Rhetorical Analysis as Analytical Technique for Critical Thinking

Kim, Eun-Jeo
Associate professor, Dankook University

[Abstract]

This study aims to illustrate how rhetorical analysis can support critical thinking (CT) as an analytical technique; how understanding and application of the ancient art of rhetoric is a powerful aid to thinking critically. CT coupled with rhetorical analysis can create awareness of how social, political, cultural, and gender-based debates are rhetorically forged and how linguistic and rhetorical choices are made in particular situations. One of the fundamental epistemological positions of this study is that the rhetorical heritage of a language is within a comprehensible systematic framework. With its assistance, language users evaluate the complicated message conveyed by a text, be it written, spoken, visual, or intersemiotic one that blends the three modes. As a discriminative value of this study, Chaïm Perelman's New Rhetoric and Kenneth Burke's dramatism are adopted to analyze a multi-semiotic document. The study implies that rhetorical analysis is a persuasive technique to reveal a kind of truth which at first seems contradictory.

Key Words: rhetoric, critical thinking (CT), milti-semiotic document, epistemological position, rhetorical analysis

1. Introduction

Linking critical thinking with rhetorical analysis can unveil how meaning is forged in social, political, cultural, and gender-based issues. Since the digital revolution swept the world, creating an information explosion of unprecedented scale, philosophical controversies and polarized discourse freighted with biased information are now disseminated to an extent not previously seen. The razor thin opinion gap regarding Brexit, the prevailing conflict in U.S.-China relations, polarized American politics and society, and splintered public opinion about Korean politics are indicative of what is happening in the world.

In a world where finding balance is an increasingly difficult challenge, rhetorical analysis with critical thinking can enable any language user to become aware of how positions are taken in heated confusing debates, and of how a particular perspective is rhetorically disseminated without consideration of other points-of-view. CT is defined as objective analysis of an issue in order to form a balanced judgment on the contradictory issue (Ennis, 1987). This means CT requires linguistic analysis, more specifically rhetorical analysis.

Taken together, rhetorical analysis and CT are powerful devices that enable us, including EFL/ ESL language learners, to recognize and resist untruth, disinformation, falsehood, and delusion (Kim, 2017, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d); they enable percipience, contemplation, and autonomy in language consumers.

In this study, the historical legacy of rhetoric is explored and employed to understand how conflicting claims from limited or biased perspectives are disseminated and how information consumers are enticed to believe them. The purpose of this paper is to propose rhetorical analysis as a analytical technique for CT. To highlight the functional role of rhetorical analysis, first, this paper will

introduce several notions and concepts with the help of historical principles of rhetorical analysis; second, the paper will introduce several notions of CT guided by Chaïm Perelman's New Rhetoric and Kenneth Burke's dramatism, which is different from the previous studys and a discriminative value of this study; third, the paper will apply those theoretical frameworks to analyze a multi-semiotic document published by the Korean daily newspaper, Hangyere, concerning the recent Cho Kuk issue.

2. Rhetoric and CT

In this era of over-produced information, the researcher came across a plethora of definitions of rhetoric and CT in an online dictionary and internet library. Even in the Encyclopedia Britannica, there are several definitions, one of which is "the principles of training communicators—those seeking to persuade or inform." Another defines rhetoric as "a practical discipline that aims not at producing a work of art but at exerting through speech a persuasive action on an audience." In the Oxford Learner's Dictionary, rhetoric is defined as "the skill of using language in speech or writing in a special way that influences or entertains people," and "speech or writing that is intended to influence people, but that is not completely honest or sincere."

Those definitions tend to emphasize the negative side of rhetoric. They imply that rhetoric is persuasion by means of linguistic manipulation and deception not through rational choice of truth and logical thinking. Rhetoric is verbosity, linguistic masquerade, an ornamental but empty (Barker, 2016) if it does not achieve its goal through rational choice of language with critical thinking.

In fact, in ancient Greece in the fourth and fifth centuries BCE, rhetoric was the

core of a sophist education. Sophists did not claim to know the truth; they were concerned with what would entertain, impress, or persuade an audience (Benardete, 1991). Later, owing largely to the influence of Plato and Aristotle, rhetoric came to be defined by practical principles, distinguished from sophistry. They required a minimal commitment to the distinction between rhetoric and reality; for instance, Socrates suggested in *Gorgias* that rhetoric, as the expertise of persuasive speech, was a source of power (Plato, 2008). However, Plato, like his teacher Socrates, reintroduced the difference between true and false rhetoric examined primarily through the virtues of the philosopher's soul (McCoy, 2008).

Plato's treatment of rhetoric was derogatory but cautious as a counterpoint to cookery in the soul in *Gorgias*, calling rhetoric " a universal art of enchanting the souls in *Phaedrus*" (Plato, 2008, 81). Socrates suggested that rhetoric exerts "a kind of influence on the mind by means of words, not only in courts of law and other public gatherings" (Plato, 2008, 90). Plato posited that the aim of rhetoric was to convince by "winning the soul and the mind of the audience" by discourse. However, while rhetorical appeals are frequently wrought in highly institutionalized situations where there are regulations of societal behaviors or norms, rhetoric also applies in everyday situations. In this vein, then, rhetoric defends or promotes ideas or self for ordinary citizens by using enthymeme, not syllogism, to appeal to emotions, (Corbett, 1990; Herrick, 1997).

