

Schutt, Robin Muksian. "Starkweather and Smith: Using 'Contact Zones' to Teach Argument." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 25.2 (1998): 126-131.

Shor, Ira. *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life.* Boston: South End, 1980.

—, ed. *Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1987.

—. *When Students Have Power.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

Shor, Ira, and Paulo Freire. *A Pedagogy for Liberation.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1987.

For Further Reading

Argument Textbooks

Alfano, Christine, and Alyssa O'Brien. *Envision: Persuasive Writing in a Visual World.* New York: Longman, 2005.

Charney, Davida M., Christine M. Neuwirth, David S. Kaufer, and Cheryl A. Geisler. *Having Your Say.* New York: Longman, 2006.

Clark, Irene L. *Writing About Diversity—An Argument Reader and Guide.* Boston: Thomson-Wadsworth, 2004.

Walsh, Sharon K., and Evelyn D. Asch. *Just War—A Wadsworth Casebook in Argument.* Boston: Thomson-Wadsworth, 2004.

The format of this book lends itself to use in a class that seeks deep exploration of cultural issues. The readings draw from political science, religion and ethical texts to weave a complex tapestry on the topic of violent confrontations being justified as "just wars," with an introductory section that asks the question, "is there such a thing as a just war"? The first part of the book offers foundational sections on rhetoric proceeded by a diverse body of articles with questions to consider following each selection. Many of the questions are aimed at pointing out contradictions between the points of view offered within the articles. There are other content topics within the Wadsworth Casebook in Argument series: immigration and civil disobedience.

Scholarly Works

Durst, Russell K. *Collision Course: Conflict, Negotiation, and Learning in College Composition.* Urbana: NCTE, 1999.

Much scholarship has been devoted to discussions of the classroom as a site of disagreement. Durst sees the field's lack of theoretical consideration of notions of conflict as a problem, so contemporary writing theory is examined within the context of "the ways first year writing students make sense of, engage, resist, and learn from the critical literacy approach practiced in the composition program" (10). The body of the text is comprised of data collected during a two-year qualita-

tive study, focusing especially on two instructors and two students. Student resistance to writing instruction is also of importance within the book. The end call is for an ethic of "reflective instrumentalism" or respect for the exchange value of work from the student's perspective—teaching critical awareness in composition class while respecting the desire of students to receive more pragmatic instruction.

George, Ann. "Critical Pedagogy: Dreaming of Democracy." *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies.* Ed. Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick. New York: Oxford UP, 2001. 92-112.

George's contribution to this anthology on pedagogy is historical in that it examines the roots of critical pedagogy; however, it does not stop there. She calls upon the work of Jonathan Kozol to support the notion that a critical pedagogy aimed at educating students to be citizens is sensible. Much of the chapter is in literature review form—identifying important texts and contextualizing the contributions of Freire, Shor, Giroux and others in the large body of work conducted on critical pedagogy. A vast array of pedagogical models are alluded to, which seems to be meant to underscore the importance of considering localized variables when implementing liberatory ideas into the classroom. George's work complicates the issue with a section on the means and ends of liberatory pedagogy (while many of the theorists agree on the ends, they part ways on the means) and asking questions such as "Who is to be Liberated from What?" Any attempt to map theoretical terrain will have holes, but George does a good job of not myopically focusing on the major figures and incorporating both old and new texts.

Kanpol, Barry. *Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction.* Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey, 1994.

Kanpol is writing at a time when public education was beginning to lean heavily towards standardized testing and school choice, which he views as diversions away from the issues that are most in need of discussing, namely the lack of emphasis on civic engagement and bridging the gap between the quality of education that students receive in different parts of the country. Rather than critique the current institution, Kanpol instead outlines critical theory via a literature review

of relevant topics related to critical theory, such as individualism and multiculturalism, and then focuses attention on issues that are readily apparent in classrooms across the country through examining three schools in case study form and allowing the localized problems to shine light on the larger systemic problems. The final chapter takes the form of an interview between a critical theorist and a student that is used as a vehicle to demonstrate the necessity of the dense theory that Kanpol is using to support his pedagogy. This text is particularly sensitive to the role that race, class and gender play in education. Many of the arguments expressed in this book have been articulated in other texts; however, the use of theoretical oppositions (deviance/resistance, multiculturalism/similarities within difference), although reductive, are effective for mapping out the terrain of traditional versus critical educational theory.

Lynch, Dennis, Diana George, and Marilyn Cooper. "Moments of Argument: Agonistic Inquiry and Confrontational Cooperation." *College Composition and Communication* 48.1 (1997): 61-85.

This article considers ways to get students to engage issues critically instead of separating them into two diametrically opposed positions and oversimplifying complex problems. The authors advocate a pedagogy that includes moments of conflict and agonistic positioning as well as moments of understanding and communication. They believe that by critically engaging complex issues, it is easier to show students where they jump to conclusions, don't thoroughly examine an issue and/or don't move beyond impractical logical arguments. Concrete examples of writing assignments and course goals are provided for two distinct argument classes. The topics covered in the article should be helpful in the areas of pedagogy, anticipating student misunderstanding, and basic theory of argument.

McLaren, Peter. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. New York: Longman, 1994.

McLaren sees critical theory as a method for understanding modern social problems. Through a narrative of his times as a teacher, he reveals his struggles to deliver to his students the empowering, justice-centered education that he feels should be the cornerstone of public

education. What follows is a theoretical treatment of the "broken dreams, false promises" that McLaren claims traditional, uncritical educations leaves in its wake. Much like other texts on critical pedagogy, this book has an extensive section on the philosophical roots of liberatory models and the social construction of knowledge. The detailed explanation of terms such as "ideology" and "hegemony" is useful, as is the appendix that identifies "critical educators" and outlines their intellectual contributions.

Ronald, Kate, and Hephzibah Roskelly. "Untested Feasibility: Imagining the Pragmatic Possibility of Paulo Freire." *College English* 63.5 (2001): 612-32.

Ronald and Roskelly seek to align the work of Paulo Freire with North American pragmatic philosophy espoused by Cornell West, in an attempt to reconcile his ideas with the contemporary state of education in America because "for both philosophies, belief means a willingness to act and the assurance that reflection on action will lead to better, more hopeful acts" (614). A central theme is that Freire's work needs to be "imported" properly in the context that it will be used. The authors claim that many scholars read Freire as outsiders from a "voyeuristic standpoint," which undermines the importance of his message. University students may not be "oppressed" in the same ways or to the extent as Brazilian peasants; however, there are limited situations that dictate the possibilities for their lives. Thoughtful theorizing about the world can lead to changed assumptions about possibility. The North American pragmatic philosophical tradition also acknowledges the link between belief and action and the inherently communal nature of inquiry. There is not a tidy overlap of the two belief systems; the authors merely offer a new lens through which to read an old theory.

Steinberg, Shari J. "Liberation Theology and Liberatory Pedagogies: Renewing the Dialogue." *College English* 68.3 (2006): 271-90.

Whereas many articles approach liberatory pedagogy as a means of moving students to challenge the ideologies that they bring to the classroom, Steinberg's position is somewhat different. Citing the religious foundations of Paulo Freire's work and its ties to liberation theology, namely ending oppressive class structures through enacting the

messages from the gospels, Steinberg makes a call to view the spiritual and the intellectual side by side if we are truly "to begin where students are." She sees this suggestion as particularly necessary to break liberatory pedagogy from the uncritical modernist binary that relegates religion to the private and politics to the public sphere. This means accepting students' religious convictions as a part of their identities and not as roadblocks to critical thinking. Steinberg sees community, solidarity, and reflection as key terms to both philosophical traditions. There are passages to elucidate the foundation of liberatory theology and other important concepts, as well as a passage describing students using liberatory rhetoric to supplement their understanding of how they fit into and continually shape their religious communities—a perspective that is all too often brushed off as uncritical.

Thelin, William H. "Understanding Problems in Critical Classrooms." *College Composition and Communication* 57.1 (2005): 114-41.

Thelin's central thesis is that the critical classroom framework is worthwhile even if there is "failure" in implementing the pedagogy. This is a reaction to scholarly work that focuses solely on the fact that in some cases, students don't respond to critical pedagogy to the extent that teachers would like them to and that even if they do respond, they may be parroting ideas that that they feel the teacher wants to hear. Thelin sees "failure" as a tool that can be used to strengthen critical pedagogy. Through an account of a "problematic class" of his own, Thelin outlines what he believes went wrong in that class and how the reflection on pedagogical miscues can inform critical pedagogy and move beyond traditional forms of assessment that aim to standardize experience, which are not calibrated to account for the fluidity of a liberatory model. While others view the continual flux of liberatory methods as a problem, Thelin accepts it as a necessary part of working with students who are dealing with the unpleasant moments that the questioning of the social, economic and institutional realities of their lives creates.

Welsh, Susan. "Resistance Theory and Illegitimate Reproduction." *College Composition and Communication* 52.4 (2001): 553-73.

Welsh examines the tension created when using "resistance theory" as a means of having students explore mainstream culture. The main critique is that "resistance theory" reduces the constraints upon emancipatory consciousness down to a product that can be analyzed, classified, and purified, and thus undermines the importance of contradiction. The teacher is the diagnoser of students' illness, especially of those students who hold fast to dogma. "Resistance theory commits teachers to hierarchical determinations of the distance that learners have traveled beyond the status quo and beyond the compromise of contradictory consciousness" (556). What this fails to consider is that an action that would be viewed as not resisting from a resistance theory standpoint may be an understanding of the situation and a willful embracing of part of the conventional narrative and rejection of other parts. Welsh is not suggesting that critical pedagogy is not worthwhile; rather, she sees the real value of it not in the isolation and subsequent expansion of beliefs, but in the struggle with contradictory discourses and circumstances as students reflect on the ideas that make up their worldview. Her rationale is that consciousness is far too complex to be represented as a "collapse into the status quo" or a movement towards liberation.

Feminism and Argument

A feminist approach to argumentation arose out of a need for alternative models to classical argument, and out of the need to focus less on agonistic and antagonistic models of argument that assume a "winner" and a "loser," or on models which assume that the use of available means of persuasion is to get one's way. Instead, feminist argument focuses on new strategies of approaching argument, from ethical alternatives that reposition actors outside of competitive action, to viewing argumentation in less antagonistic terms of mediation, negotiation, and cooperation.

