ISSA Proceedings 2002 – Responding To Multiculturalism In The Real World: Re-Envisioning Argumentation Pedagogy To Include Culturally Diverse Methods Of Argumentation

Recent pedagogical trends in American universities emphasize teaching students "real world" critical thinking skills. Traditional argumentation courses are often perceived as a particularly good venue for teaching critical thinking, (Sanders, Wiseman, and Grass, 1994). This seems to be recognized by administrators at many America colleges and universities as Winkler and Chesier (2000) suggest that university administration "support for argumentation courses has profited from recent nation-wide moves to expand instruction in critical thinking" (102). Traditional argumentation courses are often designed to cultivate reasoning, analytical, evaluative, research, thinking, and, of course, argumentative skills that hopefully extend beyond the classroom and benefit students in academic, professional, political, and personal venues.

Yet, we should consider whether argumentation pedagogy truly fosters critical thinking in a multicultural nation and world. Not only are universities becoming increasingly more culturally diverse, but also contact with people from other cultures is more likely nationally and internationally. Courses in argumentation often teach students the skills to engage in reasoned debate emphasizing certain element of the western tradition of rhetoric and argumentation. Traditional argumentation pedagogy focuses on "rational" inductive or deductive argumentation, analysis of arguments and fallacies, and the pursuit of truth. Mastery of these skills is usually evaluated with formal graded debates with a winner, a loser, and the "best" policy or value. These methods may no longer be appropriate preparation for students' real world interactions because they neither simulates realistic intercultural interactions nor crosses cultural boundaries both

within and outside the United States. If students are taught one method of argumentation and critical thinking that is specific to dominant western culture, valued over alternate ways of arguing and linked to simulated debates that do not accurately reflect deliberation in the real world, can we say that they are prepared to engage in discussion, debate, and argumentation in intercultural settings? Responding to cultural diversity requires rethinking traditional argumentation pedagogy to reflect skills and values necessary for the "real" multicultural world, both inside and outside the classroom. This essay builds from the assumption that argumentation is a cultural phenomenon. Argumentation is a way of speaking and knowing that varies cross-culturally from reasoning styles, approaches to conflict, and evaluation of arguments. Thus, the relationship between culture and argumentation needs to be a central focus of argumentation pedagogies. Argumentation courses need to teach to and about diverse reasoning styles, relying less on formal debating as a method of assessment and more on exercises emphasizing collaboration, role-playing, and negotiation. In addition to content changes, we need to make changes in the way we teach. Drawing from theories of culturally responsive pedagogy, I argue that teachers must view educational interactions as cultured and attend to cultural variation in classroom interactions.

I will begin by establishing the link between argumentation and culture through a review of studies from multiple methodological orientations. Next, I will focuses on current trends in argumentation pedagogy by identifying both the prevalence and the limitations of traditional Western argument. Finally, I argue that a multicultural argumentation pedagogy emphasizing argument as a cultural phenomenon addresses limitations of the traditional Western approach and offers an alternate vision of the standard college argumentation class.

1. The Connection Between Argumentation and Culture

Before discussing the complexities of argument and culture, it is important to clarify traditional argumentation pedagogy by identifying several aspects of the western tradition that are particularly emphasized. First, logical reasoning is a superior form of argument to emotional or ethos appeals. Second, inductive and deductive forms of reasoning are superior forms of logic. Third, the function of argumentation is persuasion to reveal the best probable truth in a particular situation. Fourth, argumentation assumes an oppositional win/lose dichotomous framework. Fifth, evaluation of arguments is outwardly critical but not self-reflexive about argument evaluation. Perhaps most importantly, traditional

argumentation pedagogy assumes the universality of its approach and assumptions. Standards for evaluating the forms and functions of argumentation are often presented as cross-cultural universals.

It is important to note that although I link traditional argumentation pedagogy with western traditions and modernist assumptions, there are examples of argumentation theory and practice that challenge these assumptions both from within (sophist cultural relativism) and outside (Native American approaches to argument) the western tradition. My argument is not that we should flatly reject the western tradition. Rather, my critique implicates trends in argumentation pedagogy that emphasize certain elements of the western tradition as superior forms of argument and through implicitly or explicitly perpetuating these elements as universals, exclude consideration of the inherently cultured nature of argument. In the remainder of the paper, references to the Western tradition of argumentation assume a tradition that emphasizes the elements listed above.

Though argumentation is generally taught and conceived from a traditional Western perspective, this is not the only perspective on argumentation. In fact, modes of and approaches to argumentation vary cross-culturally, even within traditional linguistic, political or national boundaries of culture. Philipsen (1997) defines culture as "a socially constructed system of symbols, meanings, premises and rules" (125). This definition, therefore suggests that it is the system, not geography, nationality or polity that determines a culture. One part of a cultural system is the speech code: "a system of socially constructed symbols and meanings, premises and rules, pertaining to communicative conduct" (126). Argumentation is an element of such a system.

