

The integration of rhetoric into existing school subjects

Jonas Bakken

During the past two decades, rhetoric has been included in the national curricula in all the Scandinavian countries. However, it is not unproblematic to take an academic discipline out of its historical context and integrate it into another culture, another time period and, not least, another school system. Rhetorical theory itself may be changed and shaped by the school context into which it enters. In this article, the challenges of integrating rhetoric into established school subjects will be explored through an analysis of how rhetoric is presented in four textbooks in Norwegian Language Arts for upper-secondary school. Norwegian Language Arts is a subject regulated by a national curriculum and has a long tradition of teaching writing, reading and oral skills without reference to rhetorical theory. All of this influences how rhetoric is presented to the students in textbooks. Most characteristically, rhetoric is presented as a method of critical textual analysis, mainly of commercial advertisements. The purpose of a rhetorical analysis is, according to the textbook authors, to expose and criticise the usage of emotional appeals and other forms of linguistic influence.

Keywords: rhetoric, textbooks, Norwegian language arts.

Introduction

In the 1990s and early 2000s, rhetoric was established as an academic discipline at several Scandinavian universities and colleges, including the universities of Copenhagen and Aarhus in Denmark; Örebro, and Lund in Sweden; and Oslo and Bergen in Norway (Kjeldsen & Grue 2011). In the wake of this rhetorical renaissance, educational researchers in all three countries have argued that students in secondary school could also benefit from a rhetorical education. Both the productive and the receptive side of rhetoric has been highlighted as

Jonas Bakken, Associate Professor in Norwegian didactics at the University of Oslo, 0317 Oslo, Norway. E-mail: jonas.bakken@ils.uio.no

important to today's young people: rhetoric can improve their oral and written communication skills and provide them with a theoretical basis for analysing, assessing, and criticizing the expressions of others (Bakken 2008; Haugsted 2003; Hertzberg 2003; Jers 2011; Lyngfelt 2015; Penne 1999). In this way, rhetoric can help students become democratic citizens who actively participate in civic life and public debate (Berge 2012).

In the latest curriculum reforms in the Scandinavian countries, these ideas made their way into school policy, and rhetoric was included in the national curricula of Danish Language Arts (Undervisningsministeriet 2013), Swedish Language Arts (Skolverket 2011) and Norwegian Language Arts (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2013). During the past decade, a lot has been written about rhetorical education in Scandinavia (Bakken 2008; Haugsted 2003; Kjeldsen 2014), particularly in Sweden (Beronius & Nilsson 2014; Eriksson 2017; Gunnarson 2012; Jers 2011; Sigrell 2008); however, a majority of these publications take on a normative perspective on the subject. The authors present rhetorical theory to try to explain why it is relevant for today's teachers and students. There has been less focus on what happens to the Language Arts – and to rhetoric itself – when rhetoric is integrated into these school subjects (Bakken 2018). Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian Language Arts have long traditions of teaching students both oral and written skills and text analysis, based on academic disciplines other than rhetoric, and the inclusion of rhetoric may come into conflict with established teaching practices. This conflict can be a source of change and renewal in these traditional school subjects, but it can also change rhetoric itself. Rhetoric as an independent academic discipline at the universities may not necessarily be the same as rhetoric integrated into a school subject and presented to teenagers.

To acquire a better understanding of what may happen when rhetoric is introduced into an established school subject, I will give an analysis of how rhetoric is presented to students in the textbooks in Norwegian Language Arts for upper-secondary school. There are four textbooks available for this school subject, each comprising of three volumes, one for each year in upper-secondary school. All four textbooks clearly highlight rhetoric, and they cover both the productive and the receptive sides, but in my analysis, I will argue that the authors have chosen different ways to integrate rhetoric into Norwegian Language Arts. In three of the textbooks, the receptive side of rhetoric is intertwined with a form of textual analysis that has long traditions in the school subject, with the consequence that there is a contradiction between the rhetoric's receptive and productive sides. The fourth textbook provides a more coherent and comprehensive

representation of rhetoric, but to achieve this, the authors of the text-book have distanced themselves – perhaps too far – from established knowledge and practices in Norwegian Language Arts.

Rhetoric in the National Curriculum

In Norway, rhetoric was introduced into upper-secondary school (grades 11-13) through the 2006 *Kunnskapsløftet* (the knowledge promotion) curriculum reform, which represented a major shift in Norwegian school policy. The previous national curriculum defined a cultural canon, listing authors, historical events, and other knowledge areas that were to be taught. *Kunnskapsløftet* instead described the competencies that students need to develop to become active participants in working life and democratic society. The Norwegian Language Arts subject was given responsibility for developing students' critical literacy and their linguistic and rhetorical skills (Berge, 2012).

