



## **Variance in the Use of Invitational and Intrusive Rhetoric in Online EFL Teaching Discourse**

Presley V. De Vera, Ed.D.

*Associate Professor and ESL faculty, Pangasinan State University*

*Member, National Gender and Development Resource Pool, Philippine Commission on Women*

*Candidate, Doctor of Communication (DComm) at the University of the Philippines Open University (second doctorate degree)*

### **Abstract**

Teaching discourses essentially presuppose the use of rhetoric. This study that doubly registers as EFL Research and Communication Research draws on the Theory of Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric Theory of Communication to investigate rhetoric undertones in the teaching discourses of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers engaged in online teaching. The case study involved four participants of equal number of male and female teachers to account for sex-aggregated analysis. It employed Sinclair & Coulthard's method of classroom discourse analysis in the transcription of the teachers' spoken corpora. Findings revealed that (1) male and female teachers used rhetoric in the online teaching of EFL courses, and (2) they used rhetoric in the context of deploying certain discourse functions. On the varied rhetoric intents of the teachers underlying their rhetorical moves, male and female teachers account exhaustively on the use of all types of rhetoric, i.e. Foss' typology of invitational and patriarchal rhetoric (operationalized in this study as "intrusive rhetoric"), and the latter's sub-types. There have been noted difference, both remarkable and less significant, between male and female teachers' rhetoric practices. As a major contribution of the study, it poses significant supplement and a stark critique to Foss' Invitational Rhetoric Theory of Communication.

From the synthesis of the study's findings and conclusions, several recommendations are offered for the improvement of English language pedagogy, for future research, and the interest of advancement in theorizing under the rhetoric tradition in the field of communication and its complementary insights to the enterprise of teaching EFL.

**Keywords:** Communication research, Rhetoric Theory of Communication, Invitational and Patriarchal Rhetoric, Teaching Discourse, English Language Teaching / EFL, Discourse Analysis, Sex-Aggregated Study.

## **Introduction**

The enterprise of teaching, i.e. to speak of teaching any subject matter, basically presupposes a process of communication (Muste, 2016). On a closer look, the act of teaching is not just as simple as imparting a set of information or transferring a knowledge or skill to a learner. Such process essentially involves communicating the subject matter or the informational or the knowledge that one intends to teach the learner, always in the context of a teacher's motive to negotiate with the learner that some knowledge or skills are worth learning.

When one engages in teaching, the motive of a teacher is geared towards the expected result which is to cause learning on the part of the student. This means that the teacher often takes up a leverage to select or determine what, exactly, is the subject matter to be taught, or the teacher determines the scope and delimitation of the subject matter being taught (Unciano, 2010). This involves even a teacher's assumed authority to determine the method or approach in teaching a subject matter. In other words, the teacher does not only teach a subject matter as objectively as it is but imparts a knowledge or information in some "package". That is why the knowledge and information that reaches the student already reflects the teacher's own perspectives, schema, and conceptual framework of a subject matter, impregnated with the teacher's own biases. Thus, the teacher attempts not just to impart knowledge per se but is adjacently in a rhetoric gesture of negotiating with the learner to accept the meaningfulness of a knowledge in the context of the teacher's intellectual filters. Therefore, no knowledge is truly imparted in an objective sense as much as what the learner receives is always the kind of knowledge that is structured by the teacher. That is why, the educative process can only be too ideally viewed as a process involving mere transfer of knowledge as much as it is actually more realistically a process that involves indoctrination to a certain degree, i.e. knowledge as what and how the teacher structures or organizes it, and thus decides what he or she wants the learner to know.

In the above context, it becomes clear that the act of teaching would essentially presuppose a rhetoric gesture. A research by Petek (2014) entitled "The Teacher as a Public Speaker in the Classroom" also concurs with this idea. As such, an essential component of public speaking discourse, i.e. "rhetoric" is, indeed, inextricable and inevitable in teaching. And in this more realistic view, it becomes less presumptuous to define teaching as an enterprise of persuading or negotiating with a learner as to what a teacher thinks ought to be learned about a subject matter. The teacher is

not just a disinterested medium for the transfer of knowledge but basically always assuming the stance of a “rhetor” in relation to the learner who serves as the “audience” of a rhetoric discourse.

### **Rhetoric and Teaching**

The view that teaching can be closely intertwined with rhetoric practices is also hinted in the article by Modesti (2012) published in *Current Issues in Education*, there is a shift of attention to the ability of educators and school personnel to communicate effectively with those involved in a student’s “circle of support” is critical to the welfare of students, the efficacy of the educational experience, and the morale of the educational context and climate. Modesti adds further that schools must foster collaborative relationships with parents and communities, as these efforts will profoundly affect the welfare of students. Evidently then, educators’ communicative skills are critically important to foster not only effective instruction and classroom management strategies, but also in regard to the relational duties involved with the profession of teaching.