Dating from the fourth century BCE, Aristotle had an enormous influence on the art of the rhetoric by influencing the development of rhetorical frameworks. He defined rhetoric as the art of persuasion, a "practical discipline that aims at exerting a persuasive action on an audience through speech" (Klinck, 1992, 173). Due to its technical characteristics, and even though it was not included as part of the of trivium of the liberal arts together with logic and grammar until the medieval times,

Socrates regarded it as a counterpart of dialectic, having the power of unveiling in any particular case all of the available means of persuasion without regarding whether it bears on truth or not (Plato, 2008). In the subsequent era, Aristotle suggested that since rhetoric is concerned with making judgments, it is requisite to explore not only logical proof, but also proofs based on ethos (the ethical appeal) and pathos (the emotional appeal). It was not until the emergence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* that, in addition to logos, the cognitive features of ethos and pathos became salient (Aristotle, 1990).

In the meantime, rhetoric, coupled with the subsequent popularity of speech education, achieved intensive development to form three styles; the grand, plain, and middle style. The 'grand style (or high style)' of rhetoric, a term coined by Matthew Arnold (2002), was often used in Cicero's longer speeches to influence an audience of a particular belief or ideology by using reasonable language and style to evoke emotion, features later adopted by William Shakespeare and John Milton (Engel, 2008). Cicero pointed out that the grand rhetorical style conveyed passion to an audience but warned that if the audience was not prepared by appreciating the two other styles of speech—plain and middle style respectively used for 'teaching' and for 'pleasing', the grand style would never be realized (Nordquist, 2018). Quintilian, a Latin teacher and writer, adopting Cicero's oratory prowess as a model, conceived of rhetoric as "the art of speaking well" (Kennedy, 1972).

St. Augustine was also deeply committed to the art of speaking well, but he was more concerned with the substance of the message than its form of delivery, aware of the danger of speaking eloquently with no substantive content (Sypert, 2015). After the Renaissance, John Locke considered rhetoric a tool to be used to make known one man's thought or idea to another with as much ease and quickness as is possible in order to convey the knowledge of things. He suggested the most

important roles of rhetoric were to teach, to delight, and to persuade (Bristow, 2010).

In some studies, the definition of CT linguistically involves analysis of rhetorical device. Ennis's definition of CT is reasonable (1987), reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to think or do, and it took CT to correctly assess statements. This definition reveals rhetorical analysis is necessary to assess statements in linguistic dimension. Richard Paul's definition (1982) offered several traits of CT which resonate more like fragments of a rhetorical analysis. His definition implies language sensitivity to CT. In addition, in Lipman's definition (1988), the debate about the relationship between CT and the rhetorical analysis goes further to skillful linguistic/rhetoric correlations.

Recently linguists and educators insist on the usefulness of teaching rhetoric and critical thinking to help language users and learners procure the necessary knowledge and information to deal with practical and immediate issues they may confront (Emilia, 2005; Kim, 2017, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d; Scollon & Scollon, 1991). Hence, rhetoric is currently taught and used but still regarded negatively if it aims only for verbally manipulating an audience through fallacious arguments.

The arbitrary historical definitions of rhetoric display several features. First, rhetorical analysis has been generally regarded as a useful skill in language to assess speaker's intention. In fact, this consideration is neither positive nor negative. It substantially implies that rhetoric has to do with a speaker's skillful use of language to persuade his purpose. Second, it has been negatively identified if it is manipulated without sincerity and truthful intention, or if it is bombastic, showy, ornamented to hide the hollowness of the message. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze rhetorical devices to examine an argument from critical perspectives. Third, rhetorical analysis is considered a practical skill to develop and acquire CT for decision-making in daily social, political, and economical affairs. Therefore, mastering rhetorical analysis

enhances awareness of how persuasive techniques are developed and whether speech contains knowledge, truth, and assertion. Mastery of rhetorical analysis provides the capacity to differentiate arguments from non-arguments, evaluate their truth value, and analyze conclusions drawn from premises (Barker, 2016).

In those several respects mentioned above, rhetorical analysis is a mode of CT that many public arguments and discourses in modern society have adopted. Much of rhetorical analysis concerns investigating how speech is agreeable or disagreeable. This is why rhetoric is intrinsically connected to CT. CT based on rhetorical analysis inspires a sound skepticism toward public discourse of all sorts by examining argument patterns, styles, and truthfulness in order to unveil manipulative techniques. Rhetoric is a practical skill, particularly for language learners, that enhances their capacities to link discourse to moral action and inform rational stances towards social, political, and gender-based issues.

In conclusion, CT with rhetorical analysis gears us to rational being to evaluate discourses, texts, and speeches. CT with rhetorical analysis enhances and sustains our abilities to think critically rather than being led credulously by misleading information imposed on us. Rhetoric is relevant and crucial in helping all language users freely, rationally, and critically evaluate the texts and images we continually receive and produce. Therefore, this study promotes the critical dimension of rhetoric in every day actions and the pivotal role it may play in language learning.

