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Introduction

Movements of any kind—social, political, religious, or practice-based—forcibly rely on a certain amount of persuasion in their discourse. This persuasion draws members to a movement and keeps them a part of the community. Discourse can be orally delivered in speeches or training sessions, officially published in various forms ranging from one-page leaflets to large monographs, or form part of public discussion, which may also be delivered orally or in text form (e.g., social media). Rhetorical analysis is an approach to understanding discourse and communication that first emerged in Ancient Greece, and continues to be studied to this day. Since audiences register and assess discourse as a package (i.e., how it is delivered, as well as what is delivered) it is worthwhile to examine the nature of individual discourse “units” around movements to better understand how people interpret it and carry it forward into their lives. Understanding the rhetorical nature of the discourse sheds light on the intended audiences, and identifying gaps in discourse is critical when considering communities’ influence in matters of policy.

Holistic management (HM) and permaculture represent two movements that aim to enlist practitioners the world over in order to spread their management practices. Each practice presents a possible tool in the effort to achieve environmental sustainability and food security. HM is a practice specific to grazing animals and land management, although HM principles are incorporated into a array of practices due to its adaptive management and holistic approach underpinnings (Kent & Sherren, 2015). Permaculture has wider intended applications, representing an integrated approach to designing systems inspired by the natural world.

Each movement has a strong foundation of thorough education, careful observation, and consideration of a variety of factors before thoughtfully devising next steps. They both seek to educate practitioners in their values and methods, and to encourage the spread of their principles through increasingly broader communities. As such, important discourse units around HM and permaculture take many forms. This report examines: (1) “About Us” pages in official, online presences, (2) online practitioner testimonials, and (3) discussion on Twitter. The voices throughout these different spheres range from authoritative (i.e., those creating and controlling a one-directional message) to cooperative (i.e., those engaging in ongoing, two-way discussion). Given the highly technical roots of each practice and the uptake by a broad
array of practitioners, there is significant opportunity for information to be reduced to rigid fundamentals as opposed to guiding principles and suggestions.

Background

Rhetoric Theory: A Brief Primer for Resource and Environmental Management

Rhetorical analysis is an immensely useful tool in understanding any discourse designed to influence or persuade (Bram, Phillips, & Dickey, 1979). With roots firmly grounded in Ancient Greece, rhetoric continued to be practiced and studied throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and into modern day, with particular emphasis in political and debating platforms (Bram et al., 1979).

Rhetoric theory makes a distinction between form and content for the purposes of better analyzing discourse. This is a long-held practice going back to the roots of rhetoric (Burton, n.d.a, para. 2):

Aristotle phrased this as the difference between logos (the logical content of a speech) and lexis (the style and delivery of a speech). Roman authors such as Quintilian would make the same distinction by dividing consideration of things or substance, res, from consideration of verbal expression, verba.

Today, rhetoricians emphasize how form and content, while they may be abstractly conceived of as separate, are inextricable and intrinsically linked. Burton (n.d.a) likens them to soldiers and weapons in a war – each separate but not whole without the other.

Additionally, rhetoric is concerned with logical coherence (logos), credibility and reputation (ethos), and the emotions (pathos) contained within an element of discourse¹. Aristotle prized logos over pathos, emphasizing “the persuasive marshaling of truth, rather than the swaying of an audience by an appeal to their emotions” (Bram et al., 1979, p. 266). In today’s world however, the information media cycle is heavily influenced by pathos and ethos.

Finally, when performing a rhetorical analysis on an element of discourse, it is common practice to address the kairos, or the general constraints and considerations a particular context confers on an opportunity for communication (Burton, n.d.b). Rhetoricians discuss the contingencies of time and place on the discourse, as well as which opportunities are present for the discourse to be both effective and appropriate

---

¹ “Discourse” is a unit of communication, whether delivered orally or in textual format. There is no defined length of the unit, it depends on the analytical approach taken.
Some examples of *kairos* are space limitations in textual discourse units, or audience expertise in orally delivered discourse units, which may dictate the appropriate content (e.g., avoiding jargon, needing to include considerable introduction to the topic).

**Rhetorical Discourse in Movements**

In the 20th century, scholars of rhetoric theory considered the effect of discourse in communities and movements. They determined that effective rhetoric in the discourse created by and around movements is a precondition to effective action (Myers & Macnaghten, 1998). Rhetoric helps to form identity by providing a means for people to identify shared values and opinions (Sommerfeldt, 2011; Heath, 1992; Burke, 1945). Rhetoric in movements is key to establishing shared identities between the movement and its audience (Sommerfeldt, 2011). Shared identities promote adherence to a common goal through cohesive thought, language, and action, and facilitate communication between a movement’s leaders and their audience (Romm & Pliskin, 1998; Burke, 1945).

Creating and maintaining shared identity grows difficult the moment geographical dispersion of leaders and audience is introduced; it is especially important for the sustainability of “virtual” movements, which rely on the Internet to foster strong rhetoric (Sommerfeldt, 2011). These virtual movements are very common today, as many communities of practitioners are located around the world and engage in discourse primarily through online media.

Identity is considered to be the quintessential ingredient for individuals to participate in collective movements (Cheney, 1983). Burke (1973) identifies three ways in which parties may form identity with one another:

1. **Identification by sympathy/common ground**, whereby a party overtly emphasizes the values, concerns, and interests they have in common with their audience (Burke, 1973; Cheney, 1983);
2. **Identification by antithesis**, whereby a party adopts an insider-outside dichotomy by calling for unification against a common antagonist (Burke, 1973);
3. **Identification by unawareness/transcendence**, which is achieved by simply using the pronoun “we” without relying on overt emphasis of any other common quality (Burke, 1973; Cheney, 1983). This rhetoric nearly always goes unnoticed by the audience (Cheney, 1983).

‘Identification by antithesis’ is commonly used by activist organizations to rally their audience around a course of action against an identified enemy, while ‘identification by common ground’ is useful in galvanizing morale, and ‘identification by unawareness’ can...
be employed to foster attempts to build support for issues or values not previously incorporated into the established identity (Sommerfeldt, 2011).

Cheney (1983) suggests that in official discourse units, such as memos, newsletters, or magazines, “newsiness” can be used to disguise underlying forceful rhetoric. Additionally, audience-created discourse units, such as anecdotal articles authored by movement followers and disseminated by the official movement can be subject to a high degree of control (Cheney, 1983). As such, these units should be considered to come from the officials, and are not necessarily representative of audience membership.

Finally, a unit of discourse should not be considered one-dimensional (creator-to-receiver), but multidimensional and with the potential to set off a complex network of interactions, leading to altered and entirely new units of discourse (Myers & McNaghten, 1998). Therefore, it is important to consider the context of each unit of discourse and the kairos that applies (the constraints and considerations imposed by time and place). Virtual movements in particular are placed within a vibrantly complex web of interaction and engagement (Langman, 2005). Consideration of social media and other electronic dissemination and engagement methods is critical to understanding the rhetoric of these discourse units.

Practices and Principles

Two management practices have been selected for this analysis, based on their common roots in science and adaptive management, and their effusively staunch followings: permaculture and Holistic Management. While each practice is distinct, similarities are apparent.

Permaculture

Permaculture is a design approach to living in harmony with the environment and extending natural systems (Mollison, 1988). It encourages adopting lessons from nature, and relies on careful observation of patterns and the characteristics of system components (Mollison, 1988). Permaculture takes into account the relationships, energy functions, and interactions of components in the system, with the understanding that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts (Mollison & Holmgren, 1983). A system based on permaculture design is intended to serve as a support base for those maintaining it, providing a degree of self-sufficiency (Mollison & Holmgren, 1983).

Permaculture aims to create an ecosystem out of the managed system: for example, a permaculture farm anticipates the plants and animals within its system
growing and changing toward a climax state, where each element serves a number of functions within the system (Mollison & Holmgren, 1983). They may incorporate nut trees, which will drop their fruit to be eaten by pigs, who in turn will fertilize other plants in the area. Structural diversity and symbiotic relationships are critical within these ecosystems (Mollison & Holmgren, 1983). The practice necessitates the “conscious assembly of concepts, materials, techniques, and strategies for a particular purpose”, emphasizing critical thought, and adaptive and iterative decision-making (Figure 1) (Aranya, 2013, para. 2).