In the above context, Modesti opines that many educators are not well prepared or trained for communicative interactions. She also theorized that the art and practice of teaching should presuppose anticipating the varying collection of communicative incidences for which an educator must prepare.

### **Language Teaching and Rhetoric**

“Language teaching” which is the object of analysis using the “rhetoric communication theory” is the focus of this research and is more specifically braced on the enterprise of teaching of English as a foreign language to learners who are non-native speakers.

One prominent theorist in Language Education is R.C. Gardner, who was known for his Socioeducational Model of Language Learning Motivation (Gardner, 1985). Gardner’s research in language education focused on the causal relation between language learning and a learner’s motivational orientation in learning a language. He theorized that it is integrative motivation compared to instrumental motivation that facilitates more effectively a language learning process. Gardner’s theory is technically focused on the part of the language learner by examining the orientation of the learner when it comes to his or her motivation to learn a target language. To complement Gardner’s theory, this research attempts to characterize the rhetoric communication pattern of teachers, theoretically assumed to have an agentive and a very influential role in moulding the language learner’s attitude and motivation towards the target language. The theoretical assumption of this research is that language teachers, as to their manner of communicating to the students, either consciously or unconsciously structure the learning atmosphere on which students’

build their own motivation and attitude towards the learning of the target language. The language learner then eventually forms a perception of the learning of the target language as how the learner is convinced about the cultural, moral or practical value of such learning endeavour. As much as this invokes the role of the teacher persuading the learner, then such role necessarily signifies to the nature of the teacher's rhetoric communication skills.

### **Rhetoric Undertones in Language Teaching**

The conceptual framework of this research which is about characterizing the underlying rhetoric communication incepted in the teaching process signifies to the choice of the type of rhetoric that a teacher chooses to employ in his or her communicative interaction with the learner.

In classifying the types of rhetoric, the theory of Foss and Griffin (Craig and Muller, 2007) comes to the fore. Burke theorized a sort of a bipolar rhetoric or two opposing rhetoric traditions. Foss and Griffin's theory rhetoric sets a milestone in the scholarly discussions of the Rhetoric Theory of Communication. Burke's unprecedented explanations have altogether altered the once undisturbed concept of rhetoric from a tradition that has since endured from the time of such ancient philosophers as Plato and Aristotle. To speak of the polarized types of rhetoric, Foss and Griffin proposed a feminist perspective of rhetoric to contrast with the traditional view of rhetoric. In his article titled "A Rhetoric of Motives" (Craig and Muller, 2007), Burke explains that:

*The traditional conception of rhetoric, in summary, is characterized by efforts to change others and thus to gain control over them, self-worth derived from and measured by the power exerted over others, and a devaluation of the life worlds of others. This is a rhetoric of patriarchy, reflecting its value of change, competition, and domination. But these are not the only values on which a rhetorical system can be constructed, and we would like to propose as one alternative a feminist rhetoric ... primary among the feminist principles on which our rhetoric is based is a commitment to the creation of relationships of equality, and to the elimination of dominance and elitism ... definition and explication of a rhetoric built on the principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination rather than on the attempt to control others through persuasive strategies designed to effect change. Although we believe that persuasion is often necessary, we believe an alternative exists that may be used in instances when changing and controlling others is not the rhetor's goal; we call this rhetoric invitational rhetoric.*

Foss and Griffin's theoretical position is to qualify a rhetoric theory based on peoples' motive when engaging in rhetoric gestures. In this line, Foss and Griffin propose that these motives are somewhat gender-conditioned. For instance, the so-called traditional concept of rhetoric as anchored on the aim for persuasion is said to be a patriarchal tradition. This seems to suggest an obvious bias as to what can be considered as patriarchal or matriarchal but the choice to ascribe such rhetoric tradition to "masculinity" is nevertheless understandable given our general cultural and historical view of what masculinity has been typically represented. Foss and Griffin think that a rhetoric grounded on persuasion also indicates a motive to dominate, or control or overpower which are stereotyped to be masculine traits. On the other hand, Foss and Griffin raise our awareness to an alternative rhetoric and its peculiarities in a feminist perspective, or what they consider as opposed to a masculine orientation of rhetoric.