While I will identify cultural forms, functions, and evaluations of argumentation, ubiquity among all members of a particular culture, should not be assumed. Rather, when making a claim about a culture, it is important to recognize that cultures are dynamic, we simultaneously belong to multiple cultures (i.e., American, University, Punk Rock) and that these conceptions of culture are not universal. There are multiple forms of reasoning, functions of argumentation and ways to evaluate a desirable or good argument that stand in contrast to what is taught in traditional argumentation classes. A quick survey of the forms, functions, evaluations and intercultural settings of argumentation nicely demonstrates the complex relationship between culture and argumentation and the limits of western argumentation pedagogies.

Forms of argument are styles or patterns of reasoning. Numerous studies advise that forms of argumentation and reasoning differ across culture. In their review of contrastive rhetoric, Warnick and Manusov (2000) suggest that, in written compositions, Asian students generally follow thought patterns that are different from the traditional inductive and deductive formats taught in English composition classes. These thought patterns are often devalued in ESL classrooms because they do not follow the traditional Western organizational structure. In oral argumentation style, several studies indicate that Asians use narrative, quasi-inductive, intuitive, and indirect forms of reasoning (Choi, 1988; Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1990; Li, 1986). Further, studies of Native American rhetoric suggest Native American protestors employ non-linear forms of reasoning as well as differing temporal perspectives (Lake, 1983, 1986, 1990; Morris and Wander, 1990). Several studies suggest that African Americans tend to use more abductive and narrative forms of reasoning (Bauman, 1986; McLauirn, 1995). Finally, Warnick and Manusov indicate that, even among American students who were expected to use mostly inductive and deductive methods, there were variations in the form of reasoning employed. From this collection of studies, multiple forms of reasoning beyond inductive and deductive are identified including narrative, quasi-inductive, abductive, and indirect argumentation. Therefore, the dominant forms taught in that classroom do not correspond with the argument forms that people from varied cultures use in interactions.

Functions of argument (approaches and or goals) also differ across cultural boundaries. Much has been written about unique Asian approaches to argumentation, suggesting for example, that Japanese and Chinese nationals are disposed against debating and instead value upholding harmony, seeking sympathetic understanding (Becker, 1996). In analysis of Native American cultures, there is a similar emphasis on harmony. Argumentation scholar Nancy Woods suggests that Native American cultures tend to value community as opposed to the Western argumentation model in which there is a focus on rivalry and competition (Woods, 2001). Moreover, in his analysis of Native American protest rhetoric, Lake (1990) suggests that a function of persuasion is ritual enactment in which the action itself becomes an embodied argument. In his analysis of the rhetoric of Navajo culture, Philipsen (1972) suggests that talking things over is the most important means of persuasion and that public discussion is aimed at unanimous consensus and maintaining harmony in the community,

suggesting that all argument does not share the same function in different cultures. The function of argument emphasized in traditional pedagogy is an oppositional win/loss debate model that does not correspond to the varied functions of argument in the multicultural world.

Arguments are also evaluated differently across cultures. A traditional Western approach assumes the primacy of logos. However, the role of ethos, or credibility, in other cultures is often more important than logical reasoning. Native American "elders are responsible for passing on the collective knowledge that our people have accumulated through thousands of years" (Arnold, 1997, 48). In concerns dealing with the past, therefore, elders might be looked to as experts in many Native American cultures. Within Native American communities, younger people tend to agree with those older and wiser than them meaning that Native American students may be unwilling to argue with elders both within and outside Native American communities (Woods, 2001). From a Western perspective as taught in traditional argumentation courses, faith in elders' wisdom might be viewed as a weak argument if it is not also backed up with logic, reasoning, and facts.

Evaluating arguments is also related to epistemology. Kochman (1998) provides an example in his analysis of discursive differences between black and "mainstream white" cultures. He suggests that the appropriate truth-creating process in African American culture is making a 'sincere,' albeit oppositional, argument. While the oppositional nature would seem to fit into a traditional Western notion of argumentation, members of "white" culture, however, often perceive African Americans as argumentative, threatening, and overly emotional. Kochman argues that mainstream white society believes in the ultimate goal of objective truth and reason whereas emotions and beliefs are suspect because they imply subjectivity. According to the traditional Western perspective, which bifurcates emotion and reason, to be rational is antithetical to being emotional. From this perspective, African American argumentation, or emotional argumentation in general, is evaluated as irrational and inferior to logic and reason.