**Figure 1. The adaptive, iterative planning process involved in permaculture. Adapted from Aranya, 2013**

Permaculture is associated with a firm set of ethics: practitioners consider their existence and the existence of future generations by making responsible choices in the present, and value cooperation over competition as the basis of life systems (Mollison, 1988). Holmgren (2002) outlines 12 principles for the practice, chief among them “observe and interact”, “apply self-regulation and accept feedback”, and “creatively use and respond to change” (as cited in Telford, 2013, p. 9-21). Recently, practitioners have interpreted the latter two principles as instruction to take ownership for climate change and to anticipate the future state of the environment and adjust their plan of action accordingly (Harland, 2013).

Permaculture emphasizes teaching. As permaculture students undergo training, they are encouraged to become teachers themselves (Permaculture HQ, 2015). The uptake is small: the co-founder of permaculture estimates that only 2% of former students become teachers (Permaculture HQ, 2015). Permaculture practitioners hold the belief that as the world’s climate and overall food security become more uncertain, permaculture presents the only worthwhile solution (Permaculture HQ, 2015).
Holistic Management

Whereas permaculture represents a broader system design approach, Holistic Management (HM) has a narrower focus. HM was developed by Allan Savory, a Rhodesian-born ecologist with a long history in environmental management. In his early career in Zimbabwe he struggled to improve the health of increasingly arid ecosystems and the biodiversity present there, before approaching the problem from an innovative angle (Savory, 2013). Savory developed a process for using livestock to mimic the roving herds of the grasslands of yore to support natural grass life cycles and reverse the process of desertification (Savory, 1996). Savory suggests that desertification of global grasslands is at the heart of not only climate change, but also poverty, societal breakdowns, and cultural violence (Savory, 2013).

HM is often applied as a resource management philosophy, emphasizing goal-setting and thoughtful assessments to inform adaptive management (Savory & Butterfield, 1999). Along with careful planning and design of a management strategy for the ecological health of the subject resource (e.g., target ecosystem, livestock), HM incorporates consideration of the manager’s financial plan (Butterfield, Bingham, & Savory, 2006). In the strictest sense HM remains an approach to management in grazing land and livestock management. It is based on explicit goals, careful monitoring, and adaptive decision-making. Thoughtful assessment of all stages in the grazing and land management processes is key. Native pastures and high-intensity, short-duration grazing are often characteristic of HM ranches (Sherren et al., 2012).

There are many organizations worldwide that support research and training in HM, spreading the practice to livestock managers far and wide. While there is not such a strong cultural emphasis on students becoming teachers themselves, HM trainers at grazing education centres are often active ranchers.

Similarities

Permaculture and HM have several striking similarities. Both practices are in principle highly iterative and adaptive, and are based on thoughtful, scientific assessment and prediction. Their principles encourage an experimental rather than prescriptive approach, recognizing that each situation is unique and requires unique solutions. Both movements involve a close connection with the land on the part of the practitioner, but may also be described as “virtual movements”, in that their membership has a wide geographic dispersion and relies on the Internet to support ongoing discourse and connection (Sommerfeldt, 2011).

However, the most profound similarity between the two is the following of practitioners. Many individuals carry out their respective management practices with
near religiously dogmatic adherence. For instance, in interviews, researchers have been struck by chapter and verse endorsement and boosterism delivered by HM practitioners (e.g., Sherren, Fischer, & Fazey, 2012; K. Sherren, personal communication, October 20, 2015). The question arises whether practitioners are critically engaging with their practices, or simply using rhetoric to convince the interviewer (and therefore introducing a new kind of bias into social science research). The binaries observed between the practices as officially presented and the actual deployment of each practice are important to understand from a rhetorical perspective—adaptive versus adherent, and critical versus rote analysis—because they can serve to invalidate the movements’ legitimacy in the eyes of the scientific research community, and ultimately the realm of policy-making in the global effort to achieve environmental sustainability and food security.

Methods

Analysis Framework

Based on the review of rhetoric and discourse in movements presented above, an analytical framework was developed (Figure 2). By following the steps presented—determining the content and describing the form by (1) assessing the \textit{kairos}, (2) determining the identification method, and (3) considering the use of \textit{logos, ethos}, and \textit{pathos}—we can compile the assessed information into a statement of any given discourse unit’s impact. Readers will note that the framework omits any value assessments of the variables presented. A quantitative approach has deliberately been avoided, as the practice of rhetorical analysis resists the type of generalization necessitated by quantitative analysis. Each unit of discourse is unique, and as such must be evaluated on a highly individualized basis.
**Figure 2.** Discourse assessment framework. Analyst first separates form and content, noting the content and then describing the form by: assessing the context, including the dissemination method, to determine the constraints and considerations imposed (the kairos). Secondly, the analyst determines which method has been used to connect with the audience (common ground, antithesis, or unawareness), and thirdly extent to which logos, ethos, and pathos apply. Finally, the analyst compiles all these factors into an assessment of the discourse unit’s impact.

In the final stage of analysis, a statement of impact is produced. Several useful guiding statements have been gleaned through the literature and are applied to the discourse units:

- Identification by common ground and identification by unawareness both support maintaining a relationship by controlling in-group sentiments and ensuring interpretive cohesion (Sommerfeldt, 2011);
- Identification by antithesis is an important heuristic, as it creates division between “us” and “them”. The delivering party builds stronger relationships with their audience because within the dichotomy, the relationship is seen as the only way to oppose the threat (Burke, 1973; Cheney, 1983; Sommerfeldt, 2011). This
amounts to creating shared identity by agreement on “what we are not” as opposed to “what we are” (Sommerfeldt, 2011). This form of identification is quite aggressive, and not appropriate for all audiences;

- Logos emphasizes truth devoid of other methods of persuasion, while pathos and ethos rely on swaying an audience with peripheral cues such as their emotions or perceptions (Bram et al., 1979). Commonly, individuals with little expertise in an area are likely to rely on the lower-effort assessments enabled by peripheral cues (Fadel et al., 2014);
- “Newsiness” can disguise forceful rhetoric (Cheney, 1983);
- It is crucial to consider the authoritative control behind each discourse units – for example, testimonials on an official website are vetted before being posted (Cheney, 1983).

Word Clouds and Networks

Word clouds present occurrences of individual terms within a corpus of text, and can be useful in understanding vocabulary. Word networks map a corpus of text by popular terms and common co-occurences (i.e., instances where two words appear close together within a body of text). Taken together, these two tools support manual assessment of a discourse unit’s content, which otherwise can be difficult to conceive of as it is so closely linked to the unit’s form. For Twitter data only, an additional level of analysis springs from the content: a social network derived from retweets and “@” mentions between users, captured within the body of each message. Network visualizations are helpful in assessing the behaviour of the group and inferring intentions such as solidifying current group identity or reaching out for new members. For this analysis, software was selected based on the input:

- TagCrowd (http://tagcrowd.com/) was used to create word clouds for website discourse units,
- VOSviewer (http://www.vosviewer.com/) was used to create networks of terms’ co-occurrences for website discourse units, and
- Netlytic (https://netlytic.org/) was used to visualize Twitter networks by examining connections (i.e., retweets and “@” mentions) between posters, and to create word clouds for Twitter datasets (i.e., all tweets using a particular query during the collection period).

A complete set of all word cloud and network images can be found in Appendix A, but especially descriptive images have been included in the main body.
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Sources

Websites

Holistic Management International (HMI) was selected as a representative organization for HM. HMI was established by Savory in 1984, and has an extensive reach: in addition to providing training to ranchers and farmers, it publishes a regular journal, and fosters an international community through both its website and social networking sites such as Facebook. For permaculture, the UK-based Permaculture Association (PA) was selected. Like HMI, PA publishes a journal, as well as hosting an annual conference, and supporting its own broad community of practitioners and teachers.

For each site, the “About Us” pages were selected as representative of the practices’ ‘authority’ establishing an official identity. Additionally, testimonials from each website were chosen, to demonstrate practitioners’ voices within a one-directional context (i.e., broadcasted without opportunity for responsive discussion within the same environment). Recalling that the testimonials are disseminated by authoritative websites, these represent semi-authoritative discourse units, as the authoritative organization exercises a certain amount of control.

An initial examination of the word clouds and networks for each “About Us” page and testimonial was performed, and supported full rhetorical analysis using the framework.

