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ABSTRACT

PLAY AND PROCEDURAL RHETORIC IN COMPOSITION COURSEWORK: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TRIVIAL PURSUIT INSTRUCTIONS

by

Peter Rampa

May 2015

The rhetorical strategies used in the design of Trivial Pursuit instruction sheets were studied. The textual, visual, and procedural elements of Trivial Pursuit instruction sheets published between 1984 and 2009 revealed a series of revisions that accounted for sociocultural and historical contexts. Results indicated the potential for designing instruction sheets that are both persuasive and practical. Implications for the design of academic assignment prompts and coursework are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The research presented in this thesis is founded upon the idea that a set of instructions can be both practical and persuasive. Instructions can be practical insofar as the steps for completing a process are presented in a legible and easy-to-follow manner, and instructions can be persuasive to the extent that an audience is motivated to participate in that process. Although standardized templates help to structure the practical components of instruction-writing, persuasive components are often in flux and dependent upon shifting rhetorical elements. As a result, in popular discussions regarding technology in education, the persuasive nature of instructions is regularly attributed to novel media such as computers or videogames. This attribution risks oversimplifying both the utility of computer technology as well as the potential for designing persuasive processes at the level of methodology. In order to push back against such a simplification, two questions thus arise: What object of study is suitable for examining persuasive strategies used in instruction-writing? How might such research inform the design of instructions in academic coursework?

To answer these questions I begin with a review of concepts joined together from rhetorical theory, game theory, and pedagogy scholarship. I go on to discuss how these concepts can be used to revise pedagogical methodologies concerning the rhetorical situation and bolster student agency within the context of academic work. I conduct a rhetorical analysis of board game instructions in general and *Trivial Pursuit* instructions
in particular. From my research, I find that *Trivial Pursuit* instructions serve as a viable parallel to academic coursework for three reasons. First, *Trivial Pursuit*, specifically, is connected to real-world discourse and circulations of information in ways that are more explicit (i.e., trivia card contents) than other mainstream board games. Second, licensed editions of *Trivial Pursuit* demand design adaptations for specific rather than general audiences—football fans, for example, or film buffs. Finally, *Trivial Pursuit* is fundamentally concerned with assessing the knowledge of its players.

To conclude, I offer examples for how the results of my research could be applied to the design of academic coursework. Specifically, I endeavor to create coursework that incorporates contemporary rhetorical elements, acknowledges the agency of students, and retains the pedagogical value implicit to knowledge assessment. I argue that the persuasive nature of a process begins at the site of methodology rather than computer technology, and that this acknowledgment is crucial if instructors are to utilize the full potential of technology in education.

It is easy to overlook the persuasive strategies used in board game instructions. An instruction sheet serves so many practical purposes, after all, that something like clarity might seem a more immediate and sensible metric for assessment. Easy-to-follow instructions are great. Dense instructions are a chore. But the language of board game instructions can sustain a more critical approach. In fact, rhetorical analysis reveals that a range of persuasive strategies are often employed by board game designers and publishers as instructions shift from one context to another. In this regard, instructions can serve purposes other than those related to practicality. Consider the marketing
practice of repurposing instructions in order to create board game taglines: "The Classic Shake, Score & Shout Game" (Yahtzee), "The Flip n' Find Face Game" (Guess Who?), "The Catch It, Guess It, Pass It Game" (Catch Phrase). The standard practical function of board game instructions (i.e., as a point of reference) is joined in these instances by a persuasive function. Even while they describe the process of play, these instructions-turned-taglines serve to pique interest rather than resolve it.

The same considerations can be applied to instruction sheets. The overall objectives of Trivial Pursuit Genus IV, for example, can be found under the heading "OBJECT," where the same information in Trivial Pursuit for Kids DVD Edition falls under "What you do." Both examples portray an implicit acknowledgment of the discourse (between the text and the audience) occurring in particular contexts. In other words, it's apparent that decisions were made (whether by designers, editors, or publishers) regarding what language would connect with either audience. As a result, one must consider whether the persuasive use of language is crucial for a genre that, on its surface, is commonly approached with attention to the practical use of language. Persuasive strategies are integral to the work of tailoring a process (be it the process of purchasing, setting up, or playing a game) for a specific audience that must be persuaded to engage with such processes in the first place.

