

Rhetoric in Scandinavia Retoryka w Skandynawii

10 (4) 2023 ISSUE EDITORS: TOMMY BRUHN, LISA S. VILLADSEN, EWA MODRZEJEWSKA

JENS E. KJELDSEN

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN, NORWAY

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5940-6940>

jens.kjeldsen@uib.no

The practice and pragmatics of Scandinavian research in rhetoric. Audience studies in Scandinavian rhetorical scholarship

Praktyka i pragmatyka skandynawskich badań retorycznych: studia nad audytorium

Abstract

This paper demonstrates the connections between certain cultural traits of Scandinavia, a scholarly interest in rhetorical practice and the workings of rhetoric, and a recent interest in audience-oriented research methods. Scandinavia is characterised by a tradition of practical rhetoric, egalitarianism, high trust, and low scores on power distance and masculinity in Hofstede's culture comparison tool. This, I suggest, is reflected in an interest in the everyday pragmatic functions and workings of rhetoric, paving the way for the use of audience research.

W artykule ukazane zostały związki między skandynawskimi cechami kultury, naukowymi badaniami praktyk retorycznych oraz rosnącym ostatnio zainteresowaniem metodami analizy audytorium. Skandynawia ma długą tradycję retoryki praktycznej, a zgodnie z narzędziem porównywania kultur opracowanym przez Geerta Hofstede, charakteryzuje się egalitaryzmem, wysokim poziomem zaufania, niskimi wynikami w zakresie dystansu władzy i męskości. Odzwierciedleniem tego, jak sugeruję, jest zainteresowanie codziennymi, praktycznymi funkcjami retoryki, co skłania do badań nad audytorium.

Key words

audience studies, egalitarianism, everyday rhetoric, Hofstede cultural comparison, practical rhetoric, rhetorical reception studies, Scandinavia

badania audytorium, egalitaryzm, retoryka codzienności, wymiary kulturowe Hofstede, retoryka praktyczna, studia nad retorycznym odbiorem, Skandynawia

License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 international (CC BY 4.0).

The content of the license is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Received: 12 October 2023 | Accepted: 21 December 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29107/rr2023.4.1>

JENS E. KJELDTSEN

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN, NORWAY

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5940-6940>

jens.kjeldsen@uib.no

The practice and pragmatics of Scandinavian research in rhetoric. Audience studies in Scandinavian rhetorical scholarship

1. Introduction: The pragmatics of rhetoric

“Rhetoric is the study of good speech and writing in theory and practice”¹ (University of Copenhagen 2023a), states the homepage of the education in rhetoric at university of Copenhagen, Denmark. The introduction to the education promises to teach the students “the rhetorical craft through practical oral and written exercises” (University of Copenhagen 2023b). This commitment to craftsmanship and the practical side of rhetoric is dominant in the rhetorical education programmes in Scandinavia. At the University of Oslo (Norway), the students are told that the education will make them able to work “professionally and practically with rhetoric, text, and communication” (University of Oslo 2023). At the University of Bergen (Norway), the students learn “the art of communicating clearly and persuasively” (University of Bergen 2023). At Södertörn University (Sweden) rhetoric is seen as

fundamental for life as an active citizen: the ability to express oneself efficiently and ethically in speech and writing, as well as the ability to listen, consider, deliberate, argue and find agreement, and handle problems and conflicts (Södertörn University 2023).

When Scandinavian students leave the university with a degree in rhetoric, they are expected to be proficient in communication, able to think rhetorically, write convincingly, and in general to communicate persuasively. This is also obvious in the courses offered. At Copenhagen University 50 percent of the courses in the first two years of the BA in rhetoric deal with practical rhetoric. In the first year, the students study “Rhetorical practice and use of voice”, and “Rhetorical writing, language and style.” In the second year, they study “Rhetorical writing and counselling” and “Oral rhetoric and counselling”. Thus, a total of 60 ECTS out of 120 in the first two years are about rhetorical craftsmanship (University

1. The translations made by the author.

of Copenhagen, 2023c). The MA at the university of Aarhus, offers courses in both “Rhetorical production (10 ECTS) and “Rhetorical reflection and praxis” (10 ECTS).

This pragmatic, expedient side of rhetorical communication in the teaching of rhetoric is accompanied by scholars’ definitions of rhetoric, which mostly approach it as a pragmatic form of influencing, a form of acting in the world: “intentional orality” (Fafner 2005, 44 ff.), “an empirical and normative discipline about the production and reception of utterances” (Kock 2011b, 47), “both a praxis and a theory about this praxis” (Roer, Lund, and Madsen 2023), “to act through communication” (Kjeldsen 2014, 12). Such orientation towards real life pragmatic communication, I suggest, directs the research, teaching, and the students towards what we might call the public, the people, or – with a common Norwegian term – “folk flest”, meaning “most people”. This movement, then, naturally opens the door for pragmatic, empirical reception studies, as I will show below.

In the following, I demonstrate the affinity for praxis in the study of rhetoric in Scandinavia and argue that the tradition of audience studies in Scandinavian rhetoric is connected to certain institutional and cultural traits. The institutional aspect partly deals with the pragmatic and practical character of the rhetoric educations leading students toward jobs in communication, and it partly deals with a shared public sphere where most of the population attend to the same media outlets, such as the public broadcasting companies and the major newspapers. The cultural aspect deals with the egalitarian and homogenic character of the Scandinavian societies, marked by high degrees of interpersonal and institutional trust.

I first provide an account of the institutional and cultural circumstances which I suggest is connected to the prevalence of the ordinary and the wish to explore audience reactions to rhetoric. I then use Professor Christian Kock and his research as a brief case study illustrating the Scandinavian view of rhetoric as doing things with words and the following move toward audience studies. I follow up this with a short overview over audience studies in Scandinavian rhetoric. After this, I return to an explanation of how empirical audience- and reception studies belong to a particular Scandinavian ethos. I end with a brief section on the epistemological gain of audience studies and the place I believe it should have in our research, teaching, and curriculum.

