

# Course Design

## World Rhetorics

*Ghanashyam Sharma*

### Course Description

In light of increasing international immigration and student mobility, unprecedented redistribution of geopolitical power, and the pervasive effects of the internet on institutions and communities locally and globally, rhetoric and composition has, albeit more in theory than in practice, started responding to the multilateral flow of ideas across nations and cultures. Building on what Wendy Hesford has called the “global turn” in the discipline, World Rhetorics explores rhetorical traditions from around the world, examining texts from historical, geopolitical, and thematic perspectives. As current and future writing teachers, students in this course learn to draw on different rhetorical traditions, have conversations with a number of guest scholars using videoconferencing, and write about and present their own pedagogical models and strategies.

### Institutional Context

World Rhetorics is a part of the Graduate Certificate in the Teaching of Writing program (GCTW) at Stony Brook University. The certificate was established some time after the university’s Program in Writing and Rhetoric (PWR) separated from the English department in 1998. The current course is a response to the PWR’s recognition that there is a need and demand for adding a global/transnational dimension to the teaching of writing in secondary and tertiary education. This section briefly describes both the certificate and the program as the contexts for World Rhetorics. I then discuss my rationale for the design and implementation of the course, followed by a reflection on its first iteration, in the fall of 2014.

Writing about the history of the PWR, Peter Khost and Pat Belanoff observe that the program is now a thriving one, after having had quite an eventful life and background of more than forty years. Although it was not until 1982 that the Department of English hired a director of composition from outside—Peter Elbow was the first—the university had first sought to do so in 1974, meaning that the writing program was a distinct entity within the English department at least as early as the 1970s. As Khost and Belanoff’s history shows, the PWR has developed new pedagogical ideas, such as the writing portfolio; it has fought in favor of writing instructors and successfully

doubled remuneration for adjunct faculty; and, like writing programs elsewhere, it has experienced ups and downs since its establishment.

The GCTW provides the opportunity for graduate students to acquire an increasingly important professional skill set for teaching writing. Students complete the certificate by taking five courses in the PWR. The courses are usually cross-listed with the English department, which is the major source of master's and doctoral students for the certificate. Including these and other students, roughly half of those who enroll in the certificate are current or prospective secondary school teachers, some of them pursuing professional degrees in higher education. Not much concerted institutional effort has been made so far to promote and grow the program, but the PWR has just begun discussing the growth of the certificate, for reasons including (1) increased interest from a variety of potential students; (2) relative scarcity of comparable graduate programs in the state and region; (3) potential of the certificate to be a basis for the PWR's further growth; and (4) the need for expanding curricular opportunities in the area of writing and communication at the graduate level, including through internationalization of curricula.

From a broader perspective, the needs and challenges of writing and communication among the extremely diverse student body at Stony Brook University—which reflects a similar diversity of students in New York state at large—have also prompted us to grow the certificate and diversify our course offerings. With almost half of its students coming from beyond middle-class, European-American family/social backgrounds, Stony Brook University presents its teachers with truly “global” classrooms. It is worth noting here that institutional policies, curricula, and pedagogy do not yet explicitly and deliberately foreground the knowledge, skills, and perspectives that students bring into the classroom and need to foster in order to live and succeed in a globalized world. However, there are now discussions about internationalizing the curriculum, promoting a sense of global citizenship among students, and promoting faculty work on transnational and cross-cultural subjects. Faculty members in the PWR are increasingly using pedagogical strategies to make the curricula engaging to diverse students.

World Rhetorics is a small attempt toward “internationalizing” the curriculum, drawing the attention of the institution, program, and certificate toward the need to deliberately include international perspectives in the teaching of reading, writing, and research. Especially since most students taking the course are secondary school teachers, it is also an attempt to promote, through these teachers, a sense of belonging, knowing, and knowledge-making in the world at large among their students.

## Theoretical Rationale

At many universities across the U.S., there is a lack of attention to diversity in terms of curriculum, pedagogy, and student engagement programs. Fortunately, at my institution, an increasing number of faculty members across campus are taking this lack as an opportunity. Many of us draw on the cultural and epistemological heritages of our students, both domestic and international while designing and teaching courses. Whether their families have been on the continent for centuries, decades, or years, we see all students as deserving a rhetorical education that transcends a particular tradition, or set of traditions, established upon the geopolitical power and historical contingencies of one particular region of the world, namely Western Europe and North America. Even from a pragmatic point of view, we realize that students can be more successful in their personal, social, and professional lives if they have greater knowledge of different rhetorical practices and traditions and increased curiosity and desire to communicate across national and cultural borders. In the PWR in particular, we see the broadening of the rhetorical basis of writing courses in college as an important goal of education.