Initially, only the receptive dimension of rhetoric was included in Norwegian Language Arts in upper-secondary school in the form of rhetorical analyses of written and multimodal texts (Bakken 2014, p. 79). However, with the revision of the national curriculum in 2013, the productive side of rhetoric was also included. At the same time, rhetoric was included in Norwegian Language Arts at the lower-secondary school level (grades 8–10) and in vocational education programmes. This article, however, will focus only on Norwegian Language Arts in Programmes for General Studies, that is, those programs that qualify students to apply for admission to higher education. These programmes are those in which students get the most thorough training in rhetoric.

The productive side of rhetoric is part of Norwegian Language Arts in all three grades of the Programmes for General Studies. After grade 11, students should be able to “apply knowledge about the rhetorical modes of persuasion in oral presentations”; after grade 12, they should be able to “apply knowledge about the rhetorical modes of persuasion in discussions and oral presentations” and, after grade 13, they should be able to “use rhetorical and digital skills to produce and present multimodal texts” (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2013). Thus, it is primarily the students' oral skills that are to be developed by rhetoric, not writing, and the central parts of rhetorical theory covered are the rhetorical modes of persuasion: ethos, pathos and logos.

The receptive side of rhetoric is included in the last two years of upper-secondary school. After grade 12, students should be able to “explain the argumentation of non-fiction texts using knowledge of

rhetoric,” and after grade 13, they should be able to “use rhetorical concepts to analyse and assess different types of non-fiction texts” (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2013). In both cases, non-fiction texts – and especially argumentative texts – are the objects of analysis, and a rhetorical analysis also involves an assessment of the text. However, the assessment that students are supposed to perform, and the criteria on which they are to base the assessment, are not specified.

From Curriculum to Textbook

The Ministry of Education thus emphasizes the importance of young people having rhetorical competence, but nothing is said about how to acquire this. After the curriculum reform in 2006, the Norwegian national curriculum only specifies the competence aims for individual subjects, i.e. the competence that students should have acquired at the end of certain levels of the study programme. There are no guidelines for the subjects’ content, teaching materials or teaching methods. The question of how rhetoric is to be integrated into Norwegian Language Arts is largely left to the individual teachers, the schools – and not least – textbook authors

On the market today, there are four competing textbooks in Norwegian Language Arts for upper-secondary school, Programmes for General Studies: *Panorama*, *Grip teksten*, *Intertekst*, and *Moment*. Each of these textbooks consists of three volumes, one for each year. In addition, publishers have websites with additional content for teachers and students, but these will not be analysed in this article, as they are merely supplements, and are not necessary to enable students to reach the competence aims.

The Productive Side of Rhetoric

The productive side of rhetoric is, in theory, easy to integrate into Norwegian Language Arts. According to the curriculum, the oral skills of the students, especially in the genres of presentation and discussion, are to be developed by means of rhetorical competence, which is an area of Norwegian Language Arts where rhetoric will not conflict with any strong teaching traditions. Admittedly, the focus on oral skills has gradually become keener in the national curricula, starting with the reforms during the 1970s, but as late as 2003, Frøydis Hertzberg writes that there is still little systematic training in oral genres in Norwegian Language Arts teaching, and that teachers’

feedback on the students' oral presentations is sparse and vague. The teachers lack a good theoretical foundation for teaching and guiding students in oral skills, but this professional gap can be closed with the inclusion of rhetoric in the subject: "Nothing can compete with rhetoric as a tool for planning oral presentations" (Hertzberg 2003, p. 169). With the revision of the curriculum in 2013, this view also gained currency with Norwegian education authorities.