Twitter

Data was collected from Twitter to understand the social networks for both permaculture and HM. The online social network analysis tool Netlytic was used to collect and visualize the data. Each data set was collected based on a query, which was determined by a preliminary search for popular terms in each social media tool to assess the rate of retrieval (i.e., number of messages) compared to the relative level of unrelated material (e.g., “grazing” used to discuss dieting). The queries were set as follows:

2 HM About Us: http://holisticmanagement.org/about-hmi/
Permaculture About Us: https://www.permaculture.org.uk/about and associated links
3 HM testimonial: http://holisticmanagement.org/holistic-management/case-studies/case-studies-spring-creek-farm/
Holistic Management: “holistic management” OR #holisticmanagement OR “cell grazing” OR #shortdurationgrazing OR “short duration grazing” OR #rotational grazing OR “rotational grazing” OR “allan savory”

Permaculture: permaculture

Collection took place between September 21 and October 21, 2015. Each query returned a number of messages and unique nodes (i.e., user accounts), which is indicative of the popularity of the social network springing from the query’s terms. Word clouds supporting further analysis were generated conducted on the corpus of all tweet content. Detailed discourse analysis using the framework presented above was conducted on 20 tweets chosen at random (balanced across the collection period by sampling evenly from each week).

Results

As discussed, content and form are difficult to separate, but proper rhetorical analysis depends on being able to assess each independently, before determining the overall impact of all present factors. Tools like word clouds and networks, which present words without their rhetorical “noise”, aid content assessment. Combined with a manual qualitative assessment of the content, and then using the framework to guide assessment of the form, a determination of each discourse unit’s rhetorical effect is presented below.

Web Discourse

1. Holistic Management International “About Us”

1.1 Content

An initial look at the content of HMI’s “About Us” page reveals that terms relating to the practice and practitioners dominate (e.g., holistic, management, land, community, and educator), as well as self-referential terms (i.e., HMI). The content of the page associates the practice of HM with land, and describes HMI as an education-focused community (Figure 3). Considering words’ co-occurrence, the word network reveals that “HMI” is strongly associated with contributions, impacts, and ranchers themselves (Figure A.2), which supports the education-focused community identity suggested by the above word cloud. “Value” and “life” are likewise strongly associated with one another, as well as “land” and “health”.
Manual assessment of the content confirmed that the discourse unit deals with describing HMI’s impact on the community of practitioners through education, outlining HMI’s values and emphasizing the alignment with HM as a practice, and justifying HM as a means to achieve healthy, productive ecosystems. Four additional points were revealed by manually assessing the content: HM’s ability to provide improved profitability, HMI’s role in fostering a framework for stakeholder cooperation, brief mention of HM’s application to land management outside agricultural applications, and presenting the different educational offers.

1.2 Form

The *kairos*—the context and constraints that it imposes—of HMI’s “About Us” page is a static webpage, limited in space due to blog post panes that dominate the right half of the page. Text is accompanied by photos and is frequently broken up, likely in an effort to keep the reader engaged – visitors to web pages often “bounce” around, seldom staying to read lengthy columns of text (Manjo, 2013). Because of this, there is only space for brief statements, which we may think of as thematic “packages” before each new thought is presented.

The identification method used is Common Ground, and the discourse unit uses *ethos* (e.g., “… HMI, as the leader in educating people to better manage land …” para. 1) and *pathos* (e.g., “We are passionate about this …” para. 3) to persuade its audience. The *kairos* limits the space available, possibly limiting use of other persuasive methods (i.e., *logos*).

1.3 Impact

In essence, the content explains the organization, the value of the practice, and the value of the organization to practitioners. The format and intended use of the
webpage (*kairos*) does not lend itself to lengthy justifications and logical arguments, therefore the discourse unit relies on galvanizing its audience to their shared goals and values through emotional pressure and perceived reputation.

2. Permaculture Association “About Us”

2.1 Content

Using the word cloud generator, an initial content analysis for PA’s “About Us” page shows that terms relating to the organization dominate (“association”, “charity”, “organisation”, “information”), as well as the members and practitioners, as they interact with PA (“members”, “people”, “provide”, “support”) (Figure A.3). The practice itself is also prevalent (“design”, “permaculture”, “practice”, “projects”, “work”). The word network reveals that “permaculture” is clustered with terms relating to training and learning, while “association” is tied to terms like “order” and “support” (Figure 4). Individuals are associated with unique skills and knowledge, while “members” are tied to projects and collaboration, and “groups” are tied to “design courses”.

![Figure 4. Permaculture Association “About Us” corpus word network](image)

Qualitative analysis confirms that content establishes PA as an ordered source of information, defines permaculture as an ongoing training and collaborative learning process, and places individuals, members, and groups as intrinsic players in the learning process. Additionally, PA presents itself as contributing to the ongoing development of permaculture theory and practice, and announces its commitment to research and communication. It discusses an intention to nurture permaculture networks and collaborations, and to encourage the growth of the practice by connecting people and groups. It also mentions its roots in a small group of “off the wall starry eyed lunatics” in the early 1980s (Permaculture Association, n.d., para. 5).
2.2 Form

The *kairos* for PA’s “About Us” page presents numerous spatial limitations. The discourse unit is presented as a static webpage, which has been divided into three nearly equal columns: a “Table of Contents”-style pane occupies the space to the left of the discourse unit, and bulletin-style posts take up the right. Instead of presenting the information in a continuous column of thematic packages as HMI’s “About Us” page does, PA spreads the discourse unit across several separate pages, each accessed through the Table of Contents to the left. This may be an effort to take advantage of readers’ compulsion to “bounce” away (Manjoo, 2013). There are some photos breaking up the text.

We may associate this discourse unit with Common Ground identification as it assumes the audience will prize the same values held by PA. In order to persuade the audience, *logos* (e.g., “Services” section, presenting ordered evidence to reader) and *ethos* (e.g., “The Association is a growing charity within a fast expanding network, so we tend to be very busy!” para. 10) are used.

2.3 Impact

Ongoing training and learning in a collaborative and equitable environment are important to permaculture. The discourse unit emphasizes PA’s role as a research facilitator, both in original research and in fostering collaboration networks. The *kairos* limits the space available, and therefore may hinder the discourse unit’s ability to explore arguments fully. The intended audience is assumed to hold common values with PA, and the organization relies on reputation and fact to communicate the message.

3. Holistic Management International Testimonial

3.1 Content

Testimonials are discourse units created by members of the public as opposed to created by an authoritative control. An initial content assessment of the testimonial selected from HMI’s website reveals an emphasis on the business (“business”, “cattle”, “costs”, “cropping”, “farm”), practice (“holistic”, “management”, “framework”), and the practitioners themselves (“farmers”, “Greg”, “Lisa”) (Figure A.5). The word network is interesting, in that it reveals an emphasis on Lisa and her close ties to the grazing landscape (“farm”, “land”, “soil”), while Greg appears alone (Figure 5). HM is most closely associated with the adoption of the management practice (“cattle”, “future”, “business”, “way”), as well as education (“training”).

Qualitative assessment of the testimonial supports the results of the word cloud and network: practitioners and farm components are emphasized and the farmers’ adoption of HM and the impact it has had on their lives is discussed. Other important notes include the fact that Lisa learned about HM from her sister, emphasizing the non-traditional pathway many practitioners take to adopting HM. Calculated business decisions within HM’s planning framework are discussed, and the social cohesion the farmers have enjoyed after adopting the practice (family and community meetings). The testimonial also uses measurable comparisons to establish their success, and mentions the environmental benefits, before concluding that Lisa and Greg are very impressed with HMI as an organization.

3.2 Form

The *kairos* imposed by a static webpage is the same as that which applies to HMI’s “About Us” page. Space is shared with blog-style panes, constraining the discourse unit. In order to keep the testimonial visually appealing, the text is broken up by images and highlighted statements.

The testimonial is presented as an account of two farmers, and does not make any overt attempt to create identity with the audience. Given the nature of the site, and especially given the tone of the “About Us” page, shared identity may be assumed. However, the discourse unit cannot be attributed as identification by Unawareness, as there is no use of “we”. Identification by Antithesis is a more appropriate fit, as the unit frequently mentions the poor performance of the neighbouring conventional farms in contrast to the success experienced by the HM farmers, emphasizing “us versus them” (Figure 6). Persuasion is accomplished by all three methods: *logos* (e.g., referring to analysis of business inputs and outputs when making decisions), *ethos* (e.g., emphasizing the practitioners’ lifelong experience on farms, bestowing a high level of
expertise), and *pathos* (e.g., invoking the return of the possibility for their children to return to the farm and continue the practice) are all present.