My own desire to develop and teach a course drawing on rhetorical traditions from around the world was prompted by an awareness that New York is characterized by what scholars have described as “superdiversity.” First used by Steven Vertovec in a BBC article and elaborated best in “Super-diversity and its Implications,” this term refers to precisely the kind of diversity represented by domestic and international students at my institution, a diversity that is “distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables” in terms of culture, class, and national origin (1024). I also developed World Rhetorics with the awareness that in the field of rhetoric and composition, there has been a general lack of attention to histories, traditions, and resources of rhetoric from beyond the Western world. For a few decades now, some scholars of rhetoric in North America have—from perspectives such as feminist, postmodernist, and post-colonial—critiqued the mainstream history and theory of the discipline for being limited to a particular hemisphere and geopolitical region in the world. Scholars like Mary Muchiri, Victor Vitanza, Patricia Bizzell, Susan Jarratt, Jan Swearingen, and Damián Baca, to name a few, have also highlighted how the field’s canon has been shaped and dominated by certain power structures and power groups in terms of class, race, gender, ethnicity, and culture.

While rhetoric and composition does not have the equivalent of the robust scholarship of postcolonialism that we see in English studies, scholars like Baca have shed light on the historical and political backdrops of the field. According to Baca, the profession of teaching writing in the U.S. has historically been complicit with colonization and continues to be so, both within the West and

on a global scale. Pointing out that composition treats the Greco-Roman-Anglo-American rhetorical tradition as if it is a universal history of all rhetoric, instead of being *a* rhetoric among many, Baca suggests that scholars are not aware of the colonial legacy of their discipline. Indeed, even when composition scholars theoretically subscribe to the notion of “diversity,” many continue to buy into the “Eurocentric myth [that links] the Western Roman alphabet to rationality, critical agency, and social equality” (230-1). In “Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition,” Wendy Hesford also notes that alongside a global turn, “there is evidence of a nostalgic retreat to disciplinary identities and homelands and a resurgent, though not uncritical, localism” (788). As such, I start this course with an examination of how the field has generally approached or responded to calls for going beyond the Western and mainstream canons, what the educational benefits of doing so are, and how writing teachers can pedagogically realize those benefits.

Generally speaking, the official history of rhetoric that composition studies typically relies on is inadequate, and the assumption of its universality goes counter to the needs and realities of the twenty-first century. However, since it is also unproductive to focus on those limitations, I opt for a practical pedagogical approach that helps to address the challenges. LuMing Mao’s article, “Reflective Encounters: Illustrating Comparative Rhetoric,” provides that approach for World Rhetorics. In this article, Mao describes a strategy for studying rhetorical traditions from beyond the Western world through “reflective encounters where different rhetorical traditions can truly converse with and learn from each other” (401). As Roberta Binkley and Marissa Smith note, studying the geopolitics of rhetoric “permits a complexified spatial deconstruction of the familiar, making it unfamiliar, and therefore in its unfamiliarity, to provide a new view, and the chance to reconceptualize our own epistemological geographic spaces, to reexamine the meanings inherent in those spaces.” Thus, in World Rhetorics, students read texts from or about different rhetorical traditions, first trying to understand the “social, cultural, and linguistic forces that have been in play” (Binkley and Smith), then using that understanding for critically reflecting on the local traditions. Such encounters, Mao has suggested, help us to “interrogate the familiar inside out and to pursue the unfamiliar on its own terms” (416). To borrow words from Timothy Reagan, the objective of the course is to help students recognize that “one’s own tradition is simply one among many,” a recognition that is necessary “if the study of the history of educational thought and practice is to be more than a parochial artifact” (11).

Furthermore, the curriculum and pedagogy used in World Rhetorics are characterized by the following features: (1) multiple axes of inquiry, rather than a historical or comparative survey; (2) focus on pedagogy and developing teaching ideas; (3) inviting authors of some of the readings for class as guest

speakers, drawing on David Cormier's writings about "community as curriculum;" (4) encouraging students to use social media platforms to share ideas and join or build community around their ideas; and (5) keeping the course student-centered and adaptable to the interests of individual students. The effectiveness of the curricular design and pedagogical strategies of the course are described and assessed in the next section.

Because a course like this is bound to select only a few rhetorical traditions and only a few texts from each, the class used three different axes to read and analyze texts, as indicated in point one above: geopolitical/regional, historical/temporal, and thematic/ideational. This three-dimensional approach to reading the selected texts helps students to gain a richer understanding of the broader contexts of and issues in the texts, as well as the changes and complexities in both. First, in order to situate a text in its geopolitical context and try to understand the broader society and culture informing it, students read one or more texts representing rhetorical traditions from different parts of the world. Second, because it is easy to look at a distant sociocultural context from a previous historical time and assume that that culture or society is still characterized by the same issues and qualities, students deliberately avoid looking at texts as slices of societies and issues frozen in time. That is, they delve deeper into how rhetorical traditions and issues have changed over time in the respective societies and cultures, as well as how our understandings of them are shaped by "relations of power, discursive construction of knowledge, colonial construction of cultural dichotomies, and rhetorical plurality brought about by diaspora and cultural hybridity" (Kubota and Lehner 7). Third, to try to understand rhetorical traditions in relation to one another, students examine them in terms of particular themes, being aware that using common terms and themes could be insufficient and even problematic. Those themes include transaction and trust as seen in textual negotiations and in other rhetorical acts, knowledge and epistemology as defined and practiced in different sociocultural contexts, education and the practice of teaching and learning, and the mediation of knowledge and information by evolving technologies. Mao's approach of "reflective encounter" serves as an overarching framework for the analyses of texts while students integrate all three approaches.