2. The egalitarian, pragmatic, and high trust society

One should be careful to make essentialist claims about communities and nations. The three Scandinavian countries are different, and the people in each nation are

also different from each other. Still, there are traits that distinguish Scandinavian society and culture from other countries, and traits that distinguish Scandinavian research in rhetoric from research performed in other countries. I have written about Scandinavian rhetoric and described aspects of such distinguishing traits in several papers (e.g. Kjeldsen 2012; 2021, Kjeldsen and Grue 2011; Kjeldsen, Kock, and Vigsø 2021; Bjørkdahl et al. 2021). Despite differences between these three nations, the Scandinavian countries nonetheless share certain democratic institutional circumstances, and research points to certain values, cultural institutional traits prevalent and shared in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

Firstly, the Scandinavian media system is a prototypical example of Hallin & Mancini's "democratic corporatist model" (Hallin and Mancini 2004), with dominant public broadcasters, a high degree of newspaper reading, and also relatively small populations, which has fostered shared national public spheres (Skogerbø et al. 2021, Newman et al. 2023). As elsewhere, political rhetoric is mainly performed in the media, and the media system creates important rhetorical constraints.

Secondly, the Scandinavian political systems and the Nordic model rests on normative preconditions that "constitute democratic culture, egalitarianism and social inclusion" (Engelstad, Larsen, and Rogstad 2017). In practice, there is a marked proximity between politicians and the public: politicians, including party leaders, cabinet members, and prime ministers, regularly participate in the public sphere with comments, interviews, and debate pieces, and especially on political broadcast debates (Kjeldsen, Kock, and Vigsø 2021).

Thirdly, the Scandinavian countries share certain cultural traits. This is obvious in the country comparison tools from Hofstede Insights. Hofstede Insights defines culture as:

the collective mental programming of the human mind distinguishing one group of people from another. This programming influences patterns of thinking which are reflected in the meaning people attach to various aspects of life and which become crystallised in the institutions of a society. (See <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/>)

Using Hofstede's country comparison tool (see <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/>), we see how the three Scandinavian countries are both similar and different in culture, as defined by Hofstede. His tool is based on more than two decades of research in national cultures (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010, Hofstede, Pedersen, and Hofstede 2002), and surveys six cultural dimensions on a score from zero to hundred (0-100):

1. *Power distance*: the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally.
2. *Individualism*: degree of interdependence a society maintains among its members.
3. *Masculinity*: A high score (Masculine) on this dimension indicates that the society will be driven by competition, achievement, and success, with success being defined by the winner/best in field. A low score (Feminine) on the dimension means that the dominant values in society are caring for others and quality of life.
4. *Uncertainty avoidance*: the way that a society deals with the fact that the future can never be known: should we try to control the future or just let it happen?
5. *Long-term orientation*: Normative societies, which score low on this dimension, prefer to maintain time-honoured traditions and norms while viewing societal change with suspicion. Those with a culture which scores high, take a more pragmatic approach: they encourage thrift and efforts in modern education as a way to prepare for the future.
6. *Indulgence*: the extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses, based on the way they were raised. Relatively weak control is called "Indulgence" and relatively strong control is called "Restraint".

The Scandinavian countries are all rated as low on power distance, high on individualism, very low on masculinity (considered feminine countries in Hofstede's rather specific meaning of 'feminine'), relatively low on uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation, and high on indulgence. Compared to Scandinavia, a country like Poland distinguishes itself from Scandinavia by being high on power distance and masculinity, and very high on uncertainty avoidance, while relatively low in indulgence. The United States is like Scandinavia on most scales, but with higher scores on power distance and individualism (91). The US, however, differs significantly in masculinity. Here Denmark scores 16, Norway 8, and Sweden 5. In a stark contrast to this, the US scores 62. No culture is completely uniform, of course, and scholars will often enact a culture different from the dominant part of a nation. Nonetheless, it is evident that Scandinavian research into rhetoric shares the cultural traits found in Hofstede's research and in the country comparison tool. I suggest that the interest in reception and audience studies in rhetorical scholarship, is connected to the Scandinavian ethos of low power distance, high individualism, and very low masculinity (with high femininity, where dominant values are caring for others and quality of life).

The existence of an egalitarian tendency in Scandinavia is scholarly documented and widely accepted (Bendixsen, Bringslid, and Vike 2018a). It has also been scholarly pointed out and documented that these three countries share an informal style of rhetoric undergirded by egalitarianism and authenticity (Kjeldsen, Kock, and Vigsø 2021; Kjeldsen 2008b). Anders Johansen, for instance, has demonstrated the dominance of rhetorical authenticity in contemporary society in general and in Norway in particular (Johansen 1999; 2002).

I have noted elsewhere (e.g., Kjeldsen 2021, 3–4) that compared to for instance the United States, some of the most important differences in the framework for rhetoric in Scandinavia, is 1) a culture of egalitarianism, trust, and high levels of literacy and education for the population in general; 2) a political system with more parties and compromises, and less polarization, and 3) a media system that is a democratic corporatist model dominated by public service broadcasting, and frequent visits by politicians in national media – even by cabinet ministers and prime ministers. Obviously, these traits are important constraints for rhetorical communication: Egalitarianism does not approve of soaring and visionary oratory but listens to everyday practical argumentation. This, arguably, will affect scholarly work as well.

Already in 1966, the American social scientist Harry Eckstein described the particular authority and legitimacy of a Norwegian politician, displaying a style still prevalent in Scandinavian politics – especially in Norway and Denmark: Prime ministers “cultivate equality more than primacy” (Eckstein 1966, 156 ff., see also Kjeldsen, Kock, and Vigsø 2021, 368). “The great thing”, Eckstein writes:

even among parliamentarians, for example, is to appear to be a regular fellow, practical and commonsensical, well versed in dull facts, rather inelegant, unimpressed, indeed embarrassed by success. One displays [...] a monotonous delivery, a bare style, a lack of ‘manners’ (although not of courtesy) (Eckstein 1966, 156 ff).

Prime Ministers, Eckstein explains, “cultivate equality more than primacy” (Eckstein 1966, 156). In line with this, the ethos of egalitarianism and equality is part of the probably most characteristic trait of the Scandinavian social democratic welfare state, namely its universalism, its application of welfare burdens and benefits to all equally, and its positive emphasis on high levels of welfare, as opposed to more minimal strategies (Esping-Andersen 1990). This aims at elaborate transfer of responsibilities from the family to the state, which ensures a greater degree of economic quality, gender equality, among other things.