![Image](image.png)

*Figure 6. Excerpt from HMI testimonial, demonstrating Identification through Antithesis*

### 3.3 Impact

It is important to consider that the testimonial was posted by an authoritative source and may not be entirely candid. The message is a galvanizing one: two farmers were failing in their business and turned to HM, after which they regained their success while their neighbours continued to struggle. The context of the story will be familiar to the audience (drought, difficult times), and the choice is presented as continuing to farm traditionally like the neighbours and fail, or adopt HM and thrive (therefore Antithesis, as what draws the audience together is fear of the “other”, not shared HM values). The testimonial is highly persuasive, using every method available.

### 4. Permaculture Association Testimonial

#### 4.1 Content

The word cloud for PA’s online testimonial places heavy influence on only a few terms. Terms appear in two categories: those associated with the practice and its stated characteristics (“permaculture”, “alternative”, and “design”), and those associated with the practitioners’ experiences (“life”, “love”, “benefits”, and “people”) (Figure 7). The word network for PA’s online testimonial is very spare. However, it is interesting to note that “permaculture” is closely associated with “alternative”, and “life” and “benefit” tend to co-occur (Figure A.8).
Figure 7. Permaculture Association testimonial corpus word cloud

Together, the word cloud and network demonstrate that the testimonial emphasizes the positive impact that permaculture, as a design alternative, can have on the happiness of people and their lives. The testimonial describes permaculture as a positive, optimistic approach that leads to success in life, and being part of a community that is cooperative and equitable. It also emphasizes the affordability and accessibility of the practice, and the fact that certification is available.

4.2 Form

PA’s testimonial’s kairos is unique, as it actually occurs within a PDF as opposed to a traditional webpage. The PDF provides an extremely static platform, and the text’s space is nearly equally matched with a large photo of the practitioner. Identification takes the form of Common Ground, and the methods of persuasion are logos and pathos.

4.3 Impact

Permaculture is presented to the audience, which is presumed to share the speaker’s interests and values, as an accessible, respectable solution to problems in life. The author uses evidence from her experience and emotional pressure to convince to audience of the financial and social benefits of adopting permaculture, and assumes they will hold the same values. Recalling the authoritative control held by the posting over a discourse unit like a testimonial, we must consider the candor of this discourse unit carefully.

Twitter Discourse

5. HM Tweets

5.1 Content

The Twitter network for HM included a mere 66 unique tweets, and the posters demonstrated a preference for broadcasting original messages or retweeting messages
over engaging in dialogue with one another, as can be seen with Netlytic’s network visualization tool (Figure 8).

![Figure 8. Holistic Management Twitter Network](image)

The word cloud reveals an emphasis on grazing livestock (“grazing”, “#grazing”, “#livestock”, “#cows”, “cell”) when discussing HM, as well as key individuals like Allan Savory and Evan Pensini (a grazier in Western Australia) (Figure 9). Word networks are not useful tools when examining tweets, as each discourse unit is too short for anything of consequence to be revealed.

![Figure 9. Holistic Management Twitter Word Cloud](image)

The content of the selection of 20 representative tweets was then qualitatively assessed. A table with thorough content analysis for each tweet is available in Appendix B. In summary, tweets were about training and accreditation, sharing the perceived benefits and effects of HM in grazing and land management, and engaging in moderate amounts of interaction with online communities through the use of hashtags and mentions. The most common hashtags were #holisticmanagement and #grazing.
5.2 Form

The results of analyzing the 20 tweets’ form are presented Appendix B. In summary, the limitation in number of characters (maximum 140) restricts the length of the discourse units. However, Twitter allows for photos to be attached, providing additional visual communication to the audience, as well as inclusion of external links, which allow the interaction between poster and audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Messages may also be directed as other Twitter users, yet tweets remain public. The “public-ness” of these otherwise private discourses may well inform the way in which the poster forms the discourse unit.

Considering identification and persuasion, for the most part Twitter’s length restriction constrains discourse units in truly developing strong persuasive or identification messages. Throughout the collection of 20 tweets, Common Ground was the most common method of creating shared identity, as posters overtly emphasized or insinuated shared values and experiences. Identification by Unawareness was less common, and mostly used when posters entreated their audience to repost tweets (presuming an already shared identity) or celebrated some speech being delivered to them by an expert (suggesting an invisible “we the audience”). Finally, persuasion was overwhelmingly accomplished by ethos, emphasizing the reputation of the poster or the subject of the discourse unit. In rare cases pathos was employed (e.g., in entreatying audience to retweet), but never logos (the logical presentation of evidence).

5.3 Impact

Taken as a whole, this rhetorical analysis that reveals HM-related tweets incorporate discussions of grazing livestock under HM regimes, propose training and accreditation to do so, and include moderate engagement with an online community of practitioners. All this is accomplished through huge ethos persuasion, relying on reputation claims to give weight to recommendations and comments. It is important to note that these claims are not backed up in the discourse units themselves. Most tweets assumed the audience shared common values and interests, thus relied on Identification through Common Ground, while some also used Unawareness (a spoken or unspoken “we”) to bind audience and poster as a cohesive group.

6. Permaculture Tweets

6.1 Content Analysis

The Twitter network for permaculture included over 18,000 unique tweets, and included some members who frequently engaged with others, creating tightly-
connected network, while others relied on broadcasting and retweeting behaviours, as shown in Netlytic’s network visualization (Figure 10).

**Figure 10.** Permaculture Twitter Network, showing sub-groups engaged in frequent dialogues in the centre clusters, and marginally participating posters in the circumference

The word cloud for the set of permaculture tweets reveals an enormous emphasis on farms and farmers (“food”, “farm”, “farmer”, “farming”, “pertanian” which is Malay for agriculture) and gardens (“#gardening” and “gardening”, “garden”). Independence and sustainability are also emphasized (“free”, “survival”, “sustainable”) (Figure 11). Word networks are not useful tools when examining tweets, as each discourse unit is too short for anything of consequence to be revealed.

**Figure 11.** Permaculture Twitter Word Cloud

The content of the 20 selected tweets was analyzed, and the detailed notes can be found in Appendix C. In summary, posters used Twitter to disseminate images and textual accounts of their lives and activities as permaculture practitioners. They also
posted content to interact with the community in order to spread permaculture to new practitioners, to share success stories, to make it easier for new practitioners to adopt permaculture, and shared stories about their own adoption and the experiences of others around them. News and social/professional events featured among the tweets, and some entreaties to audiences to further disseminate messages. The most common hashtag was #permaculture, with spotty and inconsistent use of other hashtags (e.g., #seed, #gardenmedicine, #localfood).

6.2 Form Analysis

The set of 20 selected tweets were analysed to understand their form, for which detailed results can be found in Appendix C. To summarize the detailed findings, just as with the HM tweets, discourse units are restricted in length as Twitter only allows messages to be a maximum of 140 characters (kairos). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Tweets also allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit.

Considering the identification methods employed, the permaculture tweets exhibited higher variety than the HM tweets. While Common Ground was still most common, and still followed by Unawareness, the permaculture set included several tweets that used Identification by Antithesis. Additionally, the permaculture tweets relied far more on pathos to persuade the audience through emotional manipulation or pressure, using ethos as well by emphasizing the reputation and expertise of individuals posting or mentioned in the discourse units. In several cases, tweets relied on logic and reasoning by employing logos, which was unused in the HM set.

