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**Relationship between Pathos and Ethos within the Nonprofit Sector**

Aristotle is revered as one of the most prolific and influential thinkers of the 4th Century BC. His works have influenced Cicero, Quintilian, and post-enlightenment thinkers. Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric and use of the rhetorical appeals (ethos, pathos, and logos) are the most circulated description and application of rhetoric in first-year composition courses, but receive minimal attention outside of academia. It is the norm within the nonprofit sector to apply the use of emotional appeals in order to establish character and credibility (ethos), but the relationship between both has received minimal attention within nonprofit sector studies and in the field of rhetoric. This literature review will explore the relationship between ethos and pathos and how its embedded within the governance-as-leadership model used within leadership positions in the nonprofit sector. First, I will provide an overview of rhetoric and the use of pathos and ethos from ancient Greece. Then, an overview of the nonprofit sector and governance-as-leadership model will be presented. Finally, the paper will address how combining scholarship from nonprofit sector studies and the field of rhetoric is needed.  **Rhetoric in Ancient Greece** The contrasting definition and use of rhetoric from Plato and Aristotle demonstrates how rhetoric has evolved in Ancient Greece. Plato refutes the validity of rhetoric due to being a form of flattery, and, in *Phaedrus*, he describes rhetoric as a knack used to please and persuade the public. Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee (2012) argue how “… early rhetorical theorists like Gorgias and Plato characterized rhetoric as a psychagogia, a leader or enchanter of souls” (p. 174- 175). Prior to Aristotle, the use of emotional appeals was not categorized. Early texts like Homer’s Iliad and the Odyssey and early sophistic manuals addressed or showed the use of emotional appeals (Crowley, 2012 p. 172). The strategic use of pathos (arousing emotion) was not included in the traditional sophistic manuals, but was “part of their general discussion in the introduction and conclusion” (Crowley, 2012, p. 175). Plato found the use of emotional appeals in rhetoric problematic due to its manipulative and deceitful nature. In Gorgias, Plato’s depiction of Gorgias’s (the sophist) use of rhetoric is grounded in relativistic epistemology and does not allow for “knowledge of immutable truth” to occur due to Gorgianic rhetoric being unstable, irrational, and solely focused on the pleasures (McComiskey, 2002, p 29).

While there is a difference between emotional appeals and pleasures, Plato saw rhetoric as deceitful due to it being able to manipulate audience perception. Positioning Gorgianic and sophistic rhetoric as being irrational signified the circulation of doxa, and, to what Plato referred to, “rhetoric to the soul to what cookery is to the body.” In order to enhance the validity of democratic power structure, Plato then vilified Gorgias and Gorgian rhetoric as being “absurd” (McComiskey, 2002, p. 25). Gorgianic/sophistic rhetoric devalued the use of emotional appeals. For Gorgias, the sophist, human thought is not rational because it is heavily influenced and distorted through human sensory-perception. Thus, an emotional response can potentially alter the audience’s perception (Crowley, 2012, p. 175). Gorgianic rhetoric then relies on terpsis, “...in which terpsis, a passive, aesthetic, sensory response to a stimulus, leads to and must precede amanke, the active, psyche-based force that motivates the desired physical action in the audience” (p. 28). Similarly, for Plato, appealing to the audience’s emotions enhances the manipulative and deceitful consequences of rhetoric. When the process of sensory perception is affected, it thus deconstructs Plato’s “knowledge-versus opinion binary” and renders it as being “.. unacceptable for Gorgias the sophist” (McComiskey, 2002, p. 23). Plato’s view of rhetoric did not dissuade or hinder Aristotle’s argument pertaining to the use of emotional appeals as a persuasive technique, but rather Aristotle provided a counterargument to Plato and Gorgionic rhetoric.