Foss and Griffin's concept of rhetoric in the patriarchal tradition is basically a type of "intrusive rhetoric" or a rhetoric with an intrusive motive as may be faithfully construed from the concept of Foss and Griffin. Merriam Webster's dictionary defines "intrude" as an act of "thrusting oneself in and upon someone without invitation, welcome or permission" or an act of "entering by force". The researcher thus proposed that the term "intrusive" and its semantic qualifications fit perfectly into Foss and Griffin's conceptual framework of the masculine-oriented type of rhetoric or the so-called patriarchal rhetoric. This coinage of an alternative term to refer to such type of rhetoric is herein proposed only to depart from a very reductionist and gender-biased reference to the types of rhetoric being associated to either being patriarchal or feminist, or being masculine or feminine, which may have some sexist connotation. After all, the theory is not aimed at gender stereotyping but simply to enable an operational typology of rhetoric, which is conveniently gender neutral. This researcher thus used the term "intrusive rhetoric" and "invitational rhetoric" as politically appropriate terms to address ethical considerations especially in the interest of gender sensitivity. The researcher is also actively engaged in advocacy and cause-oriented activities under Gender and Development (GAD).

### **Redemption of the Image of Rhetorical Practice in Teaching**

Both for its practical and theoretical significance, this current study intends to contribute to the appreciation of "rhetoric" as one of the integral practices in teaching, and in the specific context of this study --- the use of rhetoric in teaching English as a foreign language in an online instructional setting (contrasted from traditional classroom setting). On a more general sense, the practice of rhetoric in general and in all other settings besides the instructional setting also calls for

the exigency to clarify our biases and presumptions about it, especially that most of these have been negative.

The negative stereotypes on rhetoric are enunciated in many scholarly literature and articles. In the article of Foss published in the Encyclopedia of Communication Theory, she referred to the pervasively negative view of rhetoric that endures even to this day. Foss likewise insinuated that this biased for a negative view on rhetoric traces back to the influence of Ancient Greek Philosophers, particularly the famous Plato.

An article by Davis (2013) published by the Michigan Radio Newsroom likewise indicates the overwhelming stigma on rhetorics as reflected in the quotes below excerpted from his article. Notably, however, David cued on the rhetoric practice being integral to teacher discourse. Davis (2013) cues the exigency to redeem the image of rhetoric in the academic enterprise. On this reason, this current study is an attempt to clarify the value of rhetoric by purifying it from the dominant bias that rhetoric is employable only in the context of deception or mere persuasion for its own sake.

### **Filling the Gap in Teaching Discourse Studies and Theorizing**

This current study was not conceptualized from a vacuum nor is its exigencies imposed from nowhere. Indubitably, there have been previous studies on “teaching discourse”. In fact, the latter can be such a frequent item of analysis but mostly in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) studies, or Linguistic studies, or Language Education studies. In most of the ways the phenomenon of teaching discourse is treated, it is more commonly associated to recommendations on improving teaching strategies in the classroom or its catalytic importance in promoting classroom atmosphere with low levels of anxiety or affective filter, conducive for second language learners to be more communicative or more productive in the second language they are attempting to learn or approximate. In all these cases, teaching discourse is mostly analyzed at how it can be instrumental to learners’ development of proficiency in a second language. But these are concerns in the realm of language education studies. In contrast, the aim in this study is to analyze teaching discourse from its most fundamental qualification as a “communicative practice” even prior to any regard for it as instrumental to promoting learning competencies. And this is also precisely where a “gap” can be perceived. It has become too overwhelming to note that scholars have almost always seen teaching discourse as a phenomenon for its instrumentality in a language education setting, and not the primordially bare fact of what it really is --- “Communication”. And basically, all attempts at theorizing teaching discourse on the level of its instrumentality in language education can only turn out to be incomplete unless we really understand its dynamics from a genuinely “communication

analysis”. And thus, the import of a Communication study on this phenomenon enters the scene to fill in most of the gap in the understanding of the dynamics of teaching discourse.

### **Research Objectives**

The focal specimen of communication dealt with in this study explored the intricacies of instructional communication or how teachers, specifically language teachers, account for communication in the process of teaching. In the allied field of Applied Linguistics, the communicative discourse of a teacher while in the performance of his or her function is also known as “teacher talk”. Thus, the characterization of this communication specimen, i.e. teacher talk, was taken here as the object of analysis. Moreover, the intricacies of teacher talk in an online EFL (English as a Foreign Language) instructional setting is staked in this study, in which analysis centered on the rhetoric types and undertones imbedded in teacher talk in an online instructional setting.