In addition to the three-pronged approach to reading texts, some other features of the course are also worth noting. First, students are provided the opportunity to discuss course issues directly with scholars of different rhetorical traditions. In the 2014 iteration of the course, I invited seven scholars, all of whom were authors of course texts; students had highly engaging conversations with the guest speakers through videoconferencing. This pedagogical strategy of taking students beyond text-based class discussion and connecting them

with the authors themselves is mainly based on the concept of “community as curriculum,” a strategy that I adapt from David Cormier.

While connecting students to writers and established scholars in the field, the course also has them use social media platforms to share, and join or build community around, their ideas. Somewhat related to the course objective of “connectivist” learning, toward the end of the course, students also situate course themes and issues in the context of how emerging communicative media and modes are affecting rhetorical practices in and across contexts. They examine how foundational issues and forces of the rhetorical traditions are shaping, and shaped by, contemporary mediums and modes of rhetorical practice.

The course focuses on pedagogy, and it does so not only as part of a teaching of writing certificate but also as an effort to address a pedagogical gap in the discipline. As such, students write their midterm papers trying to develop arguments or positions toward their final papers; in their final papers, they are encouraged to develop and present pedagogical approaches and strategies that help address content, methods, and perspectives beyond the dominant rhetorical traditions in the teaching of writing. Pursuing this goal, students also write regular blog posts, responding to the readings and gradually developing their teaching ideas, as well as sharing teaching ideas during class discussions.

And, finally, the course is student-centered and adaptable to the interests of individual students. Not all students have a deep knowledge of or interest in the issues, so, one-on-one consultations are necessary to help all students develop their own pedagogical visions and strategies. The course also takes a deliberate approach to helping students make connections with experienced scholars in the field. These strategies provide students the needed support to develop pedagogical strategies for an academic and cultural environment that does not readily appreciate knowledge cultures and educational practices from beyond its national and cultural borders.

### **Critical Reflection**

While developing the course, I consulted with a number of scholars, including LuMing Mao, Keith Lloyd, and Iswari Pandey, who have taught similar courses, also learning how their scholarship addresses the lack of non-Western rhetoric in writing studies in the U.S. and what pedagogical strategies they have used when teaching similar courses. In fact, the three features of the course as described above evolved over several years through reading and conversation with scholars of cross-cultural rhetoric. When I taught it for the first time in 2014, some of my strategies led to significant outcomes, while others were less successful. Here, I try to make sense of those successes and failures, highlighting what I would recommend to other colleagues teaching similar courses and how I might update the course in the future.

The greatest challenge I faced with the design of the course was that of scope. It is impossible to cover even one rhetorical tradition with sufficient breadth and depth within a single semester (Miller 70). However, my approach of using a sampling of materials from each rhetorical tradition and exploring the materials from three different axes—time/change, place/context, and theme/perspective—was, overall, quite effective. Students examined the texts and attempted to situate them in their geopolitical and material contexts, with attention paid to sociopolitical changes that occurred during the time the texts were written. One of the students, Michael Guerriero, made an astute observation about the benefit of this approach, which he presents in the form of a realization on a publicly accessible blog: “While working on the final paper for this course, I did not just learn about the various traditions of different cultures, I learned a new way to think about these cultures. . . .”

While noting that the course could only “scratch the surface,” Guerriero went on to describe an epiphany he had when he realized that rhetorical traditions are always in flux and what we take for granted as characteristic of a tradition may have already disappeared. When he learned that *both* Chinese and Western rhetorical traditions highly value memory, he realized that “the Chinese emphasis on memory is not a foreign concept at all. Memory is a rhetorical component in both cultures that [is still] maximized in one, but [gradually] minimized in another.” By introducing the factor of time and change, Guerriero was able to discuss the significance of understanding both place/context and time/history. Further, Guerriero identified the significance of understanding both place/context and time/history as follows:

This has implications beyond even the important revelation that commonalities exist in cultures as vastly different as China and America. Essentially, I realized both that our rhetorical traditions have changed, and that they will continue to change. “The way we do things” is not set in stone, and even if it was, the flow of time would carve new shapes into it just as rivers carve out massive canyons. Our rhetoric will change. We have no power over this. What we do have the power to decide is how it will change. How ought we change, evolve, our rhetorical traditions?

Guerriero introduces the context of place and time, the importance of change, and the possibility of similarity across unexpected places and practices, essentially highlighting the need to focus on themes and issues instead of viewing rhetorical traditions as fundamentally and always different.

Perhaps the least effective aspect of the course was the plan to let students use social media in order to join and grow the network of scholars in the profes-

sion. While students praised the more traditional mode of networking, in the form of guest speakers invited by Skype or Google Hangout, as the best aspect of the course, they were not as enthused by my suggestion that they also try to share their own ideas and join the community beyond the classroom via social and professional networks. For one thing, some of the scholars with whom I tried to connect students did not use social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and blogs. Also, the idea of students “friending” teachers and scholars is not generally accepted, so a few students followed up conversations with the scholars who virtually visited our class via email. I must also note, however, that because this course feature was not fully conceptualized on my part, I may need to either better develop and implement it or drop it altogether in future iterations.