The necessity to persuade an audience to engage with a process (in this case, a board game) helps to explain why instructions appear differently in various contexts. The difference becomes clear if one form of instruction-writing were to be switched with another form. Instructions-turned-taglines would be insufficient as a complete reference
guide for a game, and a set of instructions spanning multiple pages are not suitable for store-shelf marketing purposes. The resulting vacillation is because neither the persuasive nor practical functions of board game instructions would be singularly sufficient for guiding a participant through the processes of selecting and playing a game.

Consider the box design for early editions of Milton Bradley's *Battleship*. The early edition box showcases, on its front, a large image of two children (one boy and one girl) playing the game. The right side of that image is lined with four smaller images, each of which show a child's hand interacting with game pieces during the course of a game. Each picture is overlaid with the following text: "set up your fleet," "call out the shots," "mark the hits," and "sink your opponent's fleet." If one imagines a scenario in which a child pulls said *Battleship* box off of a store shelf, then a strictly practical approach to board game instructions won't do much to explain the purpose of these front-facing instructions. To start, the child holding the box isn't playing *Battleship*, so the instructions aren't directly guiding her actions. Further, if she were to purchase the game and take it home, then the instructions on the front of the box would be rendered obsolete by a separate and more detailed instruction sheet inside.

If this scenario is approached with attention to the persuasive property of the front-facing instructions, however, then one can observe how the instructions work in tandem with other rhetorical appeals. Instructions contextualize the visual information on the box. The instructions effectively establish an enthymeme for the child insofar as the child recognizes a process, understands that she is capable of engaging in the process, and infers that such a process leads to winning (or losing) the game. The instruction sheet
within the box and the process it describes in-depth then build on this premise in order to structure the act of play. Although this example singles out Battleship, the scenario is emblematic of the considerable utility of instructions in the rhetorical scaffolding of a process.

It is from this acknowledgement that I construct the guiding questions for my research: How might board game instructions be able to inform the design of academic assignment prompts? What rhetorical strategies enable the construction of prompts that are both persuasive and practical?

This thesis is an analysis of the persuasive strategies used in board game instructions and how those strategies can be used in ways that are attentive to the cultural contexts of discourse. Using the concepts of procedural rhetoric, enthymeme, and play, I outline the rhetorical features of board game instruction-writing as a genre and consider how it can inform the construction and communication of academic assignment prompts. I suggest that board game instructions, in concert with recent developments in scholarship regarding play and rhetoric, offer an opportunity to reexamine and address the shortcomings of process-based pedagogy. Specifically, these developments offer an opportunity to implement a process-based approach that is responsive to rhetorical and cultural contexts.

**Procedural Rhetoric and Game Studies**

In order to examine how board game instructions might inform the design of academic assignment prompts, my research begins with the concept of *procedural rhetoric*. First proposed by rhetorician and game studies scholar Ian Bogost, procedural
rhetoric is a framework for understanding how processes can mount arguments. In

*Persuasive Games*, Bogost defines *process* as follows:

> [T]he way things work: the methods, techniques, and logics that drive the operation of systems, from mechanical systems like engines to organizational systems like high schools to conceptual systems like religious faith . . . Procedures found the logics that structure behavior in all cases . . . When we do things, we do them according to some logic, and that logic constitutes a process in the general sense of the word. (3, 7)

In other words, the term *process* describes a rule-based system through which the logic of an interaction or an activity is communicated. Procedural rhetoric, then, affords the identification and analysis of how processes are used persuasively. The processes within a court hearing, for example, operate according to an overall logic intended to reinforce the authority of a presiding judge. That logic then structures the behavior of participants. In some ways behavior is structured very rigidly, such as the act of standing up when a judge enters the room, or swearing an oath. In other ways behavior is structured less rigidly, such as deliberating a verdict or testifying. That is to say, a witness has more options for how to engage with the process of testifying than how to stand up when the judge enters the room. In either case, actions are determined according to the logic employed by a rule-based system. Of course, the witness could choose to lay flat on the ground when the judge enters the room, but procedural rhetoric is concerned with how the logic of the process anticipates specific interactions.

It's important to note that procedural rhetoric originated as a critical approach to computation. In her book *Hamlet on the Holodeck*, rhetorician and narratologist Janet Murray defines *procedural* as "the computer's defining ability to execute a series of
rules” (14). Murray seeks to address the ambiguity of what it means to describe a computer program as “interactive.” She focuses on how interaction is represented in computational contexts, and how that representation delineates both the act of responding to a set of rules as well as deploying a rule-based process. That is, Murray uses *procedurality* as a cornerstone for explaining the different ways people interact with computers. This definition of procedurality is widely used in circles related to programming and computation. If the content of a program is procedurally generated, for example, then it is created by the program according to a predetermined set of rules.

