Spring 2005

The rhetoric of pedagogy and the pedagogy of rhetoric

Jennifer G. Moore
University of Richmond

The Rhetoric of Pedagogy and the Pedagogy of Rhetoric

By

Jennifer G. Moore

Honors Thesis

In

Department of Rhetoric and Communication Studies
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA

April 30, 2005

Advisor: Dr. Marilee Mifsud

Abstract

"There is a serious crisis in education. Students often do not want to learn and teachers do not want to teach. More than ever before in the recent history of this nation, educators are compelled to confront the biases that have shaped teaching practices in our society and to create new ways of knowing, different strategies for the sharing of knowledge" (hooks 12).

Drawing from the work of such writers as bell hooks, Paolo Friere, and Gilles Deleuze, this thesis explores limitations and constraints of traditional pedagogy, then brings this critique to bear upon the traditional pedagogy of rhetoric. Drawing from the work of such rhetorical scholars such as John Schilb, Diane Davis, Robert Craig, and Sonya Foss, I explore alternative pedagogies of rhetoric as well as how these pedagogies might transform the teaching of basic public speaking.

INTRODUCTION

Methodology

The method for this examination will be critical historiography, where I examine and critique histories of rhetoric pedagogy in the hope of inventing something new. This method of critical historiography will be modeled after works from theorists of pedagogy at large such as bell hooks, Paulo Friere, and Gilles Deleuze, as well as writers on rhetoric and communication in particular including Diane Davis, John Schilb, Sonya Foss, Isaac Catt, and Robert Craig.

Not only will I model my method from these writers, but I will draw from their works the tropes for my study. By "tropes" I mean dominant turns that the pedagogy of rhetoric takes to construct meaning and to coordinate social and symbolic action. George Kennedy defines "tropes" as turnings (6). Exploring these tropes will enable insights into how the constraints are turning traditional pedagogy of rhetoric. Each of these writers will help me to see dominant tropes of rhetoric pedagogy. In combination with these scholarly texts, I will draw from primary texts including Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Plato and also more contemporary scholarly texts in the Western rhetorical tradition. Additional insight into these tropes will come from my experiences as a Speech Consultant at the University of Richmond Speech Center and from the experience of Ph.D. candidate Monika Alston, University of Richmond graduate and second year teacher at Penn State University. In the end I hope a critical historiography of the dominant tropes of rhetoric pedagogy will illuminate ways of turning (troping) otherwise pedagogical practices.

Antecedent and Consequence

There is a topic of invention called Antecedent and Consequence. Similar to the notion of cause and effect, antecedent and consequence invites "one to consider consequences that follow given actions or conditions," (Burton). Different from cause and effect, antecedent and consequence explore the idea that "what follows may not be caused by what preceded it, but will naturally flow from those earlier conditions. Given a certain situation (the antecedent), what is likely to follow (the consequence)?" (Burton). I want to consider this topic of invention as a figure of speech. Figuring antecedents as part of my method will allow my reader and me to recognize potential consequences of my ideas and in doing so avoid the pitfalls of necessitating these consequences. Before I can go further in my thesis, I must figure these potential consequences and ways by which to avoid the set consequences.

The concepts that I am writing of are not new. In fact, people have been discussing these problems and solutions for years, decades, even centuries! For example, a debate that I engage in my thesis is the question of how to teach both theory and practice in a public speaking classroom. This concept has been brought into question for years, perhaps under the guise of "content versus applied learning" (Thomlison, 1996) or even back to the classical age as Cicero's "*doctrina*" (Burton).

Furthermore, while my thesis is critiquing the pedagogy of rhetoric specifically, these ideas abound in discussions and research surrounding pedagogy in general. Continuing the example of theory and practice, this debate obviously is discussed in disciplines including the pedagogy of Grammar (Godley, 2004), Environmental Pedagogy (Powers, 2004), and the teaching of Medicine (Kaufman, 2003).

Despite the fact that my thesis may only examine pedagogy of rhetoric primarily at a college education level, these ideas transcend all levels in schooling. To use the theory and practice example one last time, this tension is discussed on a primary education level (Schunk, 1998), secondary education level (Gonick, 2001), and graduate school level (Nash & Manning, 1996).

So why am I writing about all this? Research has been done surrounding these ideas for centuries, in all disciplines, and on all levels of schooling. Research is being published on critical speech pedagogy, for instance (Hardcastle et. al, 2005). While much research has been done on the crisis of pedagogy, a crisis still exists. One solution trope that I discuss later in my thesis is "Overt Pedagogy." I believe that a solution of this crisis lies in identifying the crisis and its historical entrenchment. Much importance lies in illuminating the history of rhetoric, showing how traditional pedagogy of rhetoric was constructed, understanding the impact of that problem, examining if or how the problem has changed, and using all these findings to figure new ways of troping pedagogy.

As I will discuss later, the development of rhetoric was simultaneous with the development of the pedagogy of rhetoric. Due to this parallel creation, I will spend time exploring the history of rhetoric. However, in doing this, I think it is important to destroy the consequence that could be presumed from my antecedent, that history is the cause of the crisis in the pedagogy of rhetoric today. Instead, I want to suggest that certain tropes have developed in history to the point of being over emphasized, hence more detrimental to pedagogy than helpful. In all of the problem tropes that I am proposing, I do not wish

to suggest that we get rid of these tropes but instead that we re-figure the use of these tropes in education.

