English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 30, No. 2 Summer 2024
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2024.30.2.19

Close Textual Analysis and the Design of Learning Spaces*

Chungyeol Park
(Korea Nazarene University)

Park, Chungyeol. (2024). Close textual analysis and the design of learning spaces. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 30*(2), 19-39.

This paper is a close textual analysis of what learning is in the context of learning spaces. The aim is for critical rhetorical discourse to what scholars say or write about a topic and the deeper meaning of their words. The close textual analysis is about the influence of learning spaces to have significant experiences for the network generation born in an era of information technology. The paper is to introduce a reason to pay close attention to the process of textual analysis. The process with its complexity reveals the creative density of rhetoric as well as the reason behind the words. Our compass point toward understanding what learning truly means within the context of learning spaces. But this journey is no mere academic exercise; it is a call to engage in critical rhetorical discourse, where ink meets parchment, and ideas crystalize. This study reveals how symbolic action, form and content, context, and creative concentration function within the artifact. The claim is that proposition for close textual analysis is to prepare the listener to listen and hear the importance of rhetorical discourse is taking place, as well as understanding of words to gain meaning to rhetorical discourse and critical thinking.

[close textual analysis/rhetorical discourse/learning spaces/network generation/ critical thinking]

I. INTRODUCTION

In the realm of education, the design of learning spaces extends far beyond mere aesthetics; it plays a pivotal role in shaping the learning experience. As renowned educationist Gardner (2011) aptly states, learning spaces should not be left to chance but meticulously crafted to foster effective learning. Learning spaces serve as the silent orchestrators of knowledge

* This Research was supported by the Korea Nazarene University Research Grant in 2024.

exchange, influencing interactions, emotions, and the cognitive processes that underpin effective learning. However, the design of these spaces often relies on intuition and experience, lacking a deep understanding of the underlying linguistic dynamics that influence learner behavior.

This article delves into the transformative power of close textual analysis as a tool for designing effective learning spaces. By carefully examining and interpreting architectural plans, design specifications, and user feedback, we uncover the hidden meanings and intentions embedded within these texts. This linguistic tapestry provides valuable insights into user preferences, opportunities for collaboration and communication, and potential barriers to effective learning.

As echoed by renowned author and architect Hadid (2011), "Architecture is about balance, about harmony between form and function" (p. 272). Similarly, effective learning spaces must strike a delicate balance between aesthetics and functionality, ensuring that the design aligns with the pedagogical goals and fosters a conducive learning environment.

Our journey extends beyond the confines of traditional classrooms, venturing into the diverse landscapes of corporate training rooms, museums, and even the virtual realm of online learning platforms. We examine how language shapes interactions and learning experiences within these settings, providing a roadmap for creating spaces that truly foster knowledge acquisition and personal growth. Through the lens of close textual analysis, we embark on a quest to unravel the linguistic threads that weave together effective learning spaces. By understanding the language of learning, we can craft environments that ignite curiosity, empower learners, and transform the learning experience.

Burke (1973) described the world of scholarly histories as a never-ending conversation:

> You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about…. You listen for a while until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you…. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress. (p. 110)

In the symphony of language, where words harmonize and ideas crescendo, scholars beckon us to listen—to discern the subtle notes, the hidden motives, and the resonant undertones. Burke's (1973) metaphor of "putting in one's own oar" (p. 110) invites us to approach discourse with humility. But this is no mere rowing exercise; it is an invitation to engage in critical dialogue. Let us explore the tenor of the argument—the pulse beneath the surface.

How does language transmit meaning? The answer lies in the warp and weft of rhetoric—

the deliberate choices made by authors. Each word, a thread; each sentence, a pattern. Burke's comment, pointed and incisive, directs our attention to the symphony of syntax, the dance of metaphors, and the cadence of tone. The "tenor of the argument" (Burke, 1973, p. 110) becomes our compass, guiding us through the labyrinth of discourse.

Leff (1986) extends this exploration. Close textual analysis, he asserts, is not a sterile dissection; it is an excavation. Imagine unearthing ancient artifacts—their purpose, their context, their hidden stories. The central task lies in understanding how rhetorical action affects negotiation. When a scholar constructs a symbolic event—a speech, an essay, a manifesto—it reverberates beyond ink and paper. It invites reconstruction—a reimagining of the events it references. Leff's proposition is a call to pay attention—to decode the layers, to discern the echoes.

But what of the process itself? Textual analysis is no linear path; it is a labyrinth. We follow threads, unravel knots, and encounter dead ends. The creative density of rhetoric emerges—the deliberate echoes, the whispered allusions, the coded messages. Each word choice, a brushstroke on canvas; each pause, pregnant with intent. Leff's call to pay attention—to the minutiae, the subtleties—reveals not only the words but also their reason. The scholar's pen, dipped in purpose, writes not in isolation but in dialogue with history, culture, and context.

As we navigate this textual labyrinth, may our lanterns burn brightly. Let us honor the architects—the scholars—who craft our linguistic vessels. Their words ripple across time, inviting us to listen, to row, and to understand. Within the creative density of rhetoric lies the reason—the transformative power of language. And so, we continue—oars in hand, ears attuned—toward deeper meaning.

Also, the article will try to give clarity to the Impact of Space on Learning: The traditional focus on classrooms and labs might be limiting. The article likely encourages examining all areas on campus, including informal spaces, for their potential to support learning activities. Learning Activities and Space Design: It might suggest that the design of learning spaces should be driven by the type of learning activities planned. Close textual analysis, for instance, might benefit from a space that facilitates focused discussion and critical thinking. Shifting Focus from Usage to Learning: The emphasis might be on understanding how spaces can actively contribute to the learning process, rather than just focusing on how students use them currently. The Rise of Digital Learning Spaces: The article might prompt you to consider how virtual environments can be designed to complement physical spaces and support close textual analysis.