In its earliest manifestations, alternatives to traditional Aristotelian argument took the form of compositionists appealing to the work of Carl Rogers, a psychotherapist whose works centered around client-therapist communication. Rogers's work was influential on the field of rhetoric and composition as early as 1970 with mention as an "alternative to traditional argument" (274) in Young, Becker, and Pikes's *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change,* in which Rogerian approaches were

considered appropriate to "dyadic situations." Rogerian rhetoric was hotly contested in the late 1970s and throughout the decade of the 1980s with pieces such as Maxine Hairston's 1976 "Carl Rogers's Alternative to Traditional Rhetoric," Andrea Lunsford's 1979 "Aristotelian vs. Rogerian Argument: A Reassessment," Lisa Ede's 1984 "Is Rogerian Rhetoric Really Rogerian?," Nathaniel Teich's 1987 "Rogerian Problem Solving and the Rhetoric of Argumentation," and Phyllis Lassner's 1990 "Feminist Responses to Rogerian Argument."

Rogers's work, when adapted to composition and rhetoric, presented a theory of argument based on empathetic "listening and understanding," as well as on actors seeing the particular discussion from another's point of view, in order to "sense how it feels" to be in another's shoes in order to communicate effectively (Young et al. 285). This work was appealing to feminist ideologies emerging in composition studies, as Rogerian rhetoric offered "empathy instead of opposition, dialogue instead of argument" (Lassner 220). Yet Rogerian rhetoric has never been overtly feminist; as Catherine Lamb argues in her landmark work "Beyond Argument in Feminist Composition," Rogerian argument is critiqued as being "more feminine than feminist," as "It has always been women's work to understand others" (17). Theories of and approaches to feminist argument, then, occupy themselves with providing alternatives that are concerned with power and representation as well as empathy and care. As Lamb argues, seeing argument as processes of negotiation and mediation are viable alternatives to masculinist argument because the point of argumentation "is no longer to win but to arrive at a solution in a just way that is acceptable to both sides," just as the conception of power changes "from something that can be possessed and used on somebody to something that is available to both [parties] and at least has the potential to be used for the benefit of both" (18).

Cooperative approaches to argument involving negotiation and mediation are popular feminist standpoints on argument; however, they are not without feminist critics. Many scholars point out that they rely on a truncated view of classical argument (see, for example, Lunsford), or on an overly simplistic metaphor of "argument-as-war" (Fulkerson). As Susan Jarratt argues, often argument pedagogies that center on negotiation and mediation leave students, and particularly female students, "insufficiently prepared to negotiate the oppressive discourses of racism, sexism, and classism surfacing in the composition classroom,"

in contemporary American life, and in democratic processes (106). Similarly, Alexis Easley argues that the best strategy a writing teacher can use in approaching the differences between and conflict inherent in traditional argument and alternatives to traditional argument are to bring the conflict between the two to students as a contradiction that they must mediate and acknowledge through their writing. As Easley has it, students need to be given both the tools with which to argue as well as the knowledge to use these tools ethically, reflectively, and responsibly. Additionally, Fulkerson suggests that amending metaphors of argument to reflect less violence by an increasing focus on partnership works to view argument "as an interactive discourse form . . . built on a structure of claim plus support, and [reinforces the idea] that its purpose is to engage the interlocutors in a dialectical partnership with the hope of reaching some mutually enlightening understanding" (7). Nancy Fraser, in "Rethinking the Public Sphere," engages the concept of argument and dominant discourse by suggesting that in stratified societies, "specialized discursive arenas"(73)—in the form of subaltern counterpublics—are useful and necessary for those grappling with marginalized identities. Extensions of feminist theories of argument can also be found within modern rhetorical theory by scholars who incorporate the work of Kenneth Burke (see Foss and Griffin "Feminist"), standpoint hermeneutics (see Ryan and Natalle), and invitational rhetoric (see Foss and Griffin "Beyond").

Even as feminist theories of argument themselves are negotiated, practices emerge within the argument classroom that reflect major tenets of feminist thought and action. Fulkerson suggests having students write policy proposals, requiring students to

> investigate and write about some small local procedure or policy that they feel is not working adequately, and to address their argument not to an opponent to be beaten but as a memorandum to the person or committee with responsibility for the policy. I teach my students about the standard features and reasoning patterns of the genre, show them examples from previous students, suggest areas in which they might profitably look for topics, have them interview relevant parties (especially those who operate the present system), and go through our usual multi-draft writing process with peer review. We also discuss the

> relative persuasiveness to readers responsible for the
> policy of angry or aggressive attacks versus reasoned
> critiques with easily-adopted solutions. . . . When the
> papers seem strong enough, I ask the students to send
> them to the appropriate real audiences to see how
> much success they might have at doing some work in
> the world. (3-4)

Here, Fulkerson suggests that the policy proposal genre is one that
addresses community injustices as well as approaches argument in
partnership *with*—in order to come to mutually agreeable consensus
about creating change through a democratic process.

Hildy Miller takes a different approach to feminist theories of
argumentation in her Web-based course "Feminism and Expository
Writing." Grounding the assignment within "feminist rhetorical is-
sues," Miller articulates that

> Argumentation is one of the key ways we practice
> "procedural knowing"—that is, a kind of think-
> ing that is systematic. Since argumentative skills are
> valued in this culture, it is important that we learn
> them. Yet many feminists and others object to tradi-
> tional argumentation on various grounds. They say it
> is too often intolerant of opposing views and bent on
> converting or destroying opposition. (8)

In order to make students aware of this tension, Miller offers up an
assignment in which she asks students to

> Team up with another person to "collaborate" on
> structuring an argument with each of you taking a
> different/opposing view of an issue of your choos-
> ing. Work together to develop ways of "arguing" that
> don't have traditional agonistic characteristics. How
> can we disagree in a way that is respectful, recognizes
> pluralistic perspectives, and still makes it[s] point? Is
> it possible while arguing to have a persona that is lov-
> ing and connected? (8)

Thus Miller, much in the way Easley suggests, leaves it up to students
themselves to articulate and negotiate the tensions inherent in feminist
and traditional modes of argument.

Feminist practices and approaches to argument are conflicted; however, it stands to reason that these conflicts are what make these approaches viable and tenable. Appropriating feminist responses and approaches to argument in our classrooms not only may benefit students by giving them a variety of argumentative strategies that add to the rhetorical means available to them, but also encourages teacher-scholars to "break out of calcified, acritical approaches" (Palczewski 161) to argument and to teaching.

Works Cited

Easley, Alexis. "Toward a Feminist Theory of Teaching Argumentative Writing." *Feminist Teacher* 11.1 (1997): 30-38.

Ede, Lisa. "Is Rogerian Rhetoric Really Rogerian?" *Rhetoric Review* 3.1 (1984): 40-48.

Foss, Sonja K., and Cindy L. Griffin. "A Feminist Perspective on Rhetorical Theory: Toward A Clarification of Boundaries." *Western Journal of Communication* 56.3 (1992): 330-349.

—. "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for Invitational Rhetoric." *Communications Monographs* 62.3 (1995): 2-18.

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Habermas and the Public Sphere.* Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT P, 1992. 56-80.

Fulkerson, Richard. "Transcending Our Conception of Argument in Light of Feminist Critiques." *Argumentation and Advocacy.* 32.4 (1996): 199-218.

Hairston, Maxine. "Carl Rogers's Alternative to Traditional Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* 27.4 (1976): 373-77.

Jarratt, Susan C. "Feminism and Composition: The Case for Conflict." *Contending with Words: Composition and Rhetoric in a Postmodern Age.* Ed. Patricia Harkin and John Schilb. New York: MLA, 1991. 105-23.

Lamb, Catherine E. "Beyond Argument in Feminist Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 42.1 (1991): 11-24.

Lassner, Phyllis. "Feminist Responses to Rogerian Argument." *Rhetoric Review* 8.2 (1990): 220-32.

Lunsford, Andrea A. "Aristotelian vs. Rogerian Argument: A Reassessment." *College Composition and Communication* 30.2 (1979): 146-51.

Miller, Hildy. "Feminist Expository Writing Assignment A: Feminist Expository Writing." 2003. *Teaching with Writing: Feminist Expository Writing.* University of Minnesota Center for Writing, 26 May 2005. 29 Oct. 2005. <http://writing.umn.edu/tww/policy/syllabi/art_feminist.html.>

Palczewski, Catherine Helen. "Argumentation and Feminism: An Introduction." Argumentation and Advocacy. 32.4 (1996): 161-170.

Ryan, Kathleen J., and Elizabeth J. Natalle. "Fusing Horizons: Standpoint Hermeneutics and Invitational Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31.2 (2001) 69-90.

Teich, Nathaniel. "Rogerian Problem Solving and the Rhetoric of Argumentation." *JAC* 7 (1987): 52-61.

Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike. *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1970.

For Further Reading

Argument Textbooks

Goshgarian, Gary, Kathleen Krueger, and Janett Barnett-Minc. *Dialogues: An Argument Rhetoric and Reader.* New York: Longman, 2003.

Infante, Dominic. *Arguing Constructively.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1987.

Makau, Josina M., and Debian L. Marty. *Cooperative Argumentation: A Model for Deliberative Community.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 2001.

Makau and Marty stress the importance of deliberative communities as places from which to "develop tools for confronting disagreement peacefully, ethically, and effectively." In the first two beginning chapters, the authors explain concepts central to their theory of argument, such as critical thinking (getting into the "questioning habit"), and ethical and effective dialogue (developing empathy and compassion to increase dialogic skills and to establish nondefensive awareness of one's own "balanced partiality"). Rather than see argumentation as "winning something," the authors outline a method of interdependence, where decisions are made based on the "best or most justifiable decision in any situation." The authors contend that the purpose of deliberation is to help build and maintain democratic principles and help build "moral community" through the promotion of equity and reciprocity. Makau and Marty use a blend of classical rhetoric and an extended discussion of "context and the deliberative community" to frame their argumentative strategies, and conclude with sections on ethical advocacy and argument evaluation.

Scholarly Works

Emmel, Barbara, Paula Resch, and Deborah Tenney, eds. *Argument Revisited, Argument Redefined: Negotiating Meaning in the Composition Classroom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

In this edited anthology, Emmel, Resch and Tenney negotiate the complexities of argument by revisiting scholarship about traditional and accepted theories of argument, and redefining the future of argument theory. The first half of the anthology is devoted to revisiting "named" and "traditional" theories of argument, such as theories of the enthymeme, classical and Aristotelian rhetoric, and theories of Stephen Toulmin and Carl Rogers. Part two, "Argument Revisited," offers essays which illustrate and analyze theories perceived to be a "threat" to traditional models of argument, such as those represented by feminism, narratology, and reflexive reading strategies. As the editors claim, what unifies this text is that both sections see argument as a "genre and as a process that can serve students well" (xi).

Faigley, Lester, and Julia M. Allen. "Discursive Strategies for Social Change: An Alternative Rhetoric of Argument." *Rhetoric Review* 14.1 (1995): 142-172.