Bogost builds on Murray’s work by exploring how rules create procedural representations that are persuasive. His use of procedural rhetoric focuses on the practice of using rule-based systems in programming in order to create simulations or videogames that construct arguments about a process. In his text *Persuasive Games*, Bogost examines the rhetorical nature of a political game called *Tax Invaders*--a *Space Invaders*-style game in which players control the head of George W. Bush in order to shoot descending tax increases out of the sky before they slip past and presumably harm the country. The game's argument, according to Bogost, is constructed through the symbols (George W. Bush's head, falling numbers) and rules (achieving a win condition by shooting the tax increases) that constitute the process of interacting with it (57). In other words, the procedural representation of *Tax Invaders* effectively comments on what Bogost calls “specific patterns of cultural value” (54). The application of procedural rhetoric to videogames has been influential in game studies as well as rhetorical studies. With procedural rhetoric Bogost provides a new avenue through which to use videogames for
purposes other than recreation—namely, as educational tools. In this regard, Bogost builds on critical attention paid to the pedagogical value of videogames.

Discourse analyst James Paul Gee turned his attention towards videogames in 2003 with his book *What Video Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy*. Gee argues that videogames are microcosmic education systems insofar as they rely on real-world skills like analysis, interpretation, understanding, and recreation. Like Bogost, Gee’s text helps to separate videogames from the perception that they can only be used for recreational purposes. Specifically, Gee approaches videogames in terms of what he calls *semiotic domains*—a set of practices that imbue signs with new types of meanings. Where Bogost uses procedural rhetoric to examine representations of processes, Gee looks for how processes shape the way people “think, act, and value in certain ways” (19). He uses a cross as an example of a sign that is recognized and interacted with differently depending on the context (or *semiotic domain*) in which it appears. The concept of the semiotic domain informs my approach to board game instructions, and I will return to the importance of this concept later in the thesis.

Thanks in part to the work of Murray, Bogost, and Gee, a considerable amount of attention has been paid to the careful design of videogames for educational purposes (though educational games are not themselves new, the critical approaches to their development has evolved), and how educators can integrate videogames into a curriculum. By including this background information my intention is not to devalue the efforts made toward the use of videogames as educational tools but rather to point out
what I consider to be a gap in the scholarship. Specifically, the application of procedural rhetoric to board games, and what that approach can contribute to pedagogy.

The idea of deploying videogame processes and simulations for educational purposes has been met with some resistance. In his article “Against Procedurality,” game studies critic Miguel Sicart argues that procedural rhetoric downplays the human element of a process participant. Although procedurality is able to explain the "whys and hows" of how a process operates, and how processes can "aspire, as designed objects, to funnel behaviors for reflection," it cannot hope to account for personal determinants--politics, ethics, communication styles--that significantly influence how one responds to a process (par. 5). In other words, although a process might operate according to a particular logic, that logic is not universally recognizable.

Sicart's argument reveals weaknesses in the courtroom example I used to begin this section. Indeed, the processes of a courtroom hearing operate according to logic that reinforces the authority of a judge, but the embezzling business mogul is likely to read that authority very differently from the reckless teenage driver, and different still from viewers watching the proceedings via broadcast. Accordingly, the behavior structured by this logic then manifests in different ways. Interaction has, however subtly, altered the process at hand. How then can a process be implemented in such a way that it is neither highly restrictive nor inattentive to the participants? This is a question that has precedence in pedagogy scholarship.
Process-Based Pedagogy

Historically, the application of rhetorical theory to process-based pedagogy has received criticism similar to that which Sicart posed to Bogost. In 1981, researchers Linda Flower and John Hayes attempted to build on process-based pedagogy through the application of cognitive rhetoric in their article "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." Flower and Hayes saw in cognitive rhetoric the potential for identifying processes—specifically, the mental processes employed during the act of writing. This effort was in response to critical debates regarding what, precisely, determines the choices a writer makes during the process of writing. A cognitive rhetoric approach, Flower and Hayes argued, would not only help to identify and categorize the processes that appear during the act of writing, but also establish a metric for identifying proficient writers from struggling writers. Ultimately, critics faulted the so-called Flower-Hayes model for being too rigid, overly scientific, and ignorant of social contexts in writing.