All four of the Norwegian Language Arts textbooks devote a great deal of space to the topic of oral presentations and discussions, and the conceptual and theoretical basis is derived mainly from rhetoric. As the curriculum requires, the theory of the modes of persuasion is central. The authors refer explicitly to classical rhetoric, and they give the students practical advice on how to persuade their audience using ethos, pathos and logos. Ethos is defined in *Grip teksten* as being "credible and trustworthy" and pathos as "appealing to and awakening emotions in the audience" (Dahl et al. 2013, p. 44). Similar definitions are found in the other textbooks. However, the descriptions of logos vary somewhat from textbook to textbook. *Panorama*, *Grip teksten* and *Intertekst* link logos to reason, logically valid argumentation, facts, and verifiable evidence, and *Panorama* also includes a classification of argumentative forms derived from philosophical argumentation theory. *Moment*, on the other hand, takes on a clearly relativist stance. Persuasion through logos does not mean that the presentation needs to be objectively true or logical, but that the audience is to be given the impression that it is: "In a speech or presentation, we should therefore present the case or point of view so that the public perceives it as sensible and probable" (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 88). Although the classical rhetorical canons are not mentioned in the national curriculum, the four textbooks offer detailed descriptions of these, and students learn to work systematically with *inventio*, *dispositio*, *eloquutio*, *memoria* and *actio* when planning and presenting an oral text.

The four textbooks use the original Greek and Latin terms, and the authors refer explicitly to classical rhetorical texts by Aristotle and Cicero. The authors also argue that the ancient tradition of rhetoric is highly relevant for today's students: "In ancient Greece and Rome, public speeches followed a set of rules, called rhetoric – the art of oratory. The philosopher Aristotle was the first to systematize these rules. Even though he lived more than 2,300 years ago, many of these rules have proved to be useful in our time as well" (Dahl et al. 2013, p. 44).

In the chapters on oral skills, rhetoric is primarily presented as a way of empowering students. The authors of *Moment* tell the students

that it is in their own best interest to study rhetoric because it shows us “how we can persuade others” (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 78). The authors of *Intertekst* claim that rhetoric “can make us better language users” and make our texts “successful” (Eide et al., 2014, 16). In *Panorama*, rhetoric is described with metaphors of competition, sports and war: “Which mode of persuasion are you going to use? You inspect the terrain, like the football player or the general does before the battle! This preparation was called *inventio* in rhetoric” (Røskeland et al. 2013, p. 21). The passage is illustrated with a photo of the world champion Norwegian chess player, Magnus Carlsen.

According to the authors of *Panorama*, *Grip teksten* and *Intertekst*, rhetoric is so powerful that students need a set of ethical rules for their rhetorical practice. When debating, the students should not try to win at any cost, but be constructive (Eide et al. 2014, p. 39) and respect the input of others (Dahl et al. 2014, p. 272). Once again *Moment* stands out. Here we find no such rules, just one sentence at the end of the 13th grade volume, in which the authors define what bad rhetoric is: “If you are completely unprepared, lying or do not have good intentions, then it’s bad rhetoric” (Fodstad et al. 2016, p. 281).

The Receptive Side of Rhetoric

The receptive side of rhetoric is far more challenging to integrate into Norwegian Language Arts. According to the curriculum, students are supposed to use rhetorical knowledge to analyse and assess non-fiction texts, and this puts rhetoric on a collision course with an academic tradition that has been central in teaching and in the national exams in Norwegian Language Arts since the 1970s, the language usage analysis (*språkbruksanalysen*). Language usage analysis has its roots in German and Danish ideological criticism from the 1960s, and in Norwegian Language Arts, it has been the preferred method of analysing texts from mass media, especially advertisements and various types of argumentative non-fiction texts, such as chronicles and debate articles (Hoel 1990, p. 74). The purpose of language usage analysis is primarily to teach students how to resist pressure from advertising and mass media.

Language usage analysis is based on two theoretical assumptions: language is an instrument of power, and power is inherently bad – or at least highly suspicious. This, in turn, leads to the idea that speakers and writers use language and texts to try to force their will upon us. And we have to learn how to resist (Bull et al. 1981, p. 171). Language usage analysis primarily focuses on argumentation, and arguments

are divided into two types: open and concealed. Open arguments are the explicit, logical arguments, and concealed arguments are the implicit, emotional appeals (Andersen et al. 1981, p. 90). When doing a language usage analysis, the students have two main tasks: firstly, they identify and describe the open arguments in the text and assess their validity and relevance. Secondly, the students expose the concealed arguments in the text, and criticize the author for using emotional appeals instead of logical arguments (Andersen et al. 1981, p. 118–122; Hoel 1990, p. 85).