The authors provide a repertoire of alternative argument strategies that have been used to enact discursive change by writers who, historically, did not or felt they did not have the power to engage in the dominant discourse; however, Allen and Faigley do not make claims "for the utility of any strategy." Strategies for social change that have been used are: creating new languages (such as "Laadan" for writer Suzette Haden Elgin); constructing new pronouns (such as "co" or "na"); using neologisms; reclaiming or redefining words (such as "spinster" or "dyke"); juxtaposing language and "creating struggle within and utterance" (as is demonstrated by Gloria Anzaldúa's Borderlands/*La Frontera*); using musical forms to structure written communication; utilizing "perspective by incongruity," which puts "one assumed truth into an incongruous situation to undermine its truthfulness;" playing with language and metaphor and "calling without naming" (referring to Gertrude Stein's prose); and using narratives as a way to make oneself heard politically. The authors assert that writing teachers need to

rethink traditional assumptions about the validity and use of logical arguments' ability to shift social structure, given the wide range of forced alternatives that have arisen out of power struggles throughout history.

Gilbert, Michael A. *Coalescent Argumentation.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1997.

Gilbert presents an approach to argumentation that "could better serve everyday arguers." Part one, chapters one through four, addresses general aspects of argumentation theory. Chapter one offers a general view of the history of argumentation and different perspectives of different specialists in the field. Tackling ways of defining argument, chapter two offers six definitions of argument as well as a comparison between them. Chapter three addresses the relation between argumentation, critical reasoning, and informal logic. Discussing the influence of feminist theory on argumentation, chapter four touches on voices in the field such as Gilligan, Tannen, Warren and Nye. Part two, chapters five through ten, addresses different models of argumentation. The fifth chapter of Gilbert's text focuses on the relationships between arguments and their goals, delineating between *task goals,* which refer to the direct goals of the argument, and *face goals,* which concern relationships between the participants. In chapter six, Gilbert identifies and explicates the four modes that categorize arguments: logical, emotional, visceral, and kisceral. Chapter seven addresses the influence of different argument modalities on argumentation theory. Chapters eight and nine address coalescent argumentation, the theory of "joining together of two disparate claims through recognition and exploration of opposing positions" (102). The last chapter offers a summary of Gilbert's theory of argumentation as well as a call to "leave violent conflict behind us" (145).

Kroll, Barry M. "Broadening the Repertoire: Alternatives to the Argumentative Edge." *Composition Studies* 28.1 (2000): 11-27.

Kroll explores three alternatives to traditional thesis-driven argument: "conciliatory," "integrative," and "deliberative" approaches. The conciliatory approach is best represented by Rogerian argument, in which a writer introduces a problem that, rather than divide the writer and

reader, insinuates they work together to solve a problem in a conciliatory way. The integrative approach, closely tied to mediation and negotiation in current publications, emphasizes participants' ability to combine values rather than "elevate one set of values over another." Deliberative approaches, according to Kroll, differ slightly from Aristotle's idea of deliberative rhetoric in that a deliberative argument will consider alternatives before arriving at a decision (similar to a delayed-thesis argument). Kroll stresses the need for students to broaden their argumentative repertoire by learning and practicing these alternatives.

Tannen, Deborah. *The Argument Culture: Moving from Debate to Dialogue.* New York: Random, 1998.

Tannen critiques contemporary American culture for the "warlike atmosphere" surrounding its approach to public dialogue. Claiming that Americans have grown accustomed to this "culture of critique" through popular press, politics, and litigation, Tannen argues that an approach beyond the adversarial is needed to diversify approaches to seeking and gaining knowledge. She espouses moving away from dualism, looking to other cultures' ways of negotiating conflict in order to move beyond dissensus and into dialogue.

Teich, Nathaniel, ed. *Rogerian Perspectives: Collaborative Rhetoric for Oral and Written Communication.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1992.

This edited collection, broken up into three sections, includes two written works of Carl Rogers, as well as commentary and analysis on Rogerian rhetoric and communication. The first section, "Carl Rogers on Communication," includes a 1951 work by Rogers, "Communication: Its Blocking and Its Facilitation," as well as a 1984 piece co-written by Rogers and David Ryback, "One Alternative to Nuclear Planetary Suicide." The first section also includes a conversation with Carl Rogers, written by the editor. Part two, "New Views on Rogerian Theory and Practice," includes quite a few essays relevant to composition instruction, as well as referents to rhetoric and argument by writers such as Richard Coe and Richard E. Young. Essays most relevant to the teaching of argument are "Classical and Rogerian Persuasion: An Archeological/Ecological Explication," "Rogerian

and Platonic Dialogue in—and Beyond—The Writing Classroom," and "Carl Rogers and the Teaching of Rhetoric and Composition." The last section of the book, "Empathy: The Heart of Collaborative Communication," is made up of contributions from the editor in which he negotiates competing definitions and implications of the concept of empathy.

Service Learning and Argument

Service learning within rhetoric composition has its roots in the "social turn" of the field, represented most clearly in Marilyn Cooper's 1986 piece "The Ecology of Writing," in which she alludes to writing pedagogy that is concerned with the writing process as well as that which reflects a "growing awareness that language and texts are not simply the means by which individuals discover and communicate information, but are essentially social activities, dependent on social structures and processes not only in their interpretive but also in their constructive phases" (366). The aims of service learning have been tied to the work of John Dewey, who asserted that education has an explicit democratic function, as well as to liberatory pedagogies, taking cues from the work of Paolo Freire as a way to create citizens who are critically conscious about institutions of power, and who work to change social inequities. Since the mid-1990s, scholars have been engaging service learning as a topic to be distinguished in the field with articles such as Bruce Herzberg's 1994 "Community Service and Critical Teaching," Ellen Cushman's 1997 Braddock-award winning essay "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change," and Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters's 1997 edited anthology *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition.* Recently, service learning has also been tied to the idea that effective writing takes *place;* that is, geographic locations beyond the classroom, in order to provide students with real, rather than unreal, rhetorical situations (see also Heilker, Mauk).

Specific to theories of argument, service learning emerges out of much older stock, from Quintilian's plea that a rhetor be a "good man speaking well"—that is, the assumption that one's ability to be persuasive in a given case is as much tied to the ethical character of a speaker and a speaker's civic duty to *do the right thing* as it is about the

rhetorical matter at hand. Thus service learning pedagogy, put into the context of argument, is about producing a citizen-orator, someone "who could bring his discursive skills to bear when the community [s]he served faced a difficult political or judicial decision, or required a celebration of its uniqueness or cultural worth, or simply needed its morale boosted" (Crowley 318).

Yet such a pedagogy is not without its critics. Service learning has been critiqued as being "hyperpragmatic at the expense of sustained critical analysis" (Scott 301), of being too idealistic in its expectations of social change (Rozycki), and of paying too little attention to the power relationships at work between colleges/universities and communities, given the sudden popularity of funding initiatives based uncritically around service-learning agendas (Mahala and Swilky). As universities are increasingly compelled to advertise their community partnerships to gain funding, and as university mission statements increasingly include phrases which reaffirm their "commitment to public service" (William and Mary) or their "commitment to sustained, engaged service to local, regional, national, and international constituencies" (UCSC), many may find themselves under pressure to commit to service-learning initiatives. In addition, much has been argued—on both sides—about the authenticity of writing assignments and service learning's place in providing a located, authentic rhetorical situation from which to produce texts (see Deans, Petraglia).

However, despite the seeming heyday of service learning coming to an end, scholars have spent as much or more time defending service learning initiatives with scholarship that attests to the large-scale sustainability of such programs around the country (see Robinson; Cushman "Sustainable"). Service learning pedagogy arises out of a commitment to democratic action and service to community, usually includes some component of experiential learning outside the classroom walls, addresses a community need, and contains some type of structured reflection about the experiential component (Scott 303). Thus the best practices that surround service learning and argumentation are those that support the Quintilianic philosophy behind service learning, as well as contribute to a better understanding of experiential learning, community and geography, and critical reflection.

Engaging practices of service learning within the argument classroom may be as straightforward as assigning a proposal argument to address community injustices; it may also, as Jonathan Mauk suggests,

be a way of getting students to think critically about citizenship and care:

> An investigation or explaining assignment begins with readings on political action. The students are prompted to find the names of city, district, state, and federal officials elected to serve their communities. Then they are prompted to write a brief essay [argument] or develop a pamphlet that explains how an average citizen can correspond with government officials. Students then deliver their texts to their neighbors. In a follow-up essay, students explore the significance of their work. They may draw on particular encounters and/or outside texts on civic action. (381)

Arguments that engage service learning activities can be slightly more complex, having students critique their experiences specific to experiential learning or ideas such as "civic literacy" that are central to Quintilian's model. Students might also negotiate argumentative writing within service-based classes by taking a stake in local political issues, as Cooper and Julier explain:

> Our students researched and collected information about the proposed amendment [to protect citizens from discrimination based on height, weight, family, student, sexual orientation, or handicap status] from the local press . . . [t]hey solicited position statements from various individuals and organizations. . . . Other students followed the debate as the City Council deferred discussion to the Human Relations Board. . . . Against that contextual backdrop, we asked our students to design and conduct a public opinion poll to help the Lansing Human Relations Board decide on whether or not to recommend the city council adoption of the ordinance . . . [resulting in a drafted memo] to the Human Relations Board advising it on what decision to make regarding the proposed ordinance. (86-88)

What is central to best practices of argument in service learning cours-es that observe a "democratic/rhetorical model of writing instruction" (91) is an emphasis on civic values in conflict resolution, as well as a commitment to getting students to engage in public discourse in hopes to "forge lasting affirmations of civic reciprocity and ethical obligation for our students" (92)—in short, to produce good men and women, speaking (and writing) well.

Works Cited

Adler-Kassner, Linda, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters, eds. *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition.* Washington, DC: AAHE, 1997.

Cooper, David D., and Laura Julier. "Democratic Conversations: Civic Lit-eracy and Service-Learning in the American Grains." Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters 79-94.

Cooper, Marilyn M. "The Ecology of Writing." *College English* 48.4 (1986): 364-75.

Crowley, Sharon. "A Plea for the Revival of Sophistry." *Rhetoric Review* 7.2 (1989): 318-34.

Cushman, Ellen. "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change." *College Composition and Communication* 47.1 (1996): 7-28.

—. "Sustainable Service Learning Programs." *College Composition and Com-munication* 52.1 (2002): 40-65.

Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition.* Ur-bana: NCTE, 2000.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education.* London: Macmillan, 1916.

Heilker, Paul. "Rhetoric Made Real: Civic Discourse and Writing Beyond the Curriculum." Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters 71-78.

Herzberg, Bruce. "Community Service and Critical Teaching." *College Com-position and Communication* 45.3 (1994): 307-19.

Mahala, Daniel, and Jody Swilky. "Constructing Disciplinary Space: The Borders, Boundaries, and Zones of English." *JAC* 23.4 (2003): 766-97.

