

Running head: WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

WWW: Who, What, Where is the Audience?

Semester Paper spring 2014

M. W. Shealy

English 5364: History of Rhetoric

Dr. Rich Rice

Texas Tech University

English (Technical Communication & Rhetoric)

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

Abstract

Beginning with a Problem Based Learning & Universal Design for Learning (PBL-UDL) scheme for composition classes, I address ideas of “audience” based in the classical rhetoric of Protagoras and then outline strengths and weaknesses with such a PBL-UDL scheme for contemporary audiences that use new modalities in online education.

Keywords: problem based learning, PBL, universal design for learning, UDL, audience, classical rhetoric, phenomenology, online class design, learning management systems, glocalization, instructor-composer, student-composer, rhetor-composer, audience-composer, synchronicity, asynchronicity, commonplace, rhetoric, simulation, reality, phenomenology, subject/object, humanism

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

WWW: Who, What & Where is the Audience?

In this paper, I examine a Problem Based Learning and Universal Design for Learning (PBL-UDL) scheme for online composition classes, focusing on ideas of “audience.” Who, what, where (when and for whom) are the audiences that constitute both ends of the dialogue in online education? I briefly consider the history and evolution of audiences (from ones synchronous, unified by distinct core features, to those asynchronous, defined by differences). Is there in fact an audience in the house?

The issue of *audience* in technical writing classrooms, both online and face-to-face, is rapidly changing due to technologies integrated with New Media (especially social media and emerging virtual environments). Many ways of dealing with such rapid changes have been offered in Technical Communications-related literature, each approach with its strengths and weaknesses; hybrid courses, MOOCs, wikis, E-portfolio, blogs, social media etc. from the technological answer side; a wide range of theories and frameworks from the pedagogical. I address pedagogy derived from Problem-Based Learning (PBL) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) that may serve to embrace technological complexities and expand student opportunities for learning. As techniques such as scaffolded instruction and flexible course design have not been entirely successful in using PBL and/or UDL approaches (Williams, 2013 p. 248), a more refined use of such theories is demanded by current pedagogy. We might begin with a “PBL that embraces the profound structural changes demanded by UDL [and] offers the pedagogical space in which students are transformed into genuine authors of their education, a transformation that is enhanced by the physical space—the third space of the media lab” (Williams, 2013, p. 250) and transition to a PBL-UDL model that

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

fully incorporates such structural changes into an ongoing pedagogy coextensive with new technology. In other words, this hypothetical PBL-UDL model would rely less on more traditional notions of instruction, communication, or materiality, thus allowing for transformational pedagogical concepts. Using De Graaff and Kolmos's (2003) seven features of PBL as a set of guidelines for course design,ⁱ the re-envisioning of a tested course design in a third space, an "organic solution to the modern day classroom" (Williams, 2013, p. 260), we might infer that connecting PBL and UDL theories could lead to a rethinking of curriculum problems and thus take a long-term, global approach to teaching in the age of instant communications (inferences beyond the scope of this paper). The local implication in regard to such an audience is that instructor and student "co-compose" course content and structure; the global implication is that pedagogies are culturally-bound less directly. These local and global orientations towards audience combined may insure that a "glocal" perspective on pedagogy emerges for future academic environments in which everyone is simultaneously student and instructor, audience member and rhetor. Features of PBL in particular that align with our concerns include how it (a) addresses a specific problem; (b) relies on self-guided learning, including the experiential; (c) involves activity-based learning, including research; (d) involves inter-disciplinary learning; (e) includes exemplary practice; and (f) is principally group-based (Edyburn, 2010, p. 36).