The enterprise of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Instruction has blossomed through the years. In the Philippines, various companies have been established to offer EFL teaching that caters to foreigner students, usually from other Asian countries and even countries outside Asia (McGeown, 2012). Adjacent the proliferation of companies offering EFL instruction services in the Philippines is the growing popularity of “online teaching” as a viable alternative instructional delivery mode adopted by many EFL companies. Online teaching has offered tenable advantages and benefits not commonly associated with regular schools that cater to either group or individualized instruction (Coleman, 2010). While individualized instruction is primordially possible in a face-to-face setting, the uniqueness features of individualized online teaching facilitate an environment said to be more psychologically convenient for the learner, with less degree of anxiety and lower affective filters compared to a face-to-face setting (Bolliger & Halupa, 2011). In an online instruction setting, it was generally found that learners are more comfortable and less intimidated when expressing themselves in the target language, and expressing their own thoughts, reflections, sentiments and challenges in the learning process (Guinan, 2014). As regards to this, there appears to be more than a mere difference in the delivery mode and medium between face-to-face teaching and online teaching. Online teaching with its unique features also set a distinct nuance in the manner and mechanics of communication between the teacher and the learner. As such, the communication phenomenon in the context of online teaching opens the research venue to investigate the distinct command and use of rhetoric by the participants of the communication process.

In view of the above, this study aimed to analyse the “verbal interactions” involved in the enterprise of online teaching English and thereby treats the teaching process as basically a

communication phenomenon. More specifically, the analysis meant to detect the manifestation of teachers' use of rhetoric, regardless of it being either unconscious or intentional.

The study analyzed the characteristics of the communication process that transpires in the online teaching of EFL from the standpoint of the Rhetoric Theory of Communication. Thus, the research navigated towards a series and sequence of investigative tasks braced on the following objectives:

1. Identify the rhetorically functional sentence structures in the teacher talk of online EFL teachers, particularly during their online dialogue with their students.
2. Determine the discourse functions of the teacher talks that are identified as rhetorically functional sentence structures.
3. Classify the rhetorically functional sentence structures from the teacher talks into invitational rhetoric and intrusive rhetoric types based on the rhetoric intent of the discourses.

## **Research Design and Methodology**

### **Research Setting and Participants**

The setting of the study is GnGn Eikaiwa Phils., Inc. Clark (GGE for brevity). It is an office-based online education company located in Pampanga, Philippines. The company provides EFL (English as a Foreign Language) education to mostly Japanese students and to non-native English speakers through online teaching programs. To date, the company is among the Top 5 popular online English schools in Japan.

The study employed a total of four (4) online EFL teachers as case subjects, with an equal number of male and female members (i.e. two male and two female teachers). The teachers were currently active and regular employees of GnGn Eikawa (GGE) Philippines-Pampanga at the time of data retrieval. The teachers were commonly assigned "accounts" (i.e. EFL courses) in which they handled Japanese EFL learners. The four male and female teachers dealt with either male or female students. The balance in the sex-distribution of the teachers was done purposively to which the GGE management concurred, as they were the one who identified the teachers to serve as case subjects.

### **Data Gathering Tool**

To determine evidence on the manifestations of rhetoric in the teacher participants' discourses, all the teachers' utterances in the duration of their online teaching and dialogue with their



respective students were recorded, i.e. audio-visual recording. This did not entail a complex procedure since it was integral to the management system of the GGE company to generate audio-visual records of their teachers' activities during the online session. This was part of their monitoring system to check on the performance of their teachers.

**A. Recording of the online teacher-learner interaction.** This refers to the documentation of the online communication exchanges between the teacher participant and his or her student. However, the object of observation here is reduced only to the level of "verbal communication", i.e. teacher talk as "utterances" (or spoken statements).

**B. Transcription of online teacher-learner interactions.** Verbatim transcription was conducted by the researcher based on the recordings provided by the GGE Management. The transcription was done in order to: (a) identify the study's basic unit of analysis, and (b) provide a concrete reference where more detailed analysis of the rhetoric-infused teacher discourses could be availed. The format of the transcription made use of Sinclair and Coulthard's Model (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).

### **Data Gathering Procedure and Analysis**

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis were used to examine the manifestations of rhetoric in teacher-talk. Presentation and discussion of data and the findings were allocated for the accounts from each teacher participant, although syntheses were also provided at the end of the discussions under each research objective. The syntheses made were also meant to offer sex-aggregated data and perspective to the findings.

### **Determining the manifestations of rhetoric undertone in online teaching discourses**

Manifestations of the teachers' use of rhetoric in their online communicative discourses with their students is technically understood as deriving or isolating the chunks of teacher talk that are identified to have rhetoric undertones.

It was a primordial assumption that not all the utterances of a teacher-participant recorded from his or her online communication with the student are expected to manifest rhetoric undertones. Somehow, this has been anticipated from the beginning. Thus, the need to isolate only those utterances that are embedded with rhetoric undertones. To facilitate this, the recordings were carefully transcribed to enable a more focused observation of every utterance of the teacher.

Likewise, each utterance was not simply observed as a fragment but in relation to the entire flow of discourse. The context of an utterance in relation to the whole discourse also helped the researcher to determine whether a rhetoric undertone was in effect in a particular utterance.