Rhetorical analysis, as a CT practice, involves what is said, who says it, to whom it is said, and how it is said (Jacobs, 2000). In more pragmatic attempts, Burke's dramatism focuses on 'How something is said' and 'who says it,' while Perelman's New Rhetoric centered on 'what is said' and 'to whom it is said.' To investigate all those factors of CT practice and how they are integrated with CT, we must shift our discussion to pragmatic standpoints. 'How something is said' and 'who says it' will

be investigated by referring to Burke's dramatism in section 3, and 'what is said' and 'to whom it is said' will be explored with guidance from Perelman's New Rhetoric in section 4.

3. Kenneth Burke's Dramatism

3.1 Who Says it

Burke (1969; Turnage, 2009) metaphorically illustrates rhetoric with dramatism, in which debates in speech, discourse, or text are staged so as to make who says it and how it is said clearly shown. He argues that the dramatistic pentad comprises five rhetorical factors; *act, scene, agent, agency* and *purpose*. *Act* investigates what took place or naming what happened in thought or deed. *Scene* is related to the setting of an act by answering "when?" and "where?" Burke (1969, Cohrs, 2011; Crable, 2000) suggests that *Scene* identifies the background of an *act*, the situation in which it occurred. Therefore both of them reveal "who says it." *Agent* answers the question "by whom?" Burke defines the *agent* as "what person or kind of person performed the *act.*" *Agency* answers "how?" It implies a pragmatic point of view. Burke defines *agency* as "what instruments are used." *Purpose* is related to answering "why?" It is linked to the analysis of motive of the person "who says it," which reflects the world view of the interlocutors or speakers.

3.2 How Something is Said

According to Burke's dramatism, a debate, speech, or discourse also presents

extralinguistic elements, where their interactions are dramatized or staged. Dramatism unveils that language functions create and sustain the assertions of individuals, so Burke defines rhetoric as "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or induce actions in other humans" (Burke, 1969, 14). He presents that language itself is a powerful symbolic medium of "how it is said" that humans use to convey meaning and attitudes to communicate with others.

Burke further asserts that the impact of language exceeds mere persuasiveness; it creates dramatic scenes in which humans are cognitively active. According to Burke's theory, language has two opposing constituents; one inclines to cooperation and mutual agreement while the other actively provokes haze, distortion, confusion, and conflict. These antagonistic factors of language require the process of 'identification' for rhetorical analysis (Ambrester, 1974; Jackson, 2013). When two persons are communicating, if their interests are joined or if one person is persuaded, they identify with each other. Persuasion is realized as soon as a counterpart manages to identify with the other person to establish common ground (Kraemer, 2013). As a rhetorical analytic strategy, identification incorporates three stages: naming, identifying "an assumed we," and identifying an "antithesis" (Burke, 1969, 148).

Naming is the initial stage in the rhetorical construction of "who says it" in each scene of communication. Whenever we communicate, we identify a person, place, object, or event; interlocutors sort them out and differentiate them from other people, places, objects, or events. From this moment, the language is almost never objective or neutral. The initial naming almost always carries attitudes of "how it is said" (Burke, 1969; Quigley, 1998; Rosenfeld, 1969), and displays positioning to what has just been named. So, the initial naming signifies defining a person on the basis of what they are or what they are not. Consequently, words used to depict someone or something are to be considered as a choice made by the interlocutor. "How it is

said" will be decided accordingly. This choice has to be questioned and analyzed.

Identifying "an assumed we" implies unity and a common interest. This promotes commonality of goals, interests and values, so that they foster a strong subjective bond between speaker and audience. In this case there should be questions of what unites the two parties, how much more significant the unity is, and what keeps apart them. "How it is said" differs according to whether the person is in "us" or "them."

Likewise, the speaker proceeds from either "I" or "you" to "we", which subsequently identifies the audience with the speaker. Through this process, the speaker sets up communion (or strengthens it). Perelman (1969, 177-178) proposes that those techniques promote the communion of the speaker with his audience while decreasing the opposites' unity.

Lastly, identifying "antithesis" is encouraged by reason of having an enemy in common. It takes for granted in advance to exclude the third as an us-versus-them polarization, which puts more value on "us" than "them." In fact, identification of antithesis, as a rhetorical strategy, is by its very nature connected with language use in the process of rhetorically constructing identities and shaping attitude to counterparts.

In conclusion, identification is a rhetorical analytic device whereby audiences are invited to participate in the stage of a drama by identifying with what the interlocutor says and how they portray events, issues, or people, etc. It seeks to have the audience align with what the text conveys and the way it frames a certain perception of speech, discourse, or text.