I believe it is important to discuss overtly the nature of the question in this thesis. There are two general questions that are often addressed in terms of research on education, the "what" of education and the "how" of education. Dr. Scott Johnson writes, about the focus of education research as too "often limited to 'what' students should learn rather than 'how' they should learn," (51). I am not addressing the "what" of education, but the "how." Many big issues and questions go into shaping what education is like. Paulo Friere writes, there needs to be a

> "learner's 'critical reflection' on the social, economic, and cultural conditions within which education occurs. The teacher is obligated to engage in 'exposition and explanation' of those economic and social conditions that bear on the educational. Since teachers are learners as well, they are not figures independent of the social process. Teachers are chronically underpaid, subject to onerous working and living conditions, and, I would add often poorly educated," (13).

Much of the solution to the "what" of education lies in the economic and social constraints that surround it. I want to acknowledge that those constraints exist and are a large part of the problem. It is difficult to separate the "what" and "how" because they are both so inter-connected. However, in my thesis, I am writing about our current educational situation as it is today applied to the particularly privileged environment of the University of Richmond and other schools like it, and how through tropes in this setting, we can turn pedagogy.

PROBLEM

The Traditional Rhetoric of Pedagogy

Telos

That we are educated solely to learn seems a truism of education. However, many scholars argue that the purpose of education has become overly goal or *telos* driven (Davis, Freire, Catt). Whether the student or teacher pushes the end goal, always an end point or *telos* remains in sight for all aspects of education. Diane Davis sees teachers as educating in order to prepare their students to join a battle fighting for certain causes after they finish their education. "This is pedagogical tyranny: using the pedagogical position to foster particular kinds of subjects of student-citizens, either to take their place in the economic/political system or in the Grand March against it" (224). Paulo Freire agrees and claims a "new common sense that the highest mission and overriding purpose of schooling [is] to prepare students, at different levels, to take their places in the corporate order" (4). This capitalistic nature of education is further supported by Isaac Catt. Education...

> "exist[s] to serve society, a society whose expectations are not always critically assessed. The academy...subscribes to a corporate model of operations of various so-called shops with dean-managers and chair-foreman. Students are frequently discussed as clients and are, upon graduation, the institution's products. These products are sold into a labor market" (Catt 8-9).

Because education can be like "a functional apprenticeship" (Davis 224), a great degree of emphasis is placed on competence as the end *telos* for the student. This can restrain appreciation of theoretical reason behind practical skills, and over-emphasize learning the basic knowledge of the skill to prepare for the future. Davis writes of her experience with the pedagogy of composition. "Writing is reduced in these classrooms to

a codifiable set of practices to be memorized and utilized by the speaking/writing subject in order to make him/her more marketable. A mechanics of solids freezes the movement of writing and then calls it teachable" (229).

When practical skills are over-emphasized, valuable aspects of schooling are constrained. "Society has lost its tolerance for even kid pleasures, and school authorities have, sometimes enthusiastically, subordinated themselves to business by imaging schools in the modalities of the factory or the large corporate office," (Freier 6). Visions of basic skills required and the need to receive a certain score on a standardized test cloud the belief that we learn to enjoy learning. "Now nearly all learning space is occupied by an elaborate testing apparatus that measures the student's 'progress' in ingesting externally imposed curricula and more insidiously, provides a sorting device to reproduce the inequalities inherent in the capitalist market system" (Freier 4). *Telos*-driven learning has created an education that is future focused, whether it is becoming competent for potential employment or preparing for graduate school opportunities.

I would like to employ the topic of invention of antecedent and consequence at this moment. While I am critiquing the current rhetoric of pedagogy, I believe that using *telos* in some aspects of education can be very useful and valuable. Without *telos* in education, I believe that learning could be disordered and chaotic.

Taxonomies

Much of education is method, recipes, and development. In order to understand why our learning has turned in this direction, we must examine limitations enforced by the underlying larger structure of our education system. One of the phenomena that has affected our education system and world most according to John Schilb is taxonomy.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines taxonomy as "arrangement, order...classification of anything, putting things in their proper order." As humans we enjoy this classification system, it simplifies our ways of knowing. While taxonomy began as an attempt at efficient learning and knowing, it has developed into a dangerous apprehension. "Many of us exhibit an unfortunate zeal for classification...that is, we attempt to map a whole field of study by dividing it into neat, distinct parts," (129). As taxonomies are created, boxes are drawn around subjects and concepts.

This taxonomic nature of education often leads to the creation of binaries. Concepts are frequently brought into a correct or incorrect, yes or no debate. Michel Foucault writes that divisions and rejections coexist, where there is division, there is rejection (1155). This division and rejection is problematic in the mindsets that taxonomies can create in the educational environment. However, while taxonomies are problematic, it is important to note that some use of taxonomies is necessary for education. For instance, without the taxonomies of the different types of psychology, it is hard to develop separate bases for research and theory development. I do not want to suggest the consequence of abolishing taxonomies, but instead use the antecedent to illuminate a limitation provoked by an excessive reliance on taxonomies.

Conformity

This taxonomic, dualistic nature of education sets up a power constructed learning environment. Gilles Deleuze says "the binary machine is an important component of apparatuses of power" (21). A unique setting is at hand as the pedagogue has the power of control to transform the many minds of his/her students. Davis writes, "the will to pedagogy is a will to truth-in-political-pedagogy and the prime directive is forestalled

precisely at the moment when radical pedagogies of any flavor begin to believe that they can teach that truth" (221). The mindset that a professor possesses the knowledge to teach the truth is a precarious mindset.

Power construction allows the teacher in the power position to enforce conformity on his/her students. Conformity often manifests itself in the form of oppression between privileged and disprivileged groups. Tracy Patton understands the university setting as not "merely an instructional site where learning takes place, but rather it is a social institution that both has the power to shape current political and cultural thought, and is also shaped by current public response to cultural, political, or social issues," (62). Patton sees biases upholding and maintaining white supremacy, imperialism, sexism, and racism as normalized in education. Hegemony has given way to "(in)civil behavior through the normalization and naturalization of certain actions and thoughts" (67) distorting education so that it is no longer about the practice of freedom.