As outlined here, PBL focuses on individual needs within a group setting; in fact, pedagogy based in a simple binary teacher-student relationship (via "process writing" methods) may be broadened to recognize that practical needs and a group consciousness are allied. What is good for the individual is good for the group, and vice-

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

versa. If the traditional student is an audience for the rhetor-teacher, then problematizing the communication relationship by making student audience members into rhetors and allowing the teacher to be a sort of prime audience member opens up a matrix of possible causal feedback relations that lends itself to online communications. Such face-to-face PBL environments may create flexible understanding and lifelong learning skills (Hmelo-Silver, 2004), but a true environment for such post-human, aleatory dynamics is cyberspace. If PBL is compatible with “human cognitive architecture”ⁱⁱⁱ (Schmidt et al., 2006), then it’s worth asking how digital architecture may allow for an extension of neural patterns, how an isolated human organism as “audience” (as a source that generates successive messages) leads via cyber relations to something considerably more complex and radically informational. If one teacher and one student can make the infamous “difference” in a life, imagine what the architectonics of a (metaphorical) singularity might mean for individual student intellectual growth and for re-envisioning net-based education as a socioeconomic institution.

Likewise, with UDL in the context of education (Edyburn, 2010): UDL values diversity and therefore lends itself to radical, global, polycultural growth. Such an educational framework (a) focuses on design, but does not occur naturally and so requires technology—yet is not assistive; (b) serves as a force to propel technology not as an end but rather as a means to greater human agency (that symbiotically propels the technology itself); (c) remains as a measure and evaluation for enhanced student performance, though student behavioral data will continue to be more complex than these measures/evaluations are capable of registering. What such notational dynamism

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

implies is that human agency—even in the form of an epistemological alterity that recognizes multicultural groups—always outpaces the system itself; therefore, such agency functions as a prophylactic to the sort of machine-based bugbear so many traditional humanists fear from technology-enhanced higher education. Such agency has practical as well as theoretical import. Systematic UDL approaches to class design (CAST, 2011) provide simple, real-world lesson plans that allow students to learn flexibly, simultaneously co-composing classroom-based centers of knowledge that allow audience members to use current technology—while moving beyond it. For instance, the use of hypermediation and hyperlinks for online student interaction, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, is both practical and theoretical (Rice, 2013), allowing for specific ideas and values based in TCR to serve two masters: the totalizing global communication system within which it embeds big data and the teacher-student audience-subject for whom the virtual classroom is always phenomenological and cognitive.

First, to address how classical notions of audience speak to such changes in educational dialogues specifically within online learning environments and how such online environments are particularly suited to such a PBD/UDL model. If “truly authentic audiences...are increasingly mixed, composed of constituents who have disparate interests and needs that must be addressed with multiple sophisticated appeals, arguments, and modalities” (Williams, 2013, p. 248), it’s worth stepping back to briefly outline how core ideas of audience in Classical rhetoric both inform and break from current real-world audiences and practical pedagogical needs. Next, in order to “shift to more dynamic, real-world mediums” (Williams, 2013, p. 251) such as those provided by

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

the Web 2.0, and Learning Management Systems (LMS), etc.; the notions of teacher, student, content, and audience need to be reformulated. Such reformulations often lie in the historical conditions within which they developed. Such reformulations also are determined partially by the meta-frames (*commonplaces* in one sense) within which they are grounded. Also, there is a practical aspect to this semantic inquiry. It's not just a matter of what "audience" now means, who audiences might be, and what new audiences might do — it's also relevant to designing virtual classrooms that accommodate such changes; there is a practicality and materiality at play. It's essential for TCR writing instructors to rethink classroom design and audience needs in current net-based and New Media-enhanced teaching environments, physical and virtual. However, the generational shift from content-based to problem-driven design for rhetorical and technical purposes is not as easily grappled with as one might imagine.