Further Examples of divergence in evaluation of arguments can be seen in analysis of social movement rhetoric. Campbell's (1971) analysis of Black Power suggests that the movement used persuasion and reasoning that was judged ineffective (or even violent) by white audiences but was effective among Black audiences. Similarly, Lake's (1983, 1986, 1990) series of articles referring to

Native American protest rhetoric discuss how critics coming from a western perspective often judge Native American rhetoric as unsuccessful and unpersuasive because they impose Western standards of argument and persuasion on Native American rhetoric. In each case, the forms and functions of argument differed. Evaluation by members of the culture deemed the arguments effective, but from a traditional Western perspective, the positions and arguments are devalued. As evaluations of argument differ across cultures, argumentation pedagogy should reflect multiple ways of evaluating an argument in use.

From the preceding review of literature, we can argue that the forms, functions and evaluations of argument differ cross-culturally. What happens in intercultural communication settings when interlocutors from various cultures use differing modes of argument? To answer this question, Glenn, Witmeyer, and Stevenson (1977) argue that differences in reasoning styles are apparent in studies of international negotiations. In an analysis of UN Security Council minutes related to 1967 Arab Israeli war, distinct patterns among Americans (factual induction) and Soviet Russians (axiomatic deductive). Neither group favored intuitive argumentation (analogical, emotional). Walker (1986) analyzed argumentation strategies in international negotiations. He concludes that reasoning styles vary among members first, second, and third cultures.

Dolino and Cecchetto (1998) suggest that intercultural argumentation also concerns elements of interpersonal communication and language. Facework and politeness strategies come into play in intercultural argumentative interactions. Moreover, language alone cannot traverse chasms of culture difference, leaving the non-native speaker is disadvantaged in the communicative event. Although most of the article deals with politeness and facework in interpersonal settings and decision-making, there are some interesting implications for argumentation, deductive reasoning and power dynamics. Use of deductive reasoning in intercultural settings with interlocutors who prefer abductive or indirect argumentation may be viewed as imposing a conclusion or solution upon dialogic partners. Ultimately, Dolina and Ceccetto suggest “decision making in intercultural communication is not a zero-sum game in which one wins and one loses, as in a straight argument, since with the success of interpersonal relations the company wins as a whole” (171). Interlocutors equipped with instruction in traditional argumentation pedagogy might engage in intercultural communicative interactions assuming the universality of western notions of reason and a bifurcated win/lose, right/wrong approach to conflict.

Traditional argumentation pedagogy ignores the strong link between cultural and argumentation. This risks excluding other cultural forms of argument while perpetuating one particular style of argumentation, neither preparing students for interactions in a multicultural world nor challenging the traditional Western way of knowing and arguing. Challenging the traditional model is important to emphasize cultural diversity. Despite abundant research suggesting that argumentation methods are culture dependent, there has not been a significant push to teach argument from a cultural perspective.

2. Traditional "Western" Argumentation Pedagogy

Recognition that argumentation courses and textbooks teach a Western model of rationality is not new. Warnick and Manusov (2000) write: "[h]istorically the study and teaching of organizational patterns in argument has been centered in a Eurocentric model that emphasizes deductive and inductive patterns of justification" (381, see also: Foss and Griffin, 1995; Gehrke, 1998; Gilbert, 1997; Johnstone, 1996; Mallin and Anderson, 2000; Mitchell, 2000; Williams and McGee, 2000, Woods, 2001). This justification process is traditionally modeled as a form of competitive debate. In American universities, the argumentation course is often linked to intercollegiate debate in one of its many manifestations (e.g., CEDA, NDT, Parliamentary, etc.). Even if the focus is not on intercollegiate debate, most university argumentation classes focus on teaching skills necessary for formal graded debates at the end of the course.

In his review of argumentation textbooks, Tindell (1995) found that textbooks further reveal the prominence of inductive and deductive modes of logic and reasoning, and exercises in debate. Most textbooks, he reveals, focus on logic and critical thinking, provide a handbook for debate, or do a combination of both. Furthermore, Gehrke (1998) suggests four ways in which argumentation textbooks perpetuate a particular notion of argument and reason:

First, argumentation texts favor a particular logical model of reasoning: a western linear mode of logic. Second, there is an implicit assumption of the need to know the truth before engaging in argument. Third, these texts approach argumentation and debate from an oppositional model. Fourth, and perhaps most disturbing, the critical tools of argumentation are depicted as ways to assess others' reasoning and rarely one's own (78).

This suggests that one of the main tools available to argumentation instructors, textbook, perpetuate a Western model of argumentation, encouraging a sense of

inertia in the curriculum of argumentation classes. Moreover, sole focus on the Western model is problematic in fostering an understanding of the complex connection between culture and argumentation.