4. Chaïm Perelman's New Rhetoric

In the 20th century, rhetoric experienced a transfer of focus from the speaker or writer to the audience or reader. It is, in fact, a standpoint shift of "to whom it is said" and "what is said" from the speech or text to the discourse consumer's point of view (Jacobs, 2000). This section of the study views rhetoric through the lens of Perelman's New Rhetoric. Perelman compounds the features of both rhetoric and dialectic in order to explore argumentative/ discourses. He focuses on argumentation as the realm of credibility, plausibility, probability, and preference. According to Perelman, argumentation is about values and value judgments. Rhetorical analysis should illustrate how convincing arguments are rhetorically structured and why particular linguistic or stylistic choices are made. Among many notions Perelman elaborates, two of particular significance from the discourse consumers' perspective are "to whom it is said" and "what is said."

4.1. To Whom it is Said

In rhetoric "to whom it is said" refers to the audience of a speech, discourse, or text. A speaker or writer endeavors to obtain a target audience by having them share a set of beliefs and values based on knowledge and level of expertise. Much of "what you say" and "how you say it" is dependent on whether you are addressing a group of experts or a more general audience, which is "to whom it is said." This will determine the terms you define, the amount of context you provide, and the level of your explanations. Perelman defines audience as "the people whom the speaker wishes to influence by his argumentation" (Perelman, 1969, 26).

  Attention to audience in argumentation is about considering how to create assent

to what is presented (Perelman, 1969, 45). In fact, Perelman is interested in how argumentation techniques are utilized to persuade by maximizing the "intensity of adherence among those who hear it (45). So, the argumentation setting is to a considerable extent determined by the audience not only by logical flow. In fact, arguments will be judged strong, weak, or successful not on the basis of their internal logic, but on the basis of their influence on the audience. (Kerr and Tindale, 2004). This means that rhetoric is a mechanism or device preceding logical development of the audience's cognitive process.

In his *New Rhetoric*, Perelman (1969) suggests that the credibility of an argument counts to a large extent on whether it invokes the target audience or not. Hence, it is indeed the audience that has the significant role in determining the quality of argument and the attitude of speakers (24). Therefore, the interaction of the audience to the argument is significant, and interdependent rules of rhetoric between speakers and audience are continually required.

By differentiating the audience into two different types, such as a "universal" audience and a "particular" audience, Perelman refers to people who are reasonable, competent and rational in the former, and those who are a more or less ambiguously sub-grouped addressees sharing a set of features (age, social class, cultural belonging, etc) in the latter (Perelman 1982, 14). According to Perelman, for the universal audience, persuasive discourse should be based on facts and truth, whereas for the particular audience, particular or concrete value discourse or a judgment grounded in the character of the subject should be addressed to achieve persuasiveness or action. In terms of audience, a particular audience is subject to persuasiveness whereas the universal audience holds to its convictions. Thus "speeches for the universal audience focus on the real; those for particular audiences focus on the preferable (Gross and Dearin 2003, 36).

4.2. What is said

"What is said" is composed of a speaker's choice of factors and how to present them. The presentation of argumentative factors is termed the creation of "presence" (Perelman, 1969). Perelman believes that what is said creates speaker's presence in linguistic form which the audience cognitively adheres to it as a sensory experience (1969, 116-117). It acts directly on our sensibility either to (a) make something absent 'presence' to the audience's mind or (b) increase the presence of something that has already obtained the audience's attention (Ibid). He assumes that a competent speaker produces presence by first analyzing how the audience knows and thinks, and then from their reaction. The speaker stylistically recreates the subsequent presence, which is gained through interacting with the sense of the audience. He compares rhetorical processes of the speech to a composition of psychological and cognitive phenomena. In these interactive phenomena, 'what is said' in argumentation achieves understanding and persuasiveness. Perelman is convinced that the development of all argumentation of 'what is said' is stimulated by the audience, to which the speaker is bound to adapt himself.

In fact, a speaker develops presence by responding to an audience's reaction to show their opinions, convictions, and commitments in a stylistically amplifying rhetorical device. Perelman's advice on presence is more or less psychological, and psychological interaction controls how the audience perceives, conceives, and memorizes the argument of 'what is said.' Presence is a stylistic rhetorical technique that a speaker uses to make things perceived, conceived and remembered in an audience's mind.

Presence develops better in several cases. When the speaker gives a repetitive exposition of the certain elements, presence develops better. When the accumulation

of contradictory accounts or details are presented in succession, presence is magnified. Another case is using imperatives as a call to action. (Perelman, 1969, 144-145). Similarly, the present tense, the singular instead of the plural, and an unusual use of the demonstrative convey the feeling of presence. More specifically, repetitive devices, such as anaphora, conduplicatio, and adjectio, magnifies its effects of presence. Synonymy and metabole paraphrase a single notion and thus suggest progressive direction in presence (Perelman, 1969, 160-162).

Presence is related to not only the speaker's linguistic presentation but also the argumentative plan, characterized by instances of association and dissociation. Through association, the speaker unifies separate factors so that an audience may cognitively and psychologically conceive a unity. Achieving presence, the speaker aims at establishing communion of 'what is said.'

In addition, Perelman (1969) asserts that there are common language rules of how a conversation may be entered into. For instance, an audience may refuse to adhere to a presence initially created by a speaker. If the audience does not accept the premises of 'what is said,' then the speaker employs fact and truth to validate them. Conversely when speaker produces acceptable premises of 'what is said,' the speaker should employ presumptions or values to which audience adheres.