Is higher education preparing students to write for the audiences they must address and compose for, or is it teaching to the needs of students' parents? Are we miseducating Millennials raised on social media with the hierarchical communications methods of a Baby Boomer generation?ⁱⁱⁱ In moving from content-based to problem-based coursework, student-centered teaching as a form of service learning is tricky ethically, but useful regardless of questions concerning possible misuses of power by teacher and learner, employer and worker.^{iv} So how might a problem-based PBD and a universal design UDL for learning make sense of some of the questions I've just addressed? A hybrid model gives students the best of both worlds, academic and "real," so that learning is working and working is learning. Killing two birds with one stone has its time and monetary advantages. Learning problems rooted in students' own lives--

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

their personal interests or problems that they believe need addressing—reconfigure an *instructor-composer* relationship with an *audience-composer*. One is not expressing a body of facts or knowledge (Baby Boomer requirements); one is not creating a model for engagement and redesign (Gen X requirements); one is rather engaging with the students collectively-while-individually in a *theoretical* manner so that any materialist artifacts that result from the engagement appear to evade causality in regard to *praxis*. That is to say that when students solve problems in their homes and work lives individually, there may appear to be a record of instructor-student exchanges to indicate theoretical notions at work and practical outcomes at play. However, no artifactual records apart from raw data are available for any series of teacher-student exchanges (within an educational framework such as a class or semester) when the audience is collective. And this lack of verifiability goes back to the synchronous-asynchronous dichotomy that determines the evolution of audience.^v The collective is never something that appears in praxis, but always and only in theory.^{vi}

Next, consider how the idea of audience is currently employed and how it has changed historically. The “authentic” audience in pedagogy for student writings is currently in vogue; however such authenticity goes beyond mere marketing of information and is rather made up of potential co-composers of student texts. Authenticity is increasingly a desired factor in writing programs, composition courses, and assignments; authentic materials are also increasingly demanded by current writing programs and teachers, but how do instructors get students to imagine authentic audiences? Rhetoric’s traditional interest in authenticity and audience has been transformed since modes of digital rhetoric have shifted the literacy issue from one of

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

persuasion to one of convergence. However, the evolution of educational methods and teaching responsibilities, as far back as their inception in Classical Greek thought and concern with oratory and audience, may tell us something about current pedagogical needs that on the surface seem unrelated.

Protagoras' Sophistic Humanism

The origins of Western rhetoric lie in an impetus to persuade an audience, in freedom of expression, in an ability to move through oral language and oratory—although it's interesting to note that the earliest tradition of Corax and Tisius focuses on a “doctrine of general probability” in which the more likely of two arguments is apt to win over an audience (Murphy et al., 2014, p. 29).^{vii} The real story of rhetoric for our purposes, however, begins with the sophists, specifically Protagoras. What idea of audience might we take away from early rhetorical practices and theory? While the reputation of the early Greek Sophists have endured often-deserved criticism throughout the centuries, the initial sophistic ability to distinguish between content and form in an oral tradition spoke to the individual's self-awareness in addressing an audience.

Protagoras' assertion that “Man is the measure of all things, of things that are as to how they are, and of things are not as to how they are not,” (Diogenes) reminds us that the message must remain focused on both audience and speaker as they are representative of what being *human* means. Once the message, as intent and expectation, leaves human concerns, how the information is distributed is a matter of the technological aleatory and beyond questions of rhetoric. A design that is focused on

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

self-learning presupposes that a *self* is at the center of the communication and intended audience. Such human measuring would be central to PBL-UDL approaches to class design. Pythagoras' notion that for every idea, there is a contrary idea forms the basis of most introductory rhetoric texts for composition, but it's the potentially binary nature of rhetoric that seems most relevant to current net-based classes. Information in the online class lends itself to quick yes-or-no responses (we "like" or don't), but this sort of contrarian response to learning is antithetical to PBL-UDL design. Or is it? Such binary thinking may occur neurologically, but it does not lead to complex thinking or open-ended learning—except in the sense that language-based learning is grounded in semantic difference. What I mean here is that psycho-neurological concerns in the psychology of education aside, all critical thinking (certainly that which involving natural language skills) demands dialectic to allow students to construct arguments, or at least hypotheses from enthymeme techniques. I'm not referring to argumentation or oratorical skills here so much as those critical thinking skills derived from classical rhetoric (especially from Aristotle to Cicero) that defer to logic over style. At any rate, the question of a rhetorical binary apart from traditional rhetor-audience relations is a peculiar one worth further investigation.