These features have, in turn, been connected to egalitarianism and trust (see Bjørkdahl et al. 2021). Scandinavian societies have not been “characterized by a tension or contradiction between the citizen and the state”, but rather “by high

levels of trust in the state”, and the “state in Scandinavia is to a considerable extent regarded as an extension of a political community, the legitimacy of which rests on the perception of broad participation and popular control” (all quotes from Bendixsen, Bringslid, and Vike 2018b, 7). Scandinavian countries have long been high-trust societies (see e.g., European Social Survey Round 9 Data 2018).

Egalitarianism and trust, appear to be mutually reinforcing, according to a logic by which people tell themselves that “they are like us, so we can trust them” (Bjørkdahl et al. 2021, 168). This extends to political rhetoric and debates.

3. The practical in Scandinavian rhetorical research and education

The mentioned cultural and institutional circumstances make up the ecology in which the study of rhetoric lives in Scandinavia. This, naturally, influences the way rhetoric is approached pragmatically and academically. I argue that these circumstances invite scholars to examine everyday situations, ordinary rhetoric, and ordinary people. For instance, the cultural and institutional traits described are mirrored in the affinity for praxis I described in the beginning. The ethos that appears in the course descriptions and research mentioned above and below reveals a sense of public obligation informed by egalitarianism and authenticity (see also Kjeldsen 2021).

This also corresponds to the low scores on Hofstede’s power distance and masculinity as well as the high scores on individualism and indulgence. A primary aim of the study and teaching of rhetoric in Scandinavia is to help people become active agents in their own lives, contribute to create better public debates, improve discussion and reasoning in policymaking. As documented in the first part of this paper, the rhetoric educations in the three Scandinavian countries are closely connected to practical rhetoric: training students in voice use, doing speeches, writing clearly and persuasively, and creating other forms of rhetorical discourse, including forms of multimodal communication in practices.

Particularly relevant here, is the place of “plain language” (in the Norwegian: “Klarspråk”) in both research and teaching. Plain language is concerned with the audience because it is designed to make sure that audience understands as quickly, easily, and completely as possible. In that sense it is egalitarian, since it aims to avoid jargon, verbose, and technical language, to be easy to read, understand, and use for everyone.

At the University of Oslo, for instance, the research and education in rhetoric has led to a bachelor education in “plain language”. The democratic, egalitarian, and audience-centred character of the education is clear in the programme description of “plain language”: “Plain language is communication using words, structure

and visual design so clear that the audience will find the information they need, understand it and being able to use it.” (*Hvorfor velge dette programmet?* 2018)²

This egalitarian democratic trend in rhetorical studies can also be found in the concept of rhetorical citizenship (Kock and Villadsen 2012, 2015). In the early 2000s, the research network *Rhetorical Citizenship* was created by Lisa Villadsen and Christian Kock. It formed a community of interest between rhetoricians and researchers from other subjects, focusing on the rhetorical aspects of the notion of citizenship. The network was concerned with the role of democratic citizens as participants, receivers and consumers of public debate and communication. Here, as in much Scandinavian research, the pragmatic aspect of rhetoric is at the forefront.

4. Doing things with rhetoric

The Scandinavian attention towards the pragmatic, the everyday reception situations, and the audience in general can be illustrated by the teaching and research of Professor Christian Kock. Kock is particularly relevant because was a professor of rhetoric at Copenhagen University for more than 20 years, the department which hosts the biggest, and arguably the most dominant, institution for the study of rhetoric in Scandinavia. Furthermore, since 1997 there have been less than a handful of full rhetoric professors in Scandinavia.

Throughout his work Kock emphasises the rhetorical aim of making the world better, and often mentions specific means of improving rhetoric and communication (Kock 2002; 2003; 2011a; 2011b.). Even his work on deliberation carries this tendency in a broad sense because it is based on the view that words make a difference, that they enter into the world and change it. It is not incidental that Kock – and many Scandinavian rhetoricians with him – often draws upon theories of pragmatics and speech act theory. After all, these theories deal with how words work, such as Austin’s *Doing things with words* (Austin 1976), Searle’s speech act theory (Searle 1969), and Grice’s theory of maxims (Grice 1989). A chapter in one of the most used Danish textbooks deals exclusively with “Rhetorical functions and acts” (Jørgensen et al. 2009, 159 ff.), saying among other things: “It is a common place among rhetoricians that one acts through language – that rhetorical discourse is humans’ attempt to influence their surroundings and societal development” (Jørgensen et al. 2009, 159).

Most of Kock’s research deals with “doing”, which is evident from the title of the collection of his selected writings, which is called *Deliberative Rhetoric*.

2. Quote in Norwegian: «Klarspråk er kommunikasjon med så tydelig ordlyd, struktur og visuell utforming at leserne i målgruppen finner informasjonen de trenger, forstår den og kan bruke den».

Arguing about Doing (Kock 2017). Kock is interested in *impact* and *influence* in the broad sense we find in speech act theory. The Danish word used by Kock is “virkning” (e.g. “working” or “to work”) which is not the same as impact, influence, or effect, even though these are the translations that dictionaries will suggest. The corresponding Danish verb “virke” is better translated to “work” or “function”, which captures Kock’s notion of rhetoric. Rhetoric should *do* something. One of his texts on poetry, for instance, is called “The verse should work” (In Danish: “Verset skal virke”) (Kock 2008, Chapter 7), which attempts to reveal “what makes poetic texts move the reader”, or literally translated “work on the reader” (Kock 2008, 109). This view goes back at least to the 1980s. In a festschrift to his predecessor as professor in Copenhagen, Jørgen Fafner, Kock wrote a piece in 1985 called “What moves us” (In Danish: “Hvad gribes vi af”) (Reprinted as chapter one in Kock 2008), examining how literature, poetry, and humour work rhetorically: What are the traits, techniques, and devices that influence the audience?