6.3 Impact

Taken together, posters in the permaculture online community offered discourse units about their lives and experiences, advocated for and celebrated the adoption of permaculture by new practitioners, and shared news and debates about the practice. They often assumed their audience shared values, but also created shared identity through spoken or unspoken “we”, and even emphasized an “us versus them” dichotomy at times. Contrary to the HM community, people posting about permaculture, relied mostly on emotional persuasion (pathos) and then on persuasion based in perceived reputation (ethos), and at times using logical presentation of information to convince their audience (logos).
Discussion

As a brief reminder of the theoretical terms before identifying the patterns revealed by the results:

- **Identification by**:
  - Common Ground (emphasis on shared values and experiences)
  - Antithesis (emphasis on common enemy)
  - Unawareness (use of an enveloping “we” to draw audience together)

- **Persuasive tools**:
  - Ethos (reputation and expertise of the speaker or subject of the discourse unit)
  - Pathos (emotional or social pressure to persuade)
  - Logos (presentation of logical argumentation or evidence to convince the audience)

- **Kairos** (the constraints imposed on a discourse unit by the context)

Patterns emerging from the results fell into two categories: distinctions by practice and distinctions by channel.

**Distinctions by Practice**

Content differed between the two practices. To speak broadly, HM was more likely to present discourse units that discussed the practice, while permaculture discourse units emphasized the collaborative networks. This suggests that HM is still defining the practice for its community, and that it is still establishing itself. Permaculture is able to openly refer to the strong network behind it, suggesting a stronger, more established community.

Across all different discourse unit types (“About Us”, testimonials, and tweets), HM and permaculture remained fairly evenly matched in the technique chosen to create shared identity. Common Ground was overwhelmingly the most popular choice, demonstrating that discourse unit authors believe their audience to already have developed a shared identity. The Common Ground discourse units were simply tapping into an attentive audience. The second most common method of identification, Unawareness, is useful when introducing new information to a dedicated group.

It is notable that permaculture tweets used Antithesis more than HM discourses do, however, the sample examined is insufficient to draw any strong conclusions from this point. It remains worth considering that Identification by Antithesis is an aggressive form of identification, useful when rallying a group against a common enemy, whether the participants truly share anything other than that enemy. This suggests that permaculture practitioners may be more likely to support incensed and passionate actions and drives than HM. Given PA’s characterization of its forefathers as “off the
wall starry eyed lunatics” (Permaculture Association, n.d., para. 5), the practice’s global range, widespread adoption by people from diverse backgrounds, and deployment in myriad environments (e.g., commercial farms to private backyard gardens) the presence of highly emotional social currents within the community is unsurprising.

In terms of persuasive tools, HM relied noticeably more on ethos, emphasizing the reputation and expertise of authors and subjects to the audience. This again suggests that the practice is still establishing itself, and feels a need to convince its community of its expert status. Permaculture discourse units were more inclined to persuade the audience through emotional pressure, or to present arguments logically, than HM units. This may be an artifact of the community in each practice. While permaculture has broad uptake across many demographics (urban apartment-dweller to large-scale commercial orchard operators), HM is largely limited to graziers. Permaculture prizes peer teaching and collaborative learning, while HM emphasizes professional accreditation for practicing land and livestock managers.

The discourse units’ use of persuasive tools suggests that permaculture may have a more socially diverse community that incorporates both starry-eyed poets and evidence-driven rationalists. Conversely, HM has a smaller community, and one that perhaps is at an intermediary stage of uptake, therefore relying heavily on the reputation and expertise of its members to validate and recruit. This is corroborated by the size of the Twitter networks collected over the course of a month: there were over 18,000 unique tweets in the permaculture network, while HM had only 66 unique tweets. This may be due to the practitioner population for each practice—HM is almost exclusively carried out in rural settings and requires access to large, contiguous tracts of grazing land, while permaculture can be practiced at any scale—or may hint at current uptake of each practice.

**Distinctions by Discourse Unit Type**

Drawing conclusions about distinctions between different discourse unit types (“About Us”, testimonial, or tweet) is difficult because of the proportions of each type in the sample. There were ten times as many tweets analyzed as other discourse unit types, which offer ten times the opportunities for this type of discourse unit to contain distinct content and to employ different methods of identification and persuasion.

Discourse units in the form of tweets took advantage of the kairos of tweets to communicate content that was more “newsy” than that found on more static webpages. Twitter’s platform makes it very easy to post content quickly and to interact with an audience, making it ideal to use for alerting audiences of content located in other channels or to carry out ongoing conversations. Websites are more difficult to
quickly update information and content, and are better suited to more substantial and enduring content.

Identification through Common Ground was the most common across all channels. The propensity for all discourse units to opt first for Common Ground identification suggests that the authors believe the audience shares values and interests. Given that most of the shared values are not obliquely mentioned and are merely assumed, we may understand that *kairos* has limited the authors’ self-expression – perhaps if they had more space (even on the webpages) in which to deliver their messages, shared values would be made explicit.

Discourse units on Twitter were the most likely to take advantage of all three identification methods at their disposal, notably Identification by Unawareness, which the “About Us” pages and testimonials do not use. Tweets still favour Identification by Common Ground, and like the other types of discourse units, rarely turn to Identification by Antithesis. Identification through Unawareness equates to an enveloping “we”, usually without substantiation, and the *kairos* of a tweet (i.e., 140 character limit) severely limits this channel’s ability to take advantage of the other forms of identification. Identification through Unawareness is a common tactic when advancing new ideas or values to an already committed group (Sommerfeldt, 2011). The analysis revealed that Unawareness was frequently used when introducing events or discussing the adoption of either practice (Appendices D and E for detailed notes). The few discourse units that opted for Antithesis were undeniably forceful in their messaging, urging the audience to “act now!”

Considering tools of persuasion, the space limitations present the same *kairos* that affected authors’ choice of identification. “About Us” pages and testimonials both employed more than one method of persuasion, likely due to having more room in which to expand their discussions. Tweets largely relied on only one method of persuasion, simply not having the room in 140 characters to include different types of arguments. “About Us” pages and testimonials each sampled fairly evenly from the available methods of persuasion, while tweets demonstrated huge preference for *ethos* and to a lesser extent *pathos*, only using *logos* in a few cases. Persuasion in tweets therefore relies mostly on the reputation of the poster or the subject, or on social and emotional pressures. The *kairos* present in tweets rarely allows for the logical presentation of evidence required for *logos*. Since tweets are unable to employ multiple types of persuasion, these discourse units likely have a far smaller impact on the audience than “About Us” pages and testimonials. However, Twitter allows posters to include images and links to external content, thereby allowing the audience to continue interacting with the subject matter beyond the discourse unit presented. The poster has
no control over the audience’s choice to pursue further material, so they must be as enticing as possible in their messaging. This may explain the strong emphasis on reputation and social/emotional pressures present in twitter discourse units.

Significance

Permaculture and HM are two practices that promise a solution to food security and environmental sustainability. HM emphasizes the continued use of livestock, (1) to meet increasing demand for high-quality meat as the global population grows and becomes more affluent, and (2) to cycle pastures’ soils and nutrients in order to reverse desertification of grasslands and restore the great carbon sinks of yore (Savory, 2013). Permaculture presents a smaller-scale, but equally powerful solution, suggesting that individuals adopt permaculture design principles in their own lives, drawing them closer to their food and the natural world around them (Mollison, 1988). Both practices have their roots firmly in principles of goal-setting, careful observation, holistic thinking, and adaptive management. Practitioners of both HM and permaculture pursue education and accreditation in their fields, suggesting that they are aware of these roots and carry out the techniques in accordance with the founding standards and methods.

However, the rhetorical analysis presented in this report suggests that discourse around both HM and permaculture tends to rely on unfounded assertions of expertise and emotional pressures in order to convince the audience. In most cases, there is little mention of evidence or logical presentation of information, even when discourse units present practitioners’ accounts of their experiences or endorse the practice. The boosterism found in most of the discourse may be linked to the fact that the practitioners are financial and emotionally invested in the practices – cognitive dissonance theory states that people are likely to behave in ways that are consistent with their beliefs (Festinger, 1957) and to value items they have adopted (Tanaka et al., 2011). Overwhelmingly, discourse is tailored to audiences that we may assume are already committed to each practice; recruitment and marketing is not a focus of the discourse units’ content. This apparent reluctance to present each practice to new communities as a viable solution to global problems is perplexing. Finally, the Twitter data revealed far less interaction in each community than expected. Many messages were one-way broadcasts or simple retweets (furthering another poster’s original one-way broadcast). The online communities did not reveal significant support for other members, which may be linked to difficulties in reaching out to new members. Robust communities will find it easier to draw in new members (Centola, 2010).
In terms of content, permaculture’s discourse units broadly emphasized lifestyle, while HM’s discourse units emphasized livelihoods. Recalling that both communities of practitioners are invested in their chosen practice, these emphases are logical. However, neither practice was striking in its discussion of environmental benefits or the adaptive management characteristics. This appears to be an oversight, given the self-described importance of each practice for the future health and prosperity of our world. It suggests that the practitioners are not engaging critically with their practices, and are simply spouting platitudes they adopted from other practitioners or from their teachers.