To determine whether a specific utterance bore a rhetoric intent, the statement is carefully analyzed of its semantic and pragmatic meaning. On top of that, each statement is analyzed in relation to the criteria set for the different types of rhetoric. A specific utterance or statement of a teacher is thus qualified as to whether or not it contains a rhetoric undertone. If a statement or utterance qualifies as such, then it was isolated and labeled as a “rhetorically functional sentence structure” (or RFSS for brevity). The RFSS units extracted from the recorded discourse corpus of each teacher participant are then collected and placed in a table as a visual presentation that served as a reference in their discussion. To avoid a presentation of the RFSS units as mere fragments extracted from the teacher-student dialogue, the entire portion of the dialogue from where they were extracted was also reflected in the tables. In this way, this kind of presentation also aids in explaining and discussing why these particular utterances were qualified as RFSS units.

### **Determining the discourse functions of rhetorically charged online teaching discourses**

To determine the specific discourse functions to which the teacher’s use of rhetoric was noted to be active, the Teacher Discourse Functions Inventory by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975 in Cockayne, 2010) was used. The theoretical assumption is that use of rhetoric is associated with the function of the discourse containing a rhetoric undertone. This means that there may be variations in the extent of using rhetoric depending on certain discourse functions

The model used for the above mentioned analysis is patterned after the procedure of Sinclair & Coulthard (1975 in Cockayne, 2010). Cockayne used the same model in his study “Applying the Sinclair & Coulthard Model of Discourse Analysis to a Student-Centered EFL Classroom”. This model intends to analyze the discourse of an EFL teacher as he or she deals with the student/s in a classroom setting, although it was specifically adopted in this study to analyze the teacher’s discourse while dealing with his or her student in an online EFL instructional setting.

The researcher also considered to resort to external expert consultation with an EFL researcher, Dr. Galahad Randall S. Unciano, for the purpose of seeking his recommendations and comments on the method of analyzing the functions of the teaching discourses. This expert consultation extends to the guidance provided to the researcher on the actual classification of the teaching discourses into the different discourse functions.

### **Determining the rhetoric intent and the type of rhetoric employed by the online EFL teachers**

The third and final research objective is meant to make the respective “rhetoric intents” of the teachers explicit by inferring them from the RFSS units. In actual communication, a rhetor would not divulge explicitly his or her rhetoric intent to the audience. When one offers a rhetoric discourse, he or she does not usually state that he or she is pulling a rhetoric strategy to persuade the audience to accept an idea or to make them act or decide in a certain way. The rhetor normally keeps the rhetoric intent to himself or herself, or at least, from the target audience.

The third research objective, however, branches yet into a second level of analysis, and that is to determine the specific rhetoric types used by the teachers. It is obvious here that the two levels of analysis, i.e. (a) determining the rhetoric intents of the teachers, and (b) determining the rhetoric types the teachers employ, were lumped under one statement of research objective and that is because these levels of analysis are indeed complementary. The teacher whose role as a rhetor in this study initially accounts for a rhetoric intent. It is assumed that a teacher who assumes the role of a rhetor must have a rhetoric intent. The rhetoric intent, though, is just a mental disposition that needs to be concretely executed and completed through an actual communication, otherwise a rhetoric intent remains to be a mere intent. To account for a rhetoric discourse requires the rhetor’s selection of a type of rhetoric to use in the actual communication of his or her rhetoric intent to the target audience. It is also possible that two different rhetors having a similar rhetoric intent may choose different types of rhetoric to communicate their rhetoric intent.

For the methodology, the process of identifying the teachers’ respective rhetoric intents was through a careful analysis of their respective RFSS units. Here, it is important to note that there is no one-to-one correspondence wherein one RFSS unit necessarily have to correspond to one rhetoric intent. What was most likely observed in the teachers’ discourses is that they employed several utterances to pursue just a single rhetoric intent.

To further the analysis and insights that can be drawn from the types of rhetoric used by the teachers, the findings were also configured to reflect sex-aggregated data. This enables the comparison of the accounts of the male and female teachers in as far as inclination towards certain types of rhetoric is concerned. The objective in this analysis is to draw comparison and contrast as to how male and female teachers consciously or unconsciously select certain rhetoric types to be used in their discourses when they engage in rhetoric communication. From this, it may be discovered if sex is a factor to one’s inclination towards or use of certain types of rhetoric.