In this way, Christian Kock exemplifies the fact that most Scandinavian rhetoric is more closely allied with analytic than with continental philosophy. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, scholars in literature became interested in deconstruction and the rhetorical tradition from among others Friedrich Nietzsche, Paul Derrida, Paul de Man and Hayden White (de Man 1988, Hagen 1998, Kjeldsen and Jarner 1998, Kjølrup 1998). While influential throughout a decade, this tradition did not continue to dominate research and teaching in rhetoric. As suggested by the publications mentioned above and demonstrated below, a pragmatic and functional view took over – or rather continued with new force. Already in 1977 Jørgen Fafner, the first Scandinavian professor in rhetoric in modern times, devoted a full chapter of his classic book, *Rhetoric. Classic and Modern* (Fafner 2005) to “The function of the text”, dealing in detail with Roman Jakobson’s functions of language. A Norwegian textbook demonstrates the same view of rhetoric as a study of how communication works and the functions it carries out, defining the praxis of rhetoric as: “acting through communication” (Kjeldsen 2014, 11).

Compared to the continental philosophical tradition, the kind of analytic philosophy practiced in Scandinavia, perhaps especially in Denmark, directs rhetoric towards the pragmatic, functional, and – by extension – towards the audience. As I will show shortly, the interest in rhetoric’s functions and workings in Scandinavia naturally invites empirical reception studies. However, before I touch upon the move to reception studies, allow me a last brief example demonstrating that this view influenced the rhetoric community at University of Copenhagen as a whole.

The orientation towards the everyday character of ordinary people can be seen in the way scholars from Copenhagen express the aim of rhetorical scholarship.

This is obvious in the volume *Rhetorical Argumentation. The Copenhagen School* (Kock and Lantz 2023) where several articles deal with the pragmatic and practical (e.g., Pontoppidan 2023), and the audience (Rønlev 2023). In the same volume, David R. Gruber recounts how professor Kock in a conversation about the curriculum in an argumentation course explained that:

argumentation as taught in Copenhagen has always responded to everyday concerns; it emphasizes the audience's local values; thus, it is not taught as a subject about structures or ways to judge formalisms; it is always focused on decisions and on actions (Gruber 2023, 387).

Gruber (2023, 387 ff.) then proceeds to tease out four tenets of the Copenhagen School of Argumentation, or we might say, rhetoric:

1. "CS emphasizes paying close attention to a specific, situated domain of action."
2. "CS remains more concerned with questions about action, or concrete proposals, than with abstracting and trying to formalize the 'truth' of a case."
3. "CS also asks rhetors to prioritize and address the actual, lived concerns held by various local stakeholders in-situ."
4. "CS focuses not on 'how to win' an argument, per se, but on how to find a way through to a next step, which is understood as a relevant next possible action."

Overall, Gruber, concludes "CS is pragmatic argumentation geared to get things done democratically, but it is also kind." So, the Copenhagen school seeks to "get things done democratically", in other words: rhetoric has to work, and in order to make it work, one must: "prioritize and address the actual, lived concerns held by various local stakeholders in-situ" (Gruber 2023, 389). Addressing such concerns naturally invites us to consider actual, lived audiences, and the Scandinavian tradition of rhetorical audience and reception studies.

5. The Scandinavian trend of rhetorical audience and reception studies

From the conviction that words can do things and that rhetoric is practical and changes worlds, it is not a long way to the wish to figure out what kind of things words do, and which kind of influence rhetoric might have, which is what we do through reception and audience studies (Bruhn Jensen and Rosengren 2006, Kjeldsen 2016a, Kjeldsen 2018b).

The first large rhetorical study in Scandinavia exploring the reception of empirical everyday audiences is the project *Rhetoric that shifts votes – How to Persuade in Public Debates* (Jørgensen, Kock, and Rørbeck 1994; 1998). This project presents

an empirical study of 10 years of a televised Danish debate programme. The authors explore audience reactions to 37 debates through empirical, quantitative methods, and conclude that “the representative audiences in our debates cast their vote for evidence and thoughtful reasoning” (Jørgensen, Kock, and Rørbech 1998, 295).

While *Rhetoric that shifts votes* primarily examined the audience quantitatively, most – almost all – of the audience and reception work done by Scandinavian rhetorical scholars are qualitative studies. A recent trend in such qualitative studies of rhetoric is a move towards empirical audience and reception studies. The most obvious example is the book *Rhetorical Audiences and the Reception of Rhetoric* (Kjeldsen 2018b). This type of research aims at studying not only rhetorical text and context, but also how empirical audiences accept, negotiate, or reject political rhetoric (Kjeldsen 2018a, 2016a). The approach acknowledges the impact of rhetoric but rejects a simple transmission model of communication. The aim is to understand the interaction between the rhetorical situation, the characteristics of the utterances, and the audience’s uptake and negotiation of them. Instead of moving conjecturally from textual traits to assumed effect, such reception studies allow researchers to move from response to text and point to rhetorical traits that may have shaped the response. Studies deal with press photographs (Kjeldsen and Andersen 2018), social media and Facebook (Vatnøy 2018), political advertising appealing to authenticity (Iversen 2018), and television debates (Vatnøy, Andersen, and Kjeldsen 2020), political commentary (Bengtsson 2018) and how political debate in online media is curated by journalists (Rønlev 2018, 2023).

As these studies suggest, from being mostly preoccupied with theory and textual analysis, Scandinavian rhetoric studies have moved toward a greater interest in research methods such as research interviews and focus groups. One method should be mentioned particularly because it appears to be especially prominent in Scandinavia, and is still rarely used in rhetorical studies elsewhere. This is the method of protocol analysis. *Protocol analysis* (Bengtsson 2018), also known as think-aloud protocols, aims at registering mental activity and responses while they occur. In the so-called think-aloud reading, for instance, informants are asked to read a text aloud, pause and verbalize what comes into mind. The researcher makes audio or video recordings of the reading and the verbalizations, which are then transcribed and analysed – these are the protocols being analysed. In principle, the process can be done with any temporal activity, for instance, having informants report what comes to mind when they are writing, browsing the internet, or listening to music.