One of the reasons I think students should seek to make virtual connections is because doing so can allow them to connect to scholars of rhetoric from other parts of the country and the world. But teachers must also note limitations, such as time zone differences, an issue that required the use of prerecorded audio in lieu of a visit by an Egyptian colleague and frustrated my attempts to invite scholars from a few other countries. The only nonlocal scholar who virtually visited the class was Jay Jordan, who was teaching at his university’s Korea campus in Seoul. My attempts to connect students with like-minded students and scholars were also limited by the time of day even here in the U.S. Because I taught at 7:00 p.m. EST, I was able to organize a videoconference between my students and a class taught by Iswari Pandey at the California State University at Northridge at 4:00 p.m. PST. This would not have been possible if the class had been taught later in the evening.

Another challenge, which was prominently highlighted in the course’s seminal reading, Mao’s “Reflective Encounters,” was trying to understand the rhetorical traditions of unfamiliar cultures, contexts, and times while using the local terms of Western rhetoric. To try to tackle this challenge, students remained aware and sensitive about potential pitfalls, adopting the idea of “reflectively encountering” unfamiliar traditions and ideas in order to question what they may have assumed about local traditions and practices. While this issue was substantively discussed in class by all students, Guerriero articulated it best in a blog post titled “Approaching a New Frame of Mind.”

The solutions to our problems in teaching writing to all students, not just minorities, can be found by looking at other cultures. We needn’t replace our own methods, nor should we, but we can build on our foundations finding inspiration in the plethora of ideas and strategies that the world has already provided us with.

From my perspective, the most important takeaway for students in the course is the ability to reflect on the local while learning more about societies, traditions, and bodies of knowledge emerging from elsewhere in the world—however small the practical steps they can take as teachers may be.

Another area where I believe the course was generally effective was in its focus on pedagogy. Students regularly discussed and wrote about what they could take from the readings and discussions to their classrooms. Some students, such as Adina Raso, thought very ambitiously while writing their blogs, asking how we may be able to reshape and reframe secondary and higher education in the U.S. by broadening the scope of education's intellectual and cultural basis. Raso observed that the narrow historical foundation of education in this country likely contributes to social problems:

Perhaps the reason why America still has issues with race, sexuality, and religion is because the “illusion of inclusion” has become an incredibly pervasive and superficial aspect of our society. While trying to include all races, sexes, and religions, we ignore important differences that ultimately put strain on local and national relationships.

She went on to suggest that these problems can only be tackled if education and social policies are more inclusive, if the intellectual bases of education are broader, and if teachers draw upon different traditions and cultures:

We mustn't ignore our differences and try to assimilate diverse groups. We need to acknowledge one another and hold critical, non-judgmental conversations about the state of relations in this country. . . . This needs to change if we are to negotiate our future as a nation.

At the end of the semester, when students presented their ideas to a group of faculty in the PWR during an informal social gathering, Raso reflected on the class in one of the most inspiring ways I have heard during my more than two decades as a teacher. She said that reading about different rhetorical traditions and exploring issues of rhetoric with a focus on education helped her realize that being a teacher could be a means to change the world, instead of being a job she might do along the way. By helping the next generation learn to draw from epistemologies beyond cultural and national borders, she observed, teachers of writing and rhetoric can help to change the world, and to right many wrongs within it.

Highlighting issues of teaching and learning in one of her blog posts, another student, Sara Santos, observed that teachers should not try to find solutions and fix problems but instead ask questions when necessary. Another student, David Johnson, blogged by applying the pedagogical approaches he

considered in World Rhetorics to writing center work. Amy McDougal, who also made her writing public, wrote about gender equity through a rhetorical and political-cultural lens. Overall, the class was generally interested in drawing pedagogical strategies and ideas from class discussions, research, and reading. This interest was reflected at the end of the semester in an extremely rich set of practical pedagogical ideas that the class wrote collaboratively in a private Google Doc file. In this document, students described a range of practical strategies, translating more general discussions into suggestions and plans for the classroom.

Students used blogging as a fairly effective means for sharing their reading responses and responding to one another's posts; but, they essentially used blogs like discussion boards limited within the class, except when (and if) they shared their blogs in their own social networks. The students' blog posts, as evidenced by the excerpts that I cited above, were generally very thoughtful and substantive: blog entries ranged from summaries and reflections of readings for class to critiques and analyses, to applications of ideas in academic work, to discussions of their implications for education and society. In sum, relatively low-tech and traditional pedagogical approaches took precedence even where more high-tech approaches would have been desirable but were prohibitive due to logistical challenges as well as habit and comfort, for both students and myself. For instance, instead of joining conversations through the course's Twitter and Facebook accounts, students directly contacted the guest speakers to thank them for their time or to ask them follow up questions.