The claim that "the worse cause may always be made to appear to be the better cause" is contentious at best and can be re-interpreted in PBL-UDL manner various ways. Would such a rhetorical play in the online environment amount to a disingenuous dumbing down? Could such a claim online indicate a willingness for the communicator/teacher to entice a student to recognize the stronger position? Since PBL-UDL depends on design rather than just teaching, any attempt to recognize a

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

weakness would have to be built into class design as an aleatory factor. Maybe we could say that aleatory play (in a Derridean sense) is an odd seizure of the prickly ancient claim that led to much criticism of sophists in general. Or we could point out that irony itself—that trope so dear to the postmodern persona—depends on such unexpected ploys. Once again, a twisted interpretation of Pythagoras is worth submitting given the radical rethinking of classical rhetoric that current modalities demand. Similarly, Protagoras' statement that we are left in an agnostic position regarding whether the gods exist or don't exist, on the face of it, bears little relevance to online class design. Unless we interpret the maxim to mean the rhetorician was encouraging students to respond to a clear message with clarity (Murphy, 2014, p. 39). Certainly, clarity of message is more essential and difficult to insure in the online class environment, where body language is absent and good design must support the message. Based on this reading, the last of Protagoras' famous claims is also pertinent PBL-UDL analysis.

Finally, Protagoras' use of "commonplaces" (or *communes loci*) has endured in the sort of "paper topics" that are often assigned in composition classes. Whether such blatant use of commonplaces weakens PBL-UDL design principles is pretty clear: the student audience should be able to generate their own topics based on the need for diversity of ideas and experiential authenticity rather than rely on dictated assignments. Another rendering of *communes loci*, however, could be as a sort of *thirdspace*, directly related to current class design concerns. Digital rhetoric (and audience) may constitute a notable shift from the perspective of ancient rhetoric with its focus on persuasion to a current net-rhetoric with the creation of thirdspaces via evolving modalities, or it may be

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

the case that a shift from the use of topics for persuasion to the use of topic spaces for group work activities is not so antithetical to Protagoras' intention. So given the shift from a content-based to problem-driven design, a current pedagogical wave, I identify some of those difficulties and address them by way of critically thinking about audience and New Media.

PBL-UDL Classes online: Issues & Answers

To begin from the position of ancient rhetoric and its need for a single rhetor and a group audience in a particular time and place, there are some problems with the new modalities. There is a perceived *reality* to online LMS class environs that is distinct, revolutionary, and uncanny. The question of whether writing online reveals a different space, sense of space, and materiality in comparison to forms of writing dating back to the origins of human inscription is worth asking here. Phenomenological features of online writing (concerning aspects of where and when, of what constitute public spaces/places, of how the subject/object connection is altered) suggest that entering the space of the text (the "textorium") intensifies the phenomenological experience of writing (Van Manen & Adams, 2009, p. 11). While phenomenology is merely one metaframe for understanding this issue, beginning with the personal experience of being within a learning environment is convenient. To assume in a problem-driven class that the audience will perceive themselves as acting upon an absent content in a manner similar to such an audience in a classical situation may be misleading. It could encourage educators to co-compose latent content that doesn't navigate the gap between real world and virtual realities. Where there is an audience, there is a problem, but the content does not always follow from the problem. While a hybrid approach may be one

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

way to bridge this content gap, current academic politics may make such dual audiences unlikely (Gouge, 2009).^{viii} Do educators really want to create environments that demand dual identities (at times real, at times virtual) for instructors and for students? Some believe that teacher/student relations are drastically altered and cheapened since one-on-one communication is unlikely (Lowe, 2013). And though the institutional impasse over hybrid classes (as with MOOCs) may now be a thing of the past, such negative faculty attitudes towards computer-based learning are based on the idea that “teaching is, and ultimately should be, a matter of control, so that the best and most effective teachers are the ones who are able to steer the whole educational process towards the production of pre-specified ‘learning outcomes’ or pre-defined identities, such as that of the ‘good citizen’ or the ‘flexible lifelong learner.’” (Biesta, 2013, p. 35). This assumption is because student audiences are often viewed by rhetors and educators as objects to be manipulated.