In the chapters on critical rhetorical analysis in three of the Norwegian Language Arts textbooks – *Grip teksten*, *Panorama* and *Intertekst* – it is apparent that the authors are trying to merge the strong tradition of language usage analysis with the new rhetorical terminology. In the preceding chapters on oral presentation, the authors had already introduced rhetorical theory and defined the three modes of persuasion: ethos, pathos and logos. But in the chapters on critical rhetorical analysis, they give new definitions of ethos, pathos and logos. And this time, they do not refer to the classical texts by Aristotle and Cicero, but instead draw on the theoretical assumptions and terminology of language usage analysis: “The *logos appeal* is an open argumentation technique where we argue directly and unambiguously (with clear logical reasoning). With a *pathos appeal*, we influence the recipient in a more indirect and concealed way” (Røskeland et al. 2014, p. 143). In this passage, the authors of *Panorama* use the distinction between open and concealed arguments to define logos and pathos. Similar definitions can be found in *Grip teksten*: “In open argumentation, logos dominates while concealed argumentation is mainly based on pathos” (Dahl et al. 2013, p. 201). These two textbooks do not mention ethos in this context, but *Intertekst* does:

As you may discover, concealed argumentation is pathos-related, and open argumentation is logos-related. The mode of persuasion (known as) ethos can be linked to both argument types. Therefore, you may also include the argumentation concepts in a rhetorical analysis (Eide et al. 2015, p. 42).

Ethos can thus act as either open or concealed argumentation, depending on whether the appeal is based on reason or emotion.

In the chapters on rhetorical analysis, we find not only the terminology from language usage analysis, but also the theoretical assumptions on which language usage analysis was based. Open argumentation is clearly described as the ideal, while concealed argumentation is seen as suspicious. In *Intertekst*, the authors write,

“Through concealed argumentation, our feelings are influenced, or we are led to feel something without reason or logic” (Eide et al. 2015, p. 42). According to *Panorama*, this manipulative form of linguistic influence plays a major part in advertising: “Concealed arguments are mostly used in advertising or in other contexts where the goal is to sell goods or opinions” (Røskeland et al. 2014, p. 143). The authors of *Grip teksten* also state that concealed argumentation can be used in advertising as a means of manipulating us (Dahl et al. 2013, p. 203) and warn the students against the advertisements’ “seductive’ devices such as value-charged words, wordplay, humour and irony” (Dahl et al. 2013, p. 202). According to *Intertekst*, one main goal for text analysis is to reveal this manipulation: “It is especially important to expose the concealed argumentation, that is, the one that addresses the reader’s emotions” (Eide et al. 2015, p. 42).

These three textbooks present a method of critical rhetorical analysis of non-fiction texts that combines theories and concepts from classical rhetoric with elements of the traditional language usage analysis. As we have seen, rhetoric provides the theory of the three modes of persuasion: ethos, pathos and logos. In addition, all three textbooks use the rhetorical concept of kairos to explain that there is a “right time” to speak (Røskeland et al. 2014, p. 144). They describe key aspects of the context using Cicero’s theory of external aptum, also referred to as “the rhetorical pentagon ...: situation, theme/matter, sender, recipient and language/medium” (Garthus et al. 2013, p. 182). Language usage analysis, on the other hand, provides the concepts of open and concealed argumentation as well as a negative perception of the power of language. The method of critical rhetorical analysis presented in the three textbook has also inherited the preferred object of analysis from traditional language usage analysis, namely commercial advertising.

It will be recalled that the Norwegian national curriculum states that pupils’ rhetorical analyses of non-fiction texts should involve an assessment of the text, but it does not specify the type of assessment. In *Panorama*, *Grip teksten* and *Intertekst*, students are instructed to evaluate non-fiction texts in two different ways. In some passages in the textbooks, students are instructed to assess how successful the text is in the rhetorical situation. According to *Grip teksten*, students should consider “the rhetorical force” of the text by answering the following questions: “Does the author succeed in the rhetorical strategy? How do the rhetorical devices work in the given situation, in *kairos*?” (Dahl et al. 2014, p. 242). In *Panorama*, students are asked to assess “the extent to which the text works in conjunction with the intended audience” (Røskeland et al. 2014, p. 168), and in *Intertekst*,

it is stated that “a rhetorical analysis does not suggest that you consider the actual message in the text, but whether it works on the reader or not” (Eide 2015, p. 39). A criterion for the assessment of the text is therefore its assumed effect on the recipient, and rhetoric provides the theoretical basis for making assumptions about how the text will function. This form of assessment is in line with the classical rhetorical theories of Aristotle and Cicero, which the textbook authors refer to in the chapters on oral presentations and discussions. Aristotle emphasizes that “rhetoric exists to affect the giving of decisions” (Aristotle, *Rhetorica* II.1.2), and Cicero writes, “The function of eloquence seems to be to speak in a manner suited to persuade an audience [;] the end is to persuade by speech” (Cicero, *De inventione* I.V). In other words, a good speech is a speech that affects and persuades the audience in the rhetorical situation.