As a student during the racial integration of schools, hooks experienced this forced conformity firsthand. "That shift [to racially integrated schools]...taught me the difference between education as the practice of freedom and education that merely strives to reinforce domination...During college, the primary lesson was reinforced: we were to learn obedience to authority...The university and the classroom began to feel more like a prison, a place of punishment and confinement rather than a place of promise and possibility..." (4). Conformity has brought an increased level of power construction in the classroom.

The Traditional Pedagogy of Rhetoric

As I have illuminated, three tropes: *telos*, taxonomies, and conformity turn the traditional rhetoric of pedagogy. These tropes have impacted the traditional pedagogy of rhetoric as well. Before I consider how these tropes have turned the traditional pedagogy of rhetoric, it is important to understand the historical entrenchment of the tropes. Because of the simultaneous development of rhetoric and the development of the pedagogy of rhetoric, it is key to understand the history of rhetoric. As I said in the methodology section, it is important to note a set consequence that I am trying to avoid: that history is to blame for the crisis of these tropes. Instead, I wish to show history's role in the initial development of these tropes. It is significant to mention that the problem tropes I illuminate began in history as positive things but have been cultivated into harmful turns in the pedagogy of rhetoric.

History of Rhetoric

The development of the pedagogy of rhetoric and of the discipline of rhetoric was simultaneous. In the fourth century, democracy began to take shape. As democracy was evolving, people learned that power came through speech; therefore, a need to teach people to be rhetors emerged. It was found that the best way to teach rhetoric was taxonomies. Because of the simultaneous development of pedagogy of rhetoric and of rhetoric, examining the history of rhetoric is imperative in order to understand how the pedagogy of rhetoric came to be.

> "In its long and vigorous history rhetoric has enjoyed many definitions, accommodated differing purposes, and varied widely in what it included. And yet, for most of its history it has maintained its fundamental character as a discipline for training students 1) to perceive how language is at work orally and in writing, and 2) to become proficient in applying the resources of language in their own speaking and writing," (Burton).

Rhetoric began in ancient times as humans tried to explain and make sense of the people and events they encountered in the world around them. Rhetoric frequently occurred in narrative form with mythical qualities, for example Homer's *Odyssey.* As the golden age of Greece approached, rhetoricians began to form theories in reaction to the belief of the naturalists, who believed that science ruled all life (Smith, 64).

While scholars had been theorizing on rhetoric since ancient times, it was Aristotle's *Rhetoric* that was foundational in producing a set of "generative and relevant principles that guide us in the craft of speech making," (Smith xi). Many of our rhetorical theories of today are indeed built off Aristotle's ideas. Aristotle was the "first systematic account of rhetoric, and in many ways set the terms for the discipline for centuries to come," (Burton). Aristotle contributed to ideas including the genres of speech, the modes of proof, and the canons of rhetoric.

Following the Greeks' contributions, Roman rhetorical theorists were greatly influenced by the ideals of democracy and inspired to teach ways of proper rhetoric to citizens. The Romans, particularly Cicero and Quintilian, contributed much to the notion of style in language and its effect on ethos and pathos. The *ad Herenium*, often referred to as Cicero's, as well as Cicero's *de Inventione* were some of the first Roman approaches to systematic rhetoric. Cicero's works were foundational in supplying a dictionary of rhetorical figures to "which countless future authorities turned," (Burton). Quintilian also did much to advance rhetorical theory. Creating *Institutio Oratoria*, literally, *The Education of the Orator*, Quintilian wrote "an exhaustive and pedagogically oriented treatment of rhetoric" in a series of twelve books (Burton). While nuances were born in rhetoric through the Renaissance, Protestant Reformation, Enlightenment, and into the

modern eras, ultimately the basis of the discipline of rhetoric was mainly formed with the Greeks and Romans, and their legacy remains with us still today. What is taught in today's classroom is most often Aristotelian rhetoric.

Telos

Telos as a trope turns the pedagogy of rhetoric towards competence. Competence becomes the most driven end goal. Isaac Catt writes, "Today research and pedagogy in communication are carried out with an eye toward the cash-value of communication competence" (97). Just as Davis struggled in teaching her students more than the basic skills in writing, speech pedagogues engage in the same question. Catt argues that there are two types of approaches to speech pedagogy. The first is the behavioral approach, focusing on learning practical skills before theory. The second is the critical phenomenological approach, looking at practical skills as abstract ideas, using theory to understand practical skills (102). Ultimately this became an entrenched debate in the teaching of rhetoric: theory or practice? With the goal of competence, often practice only wins (Craig, 309).

As a Speech Consultant at the University of Richmond Speech Center for two years, I too have struggled with this pedagogical constraint. My job is to listen to clients give speeches and then consult them on their speech for the remainder of the hour. While I want the client's speech to have improved and be prepared for the actual presentation, I also want the client to understand the theories and concepts behind the practical skills I am teaching him/her. I often wonder as a Speech Consultant how much I can really help the client in that one hour. Is there really time to teach theory, as well as the practical

skills needed? Many times the clients do not want to learn about the theories behind the practical advice.

Alston, struggles with a similar experience at Penn State. Because of the large numbers of students in public speaking classes, it is difficult to find time to explore the theory behind the practical skills students are expected to learn as they write and deliver speeches in the class.