The different views of rhetoric between Gorgias, Plato, and Aristotle influences the role of speaker/orator and the application of rhetorical appeals (a speaker’s/orator’s use of emotional appeals; moral character; and organization/content/delivery of speech). Unlike Plato, Aristotle positions rhetoric as a heuristic tool for the speaker. Aristotle situates rhetoric as not belonging to a specific subject, is dialectic, and “…its function is not to persuade but to see the available means of persuasion in each case, as is true also in all other arts” (p. 35). Aristotle claims rhetoric is both a method and art “derived from ethics and politics on the bases of its conventional uses” (p. 12). This definition is explicated through the theoretical and applicable use of Aristotle’s ethos, pathos, and logos, as well as being the foundation for the skills used by Cicero’s orator in *De Oratore*.  
 Influenced by Plato and Gorgias, Aristotle sought to expand the view and application of rhetoric in civic discourse by advocating for the opposite: using emotional appeals contextualizes the speech and can potentially build a speaker’s credibility, thus establishing a more effective outcome. *On Rhetoric* is not a manual on how to appeal to an audience, but rather details a theoretical framework on how rhetoric can be a heuristic strategy for the speaker. The conventional use of ethos, pathos, and logos is shaped through the commonplaces and context of the speech. One of Aristotle’s arguments in *On Rhetoric* is how ethos, pathos, and logos are intertwined; however, Quintilian argues that “roman rhetoricians who relied on Greek rhetorical theory sometimes confused ethos with pathos … because there was no satisfactory term for ethos” (Crowley and Hawhee, 2012, p. 174). Crowley and Hawhee (2012) state: “Aristotle’s picture of the rhetorical situation as ethos meeting (and creating) pathos, layers of dispositions. If rhetoric wants to evoke an emotion, it is best to display that emotion as well” (p. 181). Aristotle claims there are levels to emotions and is dependent on the speaker’s relationship with audience (state of mind, against whom, and reasons for the emotion) (p. 121). For Aristotle, “emotions are all those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgments, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure” (p. 35). By establishing trust and understanding the context of the emotions, the speaker is able to be more persuasive and procure a more effective outcome from his speech. Enos and Borrowman (2001) and Crowley and Hawhee (2012) build on the relationship between pathos and ethos.

To the fourth century BCE Greeks, ethos, specifically the character component, is constructed through a person’s virtuous characteristics as well as their reputation. The Greeks claimed “that a good character could be constructed by the habitual practice of virtuous acts … but ‘character’ also referred to the community’s assessment of a person’s habits” (Crowley and Hawhee, 2012, p. 148). While Aristotle provides a distinction between both ethos and pathos, it is the relationship between the two that merits attention for Aristotle. From an Aristotelian perspective, “the speaker attains ethos through ethical habits, through being the type of good person by whom an audience can be persuaded” (Enos and Borrowman, 2001, p.96). For Aristotle, “good sense, good moral character, and goodwill” create a positive ethos and a receptive emotional state of mind from the audience. The creation of a positive ethos is then attributed to virtue. Through the creation of a positive ethos, Aristotle places the speaker as having “virtuous moral intent and understanding of the good” (p. 83). Therefore, the moral capacity and understanding of the good should then, in theory, enhance knowledge and establish “trust” between the speaker and the audience. Enos and Borrowman (2001) argue that from Aristotelian perspective, the credibility of a speaker stems from “…a belief in the wisdom of the rhetor that is encouraged in the audience by the rhetor” (2001, p. 96). Thus, the rhetor’s authority lies in their credibility and ability to converse on various matters; however, “in classical rhetoric … it was a given that a rhetor with no credibility would ultimately reveal himself or herself” (Enos and Borrowman, 2001, 96). Aristotle describes virtue as being associated with “justice, manly courage, self-control, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence and wisdom” (p. 80). A virtuous man does not signify honor, but rather the greatest virtue is when it can be used to help others. In order to help others, then the speaker must understand his audience. This approach differs from his predecessor, Plato, because he perceived virtue, or a positive ethos, to solely be associated with knowledge. From an Aristotleian perspective, “trust” established between a speaker and the audience is the foundation for the application of pathos in Aristotle’s *On Rhetoric* and Cicero’s *De Oratore*.   
 Unlike Plato, Cicero builds on Aristotle’s use of emotional appeals. The use of emotional appeals allows for the orator, according to Cicero, to “lean in the direction” that the orator guided the audience (p. 172). Both Aristotle and Cicero in their respective texts pair opposing emotions and address the state of mind of the speaker/orator and the audience, reason for using emotion, and intensity received/given. Aristotle’s intensity of emotions is similar to Cicero’s “vigorous oratory,” in which the state of mind of the speaker and the audience influence the intensity (or levels) of emotions. For Cicero, it is an easier feat to embellish an emotion than to fabricate an emotion (p. 171). According to Cicero, the important emotions to arouse in a speech and “…. In the hearts of jurors, or of any other audiences [orators] address: affection, hate, anger, envy, pity, hope, joy, fear, and grief” (p. 198). Similarly, Aristotle sought to arouse similar emotions, but Cicero’s attention to emotions focused more on hostile emotional appeals than Aristotle.   
 In *De Oratore*, Cicero argues that “employing thoughts of a certain kind and words of a certain kind, and adopting besides a delivery that is gently and shows signs of flexibility, makes appear as decent, as good in character…” (p. 171). Cicero claims the use of emotional appeals can establish an orator’s credibility with the audience, and it is a crucial trait for the character of the orator and the delivery of a speech. Aristotle’s influence on Cicero is evident in the stylistic choices (pitch, tone, etc.) that are advocated by Cicero. Similar to Aristotle’s contextualization of commonplaces, Cicero’s orator “… carefully concentrate all of [his] thoughts on considering, on scenting out as keenly [he] can, what their feelings, their opinions, their hopes, and their wishes are, and in what direction my speech may most easily lead them” (p. 172). The awareness of the relationship between audience and the speaker is critical for the delivery of speech for both Aristotle’s speaker and Cicero’s orator. An understanding of the emotional state of the audience in order to evoke an emotional appeal then can create a similar sentiment to what Aristotle describes as a positive ethos. Similar to how The creation of a positive ethos by using emotional appeals situates the classists as being civic and democratically minded, which is evident in today’s interdisciplinary nature of rhetoric. Scholarship within the nonprofit sector studies often addresses the moral character/ethos/ethic and use of emotional appeals by nonprofit organizations.