Generally, argumentation texts do not address multiple styles of argumentation or cultural differences, but several new textbooks address issues of culture. Nancy Woods' (2001) textbook, *Perspectives on Argument*, includes a chapter on culture and argumentation, a valuable first step in introducing alternate styles and asking students to recognize their own personal styles. Inch and Warnick (2002) also devote a section of their text, *The Use of Reason in Argument*, to the recognition of varied cultural patterns, but primary focus is the rational logical approach to reasoning. Makau and Marty's (2001) *Cooperative Argumentation* makes moves to recognize diverse cultural perspectives and is a valuable textbook to consider for a course in multicultural argumentation. While we should applaud such textbooks for attempting to include alternate perspectives, the traditional method remains the primary focus of argumentation pedagogy.

Recently, scholars have challenged traditional argumentation pedagogy from several critical standpoints. Feminist critics implicate the Western model of argumentation and oppositional debating as confrontational and warlike, enforcing patriarchal ways of thinking (Foss and Griffin, 1995; Makau, 1990, 1992, 1996; Mallin and Anderson, 2000). Mallin and Anderson (2000) contend, "argumentation is often characterized as an adversarial activity governed by war metaphors and infused with a win-lose ideology," which is damaging because it prevents collaborative solutions and enforces power hierarchies (121). Moreover, debate classes often reinforce patriarchal notions of competition over cooperation that is antithetical to critical thinking and productive discussion. Students are taught to exert power over each other and the competitive desire to win overpowers seeking a just outcome. While this paper will draw from collaborative methods of practicing argumentation skills, feminist criticism focuses more on gender and power than on the link between culture and argumentation styles. While cooperation becomes the main focus through which one might teach argumentation, I call for culture to be the central element.

Gerhke (1998), coming from an existential perspective, calls for respecting alternate forms of arguing, embracing pluralism and dissonance, and encouraging self-reflexivity. He writes:

argumentation reconceived from an existential perspective, embraces a broad and

often divergent set of possible ways of knowing and recognizes the fallibility and contingency of its own claims. Such a position requires that we embrace knowledge of others as truths to be equally examined and discussed without prior opposition (80).

In his recognition of a plurality of ways of knowing and repositioning the self in argumentation, Gehrke offers an important element to our discussion of argumentation pedagogy: self-reflexivity about one's own style of argument. Yet, Gerhke's argument does not specifically address argument and culture. While Gerhke argues for self-reflexivity and pluralism as a focus of argumentation pedagogy, I argue for an argumentation pedagogy that highlights culture as the central focus.

This corpus of literature suggests that traditional theories of argumentation pedagogy are based in western notions of reasoning, logic and oppositional debating. Yet lacking in this conversation is an analysis of the role of culture in argumentation. In fact, existentialism and feminism are also based in Western cultural assumptions. Despite recognition that we teach argumentation from a Western rational perspective, criticisms do not offer tangible suggestions for including the link between culture and argument into the course content. This may be because of the inherent Western cultural assumptions in these critical theories. While the prior critiques of argumentation pedagogy may destabilize the foundations via analysis of subjectivity and forms of oppression, they do not directly challenge the underlying cultural assumptions of the notion of argumentation. This paper argues that sole reliance on Western rational argumentation styles maintains and places a value on a way of knowing that is not common to all people in the nation or the world.

3. Multicultural Argumentation Pedagogy

To recognize cultural diversity and prepare students for intercultural interactions, it is imperative that we break away from models of argumentation that assume there is one correct way to make an argument. Moreover, if people from differing cultures come to an interaction with differing perspectives on argumentation, which is likely to happen, their education in argumentation should provide them with the tools to have a productive discussion and cooperation.

We must move away from traditional argumentation pedagogy. First, such an approach maintains the dominant ideology, which includes one way of knowing, emphasizes logic over emotion, and values opposition and winners. According to

Leistyna and Woodrum (1999): “As microcosms of the larger society, schools also produce this social turmoil [a conflict of differences] by maintaining dominant beliefs, values and interests – cultural identities – through particular bodies of knowledge, pedagogical practices and curricula” (31). Second, highlighting the western approach devalues and often silences other cultured forms of argument. Even if a course includes a short section on cultural styles of argumentation but then focuses more attention on a Western perspective, it will not lead to “multicultural transformation” (hooks, 1994, 38). Third, in real world interactions in which we constantly face people of different cultures and encounter various forms, functions, and evaluations of argument, traditional argumentation pedagogy with oppositional debates does not simulate intercultural interaction. Instead, it imposes a western method on all interlocutors. Without an understanding that arguments differ cross-culturally, successful intercultural interactions may be hampered.