> "Just trying to get through the speeches is a challenge-I generally spend 8-10 weeks of the semester just listening to speeches. That leaves very little time for critical instruction in rhetoric or for critical feedback. I have taken to typing lengthy evaluations of speeches so that students come away with something more than a number grade and I generally construct my evaluations around invention, arrangement, memory, style, and delivery. I'm not totally happy about this, 1) it's a lot of work to type a page or more of comments per student per speech, and 2) it keeps rhetoric in a little box of skills."

The skills that rhetoric students are expected to learn are often emphasized as the sole goal of a public speaking class rather than understanding the "why" behind the skills as well. This leaves students with only a to-do list rather than new ways to think and view the world.

Taxonomies

Like the trope of *telos*-driven competence, taxonomy also turns the pedagogy of rhetoric, this time towards categorization and bifurcation for achieving clear and distinct ideas. John Schilb believes that "scholars of rhetoric in particular, have a zeal for this classification" which he calls taxonomania (129). Rhetoric has fallen victim to taxonomania on all accounts. Even classifying rhetoric as a discipline is the work of taxonomania. The establishment of rhetoric as a discipline was quickly followed by the creation of many categories within the discipline as scholars further attempted to

legitimize and simplify its concepts for pedagogy. This is demonstrated in the simple categories of the five canons—invention, disposition, style, memory, and delivery; the three modes of artistic proof—ethos, pathos, and logos; and the three types of speeches—forensic, epideictic, and deliberative (Covino and Joliffe 10-21). Quite often the creation of categories simplifies the pedagogy of rhetoric but what are we losing by simplifying it so much?

Schilb cautions us that the tendency with taxonomies causes us to lose sight of invaluable differences within categories and only see differences between categories.

> "This impulse has long characterized rhetoricians; it dates back to Aristotle...the current rage to segment and rank objects, methods, histories, epistemologies, and ideologies of rhetorial study risks obscuring too much to protect our own theoretical security. Emphasizing the differences between the items so classified can lead us to ignore the differences within them," (129).

I experience this impulse often as a Speech Consultant. The problems of the strict categories of the canons constantly bombard me in critiquing clients. Our speech critique sheet is divided into the five canons to critique the client and his or her speech. Often I find myself writing up and down the sides of the speech critique paper because my comments cannot be put into just one category. By dividing the canons into separate categories, we are only allowed to look at a speech in specific categories, rather than as a whole. A speech cannot always be correctly viewed or critiqued through the specific five categories that the canons create. For example, when I am trying to critique a client on delivery, it is hard for me not comment on the client's memory of a speech. Cicero classified delivery into two parts: voice quality and physical movement. A rhetor cannot focus on his or her gestures if s/he has not memorized the content of the speech.

Therefore, it is impossible to separate memory and delivery. Taxonomies in rhetoric have taken away the unique nuances that exist within the performative act.

Conformity

Conformity is the final trope. This trope turns the pedagogy of rhetoric towards oneness, sameness, uniformity. But whose oneness? Whose standard is used to measure conformity? Sonya Foss recognizes the standard as man's. She illuminates a patriarchal bias in the pedagogy of rhetoric. "Most traditional rhetorical theories reflect a patriarchal bias in the positive value they accord to changing and thus dominating others" (2). She claims that embedded within humans is the desire to change others, and in that is the possibility of control. "The act of changing another establishes the power of the change agent over the other...rhetors who convince others to adopt their viewpoints exert control over part of those others' lives," (3). This is called the rhetoric of patriarchy, "reflecting its values of change, competition, and domination," (4). This patriarchal rhetoric is so pervasive that "in many ways in which humans engage in activities designed for this purpose (the assumption that humans are on earth to alter the environment and to influence the social affairs of others) it goes unnoticed," (Foss 2). The value of self derives not from recognition of the uniqueness and inherent value of each living being but from gaining control over others (Foss 3). This act of changing others not only establishes the power of the rhetor over others but also devalues the lives and perspectives of the others.

Not only patriarchy, but ethnocentricity shapes the standard of rhetoric pedagogy. Peggy McIntyre argues, "There is an interdependency between Whiteness and educational reproduction, between Whiteness and control of discourse, and between

Whiteness and teaching. It is this oppression that continues to shape academia,"(125). Like the relationship between Whiteness and education in general, there is a Western standard that is seen as the norm in dominant rhetoric paradigms in particular. As Foss articulates, Western rhetoric is advocacy.

Personally, I saw this ethnocentricity clearly when I had a speech center appointment with a first year student from a Latino country. The following is an excerpt from my Speech Center Journal:

> "She came to me with her Rhetoric 101 assignment. She was supposed to create a four speech campaign on a topic of her choice. The first speech assignment was to illuminate her topic and explain why it was important to spend time on it. As she began to explain her speech, my head started to spin. She didn't have four simple arguments to support her main thesis; instead she had many points all leading up to the simple invitation of, 'please join me on this journey of exploration on this topic.' My speech center partner and I explained to her that she needed a more direct thesis with more simple direct points to follow that thesis. The client insisted over and over that she didn't want to be mean, but rather she wanted her audience to feel pleasant coming away from the speech and let them have the choice to listen to her speech rather than her telling them information. I had never encountered a student like this client before."

During that Speech Center appointment I realized the extent to which we are taught a Western standard of rhetoric.

Alston encountered conformity in the classroom not only in the content that she teaches but in issues of her own ethos as a young, Black American woman teaching at a large predominately White public university.