Mauk, Jonathan. "Location, Location, Location: The 'Real' (E)states of Be-ing, Writing, and Thinking in Composition." *College English* 65.4 (2003): 368-388.

Petraglia, Joseph, ed. *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1995.

Robinson, Gail. "Creating Sustainable Service Learning Programs: Lessons Learned from the Horizons Project, 1997-2000." *American Association of Community Colleges Project Brief*, 2000. 30 Oct. 2005. <http://www.aacc. nche.edu/Content/ContentGroups/Project_Briefs2/sustainability.pdf>

Rozycki, Edward G. "Romantics, Idealists, and True Service Learning." *Educational Horizons* 80.4 (2002): 159-161.

Scott, Blake J. "Service-Learning and Cultural Studies: Toward a Hybrid Pedagogy of Rhetorical Intervention." *Rhetorical Democracy: Discursive Practices of Civic Engagement.* Ed. Gerard A. Hauser and Amy Grim. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2004. 301-07.

University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) "UCSC At A Crossroads: Advisory Report of the Millennium Committee." n.d. 14 May 2004. <http://www.ucsc.edu/planbudg/chanc/millcom/mcmtg-980624-final report.htm>.

William and Mary University Web. "Strategic Plan: Into the Fourth Century." n.d. 14 May 2004. <http://www.wm.edu/administration/provost/ stplan/pubserv.php>.

For Further Reading

Argument Textbooks

Berndt, Michael, and Amy Muse. *Composing a Civic Life: A Rhetoric and Readings for Inquiry and Action.* New York: Longman, 2004.

Deans, Thomas. *Writing and Community Action: A Service-Learning Rhetoric with Readings.* New York: Longman, 2003.

Isaacs, Emily J., and Phoebe Jackson. *Public Works: Student Writing as Public Text.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2001.

Ross, Carolyn, and Ardel Thomas. *Writing for Real: A Handbook for Writing in Community Service.* New York: Longman, 2003.

Scholarly Works

Adler-Kassner, Linda, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters, eds. *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition.* Washington, DC: AAHE, 1997.

This edited anthology is part of a larger mission by the American Association for Higher Education to publish a series of works on service learning and individual academic disciplines. Covering both the theory and the practice of service learning within composition, the anthology offers essays from some of the field's most prominent scholars in service learning such as Bruce Herzberg, Tom Deans, and Nora Bacon. Each essay offers a theorized approach to a pedagogical practice that involves a facet of service learning, as well as a facet of com-

position. Topics covered are those such as basic writing, writing across the curriculum, civic discourse, and inquiry and logic.

Cushman, Ellen. "The Public Intellectual, Service Learning, and Activist Research." *College English* 61.3 (1999): 328-36.

Cushman argues for a wider consideration of the definition of "public intellectual," asserting that such a definition must move beyond professionals, policymakers, and administrators to include the local community at large. In order to do this, Cushman maintains that current public intellectuals as we know them should move their research, teaching, and service work into the locus of the community, particularly community members in "under-served neighborhoods" (329). Detailing her own experience with teaching a "Social Issues and Literacy" course, Cushman argues that creating service learning and outreach courses do unify teaching, research, and service—moving beyond a "liberal do-gooder stance" and toward critical, activist research while challenging the value systems in place in the academy.

Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition.* Urbana: NCTE, 2000.

Deans works to contextualize service-learning initiatives, situating English Studies within a framework of public service. This work offers three real-world examples of different kinds of service learning, broken into three major chapters. Chapter three uses the trope "writing *for* the community," and focuses specifically on writing as service, as students partner with outside agencies and perform writing related tasks. This is differentiated from "writing *about* the community," the topic of Chapter four, in which students do community service and then critically reflect on that service in writing (using Bruce Herzberg's synthesis course at Bentley College as a model). These two models are also different from "writing *with* the community," the focus of Chapter five, in which Deans explores the model of community partnerships with universities, as evidenced by the Community Literacy Center, a partnership of Carnegie Mellon University and the Community House of Pittsburgh. Deans concludes with a helpful chapter that provides assignments and heuristics for varied service-learning initiatives, as well as appendices that consist of course materials, student writing

samples, descriptions of community writing courses, and service learning resources and contacts.

Eberly, Rosa A. "From *Writers, Audiences,* and *Communities* to *Publics: Writing Classrooms as Protopublic Spaces.*" *Rhetoric Review* 18.1 (1999): 165-78.

Eberly uses her belief that pedagogy and criticism should have "public functions and reflect the social natures of reading and writing" to propose using "public" as an alternative vocabulary for the commonplace concepts of *readers, audience,* and *community.* She argues that the writing classroom should be thought of as a *protopublic space.* According to Eberly, this alteration will help students locate themselves in various overlapping publics, which will facilitate a keener sense of the situated concerns of rhetoric when addressing local issues. Her work is an attempt to address problems of teaching audience awareness in the writing classroom that have been expressed in previous scholarly work. She draws on the work of John Dewey, Richard Sennett, Jurgen Habermas, and Hannah Arendt to ground the idea that teachers can and should approach audience as "publics in process," which are continually morphing as people write, read, and speak about common interests.

Hauser, Gerard A., and Amy Grim. *Rhetorical Democracy: Discursive Practices of Civic Engagement.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2004.

This anthology brings together selected papers from the 2002 Conference of the Rhetoric Society of America. Divided into three sections: Plenary Papers, President's Panel: The Rhetoric of 9/11 and Its Aftermath, and Selected Papers, the anthology presents a wide range of perspectives regarding how teachers and students speak and write their way into the civic arena. Relevant to theories of argument, service learning, and best practices are Herbert W. Simons "The Temple Issues Forum: Innovations in Pedagogy for Civic Engagement," Rolf Norgaard's "Desire and Performance at the Classroom Door: Discursive Laminations of Academic and Civic Engagement," and J. Blake Scott's "Service-Learning and Cultural Studies: Toward a Hybrid Pedagogy of Rhetorical Intervention."

Herzberg, Bruce. "Service Learning and Public Discourse." *JAC* 20.2 (2000): 391-404.

Herzberg engages the question, "what is the theoretical justification for teaching public discourse writing in the composition classroom?," specifically focusing on service-learning courses. Four potential answers exist: that students are more engaged by current public issues, that the immediacy of public issues provides a better understanding for students of genre and audience, that such material provides backing for critical pedagogy, and that public discourse fits in with the historical ends of rhetoric. It is this fourth justification that Herzberg espouses, asserting that it is still within the realm of contemporary rhetoric teachers to emphasize a "traditional kind of public rhetoric" (399). Service learning courses, Herzberg argues, provide a space that bridges the gap between academic discourse and public discourse, and allows room for discussions about civic responsibility, citizenship, and public policy.

Jacoby, Barbara, and Associates. *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

This edited collection represents a "how-to" resource for those considering pursuing service-learning agendas within places of higher education, as well as those who may already be involved with service learning and who have hopes to improve existing institutional structure and support for such programs. Part I, "Foundations and Principles of Service Learning," presents an overview of service learning in higher education, focusing on best practices and building and strengthening community-campus partnerships. Part II, "Designing a Spectrum of Service-Learning Experiences," contains five essays, each of which marks a range of experiential learning practices, from one-time and short term service-learning experiences to intensive multi-year experiences. Part III, "Organizational, Administrative, and Policy Issues," presents nuts-and-bolts topics for teachers and administrators interested in service learning, from essays on how to start a service-learning program to securing its future in the academy.

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID)

Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) is a pedagogical and curricular movement that holds as its central principle the idea that students retain knowledge better when they are asked to engage with content in writing. In the standard writing across the curriculum system, specific courses, in a variety of disciplines, are designated as writing intensive. Within these courses, students synthesize, analyze, and apply course content through writing. Although the two are often conflated, Writing in the Disciplines (WID) and WAC have separate foundational underpinnings. WID, "a research movement to understand what writing actually occurs in different disciplinary areas" (Bazerman et al. 10) followed WAC and filled a theoretical void missing in early WAC scholarship (Jones and Comprone 60). Whereas WAC is primarily concerned with fostering an atmosphere where writing is systematically encouraged, training teachers and getting students to write in content courses, WID aims to interrogate the theoretical differences inherent in disciplinary visions of the role writing and to examine in depth the types of writing that take place across disciplines (Bazerman 10). WAC and WID are relevant to best practices in argument in two different ways:

1. Those who teach in WAC Programs or do research in the area of WID have focused on theories of argument to be at the heart of their enterprise. Different modes of writing among disciplines come back typically to differences in modes of argument among disciplines.

2. The lessons, and in some cases the controversies, gleaned from the study of WAC and WID are often applicable to the realities of writing in writing courses.

As David Bartholomae points out in "Inventing the University,"

> Every time a student sits down to write for us, he has to invent the university for the occasion—invent the university, that is, or a branch of it, like history or anthropology or economics or English. The student has to learn to speak our language, to speak as we do, to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evalu-

ating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define
the discourse of our community. (589)

One of the earliest attempts to theorize argument formation across
disciplines can be found in Stephen Toulmin's *The Uses of Argument.*
Toulmin suggests first considering the distinction between field-invari-
ant and field-dependent elements whenever one critiques an argument.
Field invariance denotes the existence of conventions such as those
mentioned by Bartholomae (37). These conventions remain relatively
constant across disciplines. No matter the field, inquiry begins with
a problem, considers constraints, and relies upon evidence to make
a case. However, field-dependent elements are always in flux. They
include, for example, the standards used to determine what subjects
are worthy of study and which claims do and don't require support
(37). Basically, the differences between how historians and biologists
write are in the ways they go about making, supporting, and eluci-
dating their arguments. Field-dependent elements can also fluctuate
within a discipline. For example, in the field of English composition,
there are scholars who hold divergent views on what constitutes data in
research. Some privilege ethnographic, observational data and others
prefer quantitative, empirical data. Differences in their views on what
constitutes good writing can be traced back to their differences on
what constitutes valid inquiry and sound argument.

Janet Emig, in her classic essay, "Writing as a Mode of Learning,"
was among the first to relate issues of WAC and WID to composition
studies. She uses the theories of Vygotsky, James Britton and others
to make the case that writing is a "unique" form of learning, in part
because "writing can sponsor learning because it can match its pace"
(12). The recursive nature of writing allows for one to process infor-
mation and make sense of it in ways that speaking and thinking don't
facilitate. Emig's essay legitimated early attempts at WAC.