Second, let’s address MOOCs as exemplary of shifts in audience, not only as subject but as object. Are MOOC’s a threat to higher education or a benefit to the public good? The ethics involved here may be addressed by the notion of audience. Perhaps MOOC’s are a “disruptive technology [since] higher education is most certainly going to evolve as a result [and] those who simply try to ignore what is coming or to deny the impact, will likely fail and fold” (Decker, 2014, p. 12). We might ask whether “engaged peer learning...an essential and valuable contributor to the learning process...can...serve as a substitute for faculty presence” (Decker, 2014, p. 7). My speculation, in opposition to such dire views, is that what is finally benefited is not a student audience made up of individual members, as most critics of open classes

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

imagine, but rather an instructor/student-audience co-creating a technologically controlled dialogue. If content and student usability is the issue, then MOOCS can appear as a threat to stabilizing teacher-student relations; if content, rather, is destabilized and ongoing dialogue is what we desire, then MOOCs and related open-enrollment venues may be prophetic, a way of forcing educators to address the new model audience. Akin to a Learning Management System (LMS), a MOOC is a means to an end, not an end in itself, so fretting over a loss of traditional human relationships is a misleading waste of time. The LMS is not designed to instruct a student audience of co-creators, but merely to perpetuate evolving virtual classroom texts; the MOOC—aside from issues of hegemony and economy and university politics—is merely a means to create ideas and open-ended dialogues. This brings us, however, to the economic and political issues of educational situations (theoretical and material classroom environments) as products.

The question of education environments as products, of their ethical and socioeconomic status and of their efficiency, effectiveness, and delivery—should be addressed here. Current “smart” databases behind single-sourcing some information and customizing others, in order to more directly delivery material to diverse audiences, may represent a future in which there is no audience apart from the individual and no rhetor apart from the marketing algorithm. Does this entail a shift from an early capitalist emphasis on marketing information products for specialized audiences to a new state advocating an emphasis on human relations? In a best case scenario, the answer is yes; in a worst case one, characteristics of New Media online audiences are not amenable to any sort of postmodern humanism^{ix} though remnants of a rhetorical

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

humanism based in Renaissance thinking (yet exposed as post-human vacancy) may remain.^x

Last is history: history itself, the history of education, and the continuity of histories of education that say something about Old versus New Media. Composition instructors often expect students to create writings which respond to audiences that are authentic, realistic, and immediate—even though such audiences rarely exist in our media-based communication world. Part of this disconnect between what instructors should and do expect is due to characteristics of Old Media (such as print, radio, and TV, of push media and high Modernist audiences) versus those of our new modalities (including net-based education) and New Media expectations. Twentieth-century audiences were loosely based on generalized markets determined by governments and corporations; they were expected to conform to the expectation of the writer or the film maker; they reflected the great American novel mentality and the time of the writer/teacher as public intellectual.^{xi} Next, having outlined four problematic concerns (individual reality and subjectivity, access to information, economics, and history) for our PBD-UDL approach, how might we respond to these issues?