II. CLOSE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE DESIGN OF LEARNING SPACE

Historical scholarly rhetoric about learning spaces probably has been part of rhetorical discourse as long as education is part of society. The principal motivation for this discourse is to discuss Johnson and Lomas (2005), *Design of the learning space: Learning and Design Principles* published in *EDUCAUSE Review*. *EDUCAUSE* Review is part of a professional association that has offered services to the higher education information technology society for more than 60 years. Also, there was greater emphasis on Johnson and Lomas' (2005) concept because the author finds it more relevant to their overall purpose. A future, in-depth study will explore the relationship between various concepts and *Close Textual Analysis and the Design of Learning Spaces,* providing a deeper analysis of their impact on learning environments.

EDUCAUSE Review publishes articles from scholars, such as Johnson and Lomas (2005)' to offer details of research and analytics to provide information to the higher education readership. Johnson and Lomas (2005) say, "Learning spaces encompass the full range of places in which learning occurs, from real to virtual, from classroom to chat room" (p. 20). Hence, Johnson and Lomas' article includes a full range of rhetoric around architecture, pedagogy, and other discourses regarding learning spaces to explicate the process of the design of learning spaces, which can be closely followed by how the discourses take place.

Certain scholars in the educational field believe it is important to talk about the didactic aspect of spaces. The approaches regarding learning spaces are a thought-provoking focus. For instance, one approach is to discuss how memory is associated with a space; how crowding, temperature, noise, physical discomfort, and how physical proximity influences learning (Gallagher, 1994). How does the arrangement of desks, the quality of light, or the hum of ventilation influence what we remember? Crowding—too many bodies in too little space—may suffocate memory. Optimal temperature, on the other hand, nurtures it. Noise—the cacophony of voices, footsteps, and rustling papers—either disrupts or enhances our mental archives. Physical discomfort—a chair too hard, a desk too high—leaves imprints on memory. And proximity—how close we sit to others—shapes our cognitive echoes. Each element orchestrates a symphony of recall, resonating through time.

Imagine two classroom arrangements: straight rows versus seminar-style circles. In the former, students face the teacher—an authoritative axis. But in the latter, they face each other—a constellation of voices. Participation rates shift. Rows breed passivity; circles, engagement. The physical arrangement becomes a conductor, directing the flow of ideas. Rows echo tradition; circles, collaboration. The didactic pulse quickens as students lean across desks, exchange glances, and weave their narratives. The architecture of interaction matters—it shapes not only what we learn but also how we learn. Griffin (1990) and Strange

and Banning (2001) beckon us to the drafting table. Here, architects and educators collaborate—an alchemical fusion of aesthetics and pedagogy. Imagine designing a classroom: the curve of a desk, the hue of a wall, the placement of a bookshelf. Each decision ripples through the learning ecosystem. A cozy reading nook whispers, *Discover*. A technology corner hums, *Innovate*. The synthesis of physical elements—their arrangement, texture, and purpose—becomes a silent curriculum. The classroom, a living text, tells stories beyond textbooks. It invites exploration, dialogue, and transformation. The didactic brush strokes—whether in ergonomic chairs or modular tables—paint a narrative of possibility (Griffin, 1990; Strange & Banning, 2001).

There is also an attitude that classroom instructions are going to wither away towards online education, which will then mostly replace the physical classroom environment (Fielding, 1999). Nevertheless, one more attitude is that the little red schoolhouse symbolizes "…both a kind of learning and a place of learning" (Campbell, 1960, p. 346). The takeaway is that the kind of learning and exigency of learning spaces have a connection of some sort. The thought may well be explored then whether spaces influence learning. Indeed physical learning spaces have been challenged for adequacy. Hebdige (1979) claims:

> The hierarchical relationship between teacher and taught is inscribed in the very layout of the lecture theatre where the seating arrangements – benches rising in tiers before a raised lectern – dictate the flow of information and serve to *naturalize* professional authority. Thus, a whole range of decisions about what is and what is not possible within the education has been made, however unconsciously, before the content of the individual courses is even decided. (pp. 12-13)

Hebdige's (1979) synthesis of "what is and what is not possible" (p. 13) sways toward a closer look at how learning spaces influence how learning is taking place. Cognitive theorists researched the construct of how the social context influences learning. Anthropologists, sociologists, and cultural theorists questioned the assumptions about the nature of knowledge, and neuroscientists and evolutionary biologists studied the physical processes and their impact on higher education (Bruning, 1994; Cassaza & Silverman, 1996; Jarvis et al., 1998; Marchese, 1997; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Stage et al., 1998; Svinicki, 1999; Tennant & Pogson, 1995).

These cognitive theorists questioned, explored, and argued across their disciplines. They did enumerated ten principles that claim that learning is, 1) about creating and continuing connections, 2) it takes place in the context of compelling situations, 3) it is an active search for meaning, 4) it not only develop the person, but influence the whole person, 5) it happens within the social context of an individual's life, 6) it requires response from all parties involved in the learning process, 7) it takes place in a relaxed way while exploring the subject

matter, 8) the foundation is in a particular contexts as well as it relies on the individual's experiences, 9) the process involves the ability of individuals to monitor their own learning, 10) it is motivated by the educational environment (Bruning, 1994; Cassaza & Silverman, 1996; Jarvis et al., 1998; Marchese, 1997; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Stage et al., 1998; Svinicki, 1999; Tennant & Pogson, 1995). Number 10) is particularly relevant to this paper, as it is about the environment and settings of where learning is taking place.

Butz (2002), an architect and space planner for educational institutions, states a person can experience powerful environments, which can stimulate physically, emotionally, and intellectually. Butz (2002) proposes that powerful environments only came about when there is collaboration between among the planners of these spaces. Butz (2002) writes it is only "…when the collaboration works well, building function efficiently, are affordable, contribute to our communities, and provide inspiring environments" (p. 53). The essence of Butz's (2002) argument is that collaboration is required and a commitment from everyone involved from campus planners and users, in order to provide spaces where learning will transpire (p. 62). He believes that when key irreversible decisions need to be made the investment in relationships will pay off. Especially, the rewards will be when crucial decision and problems need to be resolved for the successful completion of the didactic and space needs.