Perhaps the most successful aspect of the course was the involvement of seven guest speakers who spent about an hour each with my class, engaging students by presenting their ideas and responding to students' questions and observations about their work, which the students had read for class. The idea was to move students beyond texts and connect them to experts in the field. There were a few instances of technological and logistical difficulties, including one instance that required rescheduling, but students looked forward to talking to the experts and appreciated the opportunity to do so.

Looking back at the first iteration of the course more than a year after I taught it, I think it was quite a multifaceted, ambitious endeavor; I might have overdone some aspects of it. When I teach the course in future, I plan to focus more on enabling and encouraging students to draw on rhetorical traditions of their choice to develop and adapt teaching skills for their current or anticipated work in the classroom. I also intend to find alternative ways to create connections between students and scholars from beyond U.S. borders. Since students did not embrace social media—they cited privacy concerns in an end-of-semester reflection—I plan to develop strategies that might address such concerns while still engaging them in virtual, social conversations

with the broader community of scholars. I also intend to pay more attention to media and multimodality, asking students “to collaborate with speakers of world languages to design and remix texts . . . targeted at a range of local and global audiences” (Fraiberg 118). I might also encourage students to seek “partnerships with international classrooms and speakers of world languages by having [them] conduct mini-ethnographies in their own local contexts and cultures and target this research toward international audiences as part of a cross-cultural exchange” (Fraiberg 118).

The gaps in the rhetorical foundations of writing pedagogy may remain as striking as they are today for some time. However, I am optimistic that increasing numbers of teachers in the field will take small steps and gradually build the momentum. As Baca notes, while “the field rethinks its role for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, perhaps we will also consider how Composition Studies might join the much larger conversation of disparate and local composing practices throughout history, across the Americas and beyond” (239). The highly positive feedback of my students from fall 2014 has left me very inspired. I hope to further improve and teach this course many more times.

## Works Cited

- Baca, Damián. “Rethinking Composition, Five Hundred Years Later.” *JAC* 29 (2009): 229-42. Print.
- Binkley, Roberta, and Marissa Smith. “Re-Composing Space: Composition’s Rhetorical Geography.” *Composition Forum* 15 (2006): n.pag. Web. 23 July 2014. <<http://compositionforum.com/issue/15/binkleysmithspace.php>>.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Susan Jarratt. “Rhetorical Traditions, Pluralized Canons, Relevant History, and Other Disputed Terms: A Report from the History of Rhetoric Discussion Groups at the ARS Conference.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34.3 (2004): 19-25. Print.
- Cormier, David. “Rhizomatic Education: Community as Curriculum.” *Dave’s Educational Blog*. Stony Brook U, 3 June 2008. Web. 1 May 2015. <<http://davecormier.com/edblog/2008/06/03/rhizomatic-education-community-as-curriculum/>>.
- Fraiberg, Steven. “Composition 2.0: Toward a Multilingual and Multimodal Framework.” *CCC* 62.1 (2010): 100-26. Print.
- Guerreiro, Michael. “Approaching a New Frame of Mind.” *World Rhetorics Blog*. Stony Brook U, 3 Dec. 2014. Web. 20 May 2015. <<https://you.stonybrook.edu/michaelguerriero/2014/12/03/approaching-a-new-frame-of-mind/>>.
- Hesford, Wendy S. “Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies.” *PMLA* 121.3 (2006): 787-801. Print.
- Johnson, David. *A Level Playing Field*. Stony Brook U, Oct. 2014. Web. 21 May 2015. <<http://you.stonybrook.edu/davidjohnson>>.
- Khost, Peter, and Pat Belanoff. “Community through Collaborative Self-Reflection: Reports on a Writing Program History and Reunion at Stony Brook University.”

- Composition Forum* 30 (2014): n.pag. Web. 20 May 2015. <<http://composition-forum.com/issue/30/stony-brook.php>>.
- Kubota, Ryoko, and Al Lehner. "Toward Critical Contrastive Rhetoric." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13.1 (2004): 7–27. Print.
- McDougal, Amy. *Global Rhetorics*. Stony Brook U, Oct. 2014. Web. 21 May 2015. <<http://you.stonybrook.edu/amcdougal>>.
- Mao, LuMing. "Reflective Encounters: Illustrating Comparative Rhetoric." *Style* 37.4 (2003): 401. Print.
- Miller, Thomas P. "Teaching the Histories of Rhetoric as a Social Praxis." *Rhetoric Review* 12.1 (1993): 70–82. Print.
- Raso, Adina. "Chinese Rhetoric: Memorization, Cultural Values, and Why the West Isn't the Best." *Fables*. Stony Brook U, Oct. 2014. Web. 20 May 2015. <<http://you.stonybrook.edu/myblog21/>>.
- Reagan, Timothy. "An Introduction to the Study of Non-Western and Indigenous Educational Traditions: A Philosophical Starting Point." *Non-Western Educational Traditions: Indigenous Approaches to Educational Thought and Practice*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Routledge, 2004. 1–22. Print.
- Santos, Sara. "Bringing Down the Lego House and Building it Back Up." *A Multicolored Brick Road: Understanding Rhetoric Across Cultures, Languages and Spaces*. Stony Brook U, 20 Nov. 2014. Web. 20 May 2015. <<http://you.stonybrook.edu/smsantos/2014/11/20/i-dont-know-and-thats-okay/>>.
- Swearingen, C. Jan, and LuMing Mao. "Comparative Rhetorical Studies in the New Contact Zone: Chinese Rhetoric Reimagined." *CCC* 60.4 (2009): W32–W44. *Proquest*. Web. 5 May 2015.
- Vertovec, Steven. "Super-diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30.6 (2007): 1024–54. Print.