Elisabeth Hoff-Clausen (2008), for instance, has let informants talk aloud while navigating political campaign sites, blogs and Wikipedia. She calls this kind of protocol research user-oriented rhetorical criticism, because she not only

carries out user interviews and has members of the intended audience participate in protocol reading; as a rhetorical critic she also analyses and interprets the websites as rhetorical texts (Hoff-Clausen 2007, 102). Mette Bengtsson (2014; 2018) has used protocol analysis to examine how readers of newspapers react to the implied audience in political commentaries. She first analyses the discursive audience construction in a corpus of 90 political commentaries, finding that the reader is constructed as a person “who is interested in the politicians as persons, their positions and strategies for gaining votes, not their arguments for political proposals” (Bengtsson 2018, 171). She then carries out eight read-aloud protocols, finding that readers do “oppositional readings” (Hall 1980) where they characterize the commentaries as “postulating” and perceiving them as having an “excluding” and esoteric language use. Bengtsson’s studies point to the value of rhetorical studies that combine textual analysis and rhetorical criticism with reception-oriented approaches. While think-aloud reading can only be carried out individually, some forms for protocol analysis can be done in groups. Kock, for instance, has developed a written form of protocol analysis, which he has used for examining both the reception of television debates and the reception of music (Kock 2018).

As a way of doing rhetorical reception studies, protocol analysis has the value of providing immediate, concurrent response to communication and rhetorical activities. Kock sees protocol analysis as especially useful for researching rhetorical artefacts devised to *affect people*, especially aesthetic objects such as poems, music, pictures, plays, operas, and films. He has developed a method he calls *aesthetic protocol analysis*, which he uses to examine the reception of an aesthetic artefact. In one study (Kock 2018), he focuses on a purely receptive activity: listening to a piece of classical music, which in contrast to most protocol analysis is an activity where informants tend to sit still and are not engage in any deliberate actions or decisions. Where most traditional protocol analyses have been concerned with cognitive processes (what and how people think), Kock’s aesthetic protocol analysis is meant to illuminate phenomenological processes and their causes (what and how people experience). Such analysis, Kock explains, “is a powerful tool of rhetorical research – if by that we mean scholarship seeking to understand the nature, making and workings of human artefacts that are devised to somehow affect other people” (Kock 2018, 189). This, of course, is exactly what Kock himself means by “rhetorical research”.

Another area in which empirical audience research has been applied in Scandinavian rhetoric is studies of the visual. In visual argumentation, for instance, interviews and focus groups has been used to establish how audiences construct arguments and to explore the cognitive and emotional response created by the

co-called thick representation of imagery (e.g., Kjeldsen 2007, 2016b, 2015b, Kjeldsen and Hess 2021). In a similar vein, the dissertation *When places are created* (Brinch Jørgensen 2016, the original Norwegian: “Når steder skapes”), uses ethnographic approaches and interview-methods to study the visual development of *places*.

Before the publication of *Rhetorical Audiences and the Reception of Rhetoric*, textbooks in rhetoric almost exclusively dealt with either rhetorical theory or rhetorical criticism and analysis (Lund and Roer 2014; Viklund, Fischer, and Mehrens 2014; Kjeldsen 2015a). However, a general interest in method has emerged in both research and textbooks. This trend began with – or at least was supported by – an interest in works on inscribed and constitutive audiences as theorised by for instance Edwin Black (1970) and Maurice Charland (1987). This has been done in research papers (Lund and Tønnesson 2017) and in textbooks (Lund 2014).

A clear example of a more empirical audience oriented trend, is the 2020 publication of the book *Rhetoric and Method* (In Danish: *Retorik og metode*) (Bengtsson, Berg, and Iversen 2020). Here a group of Scandinavian researchers demonstrate an array of methods for rhetorical research. In contrast to previous rhetorical textbooks in Scandinavia most methods are empirical *in natura*: interview studies, ethnographic work, action research, issue mapping, and others. The editors provide three reasons for publishing the book:

1. There is no existing book on rhetorical methods,
2. New types of artefacts and a fragmented field of study creates new demands for scholarship, and, finally,
3. New methods such as ethnographic work and audience analysis have entered the field of study (Bengtsson, Berg, and Iversen 2020, 9–13).

The trend of audience research in Scandinavian rhetorical studies, as I have suggested, is not incidental. The trend is born out of a Scandinavian inclination toward the practical and the empirical, and the orientation toward the public and the rhetorical life of the everyday. In contrast such empirical approaches still appear to be relatively rare in the US (Stromer-Galley and Schiappa 2018), with the notable exception of the recent trend in critical ethnographic rhetoric (Chevrette et al. 2023; McKinnon et al. 2016; Middleton et al. 2015).

A reason for the neglect of reception studies, although not ethnographic work, in for instance the US, may be ideological aspects of academic identity and scholarly self-understanding. American scholars have given several possible explanations. Carole Blair for instance has suggested that an “exclusive focus on symbolicity

diverts us from rhetoric's *do things*", rather than to mean things" (Blair 2015). David Houck offers another explanation: the movement towards critical theory and ideological critique which consider reception and empirical audiences rather irrelevant, or in Houck's words: it is considered "a quaint scholarly anachronism in the age of domination and interpellation" (Houck 2015). Finally, as suggested by Middleton et al. (2015), the explanation might be that the rhetorician sees herself as an intellectual who interprets the world and its rhetorical complexities through her special intellectual capacities and her academic ability to analyse and provide judgement. This puts the scholar in a privileged position as an "expert reader", the brilliant, discerning mind (Middleton et al. 2015, 10, see also Stromer-Galley and Schiappa 2018). From this point of view, doing reception studies and listening to audiences entails a loss of position and power. Instead of explaining the world to people, you listen to people to understand the world. In a Scandinavian context of egalitarianism and practicality, however, such a loss would be less pertinent.

6. The epistemological gain with rhetorical audience studies

Hopefully, it is evident that audience and reception studies of public speaking studies provide us with knowledge and theoretical insight that rhetorical criticism alone cannot provide. It moves us beyond textual conjecture and allows us to understand better how rhetorical communication is received and understood.