Scholars may readily agree that learning is vital. Where this agreement usually ends, however, is with the question of validity between spaces and learning. While some are concerned for customary learning to prevail, others maintain that learning is based on the characteristics of "conceive, design, implement, and the operate process (CDIO)" (Crawley, n.d.). Leading American, European, Canadian, British, African, Asian, and New Zealand schools are talking about the CDIO initiative as a model for learning spaces (Crawley, n.d.).

Along the same lines, the primary loci for learning are the classroom, library, use of the faculty office for individual mentoring and perhaps the coffee shops where knowledge emerges. As recently as a decade ago, learning spaces locus of control paradigm shift to a wider scope to incorporate the influence of a new generation, refer to as the digital natives, of technology talkers (Prensky, 2001). Not only is it a shift to incorporate digital natives that want to shift from the physical space as formal to virtual space as informal; even the terms and terminology are ever-changing (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005).

To take a case in point, Brown (2005) states in parallel with the developments in technology, an entire new generation of learners, Net Generation, was born in the past decade. They use computers and new technology devices from an early age. Whereas for previous generations technology was only a thought of exotic connection or an optional tool, for the Net Generation, this is an essential part of their conversations. According to Brown (2005) it is clear that information technologists and the Net Generation have a strong mutual influence on conversations between themselves and other conversationalists. Brown's (2005)

argument is that the mutual influence is a symbiotic relationship. For example, in areas outside the formal classroom, library and faculty office, students can meet outside on the green, in a lounge, in any campus café. Moreover, he believes students can meet almost any time of the day. Furthermore, Brown (2005) claims that with wireless network access with a plethora of a variety of digital devices, longer battery life for the devices, learning is almost a ubiquitous access. This means that learning potentially can transpire anytime and anywhere (Brown, 2005).

Other scholars also assert that the Net Generation uses a variety of digital devices; they turn virtually any space outside the classroom into a learning space (Carmean & Haefner, 2002). Brown (2005) argues that formal classrooms spaces with the support of faculty and classroom planners can create a changeround and reform to extend technology participators' viewpoint within the learning environment.

In discussion about spaces for learning, one controversial issue has been that when it comes to implement technology, practically more often than not, are caused by any number of wrong reasons: "to dump content quickly into an online shell; to provide access to interactive assessment tools….. to respond to student pressure, [and] peer pressure" (Carmean & Haefner, 2002, p. 28).

On the one hand, Carmean and Haefner (2002) argue students select a course for its intellectual content and not for the classroom or learning system vessel. On the other hand, these scholars contend that effective learning environments towards student-centered learning allow for "a synthesis of appropriate" (p. 27) engagement. Contenders for change in learning spaces such as Brown (2005), Bransford et al., (2000), Carmean and Haefner (2002), Crawley (n.d.), Oblinger and Oblinger. (2005), and Prensky (2001), uphold that powerful learning environments have the possibility to stimulate students' understanding for deeper learning.

According to Lee (2021), "critical reading of the world invites young readers to gain a critical lens, to think beyond words and/or images in books, and to explore much broader socio-historical and cultural contexts in which the story is embedded" (p. 19). This goes beyond the classroom setting of learning. Learning, as this article is trying to emphasize, goes beyond the traditional methods of learning.

III. CLOSE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS: LEARNING AND DESIGN PRINCIPLE

In the article *Design of the Learning Space: Learning and Design Principles*, Johnson and Lomas (2005) strongly advise all involved with planning these spaces to look with other eyes. They quote *Marcel Proust, In Search of Lost Time*. The quote relates that a true voyager

looks with other eyes to see the universe through the eyes of another. In Proust words "… a hundred others, to see the hundred universes that each of them sees" (p. 16). Johnson and Lomas (2005) assert that when it comes to the design of learning spaces an intertwined connection is required to see how activities, learning, and the infrastructure of an institution need to blend and work together to support meaningful learning experiences.

Johnson and Lomas (2005) urged campus planners, and other stakeholders to consider their institutional values. For instance, what people see, talk about, and feel. The rhetors think that instead of simply planning and creating meeting spaces, they can revolutionize spaces that meet the needs of both faculty and students. The way Johnson and Lomas (2005) communicate their claims to convince and persuade do raise questions, such as whether the claims are relevant in today's didactic environment. They even urged the campus planners and other stakeholders to appoint a "champion" (p. 20) to identify the institution's vision, needs, goals, concepts, principles, requirements, and methods of evaluation to complete the project. The champion, according to Johnson and Lomas (2005) needs to select a team to help with identifying the institution's context, learning spaces, learning activities, and design principles. In fact, Johnson and Lomas (2005) claim that the champion will be the driving force, the liaison, between the iterative dialogues among all the parties involved in the design of the institution's learning spaces.

In the intricate choreography of campus planning, Johnson and Lomas (2005) beckon us to consider more than blueprints and square footage. Instead, they invite us to explore the soul of educational spaces—the pulse of what people see, talk about, and feel. Imagine classrooms that breathe with purpose, corridors that hum with curiosity, and libraries that whisper inspiration. Their vision transcends brick and mortar—it embraces the needs of both faculty and students. But how do they communicate this vision? Enter the "champion" (p. 20)—a visionary appointed by campus planners. This champion, like a conductor, orchestrates the symphony of design. They identify the institution's heartbeat—the vision, goals, and principles. With a team of architects, educators, and dreamers, they map the contours of learning spaces. The champion becomes the driving force—the liaison—between iterative dialogues. They ensure that every nook, every alcove, resonates with purpose. Yet, questions linger. Are these claims relevant in our fast-evolving educational landscape? Does the champion's role endure? As we blueprint the future, let us honor the champions—the architects of possibility. For within their designs, futures unfurl, and the symphony of learning continues.