## Course Syllabus

Stony Brook University

World Rhetorics

Topics in Composition and Writing

WRT/EGL 614

Instructor: Dr. Shyam Sharma

Email: [ghanashyam.sharma@stonybrook.edu](mailto:ghanashyam.sharma@stonybrook.edu)

The term “global” has become increasingly important in the research, scholarship, and pedagogy of composition and rhetoric over the last decade or so. In its broadest sense, the word subsumes globalization and global issues in their many manifestations, such as increases and changes in patterns of global immigration, the redistribution of geopolitical power, and the all-pervasive effects of the internet on local/global and transnational institutions and communities. Within the humanities at large—including English studies and rhetoric and composition—the scholarship and professional networking that cross national borders are turning from a one-way traffic of texts and ideas to a multilateral exchange of ideas, collaborative work, and hyper-connected professional communities. Academics have started paying attention to how transnational/global forces are influencing the production and use of texts, ideas, and professional practices. Hence, students pursuing careers related to the teaching and scholarship of writing and rhetoric have a range of powerful reasons to pay attention to the emergence of the global in this discipline.

This seminar focuses on the “global turn” in the study of rhetoric and writing. Students will study a number of rhetorical traditions from around the world, exploring texts along three different axes: historical/temporal, geopolitical/spatial, and ideational/thematic. They will develop two consecutive but overlapping projects, the first to explore a particular tradition or phenomenon in rhetoric and the second to develop a theoretical framework geared toward informing pedagogical practices, formulating research methods or questions, or some other academic or professional implementation of their choosing. Toward the end of the semester, the class will together explore how new media and modes of communication are affecting rhetorical practices in and across contexts, examining how the foundational forces of the major rhetorical traditions are shaping contemporary rhetorical practices. The broader goal of the course is for students to develop an understanding and appreciation of rhetorical traditions beyond the mainstream (Greco-Roman-Anglo-American) history of rhetoric, situating that understanding in their current academic engagements and future prospects in anticipated professions/disciplines. The course will feature a number of guest speakers who are specialists in different

rhetorical traditions; it will also provide students the option to participate in a side conversation online with students and scholars of rhetoric and related fields from different countries/contexts around the world.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

On successfully completing this course, students should be able to

- identify and discuss a few rhetorical traditions beyond the Greco-Roman-Anglo-American tradition in some detail
- develop a personal interest and expertise in a particular historical, geopolitical, or thematic area in global rhetorics
- develop and present theoretical, research, or pedagogical projects on cross-cultural rhetoric
- conduct basic research involving primary and secondary sources
- engage in effective peer review and professional networking to enhance knowledge-building and knowledge-sharing on the subject of global rhetorics

## REQUIRED TEXTS

- Baca, Damián. "Rethinking Composition, Five Hundred Years Later." *JAC* 29 (2009): 229-42. Print.
- Baraunik, Richard. "The Birth of Open Source Learning Revolution." *TED: Ideas Worth Spreading*. TED Conferences, Feb. 2008. Web. 10 May 2015. <[https://www.ted.com/talks/richard\\_baraniuk\\_on\\_open\\_source\\_learning?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/richard_baraniuk_on_open_source_learning?language=en)>.
- Binkley, Roberta, and Marissa Smith. "Re-Composing Space: Composition's Rhetorical Geography." *Composition Forum* 15 (2006): n.pag. Web. 23 July 2014. <<http://compositionforum.com/issue/15/binkleysmithspace.php>>.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Susan Jarratt. "Rhetorical Traditions, Pluralized Canons, Relevant History, and Other Disputed Terms: a Report from the History of Rhetoric Discussion Groups at the Ars Conference." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34.3 (2004): 19-25. Print.
- Brydon, Diana. "Conference Keynote: Canadian Poetry and Poetics in a Globalizing World." Western States Rhetoric and Literacy Studies Annual Meeting, Mount Allison, Winnipeg. 20 Oct. 2012. Web keynote address. 5 May 2015. <<http://publicpoetics.ca/conference-participants/>>.
- Campbell, Kermit E. "Rhetoric from the Ruins of Ancient Africa." *Rhetorica* 14.3 (2006): 255-74. Print.
- Connor, Ulla. "New Directions in Contrastive Rhetoric." *TESOL Quarterly* 36.4 (2003): 493-510. Print.
- Cormier, David. "Rhizomatic Education: Community as Curriculum." *Dave's Educational Blog*. Stony Brook U, 3 June 2008. Web. 1 May 2015. <<http://davecormier.com/edblog/2008/06/03/rhizomatic-education-community-as-curriculum/>>.