Finally, a speaker can involve an audience with dialectic. A question-answer interaction enables the speaker to recognize the points of a discourse to which an audience has adhered. In the same way, the speaker recognizes what additional contents are required to support his discourse before adherence is secured (Perelman, 1969, 106-110), and provoke immediate decision to develop presence to induce cognitive and psychological action on the part of an audience. Therefore, rhetorical analysis is necessary for the audience to investigate aspects of presence. This implies that we should examine rhetorical devices to seek for implicit values and how they

directly or indirectly act on the audience's mind and feelings.

In the following section, rhetorical analysis for CT can be achieved by scrutinizing how intersemiotic arguments seek to persuade the audience.

5. A Rhetorical Analysis of an Intersemiotic Text

Based on what has been illustrated above, this study proposes that rhetorical analysis uncovers the strength or the weaknesses of speech, discourse, or text and it discloses how well or how poorly the writer or speaker conveys his/her intention. This means that all sorts of transactions in every communicative act involve rhetoric (Kennedy, 1999). Through analysis of the rhetoric, language users can remain in critical perspectives while evaluating the rhetorical style and effectiveness of a speech, discourse, or text.

Rhetorical analysis explains how the parts work together to create a certain influence—whether to persuade, entertain or inform—by exploring goals, techniques and its effectiveness. It is not a matter of agreement or disagreement with an argument; it is a matter of analyzing the argument's rhetorical construction. Rhetoric consists of naming things and people, to illustrate them for greater or lesser appeal, which can be the pathetic (emotion) by stirring emotion, the ethical (credibility) by using expertise or reputation, or the logical (reason) by using logos-driven evidence. In fact, any speech, discourse, or text attempts to earn audience approval or agreement by operating on human cognition, tendencies, or common experiences. Therefore, rhetorical analysis is relevant to the choice of facts in a particular event, how to name or identify them, how to present them, how to explain a situation.

Unveiling the explicit and implicit communicative intention of a speech, discourse,

or text is on the process of answering to "who says it," "how it is said," "to whom it is said," and "what is said" (Jacobs, 2000). The framework of rhetorical analysis, presented below, is not distinctively categorized into four critical questions. For instance, unveiling "who says it" involves several rhetorical devices, such as choice of people, the type of identification, etc. This study proposes the following framework of rhetorical analysis as one of suggestions to be critical;

A Framework of Rhetorical Analysis

1. Choice of facts, people, or events etc.

2. Naming them (I, you, we etc.)

3. The type of identification (us-versus-them)

4. The structure or arrangement of presenting them (cause and effect, Induction, deduction, etc.)

5. Kinds of rhetorical techniques used (paradox, loaded diction, hyperobole, enthymeme, analogy, amplification, alliteration, allusion, oversimplified or overgeneralized fallacy, irony, refutation(rebuttal) rhetorical question, etc.)

6. Style of presenting (fact, examples, statistics, visuals, etc.)

7. Tone (authority, quotation, expertise, using definition, common ground, testimony, anecdotes, tone, etc.)

Apart from general rhetorical devices, this study adopts notions from Perelman and Burke in order to elucidate how a particular text, discourse, or speech can be explored by rhetorical analysis, how a certain social, economic, political, or gender-based event is constructed, what factors are emphasized and made prominent, how the issue is presented, and what causative explanations and ethical and ideological assumptions are encouraged. Providing an instance of rhetorical analysis

for CT, this study will explore how an editorial cartoon in a daily newspaper rhetorically organized its claims about recent events, examine what is made present and given prominence, and how a particular audience was targeted.

The Hankyoreh's editorial cartoon under rhetorical analysis utilizes a multi-semiotic form: language diction, drawing, colors, image, and typography. All the factors are combined in the intentionality of the editorial cartoon message and purposefully manipulated to bring about an expected response in the intended audience.

This editorial cartoon is politically, historically, and ideologically imbued. It is politically imbued since it refers to two main parties: the liberal Democratic Party (DPK) and the conservative Liberty Korea Party (LKP) that are fiercely conflicted. It is historically imbued because plagiarism, academic dishonesty and academic factionalism have been strictly reproached after Hwang Woo-suk's falsified research in 2005 and Dongguk University's former professor, Sin Jeong-Ah's fabricated an academic background in 2007, which has been winked at incorrigibly in history. It is ideologically imbued because it was published in a left-wing newspaper.

The editorial cartoon, titled Cho Kuk-versus-Cho Kuk, is a pun, which denotes a controversy between what Cho Kuk asserted in the past and why he is presently roiled in difficulty in South Korea. Both the title and the image encapsulate what the editorial cartoon is about. As a law professor at Seoul National University, Cho Kuk was a symbol of justice nominated for justice minister, and the text offers the opinion of the Hankyoreh over fraud and corruption allegations from the angle of Cho Kuk himself, from which his controverted assertions are easily seen and emphasized.