Johnson and Lomas (2005) claim that their systematic guide has the potential to create learning spaces that will allow for deeper learning. Johnson and Lomas' (2005) guide has eight overarching considerations for designing learning spaces. As aforementioned, to consider the institution's values, to select a champion with a team that consists of faculty and students who will use the spaces, campus representatives, architects, and other stakeholders.

In addition, to identify the institution's context of values, culture, strengths, and limitations.

Furthermore, to find and determine the learning principles, and learning activities that will take place in these spaces, articulate the design principles to support the learning principles. Then, to create a set of requirements that communicates to those who will carry out the renovations or construction. The final claim for the design of a deeper learning space, Johnson and Lomas (2005) assert that the champion and team must plan a methodology for ongoing experimentation, evolution, and improvement to assess whether the new spaces are stellar learning spaces. The claims are to persuade and convince educational discussions to consider their institutional values and principles instead of just the number seats that will accommodate the learning spaces.

The design of learning spaces requires an active vision to see how activities, learning, and the infrastructure of an institution need to blend and work together in order to support meaningful learning experiences raise numerous questions. For instance, how the temporal orientation of their discourse gives a good reason to be persuasive. Furthermore, how they transition from one framework point to another. How does the transitional change stress their point? Also, how do the authors position themselves in the article? What is the understanding of the design versus reality? What does the text mandates? Close textual analysis reveals: Symbolic action, form and content, the context and how the artifact exhibits artistic density (Browne, 2009). Therefore, close textual analysis is a very strong match to study the rhetorical force of: *Design of the learning space: Learning and Design Principles* (Johnson & Lomas, 2005).

Scholarly conversations, such as Black (1980, 1984, 1994), Browne (1996, 2009), Ehrenhaus (2001), Hart (1971), Jasinski (2001), Leff (1986, 1988, 1990), Lucas (1988, 1990), Mohrmann and Leff (1974), Slagell (1991), and Stelzner (1966), have used close textual analysis for their artifacts. The aforementioned scholars of textual analysis are extremely helpful because it shed light on the difficult problem of rhetorical analysis. The strongest present developed form of close textual analysis is done by Browne (2009) within his work *Close textual analysis: Approaches and applications*.

Leff and Mohrmann (1974) argue that close textual analysis can "reveal and explicate the precise, often hidden, mechanisms that give a particular text artistic unity and rhetorical effect" (Burgchardt, 2010, p. 199). Lucas (1990) has an alternative perspective on close textual analysis in his decree by "probing the discourse microscopically – at the level of the sentence, phrase, word and syllable" (p. 199). Supporters of close textual analysis advocate its power underlies in an elastic sense of what qualifies as relevant to the topic of the discourse on its own terms and "yet partakes in and deploys an indefinite range of other texts and discursive modalities" (Browne, 2009, p. 59). As Jasinski (2001) explains, "close readers linger over words, verbal images, elements of style, sentences, argument patterns, and entire paragraphs and larger discursive units within the text to explore their significance on multiple

levels" (p. 93). Overall, then, the argument may be made, that the center of a close textual analysis rewards critics who return to the text again and again, "slow[ing] down the action within the text" (Lucas, 1988, p. 249) through multiple careful readings. How does it do this, and why does it matter? According to Lucas (1990) and Slagell (1991), microscopic reading will cut to the meanings within an artifact. Therefore, close textual analysis forces to address questions of why and how of the framework and tone, tense patterns, and word choice of a rhetorical discourse.

The meanings of close textual analysis are brought together and usually followed by a synthesis by which the textual elements together form a new and satisfactory agreement (Law, 2012). Form and content cannot be broken up (Browne, 2009). Extending his precept, the content may refer to that dimension of a message reducible to the level of a proposition.

Enos (1996) writes that scholars, Derrida, De Man, Hartman and Miller, among others, argue close textual analysis or critical criticism, for that matter, is "parasitic on other texts; that is, that a specific instance of critical analysis can occur only if there first exists another text to analyze" (p. 167). Enos (1996) notes that the postmodern view even contends that analysis of the text has been regarded as "parasitic…. supposedly less creative analytic act of uncovering meaning" (p. 167). Yet, Enos (1996) observes that Kent argues "just as we cannot escape our histories, neither can text escape theirs" (p. 167). Enos (1996) writes that the skepticism is that although textual analysis produces meaning after it is interwoven with other rhetoricians' artifacts, close textual analysis remains a "process of intertextuality" (p. 167).

IV. CLOSER LOOK AT CLOSE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Close textual analysis is mindful of closely keeping the nature of rhetoric of "academic disciplines that study the techniques, principles, and practices of persons who deliberate, argue, and advocate to alter the attitudes and behavior" (Campbell & Burkholder, 1997, p. 3) of others and us. In in way, it is being mindful of what is happening around us, interacting with others, and seeing ourselves in balance within our world.

Having looked at descriptions and definitions of close textual analysis, it remains to examine some specific uses of close textual analysis. Some scholars in the rhetorical analysis field believe that close textual analysis is the relationship between "inner workings of public discourse and its historical context" (Burgchardt, 2010, p. 199) so that the persuasiveness of the artifact is revealed. Opposing to this believes, Mohrmann and Leff (1974) concede close textual analysis is to focus on the *actual conduct of the discourse* rather than *the generation of abstract methods*. Leff (1986, 1988) observes that many of Lincoln's speeches have a clear chronological pattern. For example, Leff (1986) argues that in the Second Inaugural

speech, Lincoln transports from a "perspective grounded in secular time to one grounded in sacred time" (p. 199). In other words, Leff's breakdown of Lincoln's speeches reveal the hidden mechanism of the internal sequence of Lincoln's words, which prepare the listener to listen and hear the importance of time and sphere shift to give meaning, as well as understanding of what is being said in order to gain meaning for themselves of themselves.