Although tenets of process-based pedagogy exist today in the form of prewriting, drafting, and revision, the shortcomings unveiled by the Flower-Hayes model have remained largely unresolved. The post-process movement, which originated in the late '80s and continues to the present, primarily attempts to compensate for the absence of social context in the Flower-Hayes model. Critics such as James Berlin, in his article "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class," argue that rhetoric in composition must be situated within ideology. That is, because sociocultural forces are so instrumental in shaping how students approach writing and what students choose to write about, a process-heavy pedagogy is insufficient.
Enthymeme and Play

In part, my research uses procedural rhetoric in attempt to address the shortcomings of process-based pedagogy. Where the Flower-Hayes model focuses on the identification of processes, procedural rhetoric instead makes possible the construction of processes. This pivot is useful because it shifts the question from "What processes are present?" to "How should processes be constructed?" But, as Sicart and Berlin have noted, processes run the risk of ignoring the participant. To address this risk, recent scholarship has focused increasingly on the joining of two concepts: enthymeme and play.

**Enthymeme**

Bogost acknowledges the importance of enthymeme in procedural rhetoric. He initially identified the space between the processes of a videogame and the subjectivity of a videogame player as the “simulation gap” (*Unit Operations*). This term describes the space in which the representation of a process is affected by the actions of a person interacting with it. In *Persuasive Games*, Bogost suggests a rhetorical approach to process through Aristotelian enthymeme. In this regard, a videogame that affords a range of interactions is constructing a “procedural enthymeme” insofar as the player interactions complete the game itself (however incrementally) (43). Bogost’s point is that processes (particularly videogames as objects with embedded processes) are more persuasive when they allow for a larger range of interactions. By allowing a variety of interactions, the participant is able to have some control over the act of meaning-making. Enthymeme in this regard does not omit one specific proposition but rather creates a
space for a range of propositions. Nevertheless, Bogost is interested in enthymeme as a point of interaction with a process that structures a specific argument—attention is not paid to how the enthymeme is understood but rather how it makes possible the process overall. A videogame player uses enthymeme to perform an action and then receive feedback on what that action means. Enthymeme is subordinated to the representation of a procedural argument.

While this use of enthymeme in relation to procedural rhetoric is, understandably, closely tied to the study of videogames, Bogost encourages his readers to see procedural rhetoric as a “domain much broader than that of videogames, encompassing any medium—computational or not—that accomplishes its inscription via processes” (46). It is in this spirit that scholars have since transferred these concepts to contexts outside of videogames.

In his article “Enthymeme as Rhetorical Algorithm,” Kevin Brock defines enthymeme as a rhetorical algorithm. As with the term procedural, Brock recognizes the mathematic and computational contexts of the term algorithm—a formula that’s used to complete a task or solve a problem—but shifts this structure to a more general application through rhetoric. The algorithm “if this, then that,” for example, creates a space in which the audience can determine why “this” leads to “that.” Brock describes the idea through the following scenario: “If I have no food in my refrigerator, then—assuming I want to eat—I need to visit the grocery store” (par. 4). In making this observation, Brock essentially claims that enthymeme motivates action. The audience must engage with the enthymeme in order to make sense of it. If in that engagement the audience finds a
variety of potential meanings, then the process is more engrossing. The audience has partial control over the logic that guides a process.

It’s tempting to determine, at this point, that an emphasis on enthymeme could sufficiently address Sicart and Berlin’s concerns over the lack of consideration for social forces in procedures. However, as Steven Katz demonstrates in his essay “The Ethic of Expediency: Classical Rhetoric, Technology, and the Holocaust,” enthymeme alone does not guarantee a productive (and certainly not ethical) acknowledgment of social forces.

Katz begins the essay with a rhetorical analysis of a memo, exchanged between Nazi officials, in which a request is made for modifications to the gassing vans used to execute women and children. Through the lens of technical communication, Katz argues, the memo is incredibly proficient. The purpose of the memo is made immediately clear, the document design adheres to standard practices of technical communication, and the request is argued through “a series of enthymemes that make use of the *topoi*” (257). Of course, the primary focus of Katz’s essay is not on enthymeme but rather what he describes as the “ethic of expediency”—an enabling force for deliberative rhetoric, a genre “concerned with deliberating future courses of action” (258). In other words, Katz reveals that the practical function of a text is never wholly separate from its persuasive function. The enthymemtic arguments in the memo are effective because they’re founded on the *ethos* of the Nazi bureaucracy (258).