- Craig, Elizabeth C. "Review of *Contrastive Rhetoric*." *Linguist List*. International Linguistics Community Online, N.d. Web. 10 May 2015. <<http://linguistlist.org/pubs/reviews/get-review.cfm?SubID=188428>>.
- Gage, John T. "A Review of *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*." *Rhetoric Review* 3.1 (1984): 100-5. Print.
- Grettano, Teresa. "A Review of *Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks*." *Composition Studies* 33.2 (2005): 128-30. Print.
- Hesford, Wendy S. "Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *PMLA* 121.3 (2006): 787-801. Print.
- Hutto, David. "Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric in the Old and Middle Kingdoms." *Rhetorica*. 20.3 (2002): 213-33. Print.
- Khagram, Sanjeev, and Peggy Levitt. "Constructing Transnational Studies." *The Transnational Studies Reader: Intersections and Innovations*. Ed. Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt. New York: Routledge, 2008. 1-22. Print.
- Koch, Barbara J. "Presentation As Proof: The Language of Arabic Rhetoric." *Anthropological Linguistics* 25.1 (1983): 47-60. Print.
- Lloyd, Keith. "Rethinking Rhetoric from an Indian Perspective: Implications in the Nyaya Sutra." *Rhetoric Review* 26.4 (2007): 365-84. Print.
- Mao, LuMing. "Reflective Encounters: Illustrating Comparative Rhetoric." *Style Fayetteville* 37.4 (2003): 401-25. Print.
- Markel, Mike. "The Rhetoric of Misdirection in Corporate Privacy-Policy Statements." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 14.2 (2005): 197-214. Print.
- Matalene, Carolyn. "Contrastive Rhetoric: An American Writing Teacher in China." *College English* 47.8 (1985): 789-808. Print.
- Miller, Susan. *Trust in Texts: A Different History of Rhetoric*. Carbondale: SIUP, 2008. Print.
- Miller, Thomas P. "Teaching the Histories of Rhetoric As a Social Praxis." *Rhetoric Review* 12.1 (1993): 70-82. Print.
- Mishra, Vidya Niwas. "Sanskrit Rhetoric and Poetics." *Mahfil* 7.3/4 (1971): 1-18. Print.
- Miyahara, Akira. "Toward Theorizing Japanese Interpersonal Communication Competence from a Non-Western Perspective." *Academic Communication Journal* 13.3 (2008): 279-92. Web. 2 May 2015. <<http://www.acjournal/holdings/vol13/Iss3/spec/kluver.htm>>.
- Olid-Pena, Estefania. "The Art of Future Discourse: Rhetoric, Translation and an Interdisciplinary Pedagogy for Transglobal Literacy." Diss. Georgia State U, 2012. Web. 2 May 2015. <[http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english\\_diss/94/](http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_diss/94/)>.
- Pandey, Iswari P. "Literate Lives Across the Digital Divide." *Computers and Composition* 23.2 (2006): 246-57. Print.
- Porter, James E. "Recovering Delivery for Digital Rhetoric." *Computers and Composition* 26.4 (2009): 207-24. Print.
- Reagan, Timothy G. *Non-western Educational Traditions: Indigenous Approaches to Educational Thought and Practice*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. Print.

- Sharma, Ghanashyam, and Maha Bali. "Bonds of Difference: Illusion of Inclusion." *Hybrid Pedagogy* (April 2014): n.pag. Web. 1 May 2015. <<http://www.digitalpedagogylab.com/hybridped/bonds-difference-illusions-inclusion/>>.
- Sharma, Ghanashyam, and Christopher Petty. "Putting Everything on the Line?" *RhetComp @ Stony Brook*. N.p., 2 Mar. 2014. Web. 1 May 2015. <<https://rhetcomp.stonybrook.wordpress.com/2014/02/26/putting-everything-on-the-line/>>.
- Stroud, Scott R., "Argument in Ancient India: The Case of Śankara's Advaita Vedānta," *Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics*. Ed. Carol S. Lipson and Roberta A. Binkley. New York: Parlor P, 2009. 240-64. Print.
- Sung-Gi, Jon. "Towards a Rhetoric of Communication, with Special Reference to the History of Korean Rhetoric." *Rhetorica* 28.3 (2010): 313-29. Print.
- Swearingen, C. Jan, and LuMing Mao. "Comparative Rhetorical Studies in the New Contact Zone: Chinese Rhetoric Reimagined." *CCC* 60.4 (2009): W32-W44. *Proquest*. Web. 5 May 2015.
- Wang, Bo. "A Survey of Research in Asian Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 23.2 (2004): 171-81. Print.
- Williams, Bronwyn T. "Speak for Yourself? Power and Hybridity in the Cross-Cultural Classroom." *CCC* 54.4 (2003): 586-609. Print.
- Wright, Elizabeth A. "A History of the Arts of Memory and Rhetoric." *InSight* 5.2 (2009): 1-11. Print.
- Zimmer, Michael. "Zuckerberg's Theory of Privacy." *The Washington Post*, 3 Feb. 2014. Web. 5 May 2015. <[https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/mark-zuckerbergs-theory-of-privacy/2014/02/03/2c1d780a-8cea-11e3-95dd-36ff657a4dae\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/mark-zuckerbergs-theory-of-privacy/2014/02/03/2c1d780a-8cea-11e3-95dd-36ff657a4dae_story.html)>.