Social sciences researchers have noted that practitioners tend to use chapter-and-verse language when describing their practice (Sherren et al., 2012; K. Sherren, personal communication, Fall 2015). Boosterism based on unfounded assertions of expertise and emotional pressure is unconvincing, and may in fact prove to be a deterrent to many people. Scholars and policy-makers, for example, value experimentation. Regarding HM, agricultural scientists have been highly critical of the practice in spite of numerous accounts of practitioners’ positive experiences, dismissed as invalid anecdotal evidence (Briske et al., 2014). The rhetorical analysis in this report offers no evidence of concerted attempts by discourse coming from either practice to address the division in perceived value between scholars and practitioners. Such discourse units might resemble: tweets by practitioners directed at agricultural scientists (using “@” mentions) and including or citing research in the language of scientists that validates each practice.

Conclusion

Food security and environmental sustainability are critical global issues. They will only grow more important in the years to come, as we face increased desertification of grazing lands, depleting capacity of suitable farmland, population growth and increasing urbanization, and growing demand from an increasingly affluent global population for more and better food. Individuals are physically and mentally removed from their food, and need to understand the importance of the situation. Farmers and other similar practitioners with first-hand, in a way “traditional”, knowledge are in an ideal position to communicate with scholars, policy-makers, and the public about these issues.

Holistic management and permaculture are promising practices that may provide part of the solution to the problems we face. However, the discourse in which practitioners are presently engaged is problematic. Persuasive methods currently used detract from the fundamental methods of each practice (e.g., critical thought, careful observation, and adaptive management) and succeed in alienating the scientific
community. By addressing discourse to an audience that is already convinced, and relying on shared values without basing comments on substantial evidence or logical argumentation, the practices create a reputation as “outliers”. Without the support of scholars, and relying mostly on what seem to be insular groups, it is difficult for policymakers to endorse the practices as reasonable solutions to food and environmental problems. HM and permaculture practitioner communities must begin to speak the language of science and policymakers in earnest and reach out to these influential groups. Their discourse could provide valuable evidence in many cases, however not in the current state as observed in this report.
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Appendix A: Word cloud and network images

Holistic Management International “About Us”:

Figure A.1. HMI “About Us” corpus word cloud, revealing top 50 terms and number of occurrences.

Figure A.2. HMI “About Us” corpus word network
Permaculture Association “About Us”:

**Figure A.3.** Permaculture Association “About Us” corpus word cloud

**Figure A.4.** Permaculture Association “About Us” corpus word network
Holistic Management International testimonial:

Figure A.5. HMI testimonial word cloud, revealing top 50 terms and number of occurrences.

Figure A.6. HMI testimonial word network
EXAMINING THE IMPACT IN HOLISTIC MANAGEMENT AND PERMACULTURE

Permaculture Association testimonial:

Figure A.7. Permaculture Association testimonial corpus word cloud

Figure A.8. Permaculture Association testimonial corpus word network

Holistic Management Twitter:

Figure A.9. Holistic Management Twitter Word Cloud
Figure A.10. Permaculture Twitter Word Cloud
## Appendix B: HM Tweets Full Analysis

### Content analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tweet</th>
<th>Content analysis</th>
<th>Form analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super Cows-- Cody explains grassland restoration using high intensity/short duration grazing. Thanks @So_Delicious <a href="http://t.co/qDNt5p7DPra">http://t.co/qDNt5p7DPra</a></td>
<td>Use of livestock and specific grazing rotations to restore grasslands. Accompanying image shows crowd of adults and children listening to man astride a horse.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Identification is not forceful. Common Ground is the most appropriate fit given the message's emphasis on values the poster assumes the audience has in common. Persuasive methods employed are <em>ethos</em> – mention of the speaker (Cody) and use of adjectives like “super” confer reputation on these subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pls RT: THREE DAYS TO GO ON EARLY BIRD RATE for Savory Inst Accredited #HolisticManagement Course in Nov #grazing <a href="http://t.co/KFqKSS8s8o">http://t.co/KFqKSS8s8o</a></td>
<td>Request for audience to disseminate the message. Announcing accreditation course’s deadline for early bird rate – link to course enrollment page. Using hashtags to identify with grazing and holistic management communities</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification method employed is Unawareness – entreating the audience to retweet and giving them the scoop on early bird rates suggests community membership without making it explicit. Persuasive methods employed are <em>pathos</em> (entreating) and <em>ethos</em> (accredited course).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Savory\’s holistic management techniques reverse desertification using #livestock <a href="http://t.co/smJRKEVpIV">http://t.co/smJRKEVpIV</a></td>
<td>Presenting Allan Savory’s technique – link to blog post discussing technique and effects in more detail[^4]. Using hashtags to identify with livestock community.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is not forceful. Unawareness is the most appropriate fit because the content of external links, while interesting, is outside the scope of this content analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^4]: The content of external links, while interesting, is outside the scope of this content analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF PRACTITIONER DISCOURSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>discourse unit</strong> presuming to be helpfully informing like-minded audience. Persuasive method is <em>ethos</em>, relying on Savory's reputation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| @AgritecSoftware is this the program to solve all our recording headaches?? Free range Berkshire herd cell grazing regenerating land |
| Message directed to another poster (software developers for livestock managers). Cell grazing to regenerate land |
| Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*). The message is directed at a company, yet tweets are public. The visibility of the discourse unit may constrain the poster or otherwise inform the discourse unit’s formation. Identification is through Common Ground as the unit emphasizes common considerations between the poster and the user they are addressing (and perhaps the wider Twitter audience, as the tweet is public). The discourse unit is not terribly persuasive, but uses *ethos* to establish a reputation as successful grazier and land manager when posing their question. |

| We increased our #grazing days by 50 percent with #holisticmanagement http://t.co/0yIrpvadAS #ag |
| Increased productivity of land using HM. Using hashtags to identify with grazing, holistic management, and “ag” communities. |
| Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Common Ground as the discourse unit assumes the audience holds similar values (e.g., would also want to increase their productivity by 50%). Persuasion is accomplished through *ethos* as the poster emphasizes their abilities as a grazing manager. |