If *procedural enthymeme* describes the space in which an audience engages with a process, and *rhetorical algorithm* claims that enthymeme motivates action from an audience, then Katz helps to explain *how* audiences are motivated to act in the first place.
Summarizing William Grimaldi, Katz explains that *logos* describes the methods for action, but “*pathos* and *ethos* . . . provide the impetus to act” (259). In this way, an enthymeme is only as persuasive as the appeals upon which it relies. A wholly objective assessment of deliberative rhetoric then, as Katz argues, is untenable.

It is with this critical history of enthymeme in mind that I modify the concept for the purposes of my research. I view enthymeme as the rhetorical space wherein appeals of a process are contextualized by both rhetor and audience. My use of enthymeme is not intended to replace any of the approaches I’ve covered up to this point but rather to coalesce them. Enthymeme, in a process, is still that which motivates an audience to act, but it is also what imbues those actions with a contextual meaning. My suggestion is that enthymeme (when it appears in processes outside of videogames) is not only a means to an end, as procedural rhetoric classifies it, but also a site for the inscription of meaning as in a *semiotic domain*. In this way, enthymeme has both practical and persuasive functions, and it is a crucial component for the use of those functions in board game instructions.

To demonstrate what I mean, let’s return to the *Battleship* scenario. The girl with *Battleship* in hand completes the enthymemic argument put forth by the instructions on the box: “[you will win if you] set up your fleet,” “call out the shots, “mark the hits,” and “sink your opponent’s fleet.” Through this enthymeme a logos appeal is made: assuming “you” (to adopt the pronoun used here) want to win, these instructions outline the logical progression toward claiming victory.
The enthymeme constructs an ethos appeal insofar as “you” are the person in charge of a fleet, calling the shots, and marking the hits—the child holding the box is invited to imagine herself performing the actions of an admiral in the Navy. This ethos appeal also presents an example of a *semiotic domain* functioning through enthymeme; the military jargon (“call[ing] out the shots”) is contextualized by the child. By completing the enthymeme, the child enters the rhetorical space of the game and learns what the act of saying, for example, “B-5” will represent.

Finally, the pathos appeal is made through the implicit narrative these instructions describe. By completing the enthymeme, the child infers her own role in the narrative: she is calling the shots in a battle—perhaps against a friend or sibling—and the conclusion is that only one fleet will emerge victorious. The process of playing the game is further contextualized as the shared experience of a mock battle.

All these appeals, contextualized through enthymemic rhetorical figures, illustrate the persuasive function of board game instructions as they appear on the front of the *Battleship* box. Though the child holding the box might now be eager to play the game, the intricacies of the process remain unknown. While in-depth instructions on a sheet of paper inside the box certainly provide a more practical introduction to playing the game, they too are persuasive through enthymeme. In the following chapter, I begin a rhetorical analysis of instruction sheets.

*Play*

In order to elaborate on what I mean by the “contextualizing” act of an enthymeme, particularly with regard to board game instructions, I turn to the study of
play. Play, in its contemporary usage, began in 1971 when cultural historian Johann Huizinga published *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*. In *Homo Ludens*, Huizinga argues that play is a fundamental aspect of culture and that play is used for a variety of purposes: to simulate real-world situations for the sake of practice (e.g., wolf cubs play-fighting), to make stimulating the learning process (e.g., nursery rhymes, mnemonic songs, and similar play-rituals), or merely for recreation. Of particular importance for my research is Huizinga’s concept of the *magic circle*, which he describes as the space in which real-world actions take on new meanings (44). The magic circle is a social construction insofar as the space and rules of a game are negotiated by the participants.

Despite their similarities, I’ve chosen to use Huizinga’s magic circle over Gee’s *semiotic domain* for two reasons. First, Gee uses the *semiotic domain* as a way to wrangle the multimodality of videogames. It’s a useful concept for understanding how images, sounds, words, actions, reactions, computations and myriad other features work together to determine new meanings. This is especially useful when the object of study is a videogame because all of these features are present. For board game instructions, though, there are less interactions of that nature. I think the *semiotic domain* would be useful if I were to examine interactive tutorials (perhaps job-training simulations), but that’s so similar to how Gee defines videogames that I’d risk redundancy.