Though the task of doing “culture” justice in pedagogy is a difficult one, we must attempt to address these issues and include more principles of multicultural education in our argumentation classrooms. A first step in this process comes with reconceptualizing argumentation pedagogy.

4. Re-envisioning the Content

Courses in argumentation can be powerful. We can teach critical thinking, multiple forms and functions of argument and reasoning, practice in using these skills, and ultimately, prepare students to actively engage in public, private, and professional deliberation and discussion. The challenge is implementation. In re-envisioning the argumentation course content, principles from multicultural education are valuable. Banks (1998), an advocate of multicultural education suggests:

major theorists and researchers in multicultural education agree that the movement is designed to restructure educational institutions so that all students, including middle class white males, will acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to function effectively in a culturally and ethnically diverse nation and world (69-70).

The remainder of the paper argues for a method of teaching argumentation from a multicultural and intercultural perspective. This method includes revisions to course content, alternatives to debating, and the creation of a culturally responsive classroom. A multicultural argumentation course should include four

elements, introducing multiple forms, functions and evaluations of argumentation, avoiding cultural generalizations while teaching students to recognize when varied modes are being used, evaluating the usefulness of all approaches, and asking students to reflect on their own styles.

Initially it is important to teach multiple modes of argumentation. This can be accomplished with two interrelated approaches. First, instructors should identify multiple forms of reasoning in addition to the traditional emphasis on induction and deduction. Second instructors should provide empirical examples of potential cultural differences in argumentation forms, functions and evaluation. Although more research in cultural argumentation is needed, we can begin to incorporate these results into our courses and include discussion of abductive, narrative, quasi-inductive, analogical, affective, intuitive types of reasoning.

Teaching a variety of reasoning methods legitimates alternate perspectives, resonates with students' personal styles and prepares students for intercultural interactions. By highlighting empirical studies of argumentation in other cultures, instructors may begin to make the case that culture and argument are inevitably linked, providing a starting point for students to understand, for example, that members of a Native American culture might emphasize narrative reasoning and deference to evidence form elders. Both address the limitation that traditional argumentation pedagogy does not explicate the relationship between argument and culture.

Second, although avoiding generalizations may seem to contradict with teaching empirical examples of cultural variation in argumentation forms, functions and evaluation, the solution to this dilemma lies in striking a balance between relying on generalizations and understanding multiple forms of argument. Teaching critical thinking in a multicultural argument class should include instruction in recognizing and discovering many forms of argumentation in any given interaction. Instead of assuming a Western perspective or even that interlocutors should follow his or her personal style of argumentation, the student with knowledge of the link between culture and argumentation and a toolbox of various forms and functions of argument should be able to engage in intercultural interactions.

According to education theorists, Bowers and Flinders (1990) "introducing new knowledge often presents the danger that the knowledge will be represented as objective and thus universally true" (11). While this quotation was used in

reference to presenting traditional Western knowledge, the admonition applies equally well to multicultural education. It is important that teachers emphasize the dynamic nature of culture and avoid the essentialist trap of associating a style of argumentation with all members of a particular cultural identity.

Third, we must teach to evaluate the usefulness of varied forms, functions and evaluations of argument to what is appropriate in the particular situation or set of interlocutors. The toolbox metaphor is useful in this argument. A student who understands the link between culture and argumentation and who understand many way of arguing will have a fuller toolbox than the student who learns only about the traditional inductive and deductive forms of reasoning and debate. The goal of a multicultural argumentation pedagogy is to provide each student with a full toolbox of different tools, and to teach them how to use and evaluate when to use each tool.

According to Bowers and Flinders (1990) "education should provide students with a basis both for understanding the forms of knowledge handed down from the past and for assessing their current value and usefulness" (5) In some settings it may be appropriate to use a logical, linear form of argumentation, but when faced with an intercultural communication setting, a student should be able to both understand alternate forms of reasoning and engage in discussion.

Argumentation, recognition and legitimization of various forms of argumentation are important. Despite criticisms of the Western rational method, my criticism does not assume that it is inherently problematic; rather that sole reliance in it is inadequate because such reliance devalues alternatives and teaches a method that is only useful in certain spheres with certain audiences. Leistyna, Woodrum and Sherblom (1991) contend:

if the United States is ever to achieve a critical, pluralistic democracy, it is essential that all society's members possess a clear understanding of difference. In order to develop such clarity, people need to be literate in multiple ways of perceiving and speaking about reality. Engaging a full range of perspectives is not an argument for a particular position or ideology, but, rather, it leads us to recognize that there are multiple audiences, and demands a willingness to understand and make ourselves understood in speaking and acting across our differences (11).