**Defining the Nonprofit Sector** Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric is the most circulated definition and application of rhetoric in undergraduate composition courses today, but the Aristotlian use of ethos and pathos is also found within nonprofit sector studies. The non-profit sector is comprised of charitable organizations that are classified by the Internal Revenue Service as a public charity or private foundations. Under the section 1986 tax code, public charities are classified as 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt organizations. 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt status are commonly referred as non-profit organizations, and differ in classification from religious organizations, political organizations, and Civic Leagues, Social Welfare Organizations, and Local Associations of Employees due to the restrictions imposed on lobbying and political action (IRS). The National Center for Charitable Statistics (2015) found that as of September 2015, there are 1, 532,250 tax-exempt organizations. The breakdown of the tax-example organizations includes: 1,061,916 public charities, 102, 055 private foundations, and 368,279 “other types of non-profit organizations, including chambers of commerce, fraternal organizations and civic leagues.” The growth of the non-profit sector has led to an increase of interdisciplinary scholarship. The Aristotelian view of rhetoric being a heuristic tool then allows for other fields, like the nonprofit sector studies, to capitalize on the interdisciplinary nature of rhetoric.

Scholarship pertaining to the governance emphasizes on the application of “ethical” and “moral” character of nonprofits, which builds on Wootliff and Dery (2001) and Laidler-Kylander, Quelch, and Simonin (2007) research on how the role of nonprofits have shifted over time. Scholarship within the non-profit sector grew in the 1980’s (Worth, 2014), and with this growth it was found that non-profit organizations shifted from being “perceived as small bands of activists, but rather as the new super brands” (Wootliff and Dery, 2001). According to a study of global brands within the non-profit sector, Laidler-Kylander, Quelch, and Simonin (2007) found “the roles brands play and the stakeholders they address vary depending on the characteristics of the organizations themselves” (p. 275). The characteristics of the organizations is reliant on the creation of ethos and the use of pathos, which is an area where scholars, like Doug White (2010) and Michael Worth (2014), explore the role of ethos in the leadership and decision making process. Other scholars investigate the use of emotional appeals in non-profit marketing strategies and in the creation of a nonprofits mission statement. According to Winton and Hochstadt (2011), “The big difference between a non-profit’s marketing message and that of a for-profit company is that the benefits are different; in the case of your nonprofit, you’re not selling products and services, you’re selling social impact” (p. 412). The social impact is tied with the organization’s ability to create a competitive advantage through a strong online presence and branding strategies. Nonprofits value social capital, but in order to receive social capital one must have strong mission statement, values, goals, and governance and strategic planning practices (Worth, 2014; Bell, 2011).  
 While Aristotle does not view passion as a virtue, passion within the nonprofit sector is seen as a strength used to create a nonprofit organization’s character for stakeholders (Allison and Kaye, 2001). Allison and Kaye (2001) describe the “passion” of a nonprofit organization to be:

A great source of strength for nonprofit organizations. The institutionalized impulse to "change the world" has brought about many important advancements in American society. As a strength, the passion for mission taps incredible creativity, energy and dedication for the work of an organization. However, zeal for the mission can lead staff board and volunteers to discount "business" realities, to turn strategic differences into interpersonal conflict, and to work with an urgency that borders on a crisis mentality.   
(p. 1)

The limitations of “passions” is then assessed through the challenges faced by governance and strategic leadership qualities (Drucker, 2008; Trower, 2010).   
 Similar to both Aristotle and Plato’s view of rhetoric, one can see connections with Rotschild and Milfosky (2006) call for additional research within the nonprofit sector on values, ethics, and passions. Rotschild and Milfosky (2006) state, “as human values and public ethics can come to be considered and known only through a dialogic and democratic forum, we believe that organizations that are values driven raise questions and opportunities for the study of participatory methods of managing organizations” (p. 142) Studies on nonprofit management, then, become areas where one can assess the relationship between ethos and pathos. In the case of the non-profit sector, ethos is associated with governance and strategic planning, and pathos is established through the nonprofits mission, social capital, and relationship with the organization’s moral/ethical guidelines (Bell, 2011; Trower, 2010; Worth, 2014). Doug White (2010) introduces the nonprofit ethos in *The Nonprofit Challenge: Integrating Ethics Into the Purpose and Promise of Our Nation's Charities* by defining the non-profit ethos as a focus on ethics and an adaptation of an “ethical foundation” in order for nonprofit organizations to “… help themselves and become leaders in society” (p. 214). Similar to Aristotle’s relationship of ethos and pathos, White (2010) argues that a non-profits contribution to society is an “ethical imperative” in order to “… find humanity in society” (p. 12). The attention to humanity is, within this context, similar to Aristotle’s argument of how the greatest virtue is when it can be used to help society, thereby, in order to help others, then the speaker must understand his audience, establish a moral character, and use the emotional appeals in order to connect and build a positive ethos. The core of White’s (2010) argument is how society lacks a “common ethos,” which he describes as a process of thinking and feeling, “…where the resulting decision, come what may, can be respected by everyone” (p. 13). It is the attention to incorporating emotion into one’s moral character and decision making process that shares similarities to Aristotle’s view of ethos and pathos. This contemporary view is not explicitly stated within White’s research, but the ethical use of emotional appeals is emphasized by White (2010), and builds on the scholarship of nonprofit leadership practices where intelligence, compassion, dignity, and authority are heralded as key characteristics of nonprofit leaders and the organizations they run (p. 13).   
 White (2010) argues ethos is not established through marketing, and is lacking within the nonprofit sector due to nonprofit solely focusing on buzzwords, such as “transparency, accountability, and conflict of interest” (p. 214). The lack of a non-profit ethos also stems from non-profits not addressing “real action items that result in an ability to make hard decisions in the right way” (p. 214). The non-profit leadership values that White (2010) emphasizes is also seen in Michael Worth’s *Nonprofit Management: Principles and Practice*. Worth (2014) states “some concern that the application of business methods and business thinking holds the risk of undermining traditional nonprofit values and diminish nonprofit organizations’ unique contributions to society” (p. 11). Common nonprofit values revolve around charity, philanthropy, and voluntarism (Worth, 2014, p. 40). Worth (2014) claims “the services [nonprofits] provide are important, but nonprofits also are essential for creating civil society, pursuing social change, and sustaining the free expression of ideas and opinions in a democratic society—indeed, for preserving our most important values as a society” (p. 11). The values which represent society are inherently tied with an organization’s identity and the governance and strategic leadership practices by the nonprofits board (Worth, 2014; Trower, 2010).