Some of the controversies associated with WAC also have impor-
tant implications for those reading argument in writing courses. David
Russell's work on activity theory challenges the notion that writing is
transferable across disciplines. Russell appropriates this theory from
Vygotsky. Activity theory assumes the existence of "activity systems"
similar to fields or discourse communities, that call upon specific
contexts to make meaning (55). These activity systems have histories
of interaction canonized in literature, and use tools (both physical—
computers, calculators, and semiotic—speaking, writing) to articulate

ideas and make meaning of the world. They change via discussions that take place within them and borrow and transform tools from other disciplines to meet their ends (56). From this perspective, there are few, if any, field-invariant elements and no part of writing is considered an autonomous skill.

To see the relevance of work done in WAC/WID to argument, consider work done in an economics course focused on helping students define constructs and terms. To hone sensitivity to these concepts, Dennis Palamini suggests using "rhetorical cases."

> The rhetorical case is a self-contained story problem that simulates a realistic communication situation. The case provides information about the experiential and education backgrounds of the writer and readers. More important, the case also specifies a particular writing situation (or forum) and thus the relationship of the writer to the readers, that is, their organizational roles with respect to each other and their respective purposes. The student then assumes the writing role described in the case and strives to explain persuasively how the economic analysis helps the readers to understand their business or other type of economic problem and make good decisions. (206)

To illustrate his method, Palamini gives the example of a staff union economist discussing cost-of-living information with a union team charged to negotiate a new contract. The author sees the value of "rhetorical cases" in the emphasis on consideration of audience in a localized context. Economists may know how to communicate with each other, but the nature of their job necessitates the ability to communicate abstract information in language that laypeople can understand and use. At the end of the article, Palamini outlines an extended rhetorical case.

Sharing the responsibility for writing instruction is an idea that has been slowly but steadily accepted in academic circles. Mass education systems all too often ignore the nature of writing and students suffer as a result of the uncritical, reductive models of writing that they encounter throughout the academy. Knowledge of specialized, disciplinary-specific rhetoric should be a staple of compulsory study in universities and colleges if students are to truly find and utilize the most effective

means of persuasion. A more careful consideration of the role of writing in education can lead to more interest from educators in how best to learn and teach writing. Only by understanding how modes of writing and argument taught in non-composition courses differ from and resemble modes of writing and argument traditionally taught in composition courses can we make appropriate adjustments to our course and assignment designs.

Works Cited

Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader.* Ed. Victor Villanueva. Urbana: NCTE, 1997. 589-620.

Bazerman, Charles, Joseph Little, Lisa Bethel, Teri Chavkin, Danielle Fouquette and Janet Garufis, eds. *Reference Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor and the WAC Clearinghouse, 2005.

Emig, Janet. "Writing as a Mode of Learning." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader.* Ed. Victor Villanueva. Urbana: NCTE, 1997. 7-16.

Garay, Mary Sue. "'Day of Absence': Preparing Students to Write Effective Instructions." *Business Communication Quarterly* 63.2 (2000): 73-78.

Jones, Robert, and Joseph J. Comprone. "Where Do We Go Next in Writing Across the Curriculum?" *College Composition and Communication* 44.1 (1993): 59-68.

Palmini, Dennis. "Using Rhetorical Cases to Teach Writing Skills and Enhance Economic Learning." *Journal of Economic Education* 27.3 (1996): 205-16.

Russell, David. "Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction.* Ed. Joseph Petraglia. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1995. 51-77.

Toulmin, Stephen. *The Uses of Argument.* New York: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Wilkes, John. "Science Writing: Who? What? How?" *The English Journal* 67.4 (1978): 56-60.

For Further Reading

Argument Textbooks

Hult, Christine A. *Researching and Writing Across the Curriculum*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 2006.

Mulvaney, Mary Kay A., and David A. Jolliffe. *Academic Writing: Genres, Samples, and Resources.* New York: Longman, 2005.

Schmidt, Diane E., ed. *Writing in Political Science*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 2005.

Tinberg, Howard. *Writing with Consequence: What Writing Does in the Disciplines.* New York: Longman, 2003.

Scholarly Works—General

Blair, Catherine Pastore. "Only One of the Voices: Dialogic Writing across the Curriculum." *College English* 50.4 (1988): 383-89.

Catherine Pastore Blair theorizes a "dialogic" Writing Across the Curriculum model for educators who are involved in interdisciplinary writing instruction. Her position is that WAC should not be housed in English departments because that would imply that English studies was master of the domain of writing, which undercuts the main premises of WAC. The dialogic model is grounded in Bakhtin's and Friere's social theories of knowledge—that meaning is created in context. If this is true, "the English department owns only its particular brand of writing that carries its particular cultural context . . . English department writing is no better than writing in anthropology. It is only better by its own local standards" (384). Whereas some scholars position English faculty as the oppressed and overworked, Blair reverses the order and positions English faculty as the oppressors, who reserve the right to final say in matters of writing (386). This model places all disciplines on level ground and relies upon an interdisciplinary committee to oversee the WAC program and mandates that members of all disciplines involved engage in dialogue about views of writing early and often.

Anthropology

Segal, Edwin S. "The Journal: Teaching Reflexive Methodology on an Introductory Level" *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 21.2 (1990): 121-27.

Segal's work is focused on the interaction between field and field worker. He cultivates an "anthropological imagination," which can best be described as a feel for placing conclusions about situations in anthropological frames without relying upon stock patterns of response. Segal views the participant-observer relationship inherent in fieldwork as a dialectical process and views writing as a way to help students establish a systematic way of thinking about their own experiences so that they can account for the differences between the observer's and the partici-

pant's worlds when they are writing up their field observations. The value of journaling, according to Segal, is that students learn to connect the course content with their own experiences and to get them to reveal information about situations that they encounter and their responses to them. The article suggests using questions to guide journal discussions, such as "describe an event or incident occurring within the past two weeks in which you found your behavior constrained by our society's sex-gender system" or allowing students to respond to anthropological articles. Segal suggests that over time, if prompted, students will gradually question the social factors affecting situations and rely less upon their own personal reading. As a pedagogical tool, it is useful to help the teacher guide direction of the class and focus class time to areas that the journals call attention.

Business

Cox, Pamela L., Paul E. Bobrowski, and Larry Maher. "Teaching First-Year Business Students to Summarize: Abstract Writing Assignment." *Business Communication Quarterly* 66.4 (2003): 36-54.

Cox et al. pinpoint as a major concern for business writing the necessity to condense large quantities of information into relatively smaller chunks. They call upon studies that have demonstrated that although this skill is integral to the field, few people summarize well. The article discusses an assignment designed to have students create an abstract of a larger text through rhetorically selecting information that is going to be most pertinent to the task at hand. They believe that "The primary purpose of the writing-to-learn assignments is to have writers explain concepts or ideas to themselves, to ask questions, and to make connections" (37). This is important because, in business writing, the writer represents the employer, thus s/he must use language that is going to clearly articulate the needs of the employer. Attention to the needs of the audience is of the utmost importance when phrasing the messages to ensure that they are received in the manner that they were intended.

Griggs, Karen. "A Role Play for Revising Style and Applying Management Theories." *Business Communication Quarterly* 68.1 (2005): 60-65.

Griggs believes that role-playing is an effective teaching tool because it allows students to call upon their previous experiences in relatively low-risk situations. The rhetorical significance of role-play is that it places purpose and audience at the center of communicative interactions, with revision as the central focus of this particular activity. The assignment sequence offered in this article begins with a scenario. All of the students are asked to pretend that they work for a corporate communications manager who has written multiple drafts of a memo. The first draft berates the staff for making a mistake that led to the loss of a court case and the revision explains court rulings and asks the staff to be more careful in the future. Some students are asked to role- play the different versions of the memo, while the rest of the students are cast in the role of the staff. After the presentations are given, the staff is asked to match role-play characters with management styles. Griggs states that it is through the ensuing discussion of management style and the varying ways that the staff could perceive the draft that students see the value of considering audience and purpose when revising. If time permits, Griggs suggests that the impact of time on revision could also be discussed (additional variables may need to be considered if the document is revised over a long period of time). There is an appendix with drafts of the memo at the end of the article.

Kallendorf, Craig, and Carol Kallendorf. "The Figures of Speech, Ethos, and Aristotle: Notes Toward a Rhetoric of Business Communication." *Journal of Business Communication* 22.1 (1985): 35-50.

After noticing that business communication (advertising, internal and external company documents such as letters and annual reports, and oral presentations and speeches) were utilizing classical figures of speech such as anaphora, hyperbole, metonymy, simile, and metaphor, the authors assert that there is a firm connection between business communication and classical Aristotelian rhetoric. Kallendorf and Kallendorf assert that business writing is intrinsically persuasive, taking its "rightful place" beside deliberative, judicial, and epideictic rhetoric.

Kreth, Melinda L. "A Small-Scale Client Project for Business Writing Students." *Business Communication Quarterly* 68.1 (2005): 52-59.

Kreth's model offers a way to engage students in an activity that mimics interaction with an audience that has specific desires and needs that need to be met within the context of a specific interaction. The author suggests that client-based pedagogy of this kind is a better alternative than service learning because client-based pedagogy has as its central goal understanding and negotiating of "real world" problems, whereas service learning emphasizes social activism. This particular assignment calls for interactions with a client-serving company. Kreth's class met with a realtor and collaborated to break up into groups to create different versions of a "buying my first home" guidebook to help first time homebuyers prepare for the experience. During the process, they met with the realtor and other realtors at the firm and considered the needs of homebuyers and realtors when deciding which information was essential for the needs of both parties to be met with one document. Since the final products were not actually used by the realtor, the "real world" value of the exercise is token. A secondary benefit of the assignment is that the students in her class took ownership of the activity and were critical of the structural constraints of the process. The critical engagement with the conventions of the field could also be fodder for discussion.

Economics

Greenlaw, Steven A. "Using Writing to Enhance Student Learning in Undergraduate Economics." *International Review of Economics Education* 1.1 (2003): 61-70.

Greenlaw's purpose in this article is not pedagogical, but there are a few good writing prompts that could aid in getting students to see the complexity involved in defining principles of economics and defending the constructs that they create. For example, one question is, "One of the results of Hurricane Andrew several years ago was dramatic increases in the prices of most products in south Florida. This prompted complaints of 'price gouging' and demands for government protection of consumers and punishment of the price gougers. Write a one- to two-page essay using the theory of supply and demand to analyze the impact of Hurricane Andrew on goods prices in south Florida. Exactly why did prices increase? Show graphically and explain in detail. In your essay, be sure to consider the following points. Define

'price gouging' in your own words. Explain the extent to which the price increases in south Florida were examples of price gouging or not. Should government have prevented the price increases? Who would have benefited and who would have been harmed if the government had prevented those price increases?" Although writing is seen primarily as a way to prepare students for class discussion, the prompts could be used for a deeper theoretical discussion about how economists appeal to people, and how visual aids can used to tell stories and even ethics in economics.