<p>| Intensive cell grazing for times of drought: It works! <a href="http://t.co/k7493D1fV6">http://t.co/k7493D1fV6</a> #haytalk #grazing #cattle #beef |
| Presents trade publication article (title is same as article) – link to article in <em>Canadian Cattlemen</em>. Using hashtags to identify with “haytalk”, grazing, cattle, and beef communities. |
| Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Common Ground as the discourse unit assumes the audience holds similar values (e.g., they also want to be able to graze in times of drought). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>This mob have been on Hill Farm for a week. Today they all successfully completed their Diploma of Cell Grazing</strong> <a href="http://t.co/2MOt47fIxT">http://t.co/2MOt47fIxT</a></th>
<th><strong>Announcing completion of cell grazing diploma (perhaps satirically, since image is of cows and not graziers). Image of cows in green pasture.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<strong>kairos</strong>). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Identification is through Unawareness as the poster enforces a common identity with their audience by sharing “mutually exciting” news. The post is not terribly persuasive, but does employ <strong>pathos</strong> by encouraging the audience to be excited by the news.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holistic management helps your #cows have more grass than they can eat!</strong> <a href="http://t.co/PMDEhDm8oB">http://t.co/PMDEhDm8oB</a> #grazing <a href="http://t.co/kf8DjYnPG3">http://t.co/kf8DjYnPG3</a></td>
<td><strong>HM linked to improved feedstock production. Link to HMI website, and image of cow eating grass. Using hashtag to identify with cows and grazing communities.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<strong>kairos</strong>). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Tweets also allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Common Ground as the poster assumes the audience holds similar values (e.g., increased feedstock). Persuasion is accomplished through <strong>ethos</strong>, as the image includes the logo for HMI, the professional centre that provides expert advice and training.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tony talks about using #holisticmanagement in #grazing planning in the northeast</strong> <a href="http://t.co/OJDQw6wuae">http://t.co/OJDQw6wuae</a> #ag</td>
<td><strong>Presenting blog-style article about incorporating HM into planning. Link to HMI site with article, and uses hashtags to identify with holistic management, grazing, and “ag” communities.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<strong>kairos</strong>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Unawareness, as the discourse unit’s implication is that Tony is telling “us” – by invoking the silent “we”, the unit is reinforcing a shared identity between poster and audience. Persuasion is done through <strong>ethos</strong>, as “Tony” is assumed to be an important expert</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and map your grazing areas <a href="Http://t.co/eV3SHMSyXi">Http://t.co/eV3SHMSyXi</a> Join us in our online holistic management courses.</td>
<td>Presenting option to take online courses, and what registrants will learn (identifying and mapping grazing areas) – link to online learning series by HMI.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Unawareness as the discourse unit clearly uses “us” to emphasize shared identity. Persuasion is accomplished through ethos as the poster is HMI, a professional centre able to offer accreditation to graziers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pls RT: @SavoryInstitute accredited introduction to holisticmanagement course 3-5 Nov, Somerset, UK #grazing #soils <a href="http://t.co/KFqKss8o0">http://t.co/KFqKss8o0</a></td>
<td>Request for audience to disseminate the message about Savory Institute’s upcoming accreditation course, with information about when and where – link to online registration. Using hashtags to identify with holistic management, grazing, and soils communities.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Unawareness as the poster entreats their audience to help them out, assuming the audience will help out because of shared identity. Persuasion through pathos (entreating) and ethos (emphasizing Savory Institute’s ability to grant accreditation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranching the Changing Times: Learning the Practice of Holistic ManagementThe Nebraska Grazing Lands Coalition... <a href="http://t.co/Dk01Ohp7Kk">http://t.co/Dk01Ohp7Kk</a></td>
<td>Announcing road show where an experienced rancher will talk about his experiences – link to Facebook post about the event.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Common Ground, as the poster assumes the audience is also struggling with ranching in changing times. Persuasion is through ethos as the article and opinions are coming from an expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cell Grazing ‡ Permaculture Livestock Systems at Zaytuna Farm <a href="http://t.co/h1Ma9vewbD">http://t.co/h1Ma9vewbD</a> via @PRIaustralia</td>
<td>Article about cell grazing incorporated into permaculture system – link to online article. Disclosing where the information came from (via Permaculture</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Institute Australia.</td>
<td>beyond the discourse unit. Identification is accomplished through Common Ground, as the poster assumes the audience will also value this type of grazing. Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> as Zaytuna Farm and their grazing practices are described as expert examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@RosewoodFarms at the moment yes. I'm trying cell grazing so there are more wires on main paddock fence. How many do you use?</td>
<td>Responding to another use, discussing cell grazing logistics, and asking a question about technique and set-up. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). The message is directed at another user, yet tweets are public. The visibility of the discourse unit may constrain the poster or otherwise inform the discourse unit’s formation. Identification is through Common Ground as the poster emphasizes common values. Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> as the poster describes their methods and therefore suggests a positive reputation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic management is more than grazing. It is financial management as well. <a href="http://t.co/eV3SHLNXFK">http://t.co/eV3SHLNXFK</a> Join our online course.</td>
<td>Presenting HM as financial management, mentioning online courses available through HMI – link to online registration. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Common Ground as the poster emphasizes common values (e.g., the audience also values financial management). Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> as the poster relies on their reputation as an expert centre (HMI).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Resting land is a myth in grazing, holistic management expert says [http://t.co/kFmNvnDBxh #mwiq](http://t.co/kFmNvnDBxh) | Link to online article about land management presented by HM expert. Using hashtag to identify with “mwiq” community – seems to be a community for news from Queensland, Australia. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification is through Unawareness as there is an invisible “we” as the audience to which the “holistic management expert” delivers the message. Persuasion is through *ethos* as the reputation of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evan Pensini Cell Grazing, Key 2 Rest pastures and capture sunlight energy. #Yarrie @Dstoate grazing density! <a href="http://t.co/yrCrmIWZrP">http://t.co/yrCrmIWZrP</a></th>
<th>Grazier presents cell grazing and density, and discusses the benefits he associates with it. Image of Evan Pensini delivering the talk. Using hashtag to identify with the “Yarrie” community, and calling out to David Stoate, another Western Australian grazier.</th>
<th>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. The message is directed at another user, yet tweets are public. The visibility of the discourse unit may constrain the poster or otherwise inform the discourse unit’s formation. Identification is through Common Ground as the poster emphasizes the shared common values with the addressee (e.g., grazing density). Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> as the discourse unit suggests expert reputation for Evan Pensini.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will be cell grazing this crop now with cow calf pairs till it’s gone <a href="http://t.co/jNQzX1jqJB">http://t.co/jNQzX1jqJB</a></td>
<td>Showing audience fodder growing and how it will be grazed. Photo of fodder.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Identification is through Common Ground, as the poster relies on the shared experiences of their audience (e.g., growing fodder, raising calves, etc.). Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> as the poster assumes some level of expert reputation by sharing their management plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@gaulstownfarms @padraig_shevlin @patquirke if you are a serious stock man get stuck into mob grazing and holistic management</td>
<td>Calling out to graziers and land managers, recommending dense grazing and holistic management.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). The message is directed at three other users, yet tweets are public. The visibility of the discourse unit may constrain the poster or otherwise inform the discourse unit’s formation. Identification is through Common Ground as the discourse unit emphasizes a shared identity of “serious stock man”. Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> (i.e., the poster is the expert) and through <em>pathos</em> (i.e., toying with the addressees’ pride).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C: Permaculture Tweets Full Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tweet</th>
<th>Content analysis</th>
<th>Form analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working on the Farm! <a href="http://t.co/CQr6NprQu">http://t.co/CQr6NprQu</a> #Permaculture <a href="http://t.co/vJCsi6x33">http://t.co/vJCsi6x33</a></td>
<td>Permaculture practitioner posts a photo of (presumably) her and a dog on a farm. External link to her Etsy online store for hemp heating pads etc. Uses hashtag to identify with permaculture community.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Identification is through Common Ground as the poster assumes the audience will share common values (e.g., high value placed on gardens and growing, as well as handmade sustainable goods). Persuasion is through <em>ethos</em> (presenting self as a farming/handicraft expert) and <em>pathos</em> (using sentimental images to persuade).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT @LeagueACS: Great article on why foxes are an asset to farmers (written by farmers) - Foxes on the Farm <a href="http://t.co/4KnECDr0yA">http://t.co/4KnECDr0yA</a> <a href="http://t.co/7xU">http://t.co/7xU</a>_</td>
<td>Presents article about the benefits of foxes to farmers, as stated by farmers. This is a retweeted post, meaning the poster is disseminating some other user’s original material.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification by Common Ground as discourse unit identify with farmers and speaks to the value of foxes for farmers. Persuasion through <em>ethos</em> as farmers are assumed to be the experts and their opinions valued above others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWOOFers Learn the Ropes at Permaculture Farm <a href="http://t.co/cL9ATWIMhK">http://t.co/cL9ATWIMhK</a> <a href="http://t.co/ZfUpcCH7Y">http://t.co/ZfUpcCH7Y</a></td>
<td>Sharing photo and link to expanded article about group of WWOOFers (World Wide Opportunities on Organic Farms) working at a permaculture farm.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience. Tweets also allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Unawareness as new practitioners join the group (silent “we”). Persuasion through <em>pathos</em> as the photo and the fact that the subjects are trainees garners emotional support from the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have not heard of #permaculture. This article is a very practical and introductory way to learn more. Please RT <a href="https://t.co/78wrGXmPLM">https://t.co/78wrGXmPLM</a></td>
<td>Sharing introductory article about permaculture. Requesting audience to disseminate further. Uses hashtag to identify with permaculture community.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Common Ground as the discourse unit seeks to recruit, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why garden? Here are my top six reasons. What motivates you? #gardenmedicine #permaculture...</td>
<td>Sharing their reasons for gardening, and asking audience what does/would motivate them. Link to identical content as a Facebook post. Uses hashtag to identify with “gardenmedicine” and permaculture communities.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Common Ground, as the poster outlines their values and asks for the audience’s values (unstated expectation that some of them will be similar). Persuasion through pathos as the discourse unit places the poster and audience on equal levels and thus plays to the audience’s ego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT IS FREQUENTLY heard that permaculture design courses are too expensive, but are they? Do those making such...</td>
<td>Responding to complaints that permaculture courses are prohibitively expensive, with link to external article.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Antithesis as the poster targets the complaints of the “other”, attempting to draw the audience closer into a shared identity. Persuasion is through logos as the poster asks a question and sets out to answer it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked a @YouTube video <a href="http://t.co/EokcVHGexN">http://t.co/EokcVHGexN</a> Miracle Farms, a 5-acre commercial permaculture orchard in Southern Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>Sharing YouTube video about a permaculture farm in southern Quebec with audience. Link to video.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Common Ground as the poster assumes audience will also share interest in the video of commercial permaculture orchard. Persuasion is through pathos as the poster talks about their personal feelings and makes no allusion to their own expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes or no: were you nervous about starting permaculture?</td>
<td>Asking audience if they were nervous about starting their own permaculture endeavours. Photo with inspirational message about not</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for photos to be attached, which provides some visual communication to the audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXAMINING THE IMPACT IN HOLISTIC MANAGEMENT AND PERMACULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Persuasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>procrastinating.</td>
<td>Identification through Unawareness as the poster alludes to a “we” that is a group of people who have already begun permaculture operations. Persuasion through <em>pathos</em> as the primary subject of the discourse unit is nervousness (a feeling) and the image is an inspirational quote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle fall winds bring sweet scents <em>Ú±</em> Started these #flowers from #seed in my #permaculture‰Û_ <a href="https://t.co/RtRDxQnukY">https://t.co/RtRDxQnukY</a></td>
<td>Sharing flowers the poster planted with audience. Link to Instagram post with photo of flowers. Uses hashtags to identify with “flowers”, “seed”, and permaculture communities.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permaculture being taught to Timorese coffee farmers and in national education ... - ABC Local <a href="http://t.co/zvu3RdXJxh">http://t.co/zvu3RdXJxh</a></td>
<td>Informing audience that permaculture is being taught to coffee farmers and others in Timor. Link to article.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think: How can we help more people learn about permaculture?</td>
<td>Asking audience how to better spread the word about permaculture.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@WOOLWORTHS_SA is doing amazing things with Food &amp; for Africa @ftfa creating and supporting Permaculture Food gardens across the country!</td>
<td>Informing audience of the positive work being done in Africa by Woolworths department store and another organization (Food &amp; Trees for Africa) to build and support permaculture food gardens.</td>
<td>Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (<em>kairos</em>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