### **SLA is not an Issue of Language per se but Communication**

The study of Doman (2005) published in the Asian EFL Journal Quarterly speaks of some extent of distortion in SLA Research, wherein a density of previous studies seems reductive in the

view that difficulties and problems in second language had to do mainly with “lack of language skill”, thereby digressing on the issue of “breakdown of communication” (Doman, 2005). Doman suggests that negotiation is essential in communicative processes. This current study articulates an aspect of this negotiation process by showing how interactants in a conversation (i.e. the conversation between the teacher and the learner in an instructional discourse setting) engage in mutual persuasion through the subtle use of rhetoric.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Manifestations of the Use of Rhetoric in**

#### **Instructional Communication**

The respective sets of online teaching discourses of the four online EFL teachers who participated in this study, i.e. male and female teachers, manifested rhetoric undertones, which means that either male or female teachers used rhetoric in the conduct of their teaching, specifically via their verbal communication with their respective students. The following set further details of the manifestation of rhetoric undertones in the teaching discourses:

- Across the raw corpora of teaching discourses of the male and female teachers, only some (and not all) of their teaching discourses were identified as rhetorically charged.
- Use of rhetoric in teaching discourse is more frequently manifested by the male teachers than the female teachers. This is calculated from the ratio of rhetorically charged versus the non-rhetorical teaching discourses of the teachers, wherein the density of rhetorically charged discourses is greater on the part of the male teachers, by at least 20%, compared to the accounts of the female teachers.

#### **Use of Rhetoric across Teaching Discourse Functions**

- Of the twenty-one (21) discourse functions in the inventory of Sinclair & Coulthard, twelve (12) of these (representing the majority at 57.14%) characterize the rhetorically charged teaching discourses of the male and female teachers. This means that their use of rhetoric is not evident in the dispense of the rest of other discourse functions.
- The male and female teachers used rhetoric in their online teaching discourses in the context of dispensing certain discourse functions, thereby indicating that some discourse functions may be catalytic to trigger the teachers’ use of rhetoric. These rhetoric inducing discourse functions are termed as “Rhetorically Productive Teaching Discourse Functions” (RPTDF).
- Rhetorically productive teaching discourse functions (RPTDF) seem to be “sex-associated”, in view of some evidence that certain RPTDFs are exclusively found in the accounts of the

male teachers namely DF-10, DF-15, and DF-20. These RPTDFs pertain to the following discourse functions:

- a) to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse
  - b) to provide additional information relating to a previous informative
  - c) to elicit the repetition of a student reply
- The most common discourse functions that triggered the teachers’ use of rhetoric include the following:

<b>Discourse Functions (Code and Meaning)</b>
<b>DF4</b> (to request a linguistic response)
<b>DF7</b> (to provide information)
<b>DF11</b> (to call on or give permission to a pupil to contribute to the discourse)
<b>DF16</b> (to indicate that a reply or reaction was appropriate)
<b>DF17</b> (to positively or negatively evaluate a previous reply)

- The discourse functions that are least productive to trigger the teachers’ use of rhetoric include the following:

<b>Discourse Functions (Code and Meaning)</b>
<b>DF10</b> (to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse)
<b>DF15</b> (to provide additional information relating to a previous informative)
<b>DF20</b> (to elicit the repetition of a student reply)

- There are discourse functions more dominant to trigger the male teachers to use rhetoric. These include the following:

<b>Discourse Functions (Code and Meaning)</b>
<b>DF4</b> (to request a linguistic response)
<b>DF9</b> (to provide additional information to help students respond to a previous directive or elicitation)

- There are discourse functions more dominant to trigger the female teachers to use rhetoric. These include the following:

<b>Discourse Functions (Code and Meaning)</b>	
<b>DF11</b>	(to call on or give permission to a pupil to contribute to the discourse)
<b>DF16</b>	(to indicate that a reply or reaction was appropriate)
<b>DF17</b>	(to positively or negatively evaluate a previous reply)

- There are discourse functions that most commonly trigger both male and female teachers to use rhetoric. These include the following:

<b>Discourse Functions (Code and Meaning)</b>	
<b>DF7</b>	(to provide information)

- The specific discourse functions that more frequently trigger the male teachers to use rhetoric are generally characteristic of “aggressive communication strategies”, while the specific discourse functions that more frequently trigger the female teachers to use rhetoric are generally characteristic of “passive communication strategies”.

## **Rhetoric Intent and the Types of Rhetoric employed in Teaching Discourses**

### **A. Rhetoric intents of male and female teachers**

- The male teachers slightly account for more diverse rhetoric intents compared to the accounts of the female teachers.
- The male and female teachers set diverse rhetoric intents for their rhetorical moves. Across the different rhetoric intents of the teachers (regardless of sex), they all register under three conceptual abstracts namely:

<b>Conceptual Abstracts of the Teachers’ Rhetoric Intents</b>	
<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>

Abstract-a	to persuade the audience to accept something
Abstract-b	to persuade the audience to feel asserted
Abstract-c	to persuade the audience to open up

- On account of the conceptual abstract of the rhetoric intents accounted for by the male and female teachers, the following observations are noteworthy:
  - a) Most of the rhetoric intents of the male teachers qualify as “Abstract-a”
  - b) The female teachers account for a balanced distribution of their rhetoric intents under “Abstract-a” and “Abstract-c”
  - c) Only the male teachers account for a rhetorical intent under “Abstract-b”
  - d) Only the female teachers account for rhetorical intents under “Abstract-c”
  - e) The common denominator between the male and the female teachers is having accounts of rhetoric intents under ‘Abstract-a’
- More dominant on the part of the male teachers is that their rhetoric intents have “teacher-centered” orientation. More dominant on the part of the female teachers is that their rhetoric intents have “student-centered” orientation.