Engineering

Thompson, Nancy S., and Elizabeth M. Alford. "Developing a Writing Program in Engineering: Teaching Writing to Teach Engineering Literacies." ERIC document. ED 409 584. n.d. 7 Feb. 2009 <http://eric.ed.gov:80/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/bd/f3.pdf >.

This document is the written version of a Conference on College Composition and Communication presentation on the authors' work in a WID writing center designated for engineers. While this is not a pedagogical piece per se, it does address the literacies that are field-dependent for engineering. They list "absence of personal voice" and valuing of information over author as particularly salient features of writing in the field of engineering. This is born out in the disciplinary reverence for the lab report, which Thompson and Alford label "the foundation of engineering literacy" (2). At the end of the article, there is a section on group learning theory in engineering as a way to better facilitate student acquisition of engineering literacies.

Political Science

Shellman, Stephen M. "Active Learning in Comparative Politics: A Mock German Election and Coalition-Formation Simulation." *Political Science and Politics* 34.4 (2001): 827-34.

Although this article does not have discussions of writing at the center, Shellman's mock German election includes components of writing that

are particularly well-suited to address methods of inquiry in political science. For example, students are split up into parties corresponding to real German political parties and asked to write party position statements on various issues to develop a sense of how the parties articulate their positions on the issues through arguments. Later in the sequence, students, still acting as representatives of political parties, are asked to fill out "coalition agreement forms" with the other parties to move the government's agenda in their direction. This writing assignment asks students to perform cost/benefit analysis of proposals, consider the motives of the group, and to consider the implications of binding their cause with another group's cause to create movement on an issue. The author believes that, during the course of the assignment, students learn the importance of a number of discipline-specific concepts.

Computers and Writing

For most of the students in our composition courses, writing and computers seem a natural pairing: drafts are easily composed and revised in any of a number of word processing programs, and emails and chat messages are composed and sent out by the dozens on a daily basis. Electronically-produced composition dominates writing and composition studies. Of course, this hasn't always been the case. Some twenty-two odd years ago, when word processing was still commonly referred to as "text processing" (Palmquist 400) and the widespread availability of microcomputers was a new phenomenon, composition scholars were divided on exactly if and how computers would impact the field. 1983 saw the creation of *Computers and Composition,* a peer-reviewed scholarly journal devoted exclusively to the theory, practice, and praxis of computers and writing. It is within the pages of this journal that many of the most important arguments about computers and writing can be found, and where the most influential scholars in the field (Kate Kiefer, Cynthia Selfe, and Gail Hawisher have formed a triumvirate of leadership from the field's inception) continue to publish their writing. Any teacher interested in understanding the history and evolution of computers and writing should begin their studies with *Computers and Composition.*

Given the relative newness of this field and the polarized reactions of many teachers to technology (Perelman's "inertia" creating many

neo-Luddites), several arguments about computers and writing can be found in the discipline's writings. One such early argument can be traced in the pages of *Computers and Composition* as teachers debated whether or not computer-based writing "had the potential to produce global improvement in the quality of student writing" (Moran 347). In "Planning and Implementing the Right Word Processing System," Brownell was adamant that "word processors do make it possible to write more in less time, and do make us better writers" (3). His claim was quickly contested by McAllister and Sommers and Collins, and later by Dowling and Collier and Werier. Interested teachers can use this argument to trace the polarity between technophiles who believe that computers will have a positive impact on student writing and those more cautious scholars (see Harris and Bangert-Drowns) who favor assessment and conclusive evidence before embracing computers in writing classes. This debate continues, with many scholars turning to students to provide their views on computer-mediated composition instruction (with researchers like Gos, LeCourt and Barnes, and Duffelmeyer leading the way).

Exactly how emerging computer technologies impact the study and teaching of argumentation is much debated. The continual advancement of hardware, software, and computer accessories each year adds new possibilities (and potential pitfalls) for teachers of argument. Gary Stephens was among the earliest scholars theorizing how computers might impact argumentation, claiming that computers would increase student argumentative skills. Of course in 1984 when Stephens was writing, computer technology meant word processing, but as the 20th century continues to shrink in the rear-view mirror, there are a variety of ways argument teachers might use computer technology in their classrooms. Several scholars have hypothesized ways arguments might be effectively constructed in hypertextual environments (see Marshall, Conklin and Begeman, Bolter, Landow, and Kolb). Locke Carter discusses argument in hypertext in great detail, drawing on Perelman's work extensively. Sean D. Williams uses Toulmin's views of argumentation and credits interaction as the key to Web-based persuasion. Kajder and Bull and Williams and Jacobs explore how Web logs (blogs) may function to provide students with audience awareness and a dialogic component crucial to constructing effective arguments. For those teachers of argument conducting class out of a computer-mediated classroom (CMC), McAlister, Ravenscroft and Scanlon and

Coffin and Hewings offer suggestions on how those spaces might be effectively used to support collaboration and argument construction. For those scholars seeking a more technical explanation of how computer technology might augment argumentation, the field of computer science has devoted space in its literature to this issue, noticeable recently in Andriessen, Baker, and Suthers, Reed and Norman, Kirschner, Buckingham and Carr, and McElholm.

For teachers of argument seeking more practical help in technological matters, many helpful academic websites exist. The reliability and citation of Internet sources remains a crucial issue, as students rely more and more heavily on websites to provide the grounds and backing for their arguments without first evaluating the ethos of the source(s) being used. Online rubrics at the Cornell University Library, the UC Berkeley Library, and the New Mexico State University Library offer a diverse sampling of evaluative questions and suggestions for further study related to evaluating online sources. Many other university websites provide additional teaching aides. The Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) was one of the first in the country and remains one of the most important, offering many heuristics and ideas for effective writing. Dartmouth College offers a comprehensive Internet site devoted to Web teaching, providing downloadable teaching resources, articles on teaching with technology, and case studies of teachers using the Internet in their teaching. Schoolcraft College's website offers similar materials, including worksheets, handouts, and teaching modules, including materials on teaching argumentation. Lingua MOO, an academic virtual community, offers teachers another space to visit to find additional teaching materials related to technology and argumentation.

The sources listed here serve as a good starting point for teachers who want to explore how computer technologies impact the writing and teaching of arguments. Teachers who desire additional scholarship on theoretical and practical applications of how argument might be taught with a variety of computer applications and/or in electronic spaces should follow the conversations taking place in the pages of *Computers and Composition,* the virtual pages of *Computers and Composition Online,* and in online academic sites like Lingua MOO, where classroom applications of cutting-edge technologies can often be found first.

Works Cited

Andriessen, Jerry, Michael Baker, and Dan Suthers. *Arguing to Learn: Confronting Cognitions in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environments.* Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2003.

Bangert-Drowns, Robert L. "The Word Processor as an Instructional Tool: A Meta-Analysis of Word Processing in Writing Instruction." *Review of Educational Research* 63.1 (1993): 69-93.

Barker, Joe. *Evaluating Web Pages: Techniques to Apply & Questions to Ask.* University of California Berkeley, 22 Mar. 2005. 26 Jan. 2006. <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/TeachingLib/Guides/Internet/*Evaluate.html*>.

Beck, Susan E. *The Good, The Bad, & The Ugly: Why It's a Good Idea to Evaluate Web Sources.* New Mexico State University, 6 Nov. 2005. 26 Jan. 2006. <http://lib.nmsu.edu/instruction/eval.html>.

Bolter, Jay David. "Topographic Writing: Hypertext and the Electronic Writing Space." *Hypermedia and Literary Studies.* Ed. Paul Delany and George P. Landow. Cambridge: MIT P, 1991. 105-18.

Brownell, Thomas. "Planning and Implementing the Right Word Processing System." *Computers and Composition* 2.2 (1984): 3-5.

Carter, Locke. "Argument in Hypertext: Writing Strategies and the Problem of Order in a Nonsequential World." *Computers and Composition* 20.1 (2003): 3-22.

Coffin, Caroline, and Ann Hewings. "Engaging Electronically: Using CMC to Develop Students' Argumentation Skills in Higher Education." *Language and Education* 19.1 (2005): 32-49.

Collier, Richard, and Clifford Werier. "When Computer Writers Compose by Hand." *Computers and Composition* 12.1 (1995): 47-59.

Conklin, Jeff, and Michael L. Begeman. "gIbis: A Hypertext Tool for Team Design Deliberation." *Proceedings of Hypertext '87.* Chapel Hill, NC: Association of Computing Machinery, 1987. 247-68.

Dartmouth College. *Web Teaching at Dartmouth College.* 8 Sept. 2003. 26 Jan. 2006. <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~webteach/>.

Dowling, Carolyn. "Word Processing and the Ongoing Difficulty of Writing." *Computers and Composition* 11.3 (1994): 227-35.

Duffelmeyer, Barbara Blakeley. "Critical Computer Literacy: Computers in First-Year Composition as Topic and Environment." *Computers and Composition* 18.3 (2001): 289-307.

Engle, Michael. *Evaluating Web Sites: Criteria and Tools.* Cornell University Library, 28 Oct. 2005. 26 Jan. 2006. <http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/webeval.html>.

Gos, Michael. "Computer Anxiety and Computer Experience: A New Look at an Old Relationship." *The Clearing House* 69.5 (1996): 271-76.

Harris, Jeanette. "Student Writers and Word Processing: A Preliminary Evaluation." *College Composition and Communication* 36.3 (1985): 323-30.

Haynes, Cynthia, and Jan Rune Holmevik. *High Wired: On the Design, Use, and Theory of Educational MOOs.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Jordan-Henley, Jennifer, and Barry M. Maid. "Tutoring in Cyberspace: Student Impact and College/University Collaboration." *Computers and Composition* 12.2 (1995): 211-18.

Kajder, Sara and Glen Bull. "Scaffolding for Struggling Students: Reading and Writing with Blogs." *Learning and Leading with Technology* 31.2 (2003): 32-46.

Kiefer, Kate. "Computers and Teacher Education in the 1990s and Beyond." *Evolving Perspectives on Computers and Composition Studies: Questions for the 1990s.* Eds. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Urbana: NCTE. 113-31.

Kinkead, Joyce, and Jan Ugan. "A Report on the 1983 CCCC Special Session for Writing Lab Directors." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 7.10 (1983): 5-6.

Kirschner, Paul A., Simon J. Buckingham Shum, and Chad S. Carr, eds. *Visualizing Argumentation: Software Tools for Collaborative and Educational Sense-Making.* New York: Springer, 2003.

Klem, Elizabeth, and Charles Moran. "Computers and Instructional Strategies in the Teaching of Writing." *Evolving Perspectives on Computers and Composition Studies: Questions for the 1990s.* Eds. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Urbana: NCTE. 132-49.

Kolb, David. "Association and Argument: Hypertext in and Around the Writing Process." *New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia* 11.1 (2005): 27-32.