## ASSIGNMENTS

**1. Reading Response (30%):** To help you enhance reading, exploration of the themes, and class discussion, this assignment asks you to respond in the form of blog entries (400-1000 words). While you don't need to present finished blog posts, you are encouraged to write clearly and with a broader audience in mind. Whenever possible, connect multiple texts and focus on the theme of the week. Discuss, critique, connect, and/or build on the key terms and/or arguments in the texts; assess the uses and limitations of the theoretical frames or their underlying assumptions; and/or pose questions and directions for the class to consider in light of your reflections on the issue at hand. Cite from the readings (with page numbers) for reference during class discussion. For initiating class discussions, you will be asked to either discuss your own posts or those of other members of class. Beyond preparation for class, consider your responses as an opportunity for developing your ideas for the larger assignments. Note: in order to allow other members of class to read your response before class, post it by noon on Monday; make sure to read everyone's responses in preparation for class.

**2. Midterm Paper (20%):** Pick a context or culture, rhetorical tradition or practice, artifact or medium of discourse, or a theme that crosses contexts or traditions and is rhetorically significant—then write an in-depth analysis, reflection, critique, or scholarly review on it (within 7-14 pages). You can write this assignment by conducting interviews, gathering other types of data, analyzing (a) text(s), doing archival research, and/or using library research. The topic/phenomena that you choose must evolve from, draw on, or be somehow relevant to the themes and issues that the class has studied (or is planning to study) together. Your project must either situate a local issue within a transnational or global perspective or focus on an issue from beyond local (North American) contexts.

**3. Final Seminar Paper (35%):** This is a standard research paper assignment that asks you to present a substantive theoretical argument or a pedagogical approach that you envision using as a teacher. You can continue to explore the same theme from the midterm paper (though the same text or ideas should not dominate this assignment) or develop and write on a new topic. As in the midterm paper, you must draw on the readings for class wherever feasible, but the assignment should be driven by what is essentially your own area of expertise as it begins to evolve by the time you start working on this assignment.

**4. Presentation/Teaching, Conferences, Participation (15%):** As a seminar, this course heavily depends on students’ active participation in class. You will be asked to sign up for and lead at least one class discussion, as well as orally share your ideas with the class at the end of semester. You must meet with the instructor to discuss your plans and get feedback, as well as support other students through peer review and contribute to class activities (including class presentations, facilitation of conversations, etc.) as assigned by the instructor.

### Course Schedule

	WORK FOR CLASS	WORK IN CLASS
Week 1		Introduction, syllabus, assignments, technologies used Discussion: times, places, themes
Week 2	World Rhetorics: Introduction  Read Khagram and Levitt; Hesford; Mao; Connor	Discussion of readings  Pick and discuss a rhetorical issue, tradition, theme

	WORK FOR CLASS	WORK IN CLASS
Week 3	Transaction and Trust  Read Williams; S.Miller	Discussion of readings  Guest lecture Student presentation
Week 4	No class: Conferences  Midterm Paper proposal due	Bring Midterm Paper proposals to meeting
Week 5	World Rhetorics: GRAA and its Critiques  Read Binkley and Smith; T. Miller, Baca; Cormier  Midterm Paper draft due	Discussion of readings Review/discuss proposals  Guest lecture Student presentation Peer review paper drafts (partners must read in advance)
Week 6	World Rhetorics: South Asia  Read Mishra; Lloyd; Stroud Midterm Paper revised/final draft due	Discussion of readings  Guest lecture Student presentation
Week 7	Knowledge and Education  Read Reagan; Olid-Pena; Canagarajah	Discussion of readings  Student presentation
Week 8	World Rhetorics: East and Far East Asia  Read Wang; Miyahara; Swearingen and Mao; Sung-Gi  Proposal for Final Paper due	Discussion of readings  Student presentation
Week 9	Teaching and Learning  Read Brydon; Craig; Matalene	Discussion of readings  Guest lecture Student presentation
Week 10	World Rhetorics: Africa, Middle East  Read Campbell; Koch; Hutto; Wright Draft of Final Paper due	Discussion of readings  Student presentation  Peer review paper drafts (partners must read in advance)

	WORK FOR CLASS	WORK IN CLASS
Week 11	Mediation and Openness/Access  Watch Baraunik Read Pandey; Porter; Sharma and Bali	Discussion of readings  Guest lecture
Week 12	World Rhetorics: AltRhet in West  Read Bizzell and Jarratt; Grettano; Gage  Revised draft of Final Paper due	Discussion of readings  Final presentations
Week 13	Privacy and Sharing  Read Markel; Zimmer; Sharma and Petty  Presentation outline due (post on Blackboard)	Discussion of readings  Guest lecture Final presentations
	THANKSGIVING BREAK	
Week 14	No readings: Last class	Final presentations  Reflections