Picture 1. The *Hankyoreh*'s Editorial Cartoon (2019. 08. 21)

The title and the words are semantically nuanced or convoluted; the words are in fact an inner monologue that questions harshly and bluntly an uncolored issue rampant in Korean society. This is a little surprising, since the *Hankyoreh* is aligned with a center-left stance politically and ideologically. Therefore, the allegations are strengthened by the semiotic complementarity between the title and the words. The words play as a caption of the cartoon, showing Cho Kuk in the past and Cho Kuk at the present.

In the cartoon, two fully-dressed male figures brandishing swords are brought face to face. One, in a striped blue suit facing the audience is in a dilemma; his face is totally blushed with perplexity. We can assume that this apparent dandy wearing a fashionable stripped suit, with his hair slanting down on his forehead is present Cho Kuk, while past Cho Kuk, holding a law book and wearing black, has his back turned to the audience, says to the past Cho Kuk "What happened to your daughter's

suspicious thesis?" They confront each other with grim postures, unable to avoid each other. The attitudes and appearances of the two Cho Kuks are intended to communicate his controversial stance and that a collision cannot be avoided. In fact, how the figures in the cartoon are dressed and the posture of their bodies convey symbolic codes indicating their social identities. The blue colored background is rolling up, reinforcing the impression of total chaos saturated with flame-like clouds, indicating that the havoc and tension are ongoing.

The cartoon is supposed to produce some level of political or social commentary and to offer or to question a facet of current affairs in the national context. Like many newspaper cartoons, it provides a genuine claim based on truth: it is preferential to grasp and to reflect what exists in the society. However, the layout of the editorial cartoon is pivotal to the construction of the genuine claim and intention.

The layout is not randomly placed in the editorial cartoon but is schemed for diverse purposes, the most significant of which is to deliver to viewers an awareness of truthfulness and justice. The consistency and cooperation of all features conveys the message. As an inter-semiotic document, the visual presentation offered by the editorial cartoon is further evoked and manifested by the words. The words are, in fact, the main naming chosen by the *Hankyoreh*.

As presented above, naming cannot be neutral; it is a rhetorical device that identifies and illustrates events and people from a certain position. By using modifiers to define Cho Kuk in the past as "a law scholar who was strict on plagiarism and academic factionalism", and by defining Cho kuk at present "A nominee for justice minister", the *Hankyoreh* avoids emotionally evocative or sarcastic language, but the SNS comments written by Cho Kuk's supporters under the editorial cartoon is spiteful and slanderous. The lexical terms are obviously neither flattering nor derogatory; on the contrary, they are factual and almost self-reflective.

The two Cho Kuks are merely descriptive and not associated with any ideological value. However, the two figures on the editorial cartoon invite the audience to build a simple association of conflicts between what the past Cho Kuk and the present Cho Kuk claim, causing left-leaning Cho Kuk supporters to feel that the *Hankyoreh* is against Cho Kuk.

In fact, visual and lexical codes give weight to what the *Hankyoreh* claims to be facts and endow them with presence. Both the true claims of the visual image and words show inner conflict and self-reflection of Cho Kuk, which possibly incite antipathy in left-leaning supporters. The editorial cartoon is indeed a method of delivering a message to the targeted audience of the newspaper of the truthfulness and factuality of what happened. It is supposed to appeal to the target audience, to unveil subjectivity, or to make them aware of what troubles the situation. However, this conception of the *Hankyoreh* is undermined by a naive premise that the target audience expects only a promise of objectivity. Needless to say, the inter-semiotic code in the editorial cartoon is far from neutral; it purposefully takes part in the naming and presence that rhetorically structured an ideological manifestation of the Cho Kuk issue.

The naming process is complicated in this editorial cartoon; under its factual and neutral presence with its images of Cho Kuk in the past and at present and a supposedly rhetorical question, it activates a typical presentation of politics involved in the issues of 2019. Nouns such as "plagiarism" "academic factionalism," and "suspicious thesis," label social stigmas, creating negative associations and a negative portrayal of those involved.

Indeed, the naming choices convey a particularly conflicting and troublesome representation of academic swindlers, rivalry between school factions, and set them apart from what the *Hankyoreh* considers social havoc. Undoubtedly, the

identification and naming together with the choice of facts presentation serve an ideological and an ethical function. They established the stance adopted by the newspaper and caused the supporters of Cho Kuk to be spiteful. The rhetorical devices used here are a persuasive strategy appealing to pathos that is supposed to bring forth an emotional response from the target audience. They not only to establish a stance for explaining what is genuinely at issue, namely the Cho Kuk issue of 2019, but also to instill a sense of indignation in the targeted audience.

What is missed from the *Hankyoreh*'s position is that not only are naming and presence in concordance, they are audience-specific. Naming and presence bring about a process of identification between the newspaper and the targeted audience. In this naming and presence process, labeling people, events, objects and their connotative meanings should be geared cautiously attending to how the target audience of the *Hankyoreh* may respond. In fact, naming plays a role as an information-processing phase for analyzing the current issue and how the cartoon presents it without bias. However, the image in the editorial cartoon is a subjective position of Cho Kuk, from which the target audience of the *Hankyoreh* is enticed to interpret that the *Hankyoreh* doesn't take side of Cho Kuk. Actually, the image of Cho Kuk's inner conflict carves out a subjective position from which the target audience is enticed to interpret the "facts" provided by the image, bestowing presence to a cliched depiction of a conflicted Cho Kuk.