Another perspective on close textual analysis is Lucas (1990) essay, *The Stylistic Artistry of the Declaration of Independence*. Lucas claims his microscopically analysis discover that the communication comprise of five major propositions that interlock with one another to show the meaning that independence is justified (Burgchardt, 2010). Lucas (1990) argues that the text when seen in context with the propositions "build upon one another through the first three sentences of the preamble to establish the right of revolution against tyrannical authority" and need to be read together to achieve a specific purpose (Burgchardt, 2010, p. 209). Lucas (1990) is corroborating that close textual analysis of microscopic approach is to illustrate the process of pragmatic communication. Lucas (1990) strongly believes that the propositions within the sentence structures, phrases, words, and syllables, all work together to contribute to its rhetorical force.

Similarly, Stelzner (1966) applied the microscopic analysis to consider the text syntax, metaphoric structure and the keywords in the *War Message* to establish a balanced meaning in the language of the war message. Stelzner (1996) provides an analysis of FDR's response to the bombing of Pearl Harbor with a model of close textual analysis. Specifically, Stelzner (1996) analysis reflects judiciously to the impact of specific words choices on speech artistry, as well as its immediate and long-term effects.

Hart (1971) close textual analysis, *The Rhetoric of the True Believer*, focuses on the language that rhetoricians use in doctrine. He concludes that the doctrine shapes the rhetorical styles as well as the content. Hart (1971) concentrates on the genre of the listeners who are encouraged by their indoctrinated rhetoric, the intellectual resources used by the spokesmen, rhetorical role of the speakers, and doctrine that defines the rhetorical relationship or bond that they maintain. He claims that the doctrinal speakers warrant fundamental tenets on other doctrinal speakers and use the sequence that rarely discusses solutions.

Ehrenhaus's (2001) close textual analysis argues that Steven Spielberg's film *Saving Private Ryan* uses key scenes to focus on the Jewish character in the film. Ehrenhaus' (2001) artifact, *Why We Fought: Holocaust Memory in Spielberg's Saving Private Ryan*, examines how the film focuses in the wake of the Vietnam War by giving presence to an even more distant past. Ehrenhaus (2001) suggests that the Holocaust became an icon of serving the purpose to go beyond the need to identify a particular history. Moreover, he states that the film participates in the *Americanization* of Holocaust memory and avoids Vietnam as a traumatic memory. His interpretation is that certain right-leaning critics attack the film as

unpatriotic because of the void to contextualize the film within the Vietnam syndrome. Ehrenhaus (2001) suggests that Steven Spielberg's film is alleging to the viewer's guilt for not having acted sooner and not having done enough in the act of horror. He concludes with a question of whether such moral belief may transport the seed of future regret.

Black (1994) illuminates yet another style to close textual analysis in his article *Gettysburg and Silence*, in which Black admires the *Gettysburg Address* in saying there is "no more celebrated eloquence than the *Gettysburg Address*" (p. 21). Black (1994) argues that Abraham Lincoln's address can only be appreciated with a "prismatic" (p. 22) approach. In other words, his argument is that the "elements of Lincoln's speech 'reflect back and forth on one another' in such a manner that the text can be appreciated both for its indivisibility and for its many-sidedness" (Burgchardt, 2010, p. 199). By using the metaphor of the prism, Black (1994) illuminates the elements of the speech one line at a time. Black's point is that a critic must study the *details* to understand Lincoln's *Gettysburg Addres* (Burgchardt, 2010, p.199). Black (1994) also uses close textual analysis in *Ideological Justification*. The essence of his argument is that text cannot speak for itself and therefore, needs to be read with a sensitivity to the nuances and ideological purity, which is concealed and is more important than the truth.

Browne (2009) refers to an interpretative close textual analysis; the goal of his discourse is to explicate how discourse functions. Browne (2009) calls on then-senator Obama's Philadelphia speech of March 2008 with his approach to close textual analysis. He focuses on four principles. The first principle is that rhetorical texts are positions for symbolic action. Browne (2009) asserts that close textual critics tend to analyze texts as "verbs, so to speak, and to ask not what a text means but what it does" (p. 64). It shows that text function as containers of readymade semantic units may be extracted from the text as needed.

The second principle, which is form and content, is about how Obama's speech shapes how we perceive the meaning of the words. The important factor of the rhetorical element "force is to the proposition by virtue of the form in which it is expressed" (Browne, 2009, p.65). Browne (2009) argues that Obama's words not only "establish the metrical cadence of the passage but rather ingeniously invoke the Obama campaign's mantra of personal empowerment" (p. 65). He believes that form and content in its practice, such as Obama's speech in Philadelphia, are in ways seen to sponsor each other.

The third principle of text which informs the context and "vice versa" (Browne, 2009, p. 65) emphasizes that close textual analysis is to consider all relevant elements of context. Browne (2009) uses the example of the Philadelphia speech to argue that there is clearly "an immediate exigence" (p. 66) with a style to keep the text close for evidence to answer the questions asked in the artifact. He advocates that Obama's speech in the context it was delivered, within it, emerges context, which eventually becomes part of yet another or greater context.

Browne (2009) concludes his analysis with his fourth principle: “Rhetorical texts exhibit artistic density” (p. 68) to which he infers that this principle “cuts to the heart of close textual analysis” (p. 68). Browne (2009) states that Obama’s “speech throughout gives evidence of this tradition at every step” (p. 69). He elaborates and in-depth discusses the words of Obama and interprets the meaning of the rhetoric. Browne (2009) concludes that the genre of jeremiad in Obama’s speech marks in it as “America’s own story and its transports towards and more perfect union” (p. 71). He significantly applies his principles to Obama’s speech and the plot by which the speech unfolds.