Teaching the Western model of argumentation values one perspective over others, which becomes problematic when students encounter conflict or

situations that necessitate the use, understanding or recognition of argumentation in their intercultural sites. “A multicultural focus on knowledge construction includes discussion of ways in which the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, perspectives, and biases within a discipline influence the construction of knowledge” (Banks, 1998, 75). As argumentation instructors we should analyze the assumptions behind the Western approach, recognize its uses, and build from this discussion to incorporate other perspectives.

Finally, students should be encouraged to reflect on their own styles of reasoning. In her textbook, Woods (2001) includes a series of examples of student essays that demonstrate individual approaches to argumentation. In a reflection on cultural differences in argumentation, Lan Mai’s student paper suggests:

The Vietnamese are taught not to argue with their elders. When I was a little child, my parents always told me that it is bad to argue with your parents and elders. Since the first grade, my teachers told us that it is bad to argue, even among friends. That is why I did not like to argue. I did not wasn’t to be disrespectful to another person. When I came to the United States, I learned that in this society you are encouraged to argue for your opinion (43).

An assignment like this is valuable in encouraging students to start thinking about the link between culture and reasoning. Both reflection on one’s own style of argumentation and knowledge of other forms can help to foster critical thinking in students, and exploration of appropriateness and the learning of many forms of argumentative expression.

Although teaching multiple cultural perspectives on argumentation increases the amount of content to be covered in the argumentation course, the benefits of preparing students with critical thinking skills for an increasingly diverse world are worth the extra effort.

5. Alternatives to Debating

The next aspect of multicultural and intercultural argumentation pedagogy is to design activities and assignments that allow students to learn multiple forms of arguing and simulate intercultural argumentative interactions. Multiple venues of practice in argumentation beyond merely debating (which can still be a valuable component in instruction as long as we challenge assumptions and evaluate the usefulness of debates) are an important element in an intercultural and multicultural argumentation classroom. Some advantages of debates are: allowing students to investigate both sides of an issue, enhancing critical thinking skills,

increasing student motivation, and increasing student involvement in social issues (Bellon, 2000; Williams and McGee, 2000). Despite the benefits of debate, "an exclusive focus on in class debates can limit students' perception of the versatility of skills they are developing" (Williams and McGee, 2000, 105). Moreover, exclusive focus on debate emphasizes only one set of skills rooted in opposition and winning. In addition to, or to replace, practice in debate, the argumentation course should include an assignment to prepare students for intercultural discussion and deliberation. I propose inclusion of an assignment in collaborative intercultural negotiation role-play.

Intercultural negotiation role-playing is based in three perspectives. First, Makau and Marty's (2002) new textbook, *Cooperative Argument*, argues for a cooperative model of argumentation for a deliberative community that values "caring justice, peace, equality, happiness, fulfillment, and sustainability" (5). Their model focuses specifically on cooperative problem solving and conflict resolution through methods other than the traditional, oppositional debates that are used in may argumentation classes.

Second, Williams and McGee (2000) suggest that a unit on negotiation can teach a cooperative form of argument that is appropriate and valuable preparation for future public or professional endeavors: "While the negotiation process might be viewed by some as still competitive, it offers an account of argumentative practice with a more cooperative framework and purpose, where a mutually satisfactory outcome is more likely" (135). This paper argues that we van extend this to intercultural settings. Negotiation simulates experiences that students may be likely to encounter in their lives in an increasingly multicultural world. Negotiation can also incorporate multiple forms of reasoning such as abductive and narrative as well as inclusion of emotion, thus providing practice in the forms of reasoning that are traditionally not valued in an oppositional debate with a winner and loser. This focuses on a different function of argument than simply using debates.

Third, in addition to the value of incorporating practice in a variety of modes of argumentation, role-playing allows students to represent different perspectives in an intercultural conflict. According to Mitchell (2000) "role play exercises encourage students to speak not as transcendent, pro/con commentators, but as situated actors in everyday circumstances, able to assume a variety of flexible rhetorical postures" (38). Pedagogical benefits of role-playing include: allowing students to experiment with new types of argumentation outside the mainstream,

providing opportunities to try on the role of someone else, encouraging active kinetic learning and applying of concepts to an actual situation, seeing multiple sides of an issue, working cooperatively, and thinking creatively and critically (Kougl, 1996; Williams and McGee, 2000). A final and crucial benefit of role-playing is its effectiveness in inducing attitude changes such as decreasing prejudice (Kibler et al., 1981). When dealing with intercultural issues and culture, this benefit can be especially important.

Building from Makau and Marty's call for more collaboration, Williams and McGee's call for teaching argumentation through negotiation, and research in role-playing, this paper suggests that an assignment that combines the three is particularly appropriate for teaching multicultural argumentation. Collaboration teaches students that competitive oppositional debating is not appropriate in all settings. Negotiation offers a way to work towards a collaborative solution using various forms of reasoning. Topics of negotiation exercises should consider issues of intercultural conflict in public and professional domains. Finally, role-playing offers students the opportunity to try on different roles and forms of argumentation.

6. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

In addition to revisions in the curriculum discussed in the previous section, we must also consider revisions to the way we teach. If instructors are to provide a model for students, it is equally important that the instructor incorporate multiculturalism into their teaching methods. According to hooks (1994):

Let's face it: most of us were taught in classrooms where styles of teaching reflected the notion of a single norm of thought and experience, which we were encouraged to believe was universal. This has been just as true for nonwhite teachers as for white teachers. Most of us learned to teach emulating this model (35).

Bringing new ways of thinking into the classroom requires challenging this model of teaching.

Bowers and Flinders (1990) provide a theory of culturally responsive teaching, which is useful for creating a classroom environment that is consistent with the multicultural values being addressed in the content of a course in multicultural argumentation. In addition to curriculum changes, there are things that we as teachers can do to enhance the multicultural messages we send with new argumentation pedagogy. Recognizing that the classroom is a language and

culture medium, Bowers and Flinders' goal is to "stress that students and the teacher, as members of different cultural traditions, communicate and learn from each other in an environment that might best be understood as an ecology of language and cultural patterns" (6). If we accept this claim, "the task of the teacher is twofold: (1) to recognize that the patterns of interaction taken for granted within the dominant culture are not universally shared, and (2) to become aware of the patterns with which students most easily identify" (22).

In teaching from a multicultural perspective, teachers risk a performative contradiction in not embodying the values they are trying to profess. If instructors want to legitimize various cultural forms of argumentation, the first place to start is in the classroom by being aware of one's own behavior and cultural assumptions and the backgrounds and assumptions of students. If argumentation instructors profess that the Western traditional mode of reasoning is one of many modes of argument, then they should challenge themselves, recognizing and accepting diversity of reasoning in students.

Teachers must also be responsive to their students: "to teach effectively to a diverse student body, I have to learn these codes…often professors and students need to learn to accept different ways of knowing, new epistemologies, in the multicultural setting" (hooks, 1994, 41). Just as we teach our student to discover and recognize multiple forms, functions and evaluations of arguments, teachers must also constantly pay attention to their students.

In addition to changes in the content of argumentation classes, this paper suggests that instructors should consider techniques for teaching multiculturalism to keep lines of communication open and remain consistent with the value of diversity being taught in the content. According to Esposito (1999) "enhancing the sense of open communication should be a goal for any instructor in the twenty-first century because it enables students to feel more comfortable about embarking on a difficult and foreign subject" (236).

7. Conclusion

This paper is intended to open a discussion about the incorporation of culture and intercultural conflict into the argumentation course. To prepare students to think critically in the multicultural world calls for consideration of multicultural education. Culture clash and conflict seem to be an inevitable element of society, but communication courses can play a role in facilitating understanding and collaboration in multiple venues of intercultural interaction. Specifically through teaching divergent cultural perspectives on argumentation and reasoning, we can

prepare students to understand situations and audiences better. The heart of multicultural education lies in critical thinking which is exactly what argumentation courses are supposed to teach. hooks (1994) argues “without the capacity to think critically about our selves and our lives, none of us would be able to move forward, to change, to grow” (202). From a multicultural perspective critical thinking does not imply only Western notions of debate, analysis of fallacies, argumentation and logic, rather it should include understanding and distinguishing multiple forms of reasoning and being able to communicate and make arguments to different audiences. The changes to argumentation courses discussed in this paper attempt to prepare students to think critically in the real world.

REFERENCES

Arnold, G. (1997). *Living in harmony: Makah*. In National Museum of the American
Indian (Ed.), *Stories of the people: Native American voices* (pp. 42-53). New York: Universe Publishing.

Banks, J. A. (1998). Multicultural education. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 69-84). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bauman, R. (1986). *Story, performance, and event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowers, C. A., & Flinders, D. (1990). *Culturally responsive teaching and supervision: A handbook for staff development*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Becker, C. B. (1986). Reasons for the lack of argumentation and debate in the far east. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 75-92.

Bellon, J. (2000). A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 36, 161-175.

Campbell, K. K. (1971). The rhetoric of radical Black Nationalism: A case study in self-conscious criticism. *Central States Speech Journal*, 22, 151-160.

Choi, Y. H. (1988). Text structure of Korean speakers: Argumentative essays in English. *World Englishes*, 7, 129-142.