As seen from the rhetorical analysis of the semiotic document, the naming strategies and the presence produce a particular response by dissociation and anti-thesis. The target audience's failure to understand the *Hankyoreh*'s intention is enticed to be outraged and resentful, since the inner conflict of Cho Kuk and what they represent metonymically are understood so negatively that some audience of the *Hankyoreh* can't help refusing acceptance and condemn the *Hankyoreh*. What

protrudes is dis-identification between the *Hankyoreh* and some audience. The audience identified with Cho Kuk and not with the *Hankyoreh* and the audience did not establish communion with the editorial cartoon but was opposed to the *Hankyoreh*.

In sum, the naming and presence exclude or include implicitly, and in this semiotic document they delineate a dividing line between "us," the *Hankyoreh* and its target audience. This binary antithesis identification is in itself a persuasive strategy that guarantees a feeling of communion and closeness with the "us" group keeping aloof from the 'them' group so that the target audience comes to determine whether they endorse the newspaper's stance or not.

6. Conclusion

This study has explored how rhetorical analysis is of significance when it comes to critically evaluating the credibility of an argument by analyzing, and scrutinizing a text. One of rhetoric's aims is to enable us to focus on what is suggested in texts, discourse or speech. In fact, rhetorical analysis of the semiotic document in this study suggests that the situations we confront in our everyday transactions are rhetorically transformed into mere versions in texts, discourse, or speech. One of the aims of rhetorical analysis is to delve for meaning, intention, and value, to understand how argumentation is implemented and persuasion is attained. Therefore, teaching rhetorical analysis integrated with CT provides keen insights into how argument is manipulated.

Rhetorical analysis of an inter-semiotic document in this study, based on adopted notions such as audience, presence, identification, naming, offers a method to explore

how language and images can persuade or mislead. The rhetorical analysis of this study has elucidated that the naming choices set the inner conflict, define the issue, question the problem, and leave moral and ideological judgments to the audience. All these rhetorical factors reciprocally bolster linguistic features and heighten a certain ideological position to significance and maximize it even though the newspaper claims to support neutrality and factuality.

This study proposed that a combination of various rhetorical devices influence an audience by rhetorically structured identification, dissociation and antithesis. The audience is invited to take a stance based on what is depicted, but interactive adjustment between the audience and texts is significant to achieve persuasiveness.

In conclusion, this study has brought to the fore-front rhetorical analysis and CT in order to make a claim about its integrative function, how rhetorical analysis supports CT, how rhetorical analysis guides us to notice salient aspects of argument, and how rhetorical analysis leads to evaluation of reliability and by extension hones our own argumentation skills.

In relation to this conclusion, one of the assumptions of this study was that rhetorical analysis may be adopted to speech writing, analysis of advertisement text, even to English text reading in EFL situation, as English is the most widely used language for global communication. Hopefully, future studies will apply integrated rhetorical analyses and CT in the research that supports language learners by developing and designing curricula and language learning materials that incorporate these insights.

Works Cited

Ambrester, Roy. "Identification Within: Burke's View of the Unconscious." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 7.4 (1974): 205-16. Print.

Arnold, M.. *On Translating Homer: Three Lectures Given At Oxford.* E-Texts for Victorianists. 2002. E-text, ed. Alfred J. D. https://web.archive.org/web/20140623011516/http://www.victorianprose.org/texts/Arnold/Works/on_translating_homer.pdf

Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. *Readings from Classical Rhetoric.* Ed. P. P. Matsen, P. B. Rollinson, and M.. Sousa. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

Barker S. "Environmental Communication in Context." *Front Ecol Environ* 4 (2006): 328–29.

Benardete, S. *The Rhetoric of Morality and Philosophy.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

Bristow, W. "Enlightenment." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/ 2010.

Burke, K. "A Rhetoric of Motives." Ed. P. Bizzell and B. Herzberg. *The Rhetorical Tradition, 1018-1034.* Boston, MA: Bedford, 1969.

Corbett E.P.J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Cohrs, B. *Kenneth Burke's Dramatism.* California State University at Fresno, 2011. Retrieved from http://zimmer.csufresno.edu/~johnca/spch100/5-3-burke.htm

Crable, B. "Burke's Perspective on Perspectives: Grounding Dramatism in the Representative Anecdote." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 86 (2000): 318-33.

Engle, W.E. "John Milton's Recourse to Old English: A Case-Study in Renaissance Lexicography." *LATCH: A Journal for the Study of the Literary Artifact in*

Theory, Culture, or History 1 (2008).

Emilia, E. *A Critical Genre Based Approach to Teaching Academic Writing in a Tertiary EFL Context in Indonesia.* PhD. thesis, Dept. of Language, Literacy and Arts Education, University of Melbourne. (2005).

URI http://hdl.handle.net/11343/39548

Ennis, R.H. "A Taxonomy of Critical Thinking Dispositions and Abilities." *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice.* Ed. J.B. Baron and R.J. Sternberg. New York: W.H. Freeman, 1987. 9-26.