PERFORMANCE -- Addressing the initiation of phenomenological-based reality and/or subjectivity for online education, I like the idea of writerly co-creation as a *performance*. Certainly the notion of performativity (out of modernist semiotics) has been a popular metaphor and working term among post-structuralists over the past 40 years [Judith Butler's performativity of gender comes first to mind]. In a smaller way, however, the process applies to what we've said about PBL-UDL, co-composition, and online education. Writing performances certainly play a role in student compositions,

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

especially net-based classes, and “in an age of (multi)media, we can no longer ignore the embodied nature of discourse,” (Fishman et al., 2005, p. 229) making the notion of performance crucial to how instructors design classes with open content and/or PBL design.

INFRASTRUCTURE -- Regarding access to information, infrastructure and the focus on institutional organization and cultural contexts (De Voss et. al., 2005) we might argue for the importance of a reconsidered infrastructure in regard to new-media compositions. By expanding infrastructure to include conceptual policies and standards as well as material computers and networks, we arrive at infrastructure as a “when” and not a “what” so that the underlying organization of the classroom is continuously reinvented and re-assembled over and over. Because classrooms, assignments, structures, and infrastructures are means to an end (a revised humanism for a decentralized audience) there is less to concern the New Humanist who would have us relearn how to wield content. Aside from an always approaching Totalitarian Cyber/Cypher, the very structure of the thirdspace classroom is a lack of structure. The only real issue is convincing instructors stuck in old models and repetitive ways to allow the student audience to co-compose its shifting identify.

THE SOCIOCRITICAL -- Addressing economic issues, a sociocritical literacy, “a program...oriented toward a form of ‘cosmopolitanism’ [and] characterized by the ideals and practices of a shared humanity, a profound obligation to others, boundary crossing, and intercultural exchange in which difference is celebrated without being romanticized” (Gutiérrez, 2008, p. 148-49) seems a solid thirdspace from which to begin speaking of humanism, educational products and monetized environments. In its early days, the

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

internet represented a virgin New World within which cyber-pioneers could stake out intellectual territory outside the vantage point of the corporate state, the governmental state, or even the technological state; now early net gurus such as Jaron Lanier can claim that “perhaps people should be free to choose among varying degrees of privacy” (Lanier, 2013). How did we reach the point where those very pioneers who sanctioned a lack of state sanctions can ponder whether privacy (surely the baseline for net power) is no longer de facto possible online? I would like to believe that classroom environs structured to do more than offer a variety of course content to students would remain possible (even in a post-privacy Net State). However, sociocritical literacy may not be enough to counteract the epistemological changes, the ruptures in meaning and truth, that the net has invited.

HISTORY -- Finally, it is history and how PBL-UDL may be linked to an historical trajectory beginning with the early sophists that is most problematic. And, oddly enough, the seemingly a-historical Baudrillard is whom I consult rather than Foucault or the epistemic. In *Fatal Strategies*, Baudrillard proclaims, “Outside the realm of history, history itself can no longer reflect, nor even prove its own coherence” (Baudrillard, 1986, p. 192) in analyzing Elias Canetti’s ideas on history and exchange values after Marx. Temporality and history are radically altered in the net-based classroom, so who, what, where (when and for whom) are the audiences that constitute both ends of the dialogue in online education? How we answer that series of questions depends how we see ourselves in relation to the values that lie beneath the PBL-UDL scheme I’ve discussed. *Who* is the amalgam of instructor and student; *What* is the virtual classroom as thirdspace; *Where* is the cloud, everywhere and nowhere; *When* is asynchronous, the

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

perpetual present—but for *whom* does education exist? Perhaps the early sophists had an answer. How instructors co-compose audience spaces in net-based composition educational environments is a way to limit what can seem undefined, to be realistic in an educational culture overburdened with information and choice. In other words, “[Hu]man is the measure of all things, of things that are as to how they are, and of things are not as to how they are not.”