Landow, George P. *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992.

LeCourt, Donna, and Luanne Barnes. "Writing Multiplicity: Hypertext and Feminist Textual Politics." *Computers and Composition* 16.1 (1999): 55-72.

Marshall, Catherine C. "Constraint-Based Hypertext for Argumentation." *Proceedings of Hypertext '87.* Chapel Hill, NC: Association of Computing Machinery, 1987. 253-68.

McAlister, Simon, Andrew Ravenscroft, and Eileen Scanlon. "Combining Interaction and Context Design to Support Collaborative Argumentation Using a Tool for Synchronous CMC." *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 20.3 (2004): 194-204.

McAllister, Carole H. "The Effects of Word Processing on the Quality of Writing: Fact or Illusion?" *Computers and Composition* 2.4 (1985): 36-44.

McElholm, Dermot. *Text and Argumentation in English for Science and Technology.* Berlin: Peter Lang, 2002.

Moran, Charles. "*Computers and Composition* 1983-2002: What We Have Hoped For." *Computers and Composition* 20.4 (2003): 343-58.

Palmquist, Mike. "A Brief History of Computer Support for Writing Centers and Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs. *Computers and Composition* 20.4 (2003): 395-413.

Purdue University. *The OWL at Purdue.* n.d. 26 Jan. 2006. <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/>.

Reed, Chris, and Timothy J. Norman, eds. *Argumentation Machines: New Frontiers in Argument and Computation.* Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2004.

Selfe, Cynthia L., and Richard Selfe. "The Politics of the Interface: Power and Its Exercise in Electronic Contact Zones." *College Composition and Communication* 45.4 (1994): 480-504.

Sommers, Elizabeth, and James Collins. "Microcomputers and Writing." *Computers and Composition* 2.4 (1985): 27-35.

Stephens, Gary. "Computer Debating." *Computers and Composition* 1.4 (1984).

Williams, Jeremy B., and Joanne Jacobs. "Exploring the Use of Blogs as Learning Spaces in the Higher Education Sector." *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 20.2 (2004): 232-47.

Williams, Sean D. "Process-Product Ambiguity: Theorizing a Perspective on World Wide Web Argumentation." *JAC* 22.2 (2002): 377-98.

For Further Reading

Textbooks

Carbone, Nick. *Writing Online: A Student's Guide to the Internet and World Wide Web.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.

Kolko, Beth E., Alison E. Regan, and Susan Romano. *Writing in an Electronic World: A Rhetoric with Readings.* New York: Longman, 2001.

Holmevik, Jan Rune, and Cynthia Haynes. *MOOniversity: A Student's Guide to Online Learning Environments.* New York: Allyn & Bacon, 2000.

Ulmer, Gregory. *Internet Invention: From Literacy to Electracy.* New York: Allyn & Bacon, 2003.

Ulmer's book provides a pedagogy of online learning and is meant as a supplement to texts that introduce students to the Web, html, and graphics design. Ulmer hopes to move students familiar with print culture (literacy) towards familiarity with electronic culture ("electracy") and the rhetorics that surround it. A self- proclaimed "workbook-

reader-theory," the text comes with a partner website and is broken into sections that both extract electronic literacy out of conventional print materials, as well as provide explicit discussion about the theory and pedagogy behind assignment choices. Topics for discussion are broken into career, family, entertainment, and community discourses, "emblems of a wide scope," which is concerned with the creation, production, and consumption of images, and ends with a chapter that asks students to invest in world issues and create a website on public policy in "conclusion: culture wars or syncretism?"

Scholarly Works

Andriessen, Jerry, Micheal Baker, and Dan Suthers. *Arguing to Learn: Confronting Cognitions in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environments.* Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2003.

Andreissen, Baker, and Suthers offer this edited collection as one that revolves around computer-mediated interaction and argumentation, and specifically, computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) environments. The collection offers an overview of these environments, as well as their role in collaborative inquiry, literacy projects, and scientific investigation. The collection includes essays such as "Argumentation as Negotiation in Electronic Collaborative Writing," "Elaborating New Arguments through a CSCL Script," and "CSCL, Argumentation, and Deweyan Inquiry: Argumentation *is* Learning." The collection offers instructional strategies for improving the quality of learning and of producing written arguments, as well as for avoiding the pitfalls often associated with computer-mediated and collaborative learning environments.

Coffin, Caroline, and Ann Hewings. "Engaging Electronically: Using CMC to Develop Students' Argumentation Skills in Higher Education." *Language and Education* 19.1 (2005): 32-49.

How might electronic conferencing provide students with opportunities to develop argumentation skills? The authors explore this question by collecting data from a post-graduate distance education TESOL course, examining the asynchronous conference posts of two differ-

ent student groups over the course of the academic term. Using the concept of engagement ("the system of semantic options available to writers for negotiating and adjusting the arguability of propositions and proposals" [37]), the authors examine how often in their posts the participants either endorsed, distanced, or challenged the views of their classmates in this electronic space. Their findings suggest that even though electronic conferences can facilitate engagement with difference, students were still reluctant to challenge their peers (much in the same way they are in more traditional face-to-face classroom settings). Teaching argument in electronic spaces presents some of the same challenges as teaching it in non-virtual classrooms.

Ladikas, Miltos, and Doris Schroeder. "Argumentation Theory and GM Foods." *Poesis & Praxis: International Journal of Ethics of Science and Technology Assessment* 3.3 (2005): 216-25.

The authors apply Stephen Toulmin's model for argumentation to the European debate around genetically modified (GM) foods that took place in public writings in the late 1990s. Their goal was to see if Toulmin's model was useful in analyzing public debates. British newspaper articles on GM soya (the first GM product to enter Europe) were analyzed over a two year period, examining the warrants, backing, and rebuttal of the claims discovered. The authors concluded that the Toulmin model of argumentation was a very effective tool for analyzing public debates. This essay serves as a useful model for teachers who seek examples of how to apply argumentation to current news events.

Weger, Harry Jr., and Mark Aakhus. "Arguing in Internet Chat Rooms: Argumentative Adaptations to Chat Room Design and Some Consequences for Public Deliberation at a Distance." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 40.1 (2003): 23-38.

Does the format of the argumentation venue alter the form of the argument itself? The authors explore this question by examining the quality of chat room argumentation, collecting data from America Online (AOL) political chat rooms. Data was analyzed using the pragma-dialectical approach, which places emphasis on the functional utility of arguments in attempt to understand how Internet chat rooms "encourage or discourage critical discussion in the public sphere" (27).

Data analysis indicated that several features problematic for supporting critical discussion (lack of conversational coherence, under-developed arguments, and flaming) were typical in chat room spaces. The authors theorize that design elements of chat rooms (continuous scrolling transcripts, contribution limits, and unidentified participants) directly influence the form argumentation can take in these spaces. Rather than seeing chat rooms as a failed space for argumentation, the authors suggest seeing them as "an achievement of an alternative model of argumentative dialogue adapted to the format of the venue for public participation" (37).

Visual Rhetoric

In *A New Rhetoric,* Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca identify the importance of *presence* to argumentation. There, the authors describe presence as the combination of form and substance, psychologically influencing the audience through such techniques as omission, emphasis, choice, and selection. Even though these authors do not discuss much in the way of extra-verbal uses of the visual, it seems clear that this concept, which stresses putting something immediately in front of the audience, is particularly important in visual rhetoric, arguably the most dominant and pervasive types of appeals in our culture. The visual rhetoric of magazines (a glossy two-page spread in *Vanity Fair* for Lancome depicting a young female model lounging in a pink summer dress and inviting viewers to "Awaken to a new spring" line of cosmetics), television (a smiling and patient Alex Rodriguez helping children learn the basics of catching a baseball in a television promotional for Boys and Girls Clubs of America), and the Internet (at the Greenpeace International website, the wide-eyed face of a baby orangutan greeting visitors next to text that suggests "This fragile Earth deserves a voice. It needs solutions. It needs change. It needs action.") are among the almost 3000 messages that the average person encounters each day that are predominantly visual in their persuasive appeal.

However, we have been slow to fully embrace visual rhetoric studies in composition and rhetoric and argumentation. Carolyn Handa articulates this clearly:

> Composition and classical rhetoric as disciplines approach rhetoric and argument in strictly verbal terms

> . . . Within composition scholars by no means agree
> universally on the question of whether or not imag-
> es can make arguments, especially as arguments are
> classically defined: linear sequences of claims, coun-
> ter-claims, and evidence. Whether images can argue
> on their own or only in conjunction with words is an
> even more contentious subject. (305)

For those readers who have grown up in a culture dominated by im-
agistic rather than print-based media, the persuasive power of images,
signs, and symbols seems a foregone conclusion. Why, then, has our
discipline been so resistant to accepting visual rhetoric as a legitimate
field of study?

Craig Stroupe helps situates this phenomenon by pointing out that
rhetoric and composition programs are usually contained within Eng-
lish departments, and that it is English studies as a whole that has been
staunch in its defense of verbal print culture and its "customary dis-
missal of popular, predominantly visual discourses" (609-10). Fear of
technology (particularly computer technology) and disdain for popu-
lar "texts" contributed heavily to this early marginalization of visual
rhetoric in the discipline. Visual rhetoric clearly complements many
disciplines, but as other "new" fields of study have experienced, it also
may threaten established academic disciplines, whose completeness,
internal coherence, and boundaries may be called into question if vi-
sual rhetoric is recognized. Given these obstacles, the pace of visual
studies' (re)emergence is more easily understood.

Rhetoric and composition's reticence to embrace visual rhetoric
studies is ironic, given the importance of the visual throughout the
history of the discipline since ancient times. Aristotle acknowledged
the power of metaphor and visualization and Quintillian identified vi-
sualization as the surest means of arousing emotions. Plato placed great
importance on light and vision in both the extra-sensory and the sen-
sory worlds. Ernst Robert Curtius points out that in medieval times,
epideictic rhetoric (with more emphasis placed on visual presentation)
became much more important than deliberative rhetoric. Catherine
Hobbs argues that Francis Bacon, by calling images *emblems,* accepted
the premise that images are more memorable than words. She offers
the following quote from Bacon as evidence: "It is easier to retain the
image of a sportsman hunting the hare, of an apothecary ranging his
boxes, an orator making a speech, a boy repeating verses, or a player

acting his part, than the corresponding notions of invention, disposition, elocution, memory, [and] action" (60-61). The "new rhetoricians" of the Scottish Enlightenment (Smith, Blair, Lord Kames, and Campbell among others) were also influenced by Bacon's centering of imagery and imagination. The terms and concepts now recognized as integral to visual studies have a rich history in rhetoric. Gunther Kress and Theo Van Leeuwen and Hunter Gardner are among the scholars leading the academic conversation on the need to pay attention to visual rhetorics.