Gross, A.G. and R.D. Dearin. *Chaim Perelman.* Albany: State U of New York P, 200).

Herrick, J.A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric.* Boston: Pearson, 1997.

Jacobs S. "Rhetoric and Dialect from the Standpoint of Normative Pragmatics." *Argumentation* 14 (2000): 261-86.

Jackson, Chonticia Y. *The Use of Rhetoric in Public Relations: Kenneth Burke's Theory of Identification and Consubstantiality* 2013. Dissertations, Theses and Capstone Projects. Paper 556.

https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1560&context=etd

Kim, Eunjeo. "Fostering Criticality in English Presentation Class for EFL Learners." *The Journal of Studies in Language* 33.1 (2017): 45-70.

_____. "Scrutinizing Critical Reading Strategies (CRS) for Implicit Meaning Comprehension in EFL Context." *Studies in Linguistics* 47 (2018a): 279-305.

_____. "Criticality: A Framework for Teaching English in EFL Context." *eLSOK* 24.1 (2018b): 123-52.

_____. "A Study on Self-Critical Reflections of Illocutionary Act Strategies Utilized in L2 Learners' Social Network Service." *STEM Journal* 19.2 (2018c):

121-43.

_____. "Enhancing Criticality in EFL Learners through Active Critical Writing Program."*British & American Studies* 42 (2019d): 201-30.

Kennedy, G.A. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.‒A.D. 300.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1972.

_____. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2d ed. Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 1999.

Kerr, N.L. and R.S. Tindale. "Group Performance and Decision Making." *Annual Review of Psychology* 55 (2004): 623‒56.

Klinck, D.R. *The Word of The Law, Approaches to Legal Discourse,* Canada: Carleton UP, 1992.

Kraemer, Don J. "Between Motion And Action: The Dialectical Role Of Affective Identification in Kenneth Burke." *Advances In The History Of Rhetoric* 16.2 (2013): 141-64.

McCoy, M.. *Plato on the Rhetoric of Philosophers and Sophists*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.

Lipman, M. *Thinking in Education*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Nordquist, R. *Subordinating Conjunction*. 2018. https://www.thoughtco.com/subordinating-conjunction

Quigley, B. L. "'Identification' as a Key Term in Kenneth Burke's Rhetorical Theory." *American Communication Journal* 1.3 (1998): 1-5.

Perelman, C. *The Social Contexts of Argumentation*. Trans. John Petrie. *Perelman's The Idea of Justice and the Problem of Argument.* NY: Humanities, 1963.

Perelman C. and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric*. Trans. J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1969.

Perelman, C. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Trans. William Kluback. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1982.

Plato. *The Complete Works of Plato*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. New York: Akasha, 2008.

Rosenfeld, L.B. "Set Theory: Key to the Understanding of Kenneth Burke's Use of the Term 'Identification'." *Western Speech* 33 (1969): 175-83.

Scollon, R., & S.W. Scollon. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995.

Sypert, J.A. "Redeeming Rhetoric: Augustine's Use of Rhetoric in His Preaching Ministry." *Eleutheria: A Graduate Student Journal* 4.1 (2015): 18-34.

Turnage, A. K. "Scene, Act and the Tragic frame in the Duke Rape Case." *Southern Communication Journal* 74 (2009): 141-56.

국문초록

수사 분석과 비평적 사고와의 상관관계

김 언 조

단독 / 단국대학교 부교수

본 연구의 목표는 수사 분석과 비평적 사고가 상호작용하는 과정을 논의하는 것이다. 즉 고대의 수사적 기술에 대한 이해와 적용이 어떻게 비평적으로 사고하는데 강력한 도움이 될 수 있는지를 논의하고자 한다. 수사 분석과 상관관계가 높은 비평적 사고는 사회적, 정치적, 문화적, 성차별기반의 논쟁이 어떻게 수사적으로 구축되어 있는지, 그리고 특정한 상황에서 어떻게 언어적, 수사적 선택이 이루어졌는지에 대해서 자각할 수 있게 한다. 본 연구의 가장 근본적인 인식론적인 입장은 언어의 수사적인 유산이 이해가능한 체계적 틀 안에 있다는 것이다. 따라서 언어 사용자는 언어의 수사적 유산을 이용하여 쓰여진 텍스트이거나, 말해진 텍스트이거나, 시각적 텍스트이거나 혹은 세 가지의 방식을 모두 종합한 다중 기호적 텍스트에서 전달되는 복잡한 메시지를 평가할 수 있도록 도울 수 있다는 것을 전제로 한다. 본 연구에서는 다중 기호적 문서를 분석하기 위해서 챔 패럴만의 새로운 수사학과 케니스 벌크의 드라마주의를 채택하였다.

주제어: 수사학, 비평적 사고, 다중 기호적 문서, 인식론적 입장, 수사 분석

이름: 김언조
소속: 단국대학교 교육대학원 교육학과
주소: (우)16890 경기도 용인시 수지구 죽전로 152 인문관 517호
이메일: wingit@hanmail.net