MAIN IDEAS

- PBL-UDL design allows for a rethinking of ideas on “audience”; a hypothetical PBL-UDL model would rely less on more traditional notions of instruction, communication, or materiality, thus allowing for transformational pedagogical concepts.
- If the traditional student is an audience for the rhetor-teacher, then problematizing the communication relationship by making student audience members into rhetors and allowing the teacher to be a sort of prime audience member opens up a matrix of possible causal feedback relations that lends itself to online communications.
- Learning problems rooted in students’ own lives—their personal interests or problems that they believe need addressing—reconfigure an instructor-composer relationship with an audience-composer.
- The evolution of educational methods and teaching responsibilities, as far back as their inception in Classical Greek thought and concern with oratory and

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

audience, may tell us something about current pedagogical needs that on the surface seem unrelated.

- There are four areas of that PBL-UDL must address in order to work as a base model: 1. Subjectivity or the Subject, 2. Access to information, 3. Socio-economics, and 4. the dilemma of history.
- Performance, rethinking infrastructure, the sociocritical element, and a new form of Humanism are possible concepts from which to address PBL-UDL areas of concern.

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

References

- Baudrillard, Jean. (1986). *Selected writings*. Ed. Mark Poster. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Biesta, G. J. (2013). Giving teaching back to education: responding to the disappearance of the teacher. *Phenomenology and Practice*, 6(2), 35-49.
- Bizzell, Patricia, & Herzberg, Bruce. (2001). *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present* (2nd ed.) Boston: St. Martin's.
- CAST (2011). *Universal design for learning guidelines* version 2.0. Wakefield, MA. Retrieved from: <http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlguidelines>.
- De Voss Dànienne Nicole, Cushman, Ellen, & Grabill, Jeffrey T. (2005). Infrastructure and composing: The when of new-media writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(1), 14-44.
- De Graaff, E., & Kolmos, A. (2003). Characteristics of problem-based learning. *International Journal of Engaging Education*, 19(5), 657-662.
- Decker, Glenna L. (2013). MOOCology 1.0. *Invasion of the MOOCs..* Kruase and Lowe, (Eds.). PDF. 3-13. Available at http://www.parlorpress.com/pdf/invasion_of_the_moocs.pdf.
- Diogenes Laërtius. (1925). *Life of Protagoras*. (Robert Drew Hicks, Trans.). Available at http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Lives_of_the_Eminent_Philosophers/Book_IX#Protagoras.

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

Edyburn, D. (2010). Would you recognize Universal design for learning if you saw it? Ten propositions for new directions for the second decade of UDL. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 33(1), 33-41.

Fishman, J., Lunsford, A., McGregor, B. & and Otuteye, M. (2005). Performing, writing, performing literacy. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(2), 224-253.

Gouge, Catherine. (2009). Conversation at a crucial moment: Hybrid courses and the future of writing programs. *College English*, 71(4), 338-362.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148-164.

Hmelo-Silver, C.E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(3), 235-266.

Lanier, J. (2013). How should we think about privacy?. *Scientific American*, 309(5), 64-71.
HTML.

Lowe, C. (2013). Introduction: building on the tradition. *Invasion of the MOOCs*. Kruase and Lowe, (Eds.). PDF. ix-xiv. Available from
http://www.parlorpress.com/pdf/invasion_of_the_moocs.pdf.

Murphy, James J., Katula, Richard A., & Hoppmann, Michael. (2014). *A synoptic history of classical rhetoric* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Rice, Rich. (2013). The hypermediated teaching philosophy of ePortfolio performance and support system. In Wills, K. V. & and Rice, R. (Eds.) *Portfolio performance support systems; constructing, presenting, and assessing portfolios*. 37-52.

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

Schmidt, Henk G. et. al (2006) Problem-Based learning is compatible with human cognitive architecture: commentary on Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark. *Educational Psychologist*. 42(2), 91–97.

Van Manen, M., & Adams, C. (2009). The phenomenology of space in writing online. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 41(1), 10-21.

Williams, J., Rice, R., Lauren, B., Morrison, S., Van Winkle, K. & Elliott, T. (2013). Problem-based universal design for learning in technical communication and rhetoric Instruction. *Journal of Problem Based Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1) 247-261.