> "I am pretty much the antithesis of the image of a college professor (White male with gray hair and a smoking jacket). In and of itself this should not matter, however, the majority of students here come from central Pennsylvania, a rural area with no diversity whatsoever. It is not unusual for a student to tell me that I am the first Black American to ever teach them in a classroom. I've had more than one student use the term "colored" to refer to Black Americans. The only real hostility I have faced though is in my other class, Introduction to Human Communication (a

> survey of rhetorical studies and communication studies), where I talk (for 1.5 class periods) about women's rhetoric and African-American rhetoric. In the majority of the course I discuss presidential rhetoric, classical rhetoric, history of public address, rhetoric and media, rhetorical criticism, etc. In that class I have had a couple comments from students at the end of the semester saying that "instructor should not talk about her race/gender so much.'"

I believe it is important to examine who is given the authority in the classroom. How has this oneness of standard affected the nature of rhetorical studies to allow some students and professors to speak more freely than others?

Summary of Crisis

As demonstrated from examining the rhetoric of pedagogy in general and the pedagogy of rhetoric in particular, we can see that clear tropes of *telos*-driven, taxonomical, and conformist learning have emerged yielding a crisis in the current education system. According to Martin Buber, life in general and education in specific has fallen victim to the "thing."

Buber divides moments of being in two categories—I-It relationships and I-Thou relationships (1). "When thou is spoken, the speaker has no thing for his object. For where there is a thing there is another thing. Every It is bounded by other; It exists only through being bounded by others. But when Thou is spoken, there is no thing. Thou has no bounds" (Buber 2). It is I-Thou moments that we are lacking in the pedagogy of rhetoric. Buber uses a tree to describe the I-It relationship.

> "I *consider* a tree. I can *look* at it as a picture: stiff column in a shock of light, or splash of green shot with the delicate blue and silver of the background. I can *perceive* it as movement: flowing veins on clinging, pressing pith, suck of the roots, breathing of the leaves, ceaseless commerce with earth and air—and the obscure growth itself. I can *classify* it in a species and study it as a type in its structure and mode of life. I can *subdue* its actual presence and form so sternly that I *recognize* it only as an expression of law—of the laws in accordance with which a

> constant opposition of forces is continually adjusted, or of those in accordance with which the component substances mingle and separate. In all this the tree *remains my object*, occupies space and time, and has its nature and constitution, (Buber 3).

As Buber is with the tree, still in "all this the tree remains [his] object." I believe that through the tropes of *telos,* taxonomy, and conformity, the pedagogy of rhetoric has become an object. Through the trope of *telos* we now view learning as competence driven, through the trope of taxonomy we have lost unique nuances in understanding rhetoric, and through the trope of conformity one Western standard is enforced on students and teachers alike. Like Buber we can spend time with the tree (learning) but in all of that time we are continuously bounded by these tropes to learning remaining an object.

SOLUTION

Pedagogy cannot remain unchanged. To combat this crisis some scholars have developed their own theories, or what I consider, tropes of revisionist pedagogy, that bear upon the pedagogy of rhetoric. I will draw from the work of Gilles Deleuze, bell hooks, Paulo Freier, Diane Davis, and Sonya Foss. I examine the following four tropes from which innovative pedagogy in rhetoric can be affirmed: overt pedagogy, the paratactic AND, the paradigm of excitement, and empathy.

Overt Pedagogy

Tracy Patton writes, "I believe that people are consciously taught not to recognize any privileges they may have, particularly those related to gender and race," (61). What Patton articulates, is a problem of hegemonic civility. An ubiquitous force—invisible, a dominator that penetrates the pedagogy of rhetoric. I described the implications of forced

conformity in my illumination of the crisis in the pedagogy of rhetoric. We treat rhetoric as a stable, static thing, but in reality it is always changing. We need to adapt our rhetoric to our audience. The practice of rhetoric is situational.

A solution to this crisis of pedagogy is to recognize and articulate the problem. This trope is called overt pedagogy. I performed overtness in writing my thesis. I considered antecedent and consequence a figure of speech in figuring antecedents as part of my method, helping my reader to recognize potential consequences of my ideas and avoid the pitfalls of necessitating consequences. Patton writes, "through the daily choices we as individuals make, we determine the limits of true 'civility.' We must collectively recognize and actively confront issues of incivility thinly veiled as civility," (81). These problem tropes of *telos,* taxonomy, and conformity have permeated the classroom to such a degree that unless they are continuously articulated, they will not be brought to people's attention. To break this norm, overt pedagogy is needed.

In a classroom this would mean articulating the problems of pedagogy and constraints of teaching to the students, explaining where a professor would explain why he/she made the choices he/she did to deal with these constraints. For example, in teaching a Rhetoric and Public Address class, overt pedagogy would be articulating that the dominant paradigm of rhetoric that is taught is Western rhetoric. Overtness would suggest explaining to the Rhetoric 101 students that "Western rhetoric" meant the traditional, advocacy based, proof based, masculine, upper classed, predominately white, and Christian rhetoric. This is naming the cultural bias that Patton said is often hidden in education.

The Paratactic AND

Robert Craig imagines the discipline of communication as a caravan with many wagons of mini-disciplines following along. "I find the image of a 'caravan' more appealing. Like a wagon train advancing, we find ourselves among a caravan whose members have converged from far-flung, distant parts of the East and the Old World, each group with its own history, its own traditions. Many—a majority, of these folks have arrived from the vast territories of speech," (313). As the discipline of communication develops to include more perspectives, mindsets, and beliefs, more debates arise as well. In these debates often the binary that I illuminated earlier develops. With a common mindset of X versus Y, only further division will occur.

To combat this mindset we can employ the paratactic AND. Deleuze uses the examples of nomads as a way to view pedagogical binaries. "Undo dualisms from the inside by tracing the line of flight which passes between the two terms or the two sets, the narrow stream which belongs neither to the one nor the other, but draws both into a non-parallel evolution, into a heterochronous becoming" (35). Dualistic debates such as science versus humanities and practice versus theory are characteristic of the trap that we fall into when discussing rhetoric. Deleuze and Craig say that instead of the "versus" mindset that normally appears in the debate, the mindset of AND needs to appear. How can we have both practice and theory, both science and humanities? I fell into the trap of binaries as I asked the question of theory OR practice earlier in my illumination of the crisis of the pedagogy of rhetoric. Instead the question should be how can we have both theory AND practice?