The second reason that I’ve chosen to use the magic circle over *semiotic domains* is because Huizinga’s term prioritizes the cultural aspects of play. The magic circle is more about what people bring to a game (or process) than what is inherent to that game.
The magic circle, then, helps to expand on how an audience uses enthymeme to contextualize an action. The locus of meaning is the point at which the audience encounters the instructions, or the structure of play, unlike the objects of study for Gee (videogames) or Bogost (processes in videogames).

In their book *Rules of Play*, Eric Zimmerman and Katie Salen develop the concept of the magic circle by suggesting three different mental stages during which rules and the magic circle are interpreted. First, the space and rules of a game seem random and a player spends most of his or her mental energy working to interpret interactions. In this stage, it might not be exactly clear to a player why a Royal Flush is a good hand in a game of poker, but he or she can recognize that the hand effectively guarantees victory. Second, the space and rules of a game seem unalterable. In this stage, a player perceives the space and rules of a game as determined *ex nihilo*—rules can’t be disregarded or altered, the argument goes, because that’s how the game is played. Finally, the space and rules of a game are understood as social constructions. In this stage, a player realizes that the organizing principles of a game can be negotiated and agreed upon if everyone consents. (E.g., “house rules,” or disregarding a rule or penalty that would hinder a player’s enjoyment of the game.)

Ultimately, the magic circle serves to account for the various ways one might approach a process. Furthermore, this concept provides a purpose for the contextualizing function of an enthymeme: to make persuasive both the description and interaction with a process. As I move on to a rhetorical analysis of board game instructions, I locate
instances where a magic circle is constructed. These instances illustrate how a process can adequately account for the subjectivity of a participant.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

A key aspect of persuasive process design, particularly in the pedagogical context, is the acknowledgment of student agency. Making an assignment persuasive and practical means inviting a student to participate in a process that acknowledges opportunities for student agency. Agency can be loosely defined here as the opportunity for independent action—a student who exercises agency is one who independently adapts the coursework to his or her individual interests and goals. Persuasive coursework, it follows, is not solely a matter of embedding rhetorical appeals within the process of an assignment, but using that process to argue for the importance of student agency. That is, assignments don’t exist in isolation but rather help to shape and bolster the narrative of an entire course. In the sections that follow, I examine arguments put forth by coursework processes (such as assignment prompts and in-class activities), as well as course narratives (constructed by lectures and required texts). I find that when process and narrative put forth different arguments regarding the role of a student, a writer, or the act of writing, the resulting disconnect inhibits student agency. Thus, persuasive coursework depends upon both the design of processes as well as the space in which processes are implemented. In this way, the components of a course can present a more unified and coherent argument for the importance of student agency.

Narrative, Process, and Student Agency

One of the recurring obstacles I face while teaching English 101 is the general inconsistency between my first-day lecture and the coursework I assign throughout the
rest of the quarter. My introductory lecture is an invitation for students to consider the use of language through two broad categories: rules and choices. The students might already be familiar with using language according to rules, I explain, thanks to mnemonic devices like “i before e, except after c,” or corrections like, “you mean, ‘my friend and I.’” These are some rules that can pop up outside of a classroom setting and suggest that, at any given point, language is something to be used correctly or incorrectly. I note that the rules of language are always in flux. The application of a language rulebook isn’t a bad thing, or even definitively a good thing, but it does provide an invaluable foundation for communication in general. In the lecture, I go on to explain that a considerable portion of the course will be devoted to further reviewing and practicing rules (by way of grammar lessons and quizzes), because rules are effectively the building blocks of language.

Halfway through the lecture, I introduce the concept of using language according to choice. I often let student suggestions guide this portion of the lecture, but my default approach is to draw on the board two generic figures facing each other. Between the figures is a speech bubble with the question, “Want to hang out?” I lead my students to determine a purpose (or, later in the course, an exigence) for the question—something like, “Person A wants to meet with person B.” With the purpose written on the board, I add a column of variables—close friend, parent, boss, pet dog—and label the column “Audience.” I give my students a few minutes to rephrase the question in ways that both express the stated purpose (wanting to meet with someone) and seem appropriate for an audience listed on the board.
In my early experiences with this lecture I would specify a limit for each student’s list of possible re-phrasings. One question per audience, I’d remind them, assuming that the restriction imparted a sense of importance to the exercise. However, I quickly encountered students who would make a case for maintaining the initial phrasing (“Want to hang out?”) for every possible audience. Other students felt that each audience required multiple phrasings in order to accommodate the speaker’s intended tone or mood. A speaker who feels lonely is likely to phrase the question differently from a speaker who feels excited, for example, or aloof, or even hungry. (The last example garnered a surprising amount of support from other students.) Without my arbitrary restrictions for the lists, students seemed more likely to deduce other factors in a rhetorical context before the applicable key terms had even been introduced. I realized that, completely counter to the purpose of the exercise, my arbitrary restriction implied that each audience required a single, correct phrasing of the question. In other words, even though I’d been lecturing about the malleability of language, and arguing for the importance of phrasing a question in order to achieve an intended effect, my instructions for the in-class exercise made a completely different argument.