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

CLASS PRESENTATION INFO

Features of PBL in particular that align with our concerns include how it (a) addresses a specific problem; (b) relies on self-guided learning, including the experiential; (c) involves activity-based learning, including research; (d) involves inter-disciplinary learning; (e) includes exemplary practice; and (f) is principally group-based (Edyburn, 2010, p. 36).

Likewise, with UDL in the context of education (Edyburn, 2010): UDL values diversity and therefore lends itself to radical, global, polycultural growth. Such an educational framework (a) focuses on design, but does not occur naturally and so requires technology—yet is not assistive; (b) serves as a force to propel technology not as an end but rather as a means to greater human agency (that symbiotically propels the technology itself); (c) remains as a measure and evaluation for enhanced student performance, though student behavioral data will continue to be more complex than these measures/evaluations are capable of registering.

So given the shift from a content-based to problem-driven design, a current pedagogical wave, I identify some of those difficulties and address them by way of critically thinking about audience and New Media.

What I learned about classic rhet. – almost everything since my rhetoric reading is limited to History of Ideas and theology from the middle ages, so second-hand Greek thought. I'm very familiar with Plato, less so with Aristotle, but I do have a new appreciation for their centrality in rhetoric.

Peer Review and blogs and e-ports. Very useful. I wish we could have done more of it in larger groups, say groups of 5. But I know that we all have busy lives and aren't undergrad students hanging out at the coffee shop.

a New Humanism, my answer that needs further elucidation

publishing – a modified version of the paper, a second level journal composition journal and/or a small presentation at a conference on composition/online writing

Written Communication, College Composition and Communication, Composition Forum, College English, Computers and Composition, Journal of Online Learning and Teaching

OR I COULD DO SOMETHING WITH MY VIDEO – much more audience friendly

Did I “steal” Joseph's idea?

Does PBL-UDL have legs? Can it take so much unpacking?

unpacking and elaborating and implications and allusions

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

WWW: WHO, WHAT, WHERE IS THE AUDIENCE?

ⁱ Kolmos (2003), PBL: 1) addresses a specific problem; 2) relies on self-guided learning; 3) includes experiential learning; 4) involves activity-based learning, including research; 5) involves inter-disciplinary learning; 6) includes exemplary practice; and 7) is principally group-based. (p. 658)

ⁱⁱ They argue that problem-based learning is an instructional approach allowing for “flexible adaptation of guidance,” whose underlying principles are compatible with human cognitive structures.

ⁱⁱⁱ Note that the current educational forums are mostly Gen X instructors teaching Millennial students. What sociological and psychological problems, insofar as generational theories hold water, does that particular general dialogue entail?

^{iv} Corporate entities have a fiscal responsibility to ensure that consumers not only consume but also “produce” in a symbiotic fashion the very rhetorical products they are required to purchase. This incarnation of a high-tech, high-educational proletariat is ingenious, ubiquitous, and sourceless.

^v See my class presentation on the history of audience.

^{vi} CF. here the analogy of Schrodinger’s black box.

^{vii} It’s intriguing to imagine what a contemporary rhetoric based on probabilities rather than logic and psychology might be.

^{viii} Gouge, in “Conversation at a crucial moment: Hybrid courses and the future of writing programs” points out that despite the awareness by composition professionals to the increasing relevance of technology in literacy issues, “very little debate has taken place about the potential for dramatic, technology-mediated changes to conventional, campus-based writing program structures,” (339) or hybrid courses.

^{ix} It’s interesting that Baudrillard in his final years referred to himself as a “humanist.”

^x Here, one is reminded of how a feminist ecology may be connected to such products in order to disrupt a hierarchical hegemony, an hegemony in this case of materialist (scientific?) reality.

^{xi} They were fully recognized in such works as Guy Debord’s *Society of the Spectacle* (and before Baudrillard extended beyond Marxian considerations into simulacra).