In other passages in these three textbooks, however, the students are asked to assess the argumentation of a non-fiction text based on certain universal criteria, regardless of the context or how the text affects the recipients. In *Panorama*, the authors write, “Two questions that are important to ask when considering an argument: 1. Is the argument relevant? 2. Is the argument valid?” (Røskeland et al. 2013, p. 23). This assessment is particularly important in analyses of advertisements and other texts that use “argumentation techniques or ‘tricks’ that appeal to our emotions.” *Grip teksten* provides the following absolute criteria for assessing logos: “The content must be true, and the argumentation must be valid” (Dahl et al. 2014, p. 241). Similar thoughts can be found in *Intertekst*’s instructions for writing a rhetorical analysis: “Logos (Are the arguments clear and accountable? Show with quotes!)” (Eide et al. 2015, p. 39).

This insistence on truth and logic in argumentation clearly contradicts Aristotle’s view of logos and of rhetoric in general. Aristotle writes that the subjects of rhetorical speech are “things that seem to be capable of admitting two possibilities” (Aristotle, *Rhetorica* I.2.12). Rhetorical argumentation is therefore not based on general truths or logical necessities, but on probabilities and what is seemingly true: “it is evident that [the premises] from which enthymemes are spoken are sometimes necessarily true but mostly true [only] for the most part. Moreover, enthymemes are derived from probabilities [*eikota*] and signs [*semēia*]” (Aristotle, *Rhetorica* I.2.14). Cicero explicitly supports the views presented by Aristotle and another Greek rhetorician, Hermagoras, and argues that rhetorical speech deals with “special cases” involving “definite individuals,” whereas “general questions” like “How large is the sun?” are the subjects of philosophy (Cicero, *De inventione*, I.V). When the authors of

Panorama, *Grip teksten* and *Intertekst* instruct the students to both assess how effective the text is in the rhetorical situation, and assess the argumentation based on absolute criteria of truth and logic, it is apparent that they are trying to merge classical rhetorical theory with language usage analysis. As shown earlier, a language usage analysis in Norwegian Language Arts involves describing the so-called open arguments in the text and assessing their validity and relevance.

However, in the fourth textbook, *Moment*, the authors have chosen a different strategy. Here the traditional language usage analysis and the concepts of open and closed argumentation are set aside, and the students are instead introduced to an analytical method strongly rooted in classical rhetoric. If we focus only on the rhetorical theories and concepts presented, there are many similarities with the other three textbooks: ethos, pathos, logos, aptum and kairos are the key concepts (Fodstad et al. 2015, p. 262). The big difference lies in how the influence of language is viewed. In *Moment*, this is generally presented as something positive: rhetoric is defined as “the teaching of effective and good communication” (Fodstad et al. 2015, p. 248). The students are told that “rhetorical text is important. It has a purpose – it will help the situation to end well” (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 80). The difference between the textbooks is evident in the passages about pathos. As mentioned above, the three other textbooks are characterized by a negative view of emotional appeals, while *Moment* presents pathos as equally important and necessary as ethos and logos: if one is to appeal to recipients, “one must mobilize the whole human being, including the emotions” (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 88).

This view of the influence of language is also apparent when the authors describe their method of rhetorical analysis of non-fiction texts. This is not a method of revealing and criticizing the author and the text, but a “way to better understand the text” (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 146). The purpose of the analysis is “to show how and why a text is designed in a certain way to persuade” (Fodstad et al. 2015, p. 260). The students are asked to assess “if the sender hits the target audience with the text” and “how the text as a whole works in this particular situation” (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 146). Even in analyses of advertisements, where the other textbooks place great emphasis on revealing manipulation and seduction, the authors of *Moment* ask the students to conduct a sober “assessment of whether the advertisement will hit the target audience, if it can persuade the recipient to make or think something, and why – possibly why not – it does it” (Fodstad et al. 2014, p. 150).

This positive view of the influence of language is clearly in line with classical rhetorical theory although rhetoricians like Aristotle (*Rhetorica* I.I.13), Cicero (*De inventione*, I.II) and Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria*, II.16) also admit that eloquence may be used for both good and evil. In his defence of the art of rhetoric, Cicero argues that the invention of eloquence transformed men “from wild savages into a kind and gentle folk. [...] Certainly only a speech at the same time powerful and entrancing could have induced one who had great physical strength to submit to justice without violence” (Cicero, *De inventione*, I.II). Eloquence is, according to both Cicero and Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria*, II.16), the positive alternative to violence and a necessary factor for establishing a civil society.