In summary of scholarly conversations, such as Black (1980, 1984, 1994), Browne (1996, 2009), Ehrenhaus (2001), Hart (1971), Jasinski (2001), Leff (1986, 1988, 1990), Lucas (1988, 1990), Mohrmann and Leff (1974), Slagell (1991), and Stelzner (1966), they all contribute to the stability of close textual analysis. Whether the scholarly critics’ textual analyses are to reveal hidden mechanisms, analyze text microscopically, linger for hours over the text, or analyze artifacts using four principles, one common force holds their work together.

V. VIEW LEARNING SPACES THROUGH THE LENS OF CLOSE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Standing on the shoulders of the scholars’ rhetorical criticism that precedes thus far, this study analyzes Johnson and Lomas’ (2005) artifact. Browne’s (2009) four principles to close textual analysis stand out above all the other rhetorical communication as clear and succinct, which will be the approach for Johnson and Lomas (2005) article.

The first principle is that “rhetorical texts are sites of symbolic action” (Browne, 2009, p. 64). Principle one steers the rhetorical analysis to apply the meaning, which when turning to the text again and again will reveal to ask the question of what the text is doing and find the answers. The second principle is, “form and content cannot be divorced” (Browne, 2009, p. 64). Principle two is not only to reveal the style of the text, but also to respect the content of the text and apply the basic proposition of the text. The third principle is, that “text informs context, and vice versa” (Browne, 2009, p. 65). Principle three reveals the rhetorical criticism of other rhetors from which Johnson and Lomas (2005) borrow to explain their discourse. The fourth principle is, “rhetorical texts exhibit artistic density” (Browne, 2009, p. 66). Principle four is asking questions about how the text is applying principles one, two, and three. Another question to apply to principle four is to ask why it matters how the text is applied to principles one, two, and three. Applying all these four principles to this present paper is a very strong match to study the rhetorical criticism of Johnson and Lomas’ (2005) artifact. Now, by applying the four principles this paper will reveal Johnson and Lomas's (2005) argument:

Principle 1: Two questions are, what does Johnson and Lomas (2005) mean, and what does their text function. For instance, the word*: space/s* are used in a different context, such as *spaces for learning, formal spaces, informal spaces, other spaces, these spaces, learning spaces, new space, meeting space, the space, classroom space, all spaces, specific spaces, a space, this space, particular space, designed space, particular space, these spaces.* Therefore, throughout the article, the word space and spaces are used liberally. Johnson and Lomas (2005) use the word *space* 253 times and *spaces* 277 times. Yet, the definition and function are ambiguous. Some might object, of course, because *space/s* has a holistic meaning of the word is obvious. However, how can a word that is used in a holistic powerful manner stating such strong recommendations be unclear? Surely there has to be a clear-cut definition and function for *space/s*. Now, how would this ambiguity function in this artifact?

The symbolic action of the text closely reveals Johnson and Lomas' (2005) rhetoric to convince and educate that each learning space project must develop its own local set of principles based on the institutional framework and the learning goals of the project. Their proposition acts to inspire action, in which the thesis is: "What types of learning activities should be facilitated in these spaces, and what type of infrastructure is needed to support these activities?" (Johnson and Lomas, 2005, p. 16). Defined by Johnson and Lomas (2005) *these spaces* and *these activities* are of spaces not only classrooms or laboratories but also spaces where learning is actively taking place such as lectures or discussions using technology.

Principle 2: Form and content need to give form to the linguistic resources to give noticeable edifice to which Browne (2009) refers to "otherwise abstract formulations" (p. 65). Thus, what can be said about the interplay of form and content in Johnson and Lomas' (2005) article? With respect to Johnson and Lomas words: What is the basic proposition? They advocate throughout their text that any educationally designed learning space must support the activities intended for newly constructed buildings. So, their discourse is to influence how institutional planners think and plan the institutional space. They maintain that institutional planners need to keep learning activities first and foremost in mind.

Principle 3: What, after all, is Johnson and Lomas (2005) article's framework? "Is it the immediate exigence to which their text responds?" (Browne, 2009, p. 66). So, is rhetorical force bound by the context to Johnson and Lomas' article? There is surely a clear *immediate exigence* with the style that they keep with their words for evidence to ask rhetorical questions and then proceed to answer with key words and research findings from pedagogical scholarly work. The texts inform in its contexts, and the context informs the text. What this reveal is that the text recreates or restructures the content from texts that are borrowed from other rhetors. Thus, Johnson and Lomas (2005) invoked contemporary terms from technology books, such as *Educating the Net Gen*, which is referring to students turning to a variety of digital devices to find information; digital natives, digital immigrants, which

refers to people born within the period of technology era as net generation and the people that were born before the digital era as immigrants.

Principle 4: How do Johnson and Lomas (2005) convince or persuade their readers? Why does it matter what they say? Browne (2009) advices to step back for a moment here and look at where close textual analysis come from, and more specifically what company it keeps and "how it distinguishes itself from other reading practices" (p. 66). Browne (2009) explains that the association with the communication departments in the U.S is breaking away from the English departments and that "speech communication [emphasizes] to the products of human beings" (p. 66). Browne (2009) avers the reason why "rhetorical texts exhibit artistic density" (pp. 67-68), so that is to stimulate text to close inspection and therefore, allow for critics to better see how rhetoric works. Johnson and Lomas (2005) in their artifact manifest a design and delivery process for a new learning space. Their text describes and defines how to construct meaningful conversations about learning environments. For example, the text promotes discussions about how to focus on what people do, on the actions and activities of a learning environment, rather than on the items for learning environments. They argue that items change frequently over time.

Specifically, Johnson and Lomas (2005) rhetoric is to convince and educate that each learning space project must develop its own local set of principles based on the institutional framework and the particular learning goals of the project. They advocate throughout their article that any educationally designed learning space must support the activities intended for newly constructed buildings. Johnson and Lomas (2005) guide how institutional planners need to think and plan learning spaces. They maintain that institutional planners need to keep learning activities first and foremost in mind. Johnson and Lomas (2005) invoke contemporary terms from technology rhetoric, such as educating the *Net Generation*, which refers to students turning to a variety of digital devices to find information.