Audience and reception studies in rhetoric have grown particularly relevant because it becomes increasingly difficult to conceive of a rhetorical artefact as a discrete and easily demarcated object. In our contemporary and fragmented media environment it is challenging to determine which text an audience has experienced or even who the audience is (Kjeldsen 2008a; Livingstone 2004; McGee 1990; Radway 1988). This is especially true online where communication is constantly produced, copied, shared, and changed. Online communication is interactive, intertextual, and transitory. It is increasingly segmented and personalised through the use of algorithms, creating different texts for different groups – even for individuals. Thus, the best way of finding out how people experience the rhetoric they encounter is simply to talk to them or observe them.

Audience studies not only help us see that rhetorical communication is polysemic and that audiences are active, it also helps us see that audience interpretation and decoding (Hall 1980) are not completely free and incidental. Comprehension and interpretation influence the character of the rhetoric, the affordances, and constraints of the mediation, and – not least – on the culture and character for the audience (Kjeldsen 2018b; Livingstone 2004; Morley 1992; Schrøder et al. 2003). Audience and reception studies of rhetorical communication, then, simultaneously

offers a way of understanding the power of the audience and the power of rhetoric. Furthermore, if we truly wish to understand the persuasiveness of rhetoric, we find surprising, or even worrisome, we will not find good answers by speculating about the (lack of) values or intelligence of the audience.

Different audience and reception approaches may provide different types of insight into rhetoric (Kjeldsen 2018b). They can be combined with each other and with other types of research. They offer ways of understanding the production, appeals, and reception of rhetoric. Thus, audience and reception studies provide us with knowledge and theoretical insight that rhetorical criticism alone cannot provide. It moves us beyond textual conjecture and allows us to understand better how rhetoric is received and understood. Thereby, it not only gives us a better understanding of how rhetoric is received, but it also provides an avenue for determining what good democratic communication might consist of.

References

- Austin, John Langshaw.** 1976. *How to do things with words*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bendixsen, Synnøve, Mary Bente Bringslid, and Halvard Vike, eds.** 2018a. *Egalitarianism in Scandinavia. Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59791-1>.
- Bendixsen, Synnøve, Mary Bente Bringslid, and Halvard Vike.** 2018b. "Introduction: Egalitarianism in a Scandinavian Context." In *Egalitarianism in Scandinavia. Historical and contemporary perspectives*, ed. Synnøve Bendixsen, Mary Bente Bringslid, and Halvard Vike, 1-44. London: Palgrave Macmillan Cham.
- Bengtsson, Mette.** 2014. *For borgeren, tilskueren eller den inviede? En praksisorienteret retorisk kritik af avisens politiske kommentarer*, Doctoral Thesis. Københavns Universitet.
- Bengtsson, Mette.** 2018. "Think-Aloud Reading: Selected Audiences' Concurrent Reaction to the Implied Audience in Political Commentary." In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric. Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 161-183. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Bengtsson, Mette, Kristine Marie Berg, and Stefan Iversen, eds.** 2020. *Retorik og metode*. København: Samfundslitteratur.
- Bjørkdahl, Kristian, Jens E. Kjeldsen, Lisa Villadsen, and Orla Vigsø.** 2021. "Argumentum ad solidaritatem: Rhetorical leadership Strategies in Scandinavia During COVID-19." In *Communicating COVID-19*, ed. Monique Lewis, Eliza Govender and Kate Holland, 163-184. London: Palgrave Macmillan Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79735-5>.
- Black, Edwin.** 1970. "The second persona." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (2):109-119.
- Blair, Carole.** 2015. "'We are all just prisoners here of our own device' Rhetoric in speech communication after Wingspread." In *The effects of rhetoric and the rhetoric of effects*, ed. Amos Kiewe and Davis W. Houck, 31-58. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Brinch Jørgensen, Iben.** 2016. *Når steder skapes. Fire studier av stedsutviklingens visuelle retorikk*, Doctoral Thesis. Universitetet i Oslo.
- Bruhn Jensen, Klaus, and Karl Erik Rosengren.** 2006. "Five traditions in search of the audience." *Communication Theories* 4:185-212.

- Charland, Maurice.** 1987. "Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the People Quebecois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (2):133-150.
- Chevrette, Roberta, Jenna Hanchey, Michael Lechuga, Aaron Hess, and Michael K. Middleton.** 2023. "Rhetorical Field Methods/Rhetorical Ethnography." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.1378>.
- de Man, Paul.** 1988. "Semiologi og retorik." In *Tekst og trope. Dekonstruktion i Amerika*, ed. Lars Erslev Andersen and Hans Hauge, 31-46. Århus: Modtryk.
- Eckstein, Harry.** 1966. "Division and Cohesion in Democracy: A Study of Norway." Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Engelstad, Fredrik, Håkon Larsen, and Jon Rogstad.** 2017. "The Public Sphere in the Nordic Model." In *Institutional change in the public sphere: Views on the Nordic model*, ed. Fredrik Engelstad, Håkon Larsen, Jon Rogstad, and Kari Steen-Johnsen, 46-70. Germany: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta.** 1990. *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- European Social Survey Round 9 Data. 2018. "Data File Edition 2.0. NSD – Norwegian for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and Distributor of ESS data for ESS." doi:10.21338/NSD-ESS9-2018.
- Fafner, Jørgen.** 2005. *Retorik. Klassisk og moderne*. 9. rev. opl. ed. København: Akademisk Forl.
- Grice, Paul.** 1989. *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Gruber, David.** 2023. "Sniff the Air and Settle In: Bullshit, Rhetorical Listening, and the Copenhagen School's Approach to Despicable Nonsense." In *Rhetorical Argumentation. The Copenhagen School*, ed. Christian Kock and Marcus Lantz, 376-407. Windsor: Press Books; Windsor Studies in Argumentation.
- Hagen, Erik Bjerck.** 1998. "Dekonstruksjon og retorikk: Om Brian vickers krtikk av Paul de Man." *Rhetorica Scandinavica* (7):60-70.
- Hall, Stuart.** 1980. "Endocing/Decoding." In *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. Stuart Hall. London: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birgmingham.
- Hallin, Daniel C., and Paolo Mancini.** 2004. *Comparing media systems. Three models of media and politics, Communication, society, and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoff-Clausen, Elisabeth.** 2007. *Online ethos. Retorisk kritik af karakterfremstilling i politikeres, bloggere og brugerfællesskabers webretorik*. Doctoral Thesis. Københavns Universitet.
- Hoff-Clausen, Elisabeth.** 2008. *Online ethos. Webretorik i politiske kampagner, blogs og wikis*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
- Hofstede, Geert, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov.** 2010. *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind: intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, Gert Jan, Paul Pedersen, and Geert H. Hofstede.** 2002. *Exploring culture*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- Hvorfor velge dette programmet?* 2018. Universitetet i Oslo. Retrieved November 20, 2023, from <https://www.uio.no/studier/program/klart-sprak/hvorfor-velge>.
- Houck, Davis W.** 2015. "Of 'Very Few Men' with 'Unusual Gifts' and 'Acute Sensitivity' – Whither Wichelns, Black and Zarefsky?" In *The Effects of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Effects: Past, Present and Future*, ed. Amos Kiewe and Davis W. Houck, 282-296. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Iversen, Magnus Hoem.** 2018. "Audience Response to Mediated Authenticity Appeals." In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric. Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 109-134. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Johansen, Anders.** 1999. "Credibility and media development." In *Television and Common Knowledge*, ed. Jostein Gripsrud, 159-172. London: Routledge.