The paratactic AND can also be demonstrated in easing our reliance on taxonomies. Schilb offers a solution to the problem of taxonomies in the paratactic AND. "Although perhaps we cannot eliminate categories altogether, we can ask ourselves in specific instances whether we need to invoke them. If we do set them up, we can ponder how they might prematurely fix our own or someone else's research agenda," (129). How can we look at the categories that we have already established and look between the categories? In the taxonomy of the five canons how can we look at a speech not through only the window of the canon of memory and then the canon of delivery but understand the speech with both of the categories of memory AND delivery at the same time? The AND of Deleuze's non-parallel evolution cannot take place until the box of traditional pedagogy is broken both in theory and in motivation.

The Paradigm of Excitement

Revisionist scholars have questioned how to educate without the common *telos*-driven motivation. Davis asks, "What would happen if a composition course were to let writing have its say? If it were to serve nothing but writing? Not writing for another purpose, not writing as mastery but writing for writing's sake? Writing as a pressing of the limits of discourse?" (235). Instead of the focus being on the *telos* of the future, how would rhetoric change if it were solely focused on the present moment? This would mean forgetting the *telos*, losing the goal of competence, and learning for the sake of learning; hooks calls this, the paradigm of excitement.

Henry Johnstone articulates this flexibility as a creative communication process. "A process is creative if it consists of a series of steps none of which is strictly determined either by the project that the steps contribute to or by the preceding steps in

the series, but each of which, once taken, is seen to have been a fitting sequel to its predecessors" (39). Johnstone contrasts creative processes with technological processes—"A process is technological in this sense when it is a series of steps in which either a given step or the project as a whole determines the sequel to the given step or else the question whether the successor is fitting to its predecessors does not arise," (40). I experienced this creative communication process of the paradigm of excitement for the first time during a Speech Center appointment with Kristen Brown. What follows is an excerpt from a Speech Center journal entry I wrote after the appointment:

> "Kristen came to me with her epideictic speech that she had written for Dr. Mifsud's Rhetoric 101 class. Her topic was creativity. As I listened to Kristen I saw a girl who passionately cared about what she was speaking on, who had researched her topic extensively, and who had incorporated the theoretical ideas she had learned in class in the practical writing of her speech. She wasn't simply a client who wrote her speech at the last minute the speech was due, she was a client who had labored hard and deeply cared about writing the best epideictic speech that she could.
>
> However while I admired her passion and commitment I also saw in many ways how her speech could be taken to the next level. By the time Kristen was done delivering her speech I had a long to-do list of how to improve her speech. She needed to reorganize the structure. She needed to speak slower, add more emphasis to her words. Most of all she needed to make this speech her own.
>
> As I prepared to tell her these things, I stopped. How could I help Kristen make her speech better as well as help her understand why her speech needed to be changed that way? It is so easy to tell Kristen to add more personal examples, but how can I help her realize her own experiences with creativity and see the importance of putting her personal passion in the speech? For the rest of the speech appointment, I stopped, I listened, and I asked. I hinted at concepts, questioned in directive ways and tried to initiate the passion in Kristen for her own topic. It was different than anything I had ever done and it was challenging. I left the appointment unsure of what the result would be...no longer did I have that control of telling Kristen what to do...and that was a scary thing for me.
>
> Kristen asked to meet with me that next morning to run through her speech one more time and I agreed not knowing what speech would greet me. The next morning, she got behind the podium; I set the timer, and prepared to listen. She was different today; she was confident, calm and excited to give her speech. As her speech ended it was all I could do

> not to jump out of my chair and give her a standing ovation...in fact thinking back on it, I think I did give her a standing ovation. My mouth dropped open; Kristen had made all the changes we had talked about the night before plus more! Her speech was passionate, exciting, well organized, delivered perfectly, and powerful. Kristen thanked me over and over for meeting with her last night, for helping her. But I told her, it wasn't me that changed her speech. For the first time, I didn't tell the client what to do; I simply helped lead her to that point. She met me where I led her and surpassed that point by far."

In this Speech Center consultation, I was ready to give Kristen the to-do list of improvements of her speech as I did in other appointments. That is a technological process. However, I believe I served the paradigm of excitement. hooks describes the paradigm of excitement as:

> "To enter classroom settings in colleges and universities with the will to share the desire to encourage excitement is to transgress. Not only does it require movement beyond accepted boundaries, but excitement cannot be generated without a full recognition of the fact that there could never be an absolute set agenda governing teaching practices. Agendas have to be flexible, have to allow for spontaneous shifts in direction. Students have to be seen in their particularity as individuals and interacted with according to their needs" (7).

I did not give Kristen a to-do list of things to fix, instead "I stopped, I listened, and I asked," as I wrote in my journal entry. This allowed Kristen to determine the steps of our pedagogical process, to throw out the "absolute agenda," and to see her in her "particularity as an individual and interact according to her needs." By letting Kristen lead the way, I as a pedagogue had now relinquished the *telos*, and served the paradigm of excitement.

Empathy

Finally, when the concept of AND is applied to an individual level in the pedagogy of rhetoric, the trope of empathy is created. Freire sees education when two learners come together to share in an ongoing dialogue. "Both participants bring

knowledge to the relationship, and one of the objects of the pedagogic process is to explore what each knows and what they can teach each other," (8). hooks agrees with Freier and believes in that passion arises from interest in one another, in hearing others' voices, in recognizing others' presences. However, this trope of empathy is contradictory to the conservative, traditional educational methods that students are used to.