## **B. Rhetoric types employed by male and female teachers**

- Both the male and female teachers manifested the use of intrusive rhetoric and invitational rhetoric in their teaching discourse.
- Across the accounts of the male and female online EFL teachers, their use of “intrusive rhetoric” is vividly dominant by, at least, 28% over their use of “invitational rhetoric”. This trend is consistent even as it is broken down into the accounts of the male and the female teachers. The teachers’ dominant use of intrusive rhetoric is densely characterized by their use of its subtype namely, “conquest rhetoric”.
- The rate of using intrusive rhetoric over invitational rhetoric is higher on the part of the male teachers than on the part of the female teachers. The reverse is also true that the female teachers’ density of using invitational rhetoric is greater than the density in which the male teachers use invitational rhetoric.
- Compared to the female teachers, the male teachers account for a broader exploration and use of all the types of rhetoric, i.e. invitational rhetoric and all the three subtypes of intrusive rhetoric. The female teachers give no account of the use of conversion rhetoric which is a subtype of intrusive rhetoric.

- The male teachers account for “rhetorically hybrid strategy”, not observed among the female teachers. This means that the male teachers resort to compounding the use of more than one type of rhetoric even in the pursuit of a single rhetoric intent. The female teachers consistently used a single rhetoric type for every single rhetoric intent.
- In the pairing of rhetoric intent and rhetoric type, there are notable patterns observable in the accounts of the male and female teachers. They are noted in the following:

<b>Male Teacher</b>	<b>Female Teacher</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Alternates the use of invitational and intrusive rhetoric in a single discourse setting with a series of non-identical rhetoric intents	Alternates the use of invitational and intrusive rhetoric in a single discourse setting with a series of non-identical rhetoric intents	Similar
Alternates the use of two or more types of rhetoric even when peddling a single rhetoric intent	Uses only one type of rhetoric even when peddling a single rhetoric intent	Different
Uses invitational rhetoric always adjacent to or compounded with a subtype of intrusive rhetoric in the pursuit of a single rhetoric intent	Uses invitational rhetoric independently from any combination in the pursuit of a single rhetoric intent	Different
Uses intrusive rhetoric either independently from any combination or adjacent with the use of invitational rhetoric	Uses intrusive rhetoric independently from any combination in the pursuit of a single rhetoric intent	Different

## **Conclusions**

From this study’s findings, certain insights were offered to inform the theory of invitational rhetoric (Foss & Griffin, 2009). This study offers empirical evidences that show how male and female teachers account for the use of the different types of rhetoric and that there are surprising results which even this researcher did not anticipate despite her literature reviews on the rhetoric



theory of communication. The findings relatively oppose Foss' explicit gender-association to the types of rhetoric. This study found that male and female teachers use at a relatively balanced degree both invitational and intrusive rhetoric. More empirical evidences are needed to solidly substantiate the insights generated from this study's findings if they were to inform the theory of communication or pose a critique on the theory itself, particularly Foss & Griffin's concept of rhetoric and their association of sex to the types of rhetoric.

The study sparked interest on the pedagogical value and significance of "teacher rhetoric skills" which can be offered as a substantial addition to the roster of teaching competencies, which comprises the theoretical basis for the evaluation of teaching performance.

A proliferation of research on the characteristic use of rhetoric in teaching discourse is highly encouraged in order to further demonstrate and establish more solidly the effects that rhetoric in teacher talk has on the performance, attitude and behavior of learners. This catalyzes more reasons to consider the importance of shaping teachers' rhetoric skills if research can definitely establish the fact that rhetoric strategies contribute significantly to the conditioning of the learning atmosphere in EFL or language instructional settings, whether it be online settings or traditional classroom settings.

The study should spark interest on EFL teachers to consider the use of the types of rhetoric as ancillary to their aim to reduce learner affective filters, to condition students for an increased motivation to learn EFL, to help promote positive attitudes toward EFL learning, and to increase the communication opportunities of students in an EFL instructional setting which encourages their productive use of the target language.