I began to notice this kind of mixed signal in other lessons as well, particularly when persuasive communication was the topic at hand. In one such lesson, I ask students to compare and contrast two business memos. Both memos showcase the most important information from a meeting, and the assumed audience is the company’s CEO. The first memo is about 700 words in length, and it’s inundated with highfalutin jargon. The second memo spans 250 words in length and is by contrast full of plain (if formal)
language. My intended takeaway from this lesson is threefold: clarity and coherence are important elements of composition even outside of English 101; verbosity is not a substitute for effective, persuasive communication; and no text, however impressive at first blush, is exempt from constructive criticism. One quarter, a student half-jokingly suggested that the author of the first memo was required to meet a predetermined word count. Another quarter, a student asked why the first memo was subject to such derision. “Because the author is privileging style over substance to an extreme,” I responded. “The most important information, if present at all, is very difficult to discern.” The student rebutted by suggesting that the so-called highfalutin jargon might have been the most effective phrasing for the author’s intended audience. In that case, she reasoned, it’s not unlike when she’s required to use academic English in her essays for English 101. The graduate student part of my brain was immediately persuaded by this argument, and I recognized similarities between papers I’d written and the verbose memo I’d been lambasting. Having, by this point, been thrown into the pedagogical equivalent of an existential crisis, I simply agreed with the astute observation and took the next question.

Now that I’ve had time to reflect, I wish I could go back to that day and provide an adequate response to the student’s observation. Certainly, one of the primary learning outcomes for English 101 is a proficiency with academic writing. This is an important skillset for much of the work required at the postsecondary level because it provides students with strategies for critical thinking, effective communication, and meeting the expectations of an academic audience. I’ll concede that such expectations often include length requirements and writing conventions appropriate for academic discourse, but
neither of these stipulations are without rationale. Length requirements indicate the amount of space in which an argument or question should be explored, and the conventions of academic writing demonstrate one’s ability to participate in a discourse community. Business phrases like “actionable synergy” might induce as much eye-rolling as rote academic phrases like “in conclusion,” but both align with specific audiences, and I want my students to be aware of that connection between language and audience. To be sure, I feel no inclination to change the learning outcomes of my course.

What I would like to change, and what I think my students were noticing during the memo exercise, is the way that the writer (or rhetor) is constructed differently between the narrative of the course and the procedures outlined in assignment prompts. In the narrative of the course, the writer is frequently, and usefully, abstracted. This is evident in an early section of *ENG 101: Composition I, Critical Reading and Responding*, a required text for my course:

> Writers agree to enter a rhetorical situation when they identify an opportunity to propose change by using language effectively . . . Successful writers always link their purpose to their audience . . . Were you to write the technology department, your message would have a greater impact if it took into consideration current events. If there is a news article on fast Internet connections, you could mention that article. If budget cuts are an issue, you could propose a cost-effective solution to the problem you raised. Your primary role as a writer is to take into account all the elements of the rhetorical situation. (5)

By alternating between the writer as a subject and the second-person “you,” this narrative invites students to occupy a role in which the act of writing is determined in large part by the writer’s approach to a rhetorical situation. Elsewhere in the coursepack, the rhetorical situation is described through a series of open-ended questions such as,
“Who is your audience?” and “What do you hope to accomplish with your writing? Do you want to persuade your audience? Inform them? Entertain them?” (7). Within this narrative, choice is the crux of writing—how did the writer choose to respond to a situation, and what can we learn from critically assessing those choices? A sense of student agency is bolstered by this approach because students are associated with all of the abilities and choices available to writers. In other words, the course narrative is making the argument that writers have agency.

I also want to take a moment to point out the excerpt’s emphasis on currency, and the consideration of relevant social events. These two themes—rhetor choice and social relevance—arise repeatedly throughout the rhetorical theory, pedagogy, and game theory scholarship discussed in this chapter.