**Limitations of Assessing Values, Passions, and Ethics Within the Nonprofit Sector**

Rotschild and Milfosky (2006) assert research on the values and ethics of nonprofit leaders is underrepresented due to the “… relative methodological difficulty of getting a handle on values, passions, and ethics” (p. 139). Consequently, Worth (2014) argues that a methodologies have changed and trends in nonprofit scholarship predominantly deal with nonprofit governance and how the values, ethics, and passions, as presented by Rotschild and Milfosky, are seen as profitable management characteristics to assess. The nonprofit management revolution and how nonprofit management has paved the path for change/social impact. Nonprofit leaders establish connections with community stakeholders, thereby, enabling the organization to negotiate and compromise while providing services to their targeted audience. Nonprofit management is a relatively young field, but there has been an increase in scholarship (Trower, 2012; Worth, 2014).  
 A nonprofit organization’s mission, value, goals, ethics, and passions, as described by Worth (2014), is connected with a nonprofit organization’s identity. Organizational identity theory is commonly used within non-profit sector studies. Introduced in 1985 by Albert and Whetten, “the concept of organizational identity is specified as the central and enduring attributes of an organization that distinguish it from other organizations” (Whetten, 2006, p. 219). Controversy surrounding Albert and Whetten’s (1995) definition of organizational identity stems from scholars within the non-profit sector studies deviating from the definition of organizational identity. However, Worth (2104) asserts that the study of organizational identity is inherently selective but common characteristics of non-profit organizations stemming from organization theory can still be traced. Worth (2014) found that most non-profit organizations share the same organizational identity characteristics, such as being organized entities, private, non-profit distributing, self-governing, voluntary, and of public benefit (p. 56 – 57). The differences in organizational identity stem from the services and the organization’s external environment. According to organizational theorists, non-profit organizations are open systems, thereby “…are dependent on and interact frequently with their external environments. This is true because of their dependence on external resources, their social missions, and the involvement of volunteers at various levels of the organization” (Worth, p. 59). It through governance and strategic planning assessment, according to Worth (2014) and Trower (2010), that creates the nonprofits moral and ethical behavior.

Rotschild and Milfosky (2006) address the limitations of measuring “ values, passions, and ethics;” however, Worth (2014) asserts that a single theory cannot define and uphold the complexity and diversity of the non-profit sector, but, through the use of multiple theories, one can reach a better understanding of how a nonprofit organization is structured within specific contexts. The complexity and diversity of nonprofit organizations is reflected in the terminology that is used to describe the characteristics and strategies of nonprofit organizations. Worth (2014) states “it is worth considering some of these terms because they reveal differences in how people view the sector and which of its characteristics they emphasize” (p. 21). Trower (2010) argues that a group’s culture is influenced by artifacts, espoused values, and basic underling assumptions of the group’s vision and goals (p. 126).   
**Strategic Leadership and Governance**

Strategic leadership within a nonprofit is established through governance (Drucker, 2008; Renz, 2007; Trower, 2010; Worth, 2014). Governance within the non-profit “…refers to the process of providing leadership, direction, and accountability for a specific nongovernmental, not-for-profit organization” (Renz, 2007, p. 1). Through a board of directors or a board of trustees, governance entails an assortment of leadership and cognitive strategies to adhere to duties of care (ethical decision making), loyalty (ethical characteristics), and obedience (adherence to the organization’s mission, values, and goals) of running (Renz, 2007, p. 4). Rather than being a culture of yes, no, and maybe, nonprofit boards must adopt a culture of inquiry that enhances dialogue, candor, dissent, learning, and vigilance (Trower, 2010, p. 131). While the duties of a board may vary, boards share common responsibilities, such as upholding the values listed above, to “ensure that the organization engages in planning for its future; determine the set of programs [and financial resources] that the organization will deliver [and obtain in order] to implement its strategies and; enhance the organization's credibility and public image; ensure organizational integrity and accountability,” and to support and evaluate the chief executive officer and the board’s efficiency (Renz, 2007, p. 4). Trower (2010) argues that a formulaic structure of governance hinders leadership, and encourages the need for a board to adopt a governance-as-leadership model, which advocates for a nonprofit board to govern by mode rather than task in order to have better governance and strategic planning strategies. According to Trower (2010), the governance-as-leadership model encompasses three types of modes: fiduciary, strategic, and generative:

* Type 1 Fiduciary work “.. is intended to ensure that nonprofits are faithful to the mission, accountable for performance, and compliant with laws and regulations” (p. 4).
* Type 2 Strategic mode concentrates on the “… strategic work that enables boards and management to see the organization’s priorities and course, and to employ resources accordingly” (p. 4).
* Type 3 Generative mode “…. Involves the board as thoughtful leaders bringing wisdom and insight to critical issues facing the organization before or while policies, strategies, plans, and tactics are formed and discussed” (p. 5).