> "Since the vast majority of students learn through conservative, traditional educational practices and concern themselves only with the presence of the professor, any radical pedagogy must insist that everyone's presence is acknowledged. That insistence cannot be simply stated. It has to be demonstrated through pedagogical practices. To begin the professor must genuinely value everyone's presence," (8).

hooks is calling for professors to create an inclusive atmosphere where every student is concerned with listening to one another, as opposed to traditional pedagogy of students only concerned with listening to the professor.

The best pedagogy is the pedagogy that finds students and professors listening to one another empathetically. Sonya Foss calls this invitational rhetoric, defined as "an invitation to understanding as a means to create a relationship rooted in equality, immanent value, and self-determination," (5). Not only does the trope of empathy call professors to create an environment where students are listening to each other, empathy also calls professors to invite students to have the choice to listen. Invitational rhetoric invites the audience to make the choice to enter the rhetor's world. The rhetor or professor, while presenting one perspective, does not "judge or denigrate others' perspectives but is open to and tries to appreciate and validate those perspectives, even if they differ dramatically from the rhetor's own," (5). By allowing the audience members

or students to have the choice to accept the invitation by the professor, there is equal contribution by both the professor and the students in thinking about an issue.

In Alston's teaching experience, she found that teaching at a university that required all students to take public speaking often creates a hostile audience before the students enter the classroom.

> "I am dealing with an audience that must be from the first minute persuaded that this class will be worth their while. How does one do that? I attempt to meet students where they are—show them how public communication is a part of their everyday experience and engage them in speaking in the class about issues that have relevance to their peers."

Alston employs the trope of empathy within her pedagogy. "What does one do with the little bit of space that they have left in the classroom? Honestly, I just let my students talk and I listen." From listening to her students, Alston has found different areas that her students are passionate about and want to learn about, for example how to overcome speech anxieties.

In using invitational rhetoric, the goal of pedagogy changes. "Absent are efforts to dominate another because the goal is the understanding and appreciation of another's perspective rather than the denigration of it simply because it is different from the rhetor's own," (6). While in traditional Western rhetoric, the purpose is advocacy, in invitational rhetoric change is not the purpose. Change in invitational rhetoric is non-purposeful, it occurs in "the audience or rhetor or both as a result of new understanding and insights gained in the exchange of ideas," (Foss 6). Empathy allows students and teachers to both be changed, not by force, but by listening. It is my hope that the four tropes of solution: Overt Pedagogy, the Paratactic AND, the Paradigm of Excitement, and Empathy will begin to turn the traditional pedagogy of rhetoric.

CONCLUSION

These are but a few possibilities of figuring pedagogy otherwise. However, I realize that while I have proposed solutions, no simple answers exist. This topic is so huge that I have only scratched the surface. hooks acknowledges that while she does share strategies in her essays; her strategies are not meant to be blueprints for all students and teachers. "To do so would undermine the insistence that engaged pedagogy recognizes each classroom as different, that strategies must constantly be changed, invented, reconceptualized to address each new teaching experience," (11). The field of the pedagogy of rhetoric encompasses so many nuances that it is impossible to have a prescribed solution for all students and professors.

"To teach in varied communities not only our paradigms must shift but also the way we think, write, and speak. The engaged voice must never be fixed and absolute but always changing, always evoking in dialogue with a world beyond itself," (hooks 11). Freier also stresses the problematic implications of a set methodology of pedagogy. "What is taught is unproblematic; the only issue is how to teach on the basis of caring," (8). In my thesis, I want to overtly say that while I suggest solution tropes, these are not answers. They are simply tropes that I hope will begin to turn the pedagogy of rhetoric. As I articulated in my introduction, many factors exist that address the "what" of pedagogy that I have not begun to speak to in this thesis. My solution tropes only speak to the "how," and while it is difficult to separate the "how" and the "what," it is key to understand the nature of my thesis and the question that the solution tropes are aimed at answering.

In understanding the "what" of pedagogy, it is also important to overtly understand the privilege that comes with critiquing the pedagogy of rhetoric. As I was discussing this topic with my University of Richmond thesis committee, one professor asked me if I recognized the privilege that surrounded this topic. In my introduction I mentioned Freier's explanation of the constraints professors face in the educational system. My professor asked me to observe the privilege that I have in simply being able to critique this topic.

This idea was given even more voice for me as I heard Alston's personal battle with the school system. Alston revealed to me that even as I use the Speech Center as a means of critique how incredibly fortunate a pedagogical situation we have at the University of Richmond Speech Center.

> "I worked in the Speech Center while at Richmond and the issue of 'rhetorical pedagogy' (in all senses of the phrase) has been on my mind since. I think that to some extent, I was spoiled by the Center. I was used to working one on one with students to enhance their view of themselves and heighten their awareness of their rhetoric. There is something very reminiscent of Platonic dialogues about the Speech Center-two minds coming together through question and answer towards some 'T/truth.' I miss that. I graduated from Richmond in 2001 and began teaching public speaking at Penn State in 2002. I think that at first, I thought I could directly translate my experiences in the Center to the classroom. But I was immediately confronted with just how particular the rhetorical situation of teaching public speaking at my institution is."

As Alston went to Penn State to teach public speaking she was immediately hit with constraints that were out of her control including class size, a poorly received requirement of public speaking for all students in the university, strict department enforced curriculum, and disparate abilities in student learning. However I am given hope by how Alston ended her note, that despite all the constraints that she still is passionate about teaching rhetoric.