Discussion

The authors of the four textbooks for upper-secondary school have thus chosen two different strategies to integrate rhetoric in Norwegian Language Arts. In three of the textbooks – *Grip teksten*, *Panorama* and *Intertekst* – the academic subject’s long-standing tradition of language usage analysis is continued and linked to the receptive side of rhetoric. A challenge entailed by this strategy is that it creates contradictions between the receptive and productive side of rhetoric, and this may potentially confuse the students. In the methods of rhetorical analysis presented in these three textbooks, the modes of persuasion are viewed as suspicious, especially pathos, and students are asked to reveal and criticize authors using anything other than open, valid and relevant arguments to convince the recipients. The productive side of rhetoric, however, is clearly presented in a positive light. Emphasis is placed on the practical utility of rhetoric, and students learn that knowledge of all three modes of persuasion can help them to communicate better, although the textbooks show a preference for rational argumentation and set ethical boundaries for what students can do to win a discussion. In one of the textbooks, *Intertekst*, this contradiction in rhetoric is briefly commented on: “Rhetoric therefore means the art of speaking, and it was often defined as the art or the doctrine of speaking beautifully. In the VG2 book, we defined rhetoric as ‘purposeful and effective communication’” (Eide et al. 2015, p. 12). The textbooks thus operate with two partially contradictory views on rhetoric, and with two different definitions of rhetoric.

The authors of the textbook *Moment*, as we have seen, have chosen a different strategy. They give the students an extensive presentation of rhetoric, with a strong foundation in the classical tradition and with a

strong correspondence between the receptive and productive sides of rhetoric. In both cases, the influence of language is seen as something positive and students learn that rhetoric gives them tools both to better understand other people's communication and to communicate better themselves. Although this is a more coherent representation of rhetoric than what we found in the other textbooks, this strategy also entails challenges. *Moment* creates coherence in the presentation of rhetoric by excluding the language usage analysis, which was a dominant part of the Norwegian Language Arts for more than thirty years (Hoel 1990, p. 95).

Admittedly, the national curriculum legitimizes such a breach since language usage analysis is never explicitly mentioned. Moreover, Norwegian Language Arts in upper-secondary school is far more than the curriculum; among other things, there are thousands of teachers who developed their understanding of Norwegian Language Arts through their own schooling, teacher education, and work experience. In addition, there is an extensive repertoire of texts and established ways to teach them, and, not least, there is a national exam system with strong traditions for testing the students' competence after thirteen years of education in the subject. As shown in a previous study, the assignments in rhetorical analysis in today's exams are almost identical with the traditional assignments in language usage analysis (Bakken 2014, p. 79). The objects of analysis are the same: advertising and argumentative non-fiction texts. The students are asked to analyse the argumentation and assess the text. The difference is that students today are asked to use the terms *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* in the analysis.

When the assignments are so similar to the traditional assignments in language usage analysis, it is not unlikely that many markers will expect a critical perspective in the rhetorical analyses as well. Such an expectation will be reinforced by the fact that three out of four textbooks in Norwegian Language Arts present a form of rhetorical analysis that incorporates key features of the language usage analysis. The markers who evaluate the students' exam papers are mainly practising Norwegian teachers, and if a marker uses *Grip teksten*, *Panorama* or *Intertekst* in their own teaching, and the student has learned rhetorical analysis from *Moment*, two academic understandings are on a collision course with one another. If the marker is not aware of this challenge, in the worst-case scenario, the student's competence may be considered deficient.

Concluding Remarks

Although many of the details in this analysis are specific to Norwegian Language Arts and Norwegian schools, some of the general findings may be relevant to other countries and school systems. A key point is that developing students as democratic citizens through the introduction of rhetoric in school is not simply a matter of taking rhetoric as we know it from the classical tradition and conveying it to students. Rhetoric will always have to be integrated into a school-related context, and in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, the curricula state that rhetoric must be integrated into the existing Language Arts subjects. Here rhetoric must find its place among the many linguistic and literary disciplines within the school subject, and the subject must be related to more traditional ways of studying text and communication, such as language usage analysis in Norwegian Language Arts. This integration process can affect both rhetoric and the Language Arts subjects, and as the analysis has shown, the end results can vary greatly if left to the textbook authors.