Conner, U. (1987). Argumentative patterns in student essays: Cross cultural differences. In U. Conner & R. P. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 57-71). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Dolina, I. B. and Ceccheto, V. (1998). Facework and rhetorical strategies in

intercultural argumentative discourse. *Argumentation*, 12, 167-181.
Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: implications for effective communication. In U. Conner & R. P. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Anthony Esposito. (1999). Class, race and culture: Teaching intercultural communication. In S. L. Linkon (Ed.), *Teaching working class* (pp. 223-236). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
Foss, S. K. and Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 62, 2-18.
Garrett, M. A. (1997). Chinese Buddhist religious disputation. *Argumentation*, 11, 195-209.
Gehrke, P. J. (1998). Teaching argumentation existentially: Argumentation pedagogy and theories of rhetoric as epistemic." *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 35, 76-86.
Gilbert, M. A. (1997). Coalescent argumentation. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Glenn, E. S., Witmeyer, D., & Stevenson, K. A. (1977). *Cultural styles of persuasion. International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 1, 52-66.
Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Thai. In U. Connor and A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 89-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routlage.
Inch, E. S., & Warnick, B. (2002). *Critical thinking and communication: The use of reason in argument* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
Johnstone, B. (1996). *The linguistic individual: Self expression in language and linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kaplan, R. B. (1996). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning,* 16, 1-20.
Kibler, R. J., Cegala, D. J., Watson, K. W., Barker, L. L., & Miles, D. T. (1981). *Objectives for instruction and evaluation* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.
Kochman, T. (1998). Black and white cultural styles in pluralistic perspectives. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication* (pp. 131-156). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
Kougl, K. (1996). *Communicating in the classroom*. Prospect Heights, IL:

Waveland Press.
Lake, R. A. (1983). Enacting red power: The consummatory function in Native American protest rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69, 127-142.
Lake, R. A. (1986). The rhetor as dialectician in "Last Chance for Survival." *Communication Monographs*, 53, 201-220.
Lake, R. A. (1990). Between myth and history: Enacting time in Native American protest rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 77, 123-151.
Leistyna, P., & Woodrum, A. (1999). Context and culture: What is critical pedagogy? In P. Leistyna, A. Woodrum and S. A. Sherblom (Eds.), *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 1-8). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
Leistyna, P., Woodrum, A., & Sherblom, S. A. (1999). Introduction: A call for multiple literacies. In P. Leistyna, A. Woodrum and S. A. Sherblom (Eds.), *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 1-8). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
Li, X. (1996). *Good writing in cross-cultural context*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Mallin, I., & Anderson, K. V. (2000). Inviting constructive argument. Argumentation and Advocacy, 36, 120-133.
Makau, J. M. (1996). Notes on communication education and social justice. *Communication Studies*, 47, 135-141.
Makau, J. M. (1992). Revisioning the argumentation course. *Women's Studies in Communication,* 15, 79-91.
Makau, J. M. (1990). *Reasoning and communication: Thinking critically about arguments*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Makau, J. M., & Marty, D. L. (2001). *Cooperative argumentation: A model for deliberative community*. Prospect Heights, IL: Monterey Bay.
McLaurin, P. (1995). An examination of the effect of culture on pro-social Messages directed at African American at-risk youth. *Communication Monographs*, 62, 301-326.
Mitchell, G. R. (2000). Simulated public argument as a pedagogical play on words. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 36, 134-150.
Morris, R., & Wander, P. (1990). Native American rhetoric: Dancing in the shadows of the ghost dance." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 164-191.
Philipsen, G. (1972). Navajo worldview and culture patterns of speech: A case study in ethnorhetoric. *Speech Monographs*, 39, 132-139.
Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes." In G. Philipsen and T. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing Theories of Communication* (pp. 119-156). Albany, NY: State

University of New York Press.
Sanders, J. A., Wiseman, R. L., & Gass, R. H. (1994). Does argumentation facilitate critical thinking? *Communication Reports*, 7, 27-35.
Tindell, J. H. (1999). Argumentation and debate text books: An overview of content and focus. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 35, 185-191.
Walker, G. B. (1987). Communication across cultures: Argument and international negotiation in argumentation: Analysis and practices. In van Eemerson, F. H., Gootendorst, R., Blair, J. A., and Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Conference on Argumentation, 1986*. Providence, RI: Foris Publishing.
Warnick, B., & Manusov, V. (2000). The organization of justificatory discourse in interaction: A comparison within and across cultures." *Argumentation*, 14, 381-404.
Williams, D. E., & McGee, B. R. (2000). Negotiating a change in the argumentation course: Teaching cooperative argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy,* 36, 105-119.
Winkler, C. K., Chesier, D. M. (2000). Revisioning argumentation education for the new century: Millennial changes. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 36, 101-103.
Nancy V. Woods. (2001). *Perspectives on Argument* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.