> "My course does focus more on "skills" than I would like it too, but given the constraints, that approach seems to make students feel like their time and resources have been well invested. Most tell me that even though they don't like speaking, they've learned a lot and the students feel like they have grown as speakers. And that's what I look for—individual growth. I feel it's all I can look for. I do my best to bring in rhetorical theory and heighten their awareness of themselves as rhetorical beings, but given the constraints of the course, those are not my priorities right now. When I am out of a departmentally controlled course—that will change. Know that despite my tone, I love the challenges of teaching rhetoric."

Until this point, my thesis has been directed towards pedagogues only. However, Adrienne Rich brings in the idea of the students changing the pedagogy of rhetoric as well. She argues that students are also responsible for what happens in the classroom. She calls students to "claim" their education. "The first thing I want to say to you who are students, is that you cannot afford to think of being here to receive an education; you will do much better to think of yourselves as being here to claim one" (Rich 231). The paratactic AND applies to this situation as well—it is not only the students that can change pedagogy but a contract of students and teachers working together.

> "If university education means anything beyond the processing of human beings into expected roles, through credit hours, tests, and grades, it implies an ethical and intellectual contract between teacher and student. This contract must remain intuitive, dynamic, unwritten but we must turn to it again and again if learning is to be reclaimed from the depersonalizing and cheapening pressures of the present-day academic scene," (Rich 231).

Final Conclusion

The traditional rhetoric of pedagogy yields learning that is *telos*-driven, taxonomical, and conformist. This pedagogy in general has impacted the traditional pedagogy of rhetoric in the development of parallel tropes through the simultaneous creation of rhetoric and pedagogy through history. I-It relationships have impacted education in general and in particular and created a crisis in learning. We need to turn

pedagogy through alternative tropes of overt pedagogy, the paratactic AND, the paradigm of excitement, and empathy in order to diversify pedagogical methods and ultimately proliferate the directions of pedagogy.

Bibliography

Alston, Monika. "Pedagogy." Email. March 2005.

Buber, Martin. I and Thou. Edinburgh: T & T Clark: 1958.

Burton, Gideon O. "Silva Rhetoricae." *The Forest of Rhetoric.* March 2005. < http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/silva.htm>.

Catt, Isaac E. "The 'Cash-Value' of Communication: An Interpretation of William James." Recovering Pragmatism's Voice: The Classical Tradition, Roty, and the Philosophy of Communication. Eds. Lenore Langsdorf and Andrew R. Smith. Albany: State University of New York. 1995. 97-111.

Cole, Thomas. The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Covino, William A. & Joliffe, David A.. "What is Rhetoric." Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1995.

Craig, Robert T. "Chautauqua: Are Rhetoric and Science Incompatible?" Communication Monographs, 57. (1990): 309-314.

Davis, Diane. "Breaking up at Totality: A Rhetoric of Laughter." Rhetorical Philosophy and Theory. Southern Illinois University Press: 2000.

Deleuze, Gilles and Ponet, Claire. "A Conversation: What is it? What is it For?," Dialogues. New York: Columbia University Press: 1977.

Foucault, Michele. "From *The Order of Discourse*." The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Bedford Books. 1990. 1155.

Foss, Sonya. "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric." *Communication Monographs.* 62(1). (1995): 2-18.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield: 1998.

Godley, Amanda. "Commentary: Applying "Dialogic Origin and Dialogic Pedagogy of Grammar" to Current Research on Literacy and Grammar Instruction." *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology.* 42(6). (2004): 53-58.

Gonick, Marnina. "What is the 'Problem' with these Girls? Youth and Feminist Pedagogy." *Feminism and Psychology.* 11(2). (2001): 167-171.

Hardcastle, William J. & Beck, Janet Mackenzie. "Representing Speech in Practice and Theory." A Figure of Speech: A Festschrift for John Laver. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 2005. 93-128.

hooks, bell. Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Johnson, Scott. "Education in a Moment: Buber's Dialogue in Teaching and Learning" (Unpublished Manuscript).

Johnstone, Henry. Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Argumentation. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1965.

Kaufman, David M. "ABC of Learning and Teaching in Medicine: Applying Educational Theory in Practice." *British Medical Journal.* 326(7382). 2003: 213-216.

Kennedy, George. A New History of Classical Rhetoric. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

McIntyre, Peggy. "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies." Race, Class, and Gender. M.L. Andersen & P.H. Collins (Eds). 2001. 95-105

Nash, Robert J. & Manning, Kathleen. "The Passion of Teaching: Student Affairs Professors in the Classroom." *Journal of College Student Development.* 37(5). (1996): 550-560.

Patton, Tracy "In the Guise of Civility: The Compliticious Maintenance of Inferential Forms of Sexism and Racism in Higher Education." *Women's Studies in Communication.* 27(1). (2004): 60-87

Powers, Amy L. "Teacher Preparation for Environmental Education: Faculty Perspectives on the Infusion of Environmental Education Into Preservice Methods Courses." *Journal of Environmental Education.* 35(3). (2004): 3-11.

Schilb, John. "Future Historiographies of Rhetoric and the Present Age of Anxiety," Writing Histories of Rhetoric. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press: 1994. 128-139.

Schunk, Dale H. "Teaching Elementary Students to Self-regulate Practice of Mathematical Skills with Modeling." Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice. New York: Guilford Publications: 1998. 137-159. 1998.

Smith, Craig R. Rhetoric and Human Consciousness. Long Beach. Waveland Press, 2003.

"Taxonomy." Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd Edition. 1989.

Thomlison, T. Dean. "Taking Personal and Professional Contexts into Account in the Basic Public Speaking." ERIC Digest. Bloomington: Indiana University: 1996.