Many strong classroom applications of visual rhetoric exist. One of the earliest texts to demonstrate how to incorporate the study of visuals in the writing classroom was Stephen Bernhardt's "Seeing the Text." In this essay, Bernhardt argued that even verbal print texts are inherently visual in that they rely on spatial arrangements and decisions (font styles and sizes, locations of white spaces, paragraphing, etc.) that are rhetorical in nature. Bernhardt's essay includes copies of an environmental fact sheet produced by conservation-minded citizens and politicians pursuing wetlands protection legislation. Bernhardt's analysis of the construction of the fact sheet serves as a strong introduction to the notion that visual rhetoric need not include pictures, signs, or symbols, and provides a point of comparison for the many similar civic-minded fact sheets, advocacy pamphlets, and websites that exist.

In "Reading the Visual in College Writing Classes," Charles Hill shares some of his own techniques for introducing students to visual rhetoric. His examples are diverse, ranging from the rearrangement of the spaces between lines of text and the size of the text lines (similar to Bernhardt's essay) to the analysis of the rhetoric of famous photographs (United States Marines raising the flag over Iwo Jima) to the deconstruction of the cultural values hidden within a print-based advertisement for life insurance. Hill's analysis of each example helps clearly demonstrate the diversity of visual persuasive appeals and provides teachers and students with a strong pedagogical foundation from which to explore other examples of visual rhetoric in the sample categories provided.

For teachers who want to continue to explore the connections between visual rhetoric and culture, articles by Francis Frascina and Kenneth Zagacki offer complementary analyses of Norman Rockwell paintings. Frascina compares Rockwell's original World War

II-inspired paintings with the digitally altered versions of the paintings produced by *The New York Times* after 9/11 in an attempt to demonstrate the "collective cultural memory" powerful images can construct. Zagacki uses Rockwell's civil rights paintings to illustrate how visual works of art "may operate rhetorically to articulate public knowledge" and shape public perception. These two essays and the Rockwell paintings discussed in them offer excellent opportunities for teachers to introduce students to visual rhetoric concepts and methods through which they might analyze and deconstruct imagistic persuasive appeals.

Practical examples for other visual rhetoric genres exist as well. McCloud's *Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art* creatively uses comics themselves to analyze the rhetorical practices employed by comics. David Blakesley's analysis of the rhetorically reflexive verbal and visual components in *The Usual Suspects* provides a framework that can be applied to the study of visual rhetoric in cinema. Craig Smith's "Television News as Rhetoric" works well in conjunction with Joel Nydahl's "The Rhetoric of Television News" and John Hartley's *Uses of Television,* to provide representative examples of how television rhetoric can be studied and applied. Teachers who wish to combine the study of television and film might select Thomas Rosteck's 1989 article which analyzes the argumentative structure of Edward R. Murrow's "Report on Senator McCarthy" from the documentary series "See It Now" and George Clooney's 2005 film *Good Night, and Good Luck* which depicts the same pivotal situation in American history. Those interested in video game rhetoric and the ongoing argument about the impacts of violent video games might connect Lachlan, Smith, and Tamborini and the large amount of journalism covering the debate between Joseph Lieberman and game designers and players (Wikipedia.org has excellent coverage of this issue). These materials can be combined with the video games *Doom* and *Doom 3,* and *Doom: The Movie* to provide a practical example of how different visual rhetorics impact the same subject matter.

The next decade will see visual rhetoric studies gain increasing status in all relevant academic disciplines including rhetoric and composition; prescient teachers will begin to increase their literacy in visual rhetoric theory and pedagogy (drawing on the proliferation of cultural examples that surround them) in preparation for the increasing aca-

demic awareness of and appreciation for the persuasive power of the image and visually persuasive texts.

Works Cited

Bernhardt, Stephen A. "Seeing the Text." *College Composition and Communication* 37.1 (1986): 66-78.

Blakesley, David, ed. *The Terministic Screen: Rhetorical Perspectives on Film.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton/Bollingen, 1973.

Doom. Dir. Andrzej Bartkowiak. Perf. The Rock, Karl Urban, and Rosamund Pike. Universal, 2005.

Frascina, Francis. "The New York Times, Norman Rockwell and the New Patriotism." *Journal of Visual Culture* 2.1 (2003): 99-130.

Gardner, Howard. *Changing Minds: The Art and Science of Changing Our Own and Other People's Minds.* Boston: Harvard Business School, 2004.

Good Night, and Good Luck. Dir. George Clooney. Perf. David Strathairn, Robert Downey, Jr., Patricia Clarkson, and Ray Wise. Warner Independent Pictures, 2005.

Handa, Carolyn, ed. *Visual Rhetoric in a Digital World: A Critical Sourcebook.* New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

Hartley, John. *Uses of Television.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Hill, Charles A. "Reading the Visual in College Writing Classes." *Intertexts: Reading Pedagogy in College Writing Classrooms.* Ed. Marguerite Helmers. Mahwah, NJ: LEA, 2003. 123-50.

Hobbs, Catherine L. "Learning from the Past: Verbal and Visual Literacy in Early Modern Rhetoric and Writing Pedagogy." *Language and Image in the Reading-Writing Classroom.* Ed. Kristie Fleckenstein, Linda T. Calendrillo and Demetrice A. Worley. Mahwah, NJ: LEA, 2002. 27-44.

id Software. *Doom.* id Software, 1993.

id Software. *Doom III.* Activision, 2004

Kress, Gunther, and Theo Van Leeuwen. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

Lachlan, Ken, Stacy L. Smith, and Ron Tamborini. "Popular Video Games: Quantifying the Presentation of Violence and Its Context." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 41.1 (2003): 58-76.

McCloud, Scott. *Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art.* New York: HarperCollins, 1994.

Nydahl, Joel. "The Rhetoric of Television News." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 13.4 (1986): 290-97.

Rosteck, Thomas. "Irony, Argument, and Reportage in Television Documentary: "See It Now" versus Senator McCarthy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75.3 (1989): 277-98.

Smith, Craig R. "Television News as Rhetoric." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 41.3 (1977): 147-59.

Stroupe, Craig. "Visualizing English: Recognizing the Hybrid Literacy of Visual and Verbal Authorship on the Web." *College English* 62.5 (2000): 607-32.

Zagacki, Kenneth. "Visibility and Rhetoric: The Power of Visual Images in Norman Rockwell's Depictions of Civil Rights." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91.2 (2005): 175-200.

For Further Reading

Textbooks

Alfano, Christine and Alyssa O'Brien. *Envision: Persuasive Writing in a Visual World.* New York: Longman, 2005.

Faigley, Lester, Diana George, Anna Palchik, and Cynthia Selfe. *Picturing Texts.* New York: Norton, 2005.

McQuade, Donald and Christine McQuade. *Seeing and Writing.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000.

This textbook both asks and answers the question "what does seeing have to do with writing?" Designed to introduce students to elements of visual rhetoric, McQuade and McQuade divide each chapter into an opening set of images ("portfolio"), images juxtaposed with written text ("pair"), exercises, visual representations of history ("retrospect"), interviews, key concepts for writers ("visualizing composition"), a collection of visual and written readings ("looking closer"), and contextual historical and cultural images for difficult readings ("context"). The book makes explicit connections between visual and written texts and topics such as place, gender, difference, icons, and observing the everyday.

Ruszkiewicz, John, Daniel Anderson, and Christy Friend. *Beyond Words: Reading and Writing in a Visual Age.* New York: Longman, 2006.

Scholarly Works

Birdsell, David S., and Leo Groarke. "Toward a Theory of Visual Argument." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 33.1 (1996): 1-10.

Birdsell and Groarke assert that argumentation theorists are overly concerned with the verbal aspects of argument to the exclusion of the visual aspects of argument. This is problematic, they maintain, because of the changing nature of argument itself, particularly in new media such as television, the internet, advertising, and film. In creating a theory of visual argument, the authors assert that the unwarranted assumption that visual arguments are less precise than verbal arguments must be abandoned—they argue instead that both verbal and visual arguments may be vague and imprecise. The authors assert that a theory of visual argument will take into account the importance of context, arguing that just as verbal arguments themselves cannot stand in isolation, neither can visual arguments. The authors outline three types of context important to visual argument: immediate visual context, immediate verbal context, and visual culture. The last element in a theory of visual argument is the issue of representation and resemblance, to which the authors argue there is an argumentative component that is reflected in most visual texts.

Finnegan, Cara A. "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the Skull Controversy.'" *Argumentation and Advocacy* 37.3 (2001): 133-49.

Finnegan introduces the concept of the naturalistic enthymeme to the study of visual rhetoric: the assumptions we make about the argumentative potential of photographs, particularly nature photographs. She argues that because we perceive photographs as realistic, we assume them to be "true" or "real" until given a reason to doubt them. She uses the 1930s debate over the photographs taken by Arthur Rothstein for the Resettlement Administration depicting drought conditions in the Dakotas to support her claims. Through this article, the author hopes to demonstrate how visual cultural implications influence the perceived argumentative capacity of images.

Fox, Roy F., ed. *Images in Language, Media, and Mind.* Urbana:
    NCTE, 1994.

This anthology provides several demonstrations of how societal imag-
es are persuasive in nature. Operating under the assumption that "the
most important kind of meaning is constructed from personal inter-
actions with images" (xi), Fox has selected essays analyzing the visual
persuasion of print advertising, news coverage of the Gulf War, tele-
vision sportscasts, and the imagery of the Oliver North trial, among
others. The range of subjects covered offer several starting points for
exploring imagistic rhetoric and the terminology used by the authors
(such as symbolspeak and hyperintertextuality) provide the beginnings
of a vocabulary to aid in the discussion of visual arguments.

George, Diana. "From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication in
    the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*
    52.1 (2002): 11-39.

George argues that the current terms used to describe visual rhetoric
in the field of composition studies limit the way such communica-
tion might be brought to bear in the writing classroom. Specific to
George's argument is that visual literacy belongs in the writing class-
room and is not simply a new strategy "for adding relevance or interest
to a required course" (13). George charts the history of visual rhetoric
in English studies, including discussion of some of the first visual as-
signments in textbooks. She asserts that incorporating visual elements
in a writing course widen the possibilities for instruction, and will do
so in growing ways as teachers incorporate technology into classrooms
that allow students to both analyze and produce visual texts.

Slade, Christina. "Seeing Reasons: Visual Argumentation in Adver-
    tisements." *Argumentation* 17.2 (2003): 145-60.

Using advertisements to illustrate her point, Slade argues that visual
media can function as argumentation. Arguing against Postman and
Poster's claims that visual media function as irrational argumentation,
Slade asserts that not only does the rational/irrational divide not hold
up, but also that visual texts do function as reasoned discourse.