This study makes no assumption that only teacher-generated discourses can be analyzed of their rhetoric undertones. Thus, future research can explore the rhetoric undertones of learner talk or discourse, or even the dynamics of the interaction between teacher discourses and learner discourses to examine any probable mutual or reciprocal effects between them and how such effects inform the choice or use of a rhetoric type in a given discourse situation. For instance, some parts of the analysis hint an increased volume of learner talk or increased student participation in instances when the teacher uses invitational rhetoric, and that it seems to produce the opposite effect when intrusive rhetoric is used. But these are points in this study's analyses that are only given a passing review.

### **Pedagogical Implications / Recommendations for EFL Teaching**

This study found evidence on the profuse use of various types of rhetoric in online EFL teaching as accounted for by male and female teachers. This is not altogether surprising considering that a virtual instructional environment urges the online teacher to sustain the attention of the EFL learner to compensate for the lack of personal touch which is intact in regular classroom instruction.

Although, the study does not account for a comparison on the density of using rhetoric between online and classroom setting; nevertheless, this is also an interesting point to consider in future research. Moreover, online EFL teaching maximizes the use of all types of rhetoric, whether taken singly or in combination. The findings also suggest that online teachers appear to use rhetoric more densely in connection to certain discourse functions.

With reference to the above, it is the novel recommendation of this study to integrate “skills in the use of invitational and intrusive rhetoric” among the major skills that EFL teachers should be trained to develop. In the course of research analysis, it was found that those teachers who had a good command of rhetoric skills and efficient choice of rhetoric to employ also resulted to increase “learner talk and participation”. It would be optimal if teachers knew which discourse functions would be optimized by choosing the appropriate rhetoric type to employ and how it is properly executed. Contrary to Foss’ emphasis of invitational rhetoric being more favorable than intrusive rhetoric, the researcher observed from the teacher-learner discourses that both types of rhetoric served to be beneficial for instructional purposes, and a good balance of using the rhetoric types proves to be even more beneficial to both teacher and learner.

### **Acknowledgements**

The writer wishes to thank her dissertation committee at the University of the Philippines Open University for granting permission to reconfigure her prior research with the University and utilize the same set of data analyzed from the perspective and paradigm of EFL research. This study is the result of such reconfiguration. The writer also wishes to acknowledge and thank, in a special way, the scholarly assistance of Dr. Galahad Randall S. Unciano as the external research consultant.

### **Literature Cited**

- Bolliger, D.U. & C. Halupa (2011). Student Perceptions of Satisfaction and Anxiety in an Online Doctoral Program. *Distance Education*, Routledge, 33 (1), 81-98. Retrieved from [http://itecideas.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/59662913/anxiety\\_satisfaction.pdf](http://itecideas.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/59662913/anxiety_satisfaction.pdf).
- Cockayne M. (2010). Applying the Sinclair and Coulthard model of discourse analysis to a student-discourse analysis to a student-centered centered EFL classroom. Retrieved from <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/collegeartslaw/cels/essays/csdp/EssayBankMod4Cockayne.pdf>.
- Craig, R.C. and H.L. Muller (2007). *Theorizing Communication. Readings Across Traditions*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Davis, A. (2013). *Rhetoric: Positive, Negative, or Both?* Michigan Radio

- Newsroom. Retrieved from <http://www.michiganradio.org/post/rhetoric-positive-negative-or-both>.
- Doman, E. (2005). Current Debates in SLA. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, December 2005, 7(4), 131-143. [https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=http://asian-efl-journal.com/December05PDF%2520issue.pdf&hl=en\\_US](https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=http://asian-efl-journal.com/December05PDF%2520issue.pdf&hl=en_US)
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning. The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. Great Britain: Edward Arnold (Publishers), Ltd.
- Guinan, S. (2014). *Teaching English Online: Opportunities and Pitfalls*. British Council. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/teaching-english-online-opportunities-pitfalls>.
- McGeown, K. (2012). The Philippines: The world's budget English teacher. *BBC News, Philippines*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-20066890>.
- Modesti, S. (2012). *Invitation Accepted: Integrating Invitational Rhetoric in Educational Contexts*. *Current Issues in Education*, Arizona State University, XV(1).
- Muste, D. (2016). *The Role of Communication Skills in Teaching Process*. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*. eISSN:2357-1330. Retrieved from <http://www.futureacademy.org.uk/files/images/upload/ERD2016FA052F.pdf>.
- Petek, T. (2014). The Teacher as a Public Speaker in the Classroom. *CS Canada Studies in Literature and Language*, IX (1), 124-133. Retrieved from [http://pefprints.pef.uni-lj.si/2347/1/Public\\_speaker.pdf](http://pefprints.pef.uni-lj.si/2347/1/Public_speaker.pdf).
- Sinclair, J.M. & R.M. Coulthard (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Unciano, G.R.S. (2010). *Learner Autonomization in Classroom Language Learning Situation*. Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet. Paper presented in the TESOL Asia and EFL Journal International Conference, 2014.