What do you think: How can we help more people learn about permaculture? As asking audience how to better spread the word about permaculture. Identification through Unawareness as the poster alludes to a “we” that is a group of people who have already begun permaculture operations. Persuasion through *pathos* as the primary subject of the discourse unit is nervousness (a feeling) and the image is an inspirational quote.

Gentle fall winds bring sweet scents. Started these #flowers from #seed in my #permaculture. Link to Instagram post with photo of flowers. Uses hashtags to identify with “flowers”, “seed”, and permaculture communities.

Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit.

Identification through Common Ground as the poster assumes the audience will also value beautiful images and flowers started at home from seed. Persuasion through *pathos* due to the emotional poem and beautiful picture, and through *ethos* as the poster is presented as an expert practitioner.

Permaculture being taught to Timorese coffee farmers and in national education ... - ABC Local [http://t.co/zvu3RdXJxh](http://t.co/zvu3RdXJxh)

Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit.

Identification through Common Ground as the poster assumes the audience will care about the education of the Timorese population. Persuasion by *logos* as the discourse unit presents only the facts.

What do you think: How can we help more people learn about permaculture? Asking audience how to better spread the word about permaculture. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*).

Identification through Unawareness as the poster uses “we” to assume a shared identity with their audience. Persuasion through *ethos* as the discourse unit imbues both the poster and the audience with equal status as experts.

@WOOLWORTHS_SA is doing amazing things with Food & for Africa @ftfa creating and supporting Permaculture Food gardens across the country!

Informing audience of the positive work being done in Africa by Woolworths department store and another organization (Food & Trees for Africa) to build and support permaculture food gardens.

Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (*kairos*). Identification through Common Ground as the poster assumes the audience will also value the creation of food gardens in Africa. Persuasion through *pathos* by emphasizing the charitable “goodness” of Woolworths and Food & Trees for Africa’s actions.
**RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF PRACTITIONER DISCOURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Sustainability, move over. Here comes #permaculture. From sustaining to regenerating.</td>
<td>Sharing a video about permaculture’s potential for humans’ sustainable existence. Uses hashtags to identify with sustainability and permaculture communities. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Antithesis as poster creates an “us” (permaculture) versus “them” (simple sustainability). Persuasion through ethos as permaculture is presented as a more capable technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should join me at this Meetup. Check it out and RSVP!</td>
<td>Encouraging audience to attend a gathering, sharing link to RSVP. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Unawareness as the poster alludes to a “we” when suggesting the audience join them at an event. Persuasion through ethos as they use the pressure of their reputation to encourage audience to attend, and through pathos because it relies on social pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Confronting power is as necessary as constructing alternatives&quot; Is #permaculture a social movement? find out @</td>
<td>Proposing that permaculture may be a disruptive social movement. Link to attend a gathering in northern California. Uses hashtag to identify with permaculture community. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Common Ground, as the poster assumes the audience will also be interested in whether permaculture is a social movement. Persuasion through pathos as the discourse unit relies on mystery and social pressure, and through ethos as the poster is presented as the expert with access to the knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Monbiot tells us how it is. If the article depresses you, look to permaculture solutions for sustainable...</td>
<td>Sharing article by George Monbiot and encouraging audience to consider permaculture as a solution to the problem. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Unawareness as the poster uses the “we” (“us”) to identify with the audience as being of the same group. Persuasion through pathos as the argument rests on the feelings of the audience, as well as ethos as Monbiot is presented as an expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweet</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT @wakethefarmup: From #design to #installations to #harvest I love to serve #permaculture #GrowYourOwn #localfood #cincinnati <a href="http://t.co/0Ou">http://t.co/0Ou</a>_</td>
<td>Retweeting post about the permaculture process and the way the original poster feels about it. Broken link. Uses hashtags to identify with the design, “Installations”, harvest, permaculture, “GrowYourOwn”, “localfood”, and Cincinnati communities. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Identification through Common Ground, as poster assumes audience will identify with the sentiment being expressed (this is slightly removed because the discourse unit is reposted from a previous user’s original content, but the assumption is that the current poster also identifies with the message). Persuasion through pathos, as discourse unit invokes the selfless act of “serving”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Disabled woman wants to use #farm for #permaculture, family stealing it. HELP HER KEEP HER FARM! <a href="http://t.co/glkWyaKEMA">http://t.co/glkWyaKEMA</a> Please RT!</td>
<td>Sharing story about a woman whose trustee is taking away her property. Link to crowdsourcing campaign and entreaty to audience to help, and to disseminate the message. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Antithesis as the poster pits the evil family against the audience, a group we assume would want to help the woman. Persuasion through pathos as the family is depicted as evil and the woman as a victim, with no further context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just finished teaching a 7-month Permaculture Design Course! Congrats to all the new permie graduates. You all... <a href="http://t.co/OUEu9uD6E4">http://t.co/OUEu9uD6E4</a></td>
<td>Sharing news about recent graduates from a design course. Link to Facebook post with similar message and group photo. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Common Ground as the poster assumes the audience will also be excited about the new permaculture graduates. Persuasion through ethos as the poster’s reputation as an expert is affirmed, and also pathos as the audience is encouraged to be excited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fastest way to grow a forest. Why aren’t we doing this everywhere? #permaculture <a href="http://t.co/t0el9u84lv">http://t.co/t0el9u84lv</a></td>
<td>Sharing TED Talk about growing a small forest, and asking why the practice isn’t widespread. Uses hashtag to identify with permaculture community. Tweets allow only 140 characters, limiting the length of the message (kairos). Tweets do allow for external links, allowing interaction with the audience to continue beyond the discourse unit. Identification through Unawareness as the poster uses “we” to create a shared identity and common agency with the audience. Persuasion through logos as they present a piece of evidence and pose a rhetorical question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>