Most non-profit boards apply the Type 1 (fiduciary) and Type 2 (strategic) models, which makes it difficult to transition or incorporate the Type 3 generative model. In order to effectively implement the governance as leadership model, boards must be able to encourage dialogue with members by surveying members about board services and board effectiveness. Trower reiterates the dialectic process advocated by Aristotle. This will help build support and enhance collaborate effort towards instilling core values. Bell (2011) states that strategic planning centers on financial planning, it must be realistic in goals and in analyzing environmental and external output, the roles must be clearly defined (staff-run but is board-directed), the board must revisit the organization’s vision and mission in order to meet/clarify key questions that the planning processes seeks to answer, and, finally, the board must establish milestones and benchmarks in order to gage success. Trower (2010) states defensiveness and resistance from members can be used to encourage dialogue, thereby aiming to create meaningful insight through critical thinking, teamwork, culture, and leadership between the board and its members. (Trower, 2010). An effective leader is charismatic, flexible, open-mined, and is able to connect with both policy and community stakeholders (Trower, 2010; Worth, 2014; Drucker, 2008).   
 According to Drucker, organizing through “strategic self-assessment” is the foundation of a successful organization and the creation of ethical guidelines. While Drucker does not address the role of emotional appeals, he states “self-assessment leads to action and lacks meaning without it; to meet growing needs and succeed in a turbulent and exacting environment, social sector organizations must focus on mission, demonstrate accountability and achieve results” (p. 2). He diverts negative attention away from the word management in order to emphasize how open communication is needed between the board, staff, and customers. For Drucker, assessment through strong communication practices creates leaders. Similarly, Trower (2010) claims critical thinking is an integral component of the governance as leadership model due to the individual being more actively engaged during the decision-making process (p. 49). She argues that clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breath, logic, significance, and fairness of the decision act as guides “for better reasoning” (p. 49). Whether the board is theory or imagination driven types, there are key skills that encourage critical thinking in the boardroom, such as: being flexible and open to ideas instead of being single-minded with a point of view or being adamant about a single choice. The less open minded and flexible the board is, the more likely they will experience a “diagnosis momentum” that enhances cognitive biases. Mental errors, also referred to as cognitive biases, are focused on anchoring, coherence, and ordering, to name a few, which streamline the decision process into a single-point of view/declarative statement. Trower (2010) argues that openness, candor, informality, closure, looking at the bigger picture, shift boards from being passive to being more active. Both Trower (2010) and Drucker (2008) emphasize ethics and establishing a nonprofits and nonprofit board’s moral character; thus, enhancing the success of the organization. While both attribute the use of emotional appeals to the nonprofit organization’s cause, it merits attention that a relationship between ethos and pathos is needed in order to create an effective nonprofit board, governance, and strategic planning.   
**Conclusion and Further Research**  
 The interdisciplinary approach to rhetoric as a heuristic skill is abundant. The majority of the research within the field of rhetoric that bridges the nonprofit sector is service-learning, community literacy, and the intercultural rhetoric/communication. In addition, there is a substantial amount of research on the public sector associated with establishing a public sector ethos and the use of emotional appeals in marketing/advertising strategies. Despite attention being given to the public sector, there is minimal research that applies a rhetorical lens that compares rhetorical theory with modern practices. While rhetorical theory is evident in the communication practices established by nonprofit boards to communicate with policy and community stakeholders and embedded within governance and strategic practices, few studies utilize Aristotelian and Platonic terminology within their scholarship despite accomplishing the same intent. I argue that there are similarities in the governance and leadership strategies with the Aristotelian use of ethos, pathos, and virtue that can be capitalized by the field of rhetoric, and by applying rhetorical theory to the nonprofit sector, one can have a better understanding of rhetoric in action. To quote Jeff Grabbil, “as rhetors we speak; as engaged scholars we act.”
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