The justification to use close textual analysis for this artifact published in *EDUCAUSE Review* by Johnson and Lomas (2005) can be justified by the aforesaid work discussed by other rhetoricians. The rhetorical critics' textual analyses reveal the hidden mechanism, microscopically analyzed work; showcase the importance of lingering for hours over text and analyze artifacts using four principles. The close textual analysis reveals the conversation of Johnson and Lomas (2005) who focus on what people do, on the actions and activities of learning environments. This study reveals how symbolic action, form and content, context, and creative concentration function within the artifact. Therefore, this paper concludes that close textual analysis indeed was a very strong match to study the rhetorical force of *Design of the learning space: Learning and Design Principle* (Johnson and Lomas, 2005, pp. 16-28). The claim is that proposition for close textual analysis is to prepare the listener to listen and hear the importance of rhetorical discourse is taking place to give meaning, as well as understanding of words in order to gain meaning to rhetorical discourse

and critical thinking.

With that in mind, Johnson and Lomas (2005) work were generally focused on the following concepts: 1) Expanding the Definition of Learning Environments: Traditionally, classrooms were the primary focus for learning. This statement emphasizes that learning can happen anywhere – physical spaces like libraries, museums, or even nature can all be learning environments. Virtually, online courses, educational websites, and even online discussions can be valuable learning spaces. 2) Importance of Flexibility and Accessibility: Learning is no longer confined to a specific location or time. Students can access educational resources and engage in learning activities anytime, anywhere. This is particularly beneficial for those with busy schedules or those who prefer to learn independently. 3) Blurring the Lines between Formal and Informal Learning: Formal learning environments like classrooms provide structured learning experiences. Informal learning spaces like chat rooms or online forums allow for more casual interaction and knowledge sharing. The statement suggests that both types of spaces are valuable for fostering learning. 4) Technology as a Learning Enabler: The inclusion of virtual spaces highlights the role of technology in creating new learning opportunities. Online platforms and digital tools can facilitate communication, collaboration, and access to information, enriching the learning experience. 5) Focus on Learner-Centered Education: By acknowledging the diverse ways people learn and the different spaces they prefer, this statement emphasizes a learner-centered approach to education. Educators can design learning experiences that cater to different learning styles and preferences, maximizing engagement and knowledge acquisition.

VI. CONCLUSION

In academic circles, the field of history is often likened to an unceasing dialogue that shows no signs of conclusion. When one steps into this intellectual arena, they are immediately enveloped by fervent individuals who have been immersed in passionate debates for an extended period. The exchange of ideas is rapid, rendering it challenging to grasp every explanation put forth. As you absorb the discourse, you begin to discern the nuances of their arguments, eventually feeling compelled to interject with your own perspectives. The dialogue persists, with one participant reacting, another defending their stance, and yet another presenting a contrasting viewpoint. As the night progresses, the time creeps towards lateness, prompting you to bid farewell and depart, leaving the conversation still lively and dynamic.

Burke's (1973) perspective is noteworthy: active participation necessitates attentive listening. Before entering the debate, one must comprehend the argument's cadence - the

core of its meaning. However, how does rhetoric, with its intricate structure, transmit profound messages? Leff (1986) suggests that meticulous textual analysis uncovers this process. It unveils how rhetorical action shapes negotiations, inviting reconstructions of events through symbolic constructs. The words we choose, their arrangement, and the spaces they inhabit - all contribute to meaning and change.

Across epochs, learning environments have mirrored the ebb and flow of education itself. Imagine stepping into the past—a classroom, once confined by four walls, now unfurls into innovative architectural designs and digital realms. These spaces co-evolve with pedagogical practices, inseparable from the actions transpiring within them. Architects, like alchemists, specialize in this sub-field, adapting spaces to new requirements according to Barry J. Fraser (2023) amid this dynamic landscape, multimodal learning analytics (MMLA) emerges as a potent tool. Picture a classroom—a symphony of voices, gestures, and digital footprints. MMLA studies learners' and teachers' actions in collaborative settings, unraveling the intricate dance between architecture and education. It bridges the tangible and the intangible, informing spatial design with empirical insights. As educators, we become navigators, our oars poised to navigate the currents of learning space design. The discourse persists—a robust, transformative conversation. MMLA dissects interactions, illuminating patterns in the tapestry of learning. How do students cluster in collaborative corners? What rhythms emerge during group discussions? Which nooks foster creativity, and which stifles it? MMLA deciphers these nuances, guiding architects and educators alike. Imagine this discourse as a metaphorical party—a gathering of minds across time. The architects of antiquity converse with the data scientists of today. They share insights, challenge assumptions, and shape the blueprint of tomorrow's classrooms. The party endures, fueled by curiosity and the quest for better learning spaces. As we conclude this voyage, let us honor the legacy of learning environments—their evolution, their resilience. Our oars remain poised, ready to navigate the currents of innovation. For within these spaces, futures unfurl, and the symphony of learning continues.

For the network generation, born amidst the digital dawn, learning spaces extend beyond brick-and-mortar classrooms. They sprawl across screens, resonate in collaborative hubs, and echo within immersive simulations. Our close textual analysis seeks to illuminate how these spaces orchestrate significant learning experiences.

There was more focus on Johnson and Lomas' (2005) because their concept and analyzation of the topic is more relevant to what we want to imply in general in relation to the main topic of this article. Also, focusing on their work and concept was with the intention of giving a more general concept and setting a precedent for future studies that might arouse another's curiosity for furthering this concept of design for learning spaces.

In the educational implications of Johnson and Lomas (2005), it becomes evident that the extensive use of the term *space/s* raises significant questions regarding the specific

connotations and functional significance within their discourse. This strategic incorporation of contemporary linguistic resources serves to bolster their argument while situating it within a rich tapestry of educational scholarship.