The findings in this study also suggest possible topics for further research. As noted in the introduction, the literature on rhetorical education in Scandinavia has thus far been dominated by normative studies in which the authors argue for the possible benefits of rhetorical training in school. Now that rhetoric has been included in the national curricula in all the Scandinavian countries, however, more empirically oriented research may be relevant. One way to follow up the present study would be to analyse the presentation of rhetoric in textbooks in Swedish and Danish Language Arts, and compare how rhetoric is integrated into the different Language Arts subjects in Scandinavia. Furthermore, it would be interesting to do classroom studies of how rhetoric is taught, and to investigate critically what the students themselves feel that they have learnt from their rhetorical education. This could possibly shed new light on the claims made in previous normative studies about the benefits of rhetoric in school.

Note

1. All translations are made by the author.

References

- Aristotle (1991): *On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse. Newly Translated, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by George A. Kennedy.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Andersen, Leif Anker; Stein, Inger Marie & Aase, Laila (1981): *Språkbruksanalyse.* [Analysis of language usage]. Oslo: Det norske samlaget.
- Bakken, Jonas (2014): *Retorikk i skolen.* 2. utgave. [Rhetoric in school]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bakken, Jonas (2018): Hvorfor og hvordan skal elever gjøre retoriske analyser i norskfaget? [Why and how should students write rhetorical analyses in Norwegian Language Arts?]. In Kåre Kverndokken, ed.: *101 litteraturredidaktiske grep – om å arbeide med skjønnlitteratur og sakprosa*, pp. 89–105. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Berge, Kjell Lars (2012): Retorisk dannelse som grunnlag for demokratisk medborgerskap i skolen: om de grunnleggende ferdighetene skriving og muntlighet i Kunnskapsløftet. [Rhetorical education as foundation for democratic citizenship in school: About the basic skills writing and orality in the promotion of knowledge]. In Kjell Lars Berge & Janicke Haldal Stray, eds.: *Demokratisk medborgerskap i skolen*, pp. 79–101. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Beronius, Karin & Nilsson, Lena (2014): *Retorik i skolan. En grundläggande arbetsmodell i 12 steg.* [Rhetoric in school. A basic model in 12 steps]. Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.
- Bull, Tove; Hovdenak, Gudmund; Pedersen, Svein & Ytreberg, Stein (1981): Om språkbruksanalyse i skolen. [About language usage analysis in school]. In Kjell-Arild Madsen, ed.: *Norsk–didaktikk– Nokre aktuelle problemstillinger i morsmålsundervisninga*, pp. 166–188. Oslo: LNU/Cappelen.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius (1949): Two books on rhetoric. De inventione. In Harry Mortimer Hubbell, ed.: *De inventione. De optimo genere oratorum. Topica. With an English translation by H.M. Hubbell*, pp. 1–346. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Dahl, Berit Helene; Engelstad, Arne; Engelstad, Ingelin; Hellne-Halvorsen, Ellen Beate; Jemterud, Ivar; Torp, Arne & Zandjani, Cathrine (2013): *Grip teksten. Norsk Vg1. Studieforbereidende utdanningsprogram.* [Seize the text]. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Dahl, Berit Helene; Engelstad, Arne; Engelstad, Ingelin; Hellne-Halvorsen, Ellen Beate; Jemterud, Ivar; Torp, Arne & Zandjani, Cathrine (2014): *Grip teksten. Norsk Vg2. Studieforbereidende utdanningsprogram.* [Seize the text]. Oslo: Aschehoug.