- Johansen, Anders.** 2002. *Talerens troverdighet. Tekniske og kulturelle betingelser for politisk retorikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Jørgensen, Charlotte, Christian Kock, and Lone Rørbech.** 1998. "Rhetoric That Shifts Votes: An Exploratory Study of Persuasion in Issue-Oriented Public Debates." *Political Communication* 15 (3):283-299. doi: 10.1080/105846098198902.
- Jørgensen, Charlotte, Christian Kock, and Lone Rørbech.** 1994. *Retorik der flytter stemmer: hvordan man overbeviser i offentlig debat*. København: Gyldendal.
- Jørgensen, Charlotte, Lisa Villadsen, Christian Kock, Merete Onsberg, and Hanne Roer.** 2009. *Retorik. Teori og praksis*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2007. "Visual argumentation in Scandinavian political advertising. A cognitive, contextual and reception oriented approach." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 43 (3-4): 124-132.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2008a. "Retoriske omstændigheder." *Rhetorica Scandinavica* (48): 42-63.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2008b. "Visualizing egalitarianism. Political print ads in Denmark." In *Communication politics. Political communication in the Nordic countries*, ed. Jesper Strömäck, Mark Ørsten and Toril Aalberg, 139-160. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2012. "The study of rhetoric in Norway." In *Hunting high and low. Skriftfest til Jostein Gripsrud på 60-årsdagen*, ed. Jan Fredrik Hovden and Karl Knapskog, 757-778. Oslo: Scandinavian Academic Press.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2014. *Hva er retorikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2015a. *Retorikk i vår tid. En innføring i moderne retorisk teori (2. utgave)*. 5. oppl. ed. Oslo: Spartacus, Scandinavian Academic Press.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2015b. "Where Is Visual Argument?" In *Reflections on Theoretical Issues in Argumentation Theory*, ed. Frans H. van Eemeren and Bart Garssen, 107-117. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2016a. "Studying Rhetorical Audiences." *Informal Logic* 36 (2): 136-158. <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v36i2.4672>.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2016b. "Symbolic Condensation and Thick Representation in Visual and Multimodal Communication." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 52 (4): 265-281.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2018a. "Audience analysis and reception studies of rhetoric." In *Rhetorical audience studies and reception of rhetoric. Exploring audiences empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 1-42. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.,** ed. 2018b. *Rhetorical Audiences and the Reception of Rhetoric. Exploring Audiences Empirically, Rhetoric, Politics and Society*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E.** 2021. "Eager to Be in Touch with the World: The Practice and Study of Rhetoric in Scandinavia." *The Southern Communication Journal* 86 (2):107-118. doi: 10.1080/1041794X.2021.1882546.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E., and Ida Andersen.** 2018. "The Rhetorical Power of News Photographs: A Triangulatory Reception Approach to the Alan Kurdi Images." In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric: Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 309-333. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E., and Jan Grue.** 2011. *Scandinavian studies in rhetoric. Rhetorica Scandinavica 1997-2010*. Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E., and Kell Jarner,** eds. 1998. *Rhetoric Scandinavia. Tema: Dekonstruktion & retorik*. Vol. 7. København: Syvmil Kommunikation.
- Kjeldsen, Jens E., Christian Kock, and Orla Vigsø.** 2021. "Political rhetoric in Scandinavia." In *Power, communication, and politics in the Nordic countries*, ed. Eli Skogerbø, Øyvind Ihlen, Nete Kristensen, and Lars Nord, 365-383. Gothenburg: Nordicom.