REFERENCES

Black, E. (1980). A note on theory and practice in rhetorical criticism. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *44*(4), 331-336. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570318009374018

Black, E. (1984). Ideological justifications. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *70*(2), 144-150. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383685

Black, E. (1994). Gettysburg and silence. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *80*(1), 21-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639409384053

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: brain, mind, experience, and school.* National Academy Press.

Brown, M. (2005). Learning spaces. In D. G. Oblinger & J. L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the net generation* (pp. 1-22). EDUCAUSE. http://www.EDUCAUSE.edu/research-and-publications/books/educating-net-generation

Browne, S. H. (1996). Encountering Angelina Grimke: violence, identity, and the creation of radical community. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *82*(1), 55-73.

Browne, S. H. (2009). Close textual analysis: Approaches and applications. In J. A. Kuypers (Ed), *Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action* (pp. 63-76). Lexington Books.

Bruning, R. H. (1994). The college classroom from the perspective of cognitive psychology. In K. W. Prichard & R. M. Sawyer (Eds.), *Handbook of college teaching: Theory and application* (pp. 3-22). Greenwood Press.

Burgchardt, C. R. (2010). *Readings in rhetorical criticism* (4th ed.). Strata.

Burke, K. (1973). *The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action* (3rd ed.). University of California Press.

Butz, J. (2002). Educator and architect partnerships for success. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 92*, 53-62. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.79

Campbell, E. A. (1960). New spaces and places for learning. *The School Review, 68*(3), 346-352.

Campbell, K. K., & Burkholder, T. R. (1997). *Critiques of contemporary rhetoric* (2nd ed.). Wadsworth.

Carmean, C., & Haefner, J. (2002). Mind over matter: Transforming course management systems into effective learning environments. *EDUCAUSE Review*, *37*(6), 27-34. http://net.*EDUCAUSE*.edu/ir/library/pdf/erm0261.pdf

Cassaza, M. E., & Silverman, S. L. (1996). *Learning assistance and developmental education*. Jossey-Bass.

Crawley, E. (n.d.). *Conceive − design − implement − operate*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. http://web.mit.edu/edtech/casestudies/cdio.html

Ehrenhaus, P. (2001). Why we fought: Holocaust memory in Spielberg. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 18*(3), 321-337.

Enos, T. (1996). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age*. Routledge.

Fielding, R. (1999). *The death of the classroom: Learning cycles and Roger Schank*. (ED429434). Eric. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED429434.pdf

Fraser, B. J. (2023). The evolution of the field of learning environments research. *Education Science*, *13*(3), 257. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/13/3/257

Gallagher, W. (1994). *The power of place: How our surroundings shape our thoughts, emotions, and actions.* Harper Perennial.

Gardner, E. H. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books

Griffin, T. (1990). The physical environment of the college classroom and its effects on students. *Campus Ecologist*, *8*(1), 1-6.

Hadid, Z. (2011). Genius of the place. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, *4*, 267-287. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48599759

Hart, R. P. (1971). The rhetoric of the true believer. *Speech Monographs*, *38*(4), 249-261. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757109375718

Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The meaning of style*. Methuen.

Jarvis, P., Holford, J., & Griffin, C. (1998). *The theory and practice of learning*. Kogan Page.

Jasinski, J. (2001). *Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical studies*. Sage Publications.

Johnson, C., & Lomas, C. (2005). Design of the learning space: Learning and design principles. *EDUCAUSE Review*, *40*(4), 16-28.

Law, D. R. (2012). *Historical critical method: A guide for the perplexed*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Lee, E. H. (2021). An educational approach to critical content analysis of visual images in picturebooks for young readers. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *27*(2), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2021.27.2.1

Leff, M. C. (1986). Textual criticism: The legacy of G. P. Mohrmann. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *72*(4), 377-389.

Leff, M. C. (1988). Dimensions of temporality in Lincoln. *Communication Reports*, *1*(1), 26-31.

Leff, M. C. (1990). Words the most like things: Iconicity and the rhetorical text. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *54*(3), 252-273.

Lucas, S. E. (1988). The renaissance of American public address: Text and context in rhetorical criticism. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *74*(2), 241-260.

Lucas, S. E. (1990). The stylistic artistry of the declaration of independence. *Prologue: Quarterly of the National Archives and Records Administration*, *22*(1), 24-43.

Marchese, T. J. (1997). The new conversations about learning: Insights from neuroscience and anthropology, cognitive science and work-lace studies. In B. L. Cambridge (Ed.). *Assessing impact: Evidence and action* (pp. 11-15). American Association for Higher Education.

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Mohrmann, G. P., & Leff. M. C. (1974). Lincoln at Cooper Union: A rhetorical analysis of the text. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *60*(3), 346-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637409383242

Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger, J. L. (Eds.). (2005). *Educating the net generation*. Educause.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 1-6.

Slagell, A. R. (1991). Anatomy of a masterpiece: A close textual analysis of Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address. *Communication Studies*, *42*(2), 155-171.

Stage, F. K., Muller, P. A., Kinzie, J., & Simmons, A. (1998). *Creating learning centered classrooms.* The George Washington University.

Stelzner, H. G. (1966). 'War message,' December 8, 1941: An approach to language. *Communication Monographs*, *33*(4), 419-437.

Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (Ed). (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. Jossey-Bass.

Svinicki, M. D. (1999). New directions in learning motivation. In M. D. Svinicki (Ed.). *New direction for teaching and learning* (pp. 5-27). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.8001

Tennant, M., & Pogson, P. (1995). *Learning and change in the adult years: A developmental perspective*. Jossey-Bass.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Chung-Yeol Park (professor)
Owens Liberal Arts College
Korea Nazarene University
31172, Wolbong–ro 48, Seobuk-gu, Cheonan, South Korea
Email: cyp4x4@kornu.ac.kr

Received: April 11, 2024
Reviewed: June 5, 2024
Revised version received: June 20, 2024