- Dahl, Berit Helene; Engelstad, Arne; Engelstad, Ingelin; Hellne-Halvorsen, Ellen Beate; Jemterud, Ivar; Torp, Arne & Zandjani, Cathrine (2015): *Grip teksten. Norsk Vg3. Studieforberevende utdanningsprogram*. [Seize the text]. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Eide, Ove; Garthus, Karen Marie; Kvåle, Græsli; Bjørn, Helge; Schulze, Anne-Marie & Ystad, Ragnhild Hagen (2014): *Intertekst Vg2. Norsk Vg2 Studieforberevende utdanningsprogram*. [Intertext]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Eide, Ove; Garthus, Karen Marie; Kvåle, Græsli; Bjørn, Helge; Schulze, Anne-Marie & Ystad, Ragnhild Hagen (2015): *Intertekst Vg3. Norsk Vg3 Studieforberevende utdanningsprogram*. [Intertext]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Eriksson, Anders (2017): *Retorikens grunder*. [The foundations of rhetoric]. *Studia Rhetorica Lundensia* 2. Lund: Lunds universitet.
- Fodstad, Lars August; Glende, Magnhild; Minken, Martin; Norendal, Audhild & Østmoe, Tor Ivar (2014): *Moment VG1. Norsk for studieforberevende*. [Moment]. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Fodstad, Lars August; Glende, Magnhild; Minken, Martin; Norendal, Audhild & Østmoe, Tor Ivar (2015): *Moment VG2. Norsk for studieforberevende*. [Moment]. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Fodstad, Lars August; Glende, Magnhild; Magnusson, Camilla Gudmundsdatter; Minken, Martin; Norendal, Audhild & Østmoe, Tor Ivar (2016): *Moment VG3. Norsk for studieforberevende*. [Moment]. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Garthus, Karen Marie; Kvåle, Græsli; Bjørn, Helge; Schulze, Anne-Marie & Stensby, Merete (2013): *Intertekst Vg1. Norsk Vg1 Studieforberevende utdanningsprogram*. [Intertext]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Gunnarson, Hans (2012): *Lärarens retorik. Om tal och samtal i läraryrket*. [The teacher's rhetoric. About speech and conversation in the teaching profession]. Stockholm: Liber.
- Haugsted, Mads Th. (2003): Sprogfagene og det muntlige rum. [The Language Arts subjects and the oral space]. *Sprogforum* 10(25), 50–59.
- Hoel, Torlaug Løkensgard (1990): *Skrivepedagogikk på norsk. Prosessorientert skrivning i teori og praksis*. [Teaching writing in Norwegian. Process-oriented writing in theory and practice]. Oslo: LNU/Cappelen.
- Jers, Cecilia Olsson (2011): Den retoriska arbetsprocessens betydelse för möjligheten att framstå med starkt och trovärdigt ethos i muntlig framställning. [The rhetorical canons and their significance for presenting oneself with a strong and credible

- ethos in oral presentation]. *Educare vetenskapliga skrifter* 7(1), 115–136.
- Kjeldsen, Jens & Grue, Jan (2011): The study of rhetoric in the Scandinavian countries. In Jens Kjeldsen, & Jan Grue, eds.: *Scandinavian Studies in Rhetoric. Rhetorica Scandinavica 1997–2010*, pp. 7–38. Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet (2013): *Læreplan i norsk*. [National curriculum in Norwegian Language Arts]. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Lynghelt, Anna (2015): Klassisk argumentasjonsanalyse i ett samtida medielandskap: om behovet av att utveckla argumentasjonsanalyse i skolan. [Classical argumentation analysis: About the need to develop argumentation analysis in school]. In Anders Sigrell & Sofi Qvarnström ed.: *Retorisk och lärande. Kunskap – Bildning – Ansvar. Nordiska konferansen för retorikforskning (NKRF) 2014. Studia Rhetorica Lundensia* 1, pp. 57–67. Lund: Lunds universitet.
- Penne, Sylvi (1999): Nadia og retorikken. [Nadia and rhetoric]. In Frøydis Hertzberg & Astrid Roe, eds.: *Muntlig norsk*, pp. 85–104. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.
- Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius (1920–22): *The Institutio oratoria of Quintilian. In four volumes. With an English Translation by H. E. Butler*. London: William Heinemann.
- Røskeland, Marianne; Ohrem Bakke, Jannike; Aksnes, Liv Marit & Akselberg, Gunstein (2013): *Panorama. Norsk Vg1. Studieforbereidende*. [Panorama]. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Røskeland, Marianne; Ohrem Bakke, Jannike; Aksnes, Liv Marit; Akselberg, Gunstein & Time, Sveinung (2014): *Panorama. Norsk Vg2. Studieforbereidende*. [Panorama]. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Røskeland, Marianne; Ohrem Bakke, Jannike; Aksnes, Liv Marit; Akselberg, Gunstein & Time, Sveinung (2015): *Panorama. Norsk Vg3. Studieforbereidende*. [Panorama]. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Sigrell, Anders (2008): *Retorik för lärare. Konsten att välja språk konstruktivt*. [Rhetoric for teachers. The art of choosing language constructively]. Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.
- Skolverket (2011): *Läroplan för gymnasieskolan 2011, examensmål och gymnasiegemensamma ämnen*. [National curriculum for the Swedish school]. Stockholm: Fritze.
- Undervisningsministeriet (2013): *Bekendtgørelse om uddannelsen til studentereksamen*. [National curriculum for the Danish school]. København. Undervisningsministeriet.