- Kjeldsen, Jens E., and Aaron Hess.** 2021. "Experiencing multimodal rhetoric and argumentation in political advertisements: a study of how people respond to the rhetoric of multimodal communication." *Visual Communication* 20 (3): 327-352. doi: 10.1177/14703572211013399.
- Kjørup, Søren.** 1998. "Retorik, dekonstruktion, pragmatik og den postmoderne skepsis." *Rhetorica Scandinavica* (7): 51-59.
- Kock, Christian, ed.** 2002. *Forstå verden : politisk journalistik for fremtiden*. Fredriksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
- Kock, Christian.** 2003. "Magtkamp eller statskunst: Politisk kommunikation på mediernes præmisser." In *Maktens tekster*, ed. Kjell Lars Berge, Siri Meyer, and Tom Are Trippestad, 158-181. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Kock, Christian.** 2008. *Retorisk poetik*. Åstorp: Retorikforlaget.
- Kock, Christian.** 2011a. *De svarer ikke: fordømmende uskikke i den politiske debat*. København: Gyldendal.
- Kock, Christian.** 2011b. "The Identity of Rhetoric as a Scholarly Discipline and a University Program." In *Scandinavian Studies in Rhetoric. Rhetorica Scandinavica 1997-2010*, ed. by Jens E. Kjeldsen, 40-55. Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.
- Kock, Christian.** 2017. *Deliberative rhetoric. Arguing about doing*. Windsor, CA.: Windsor Studies in Argumentation, OSSA.
- Kock, Christian.** 2018. "The Semiotics and Rhetoric of Music. A Case Study in Aesthetic Protocol Analysis." In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric: Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 185-212. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG.
- Kock, Christian, and Marcus Lantz, eds.** 2023. *Rhetorical Argumentation. The Copenhagen School*. Windsor: Press Books; Windsor Studies in Argumentation.
- Kock, Christian, and Lisa Villadsen, eds.** 2012. *Rhetorical citizenship and public deliberation*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Kock, Christian, and Lisa Villadsen, eds.** 2015. *Contemporary Rhetorical Citizenship*. Leiden: Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Livingstone, Sonia.** 2004. "The Challenge of Changing Audiences." *European Journal of Communication* 19 (1):75-86. doi: 10.1177/0267323104040695.
- Lund, Marie.** 2014. "Retorisk publikum." In *Retorikkens aktualitet. Grundbog i retorisk kritik*, ed. Marie Lund and Hanne Roer. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Lund, Marie, and Hanne Roer.** 2014. *Retorikkens aktualitet: grundbog i retorisk kritik. 3. udg.* ed, Sprog i praksis. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Lund, Marie, and Johan Tønnesson.** 2017. "Kongens tale ved hagefesten." In *Åpne dører mot verden*, ed. Jonas Bakken and Elisabeth Oxfeldt, 32-46. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- McGee, Michael Calvin.** 1990. "Text, context, and the fragmentation of contemporary culture." *Western Journal of Communication* 54 (3):274-289.
- McKinnon, Sara L., Robert Asen, Karma R. Chávez, and Robert Glenn Howard.** 2016. *Text + field: innovations in rhetorical method, Text and field*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Middleton, Michael, Aaron Hess, Danielle Endres, and Samantha Senda-Cook.** 2015. *Participatory Critical Rhetoric: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations for Studying Rhetoric In Situ, Participatory Critical Rhetoric*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Morley, David.** 1992. *Television, audiences, and cultural studies*. London: Routledge.
- Newman, Nic, Richard Fletcher, Kirsten Eddy, Craig Robertson, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen.** 2023. Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2023. Oxford.

- Pontoppidan, Christina.** 2023. "In Search of the Productive Place(s) of Rhetoric: Outlining a Rhetorical-topical Argument Model for Argument Invention." In *Rhetorical Argumentation: The Copenhagen School*, ed. Christian Kock and Marcus Lantz. Windsor: Press Books; Windsor Studies in Argumentation.
- Radway, Janice.** 1988. "Reception study: Ethnography and the problems of dispersed audiences and nomadic subjects." *Cultural Studies* 2 (3): 359-376. doi: 10.1080/09502388800490231.
- Roer, Hanne, Marie Lund, and Carsten Madsen.** 2023. "Retorisk kritik - en oversikt." In *Retorikkens aktualitet. Grundbog i retorisk kritik*, ed. Hanne Roer, Carsten Madsen, and Marie Lund, 11-44. København: Hans Reitzels forlag.
- Rønlev, Rasmus.** 2018. "Brølet i kommentarsporet: Journalisters formidling af den offentlige opinion på politiken.dk." *Journalistica - Tidsskrift for Forskning i Journalistik* 12 (1): 48-77. doi: 10.7146/journalistica.v12i1.105541.
- Rønlev, Rasmus.** 2023. "The Roar in the Comment Section: How Journalists Mediate Public Opinion on the Danish Online Newspaper politiken.dk." In *Rhetorical argumentation. The Copenhagen School*, ed. Christian Kock and Marcus Lantz, 198-228. Windsor: Press Books, Windsor Studies in Argumentation.
- Schrøder, Kim Christian, Catherine Murray, Kirsten Drotner, and Stephen Kline.** 2003. *Researching audiences*. London: Arnold.
- Searle, John S.** 1969. *Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language*. London & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Skogerbø, Eli, Nete Nergaard Kristensen, Lars Nord, and Øyvind Ihlen.** 2021. "A Nordic model for political communication?" In *Power, Communication, and Politics in the Nordic countries*, ed. Eli Skogerbø, Øyvind Ihlen, Nete Kristensen Nørgård, and Lars Nord, 13-27. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Stromer-Galley, Jennifer, and Edward Schiappa.** 2018. "The argumentative burdens of audience conjectures: Audience research in popular culture criticism." In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric. Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 43-83. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Vatnøy, Eirik.** 2018. "Focus Group Studies of Social Media Rhetoric." In *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric. Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. Jens E. Kjeldsen, 135-160. London: Palgrave Macmillan Cham.
- Vatnøy, Eirik, Ida Andersen, and Jens E Kjeldsen.** 2020. "Velgernes reaksjon på retorikk i TV-debatter." *Rhetorica Scandinavica* 80:1-19.
- Viklund, Jon, Otto Fischer, and Patrik Mehrens,** eds. 2014. *Retorisk kritik. Teori och metod i retorisk analys*. Åstorp: Retorikförlaget.
- University of Copenhagen.** 2023a. Karrieremuligheder [Career options]. Retrieved December 17, 2023 from <https://studier.ku.dk/bachelor/retorik/karrieremuligheder/>.
- University of Copenhagen.** 2023b. Bachelor i retorik [Bachelor in rhetoric]. Retrieved December 17, 2023 from <https://studier.ku.dk/bachelor/retorik/>.
- University of Copenhagen** 2023c. Undervisning og opbygning [Courses og structure]. Retrieved December 17, 2023 from <https://studier.ku.dk/bachelor/retorik/undervisning-og-opbygning/>.
- University of Oslo.** 2023. Retorikk og språklig kommunikasjon [Rhetoric and verbal communication]. Retrieved December 17, 2023 from <https://www.uio.no/studier/program/nordisk-master/studieretninger/retkom/hvorfor-velge>.
- University of Bergen.** 2023. Retorikk, Bachelor, 3. år. [Rhetoric, Bachelor 3. years]. Retrieved December 17, 2023 from <https://www.uib.no/studier/BAHF-RET>.
- Södertörn University.** 2023. Retorik. [Rhetoric]. Retrieved December 17, 2023 from <https://www.sh.se/institutioner--amnen/institutionen-for-kultur-och-larande/retorik>.