Unlike the excerpt, a similar argument for agency is hard to locate in the language of an assignment sheet. The standard phrasing of assignment prompts seems to place emphasis on what an audience expects rather than how a writer chooses to navigate a rhetorical situation. More specifically, focus is placed on the working relationship between a student and an instructor wherein the explicit procedure for an assignment is not only practical but contextualized by the academic setting. I’ve organized the topmost information from an assignment sheet I use for an essay in English 101 (see fig. 1). In the “Discussion” chapter of this thesis, I take a closer look at heuristics for designing assignment prompts, but this Exploratory Synthesis Essay excerpt serves as an example for the discussion at hand.
Whereas course narratives use questions to discuss writers, assignment prompts use answers. More specifically, the assignment prompt provides answers for implied questions. Will the writer account for current events? Yes, in the form of five relevant and credible sources. Will the writer use language to persuade, inform, or entertain? To inform, certainly, and possibly to persuade, but not to entertain. Who is the audience? The writer’s instructor and classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Exploratory Synthesis Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>1250-1500 words and a works-cited page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total points</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sources</td>
<td>Five (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough draft due</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft due</td>
<td>Friday, March 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment Prompt**

Write a coherent and unified essay in which you use at least five sources to answer a question at issue for you, your instructor, and your classmates. Your question should be raised in the context of a claim made in a reading from the coursepack or a source article of your choosing. … Be sure that all sources are relevant and credible … As always, format your paper according to MLA guidelines.

**Organization**

In the opening paragraph of your essay, introduce source material that raises a question at issue. State the question you hope to answer and explain its significance (that is, the reason the question needs to be answered). … In the body of your paper, introduce and discuss the sources you’ve gathered, comparing and contrasting their contributions intertextually. Each paragraph should link logically with the paragraphs coming before and after it.

Fig. 1. Exploratory Synthesis Assignment Prompt.

Some elements of the assignment are open-ended, though caveats apply. For example, the essay’s topic, guiding question, and sources are chosen by the student, providing that sources are scholarly and the chosen topic derives from a coursepack...
reading (or is otherwise pre-approved by the instructor). Of course, along with formatting
guidelines, essay length, and grade value, these caveats serve a practical purpose in
outlining the level of work a student should be performing at a particular point in the
quarter. Just as well, caveats provide the instructor with a baseline for assessment, and
create for students some transparency in the grading process.

What’s missing from the assignment prompt, though, is the acknowledgment of a
writer’s agency. The trappings of the assignment help to establish a rhetorical context,
but the language no longer shifts between an abstract “writer” and the second-person
“You.” The language indicates a student responding to an assignment rather than an
author endeavoring to effect change.

When my student suggested that the author of the first memo was obligated to
meet a minimum word count, the idea was humorous in part because it evoked a similar
shift in focus. The abstract author—in this case, the image of a verbose businessperson—
isn’t perceived through the procedure of an assignment so much as through exigence and
choice. As my other student pointed out, it’s easy enough to imagine a predetermined
exigence, like a CEO mandating the length and language of a memo, but these
considerations were secondary to the main point of the exercise. I presented the memos
as two instances where writers in similar situations chose to respond in different ways.
One choice was effective and the other ineffective, but the differences between each
memo implied a range of freedom in how each author chose to respond. It wasn’t until
my student considered whether one author didn’t have much choice that the entire
exercise was upended.
Over time, it has become apparent to me that the disconnect lies between the abstract writer in the narrative of the course—one who exercises agency and uses composition as an opportunity for self-directed exploration—and the student writer beholden to a clearly demarcated process. My lessons extol a writer’s flexibility while my assignment prompts structure a product.

*Ludonarrative dissonance*, a key term in Game Studies scholarship, helps to expand on the nature of this detachment. The prefix *ludo-* is derived from the Latin root *ludere*, meaning “to play.” In whole, ludonarrative dissonance identifies instances in which the actions necessary for playing a videogame undermine or otherwise conflict with the narrative used to contextualize those actions. The term expanded into popular culture in 2007 upon release of the videogame *Uncharted: Drake’s Fortune*. Touted for its cinematic qualities, *Uncharted* presents a charismatic Han Solo-esque treasure hunter, Nathan Drake, as its protagonist. Following a series of clues, Drake encounters enemy forces comprising gun-toting mercenaries and fellow, albeit villainous, treasure hunters. The narrative is replete with adventure story tropes, including the archetypal witty love interest, gruff best friend, and ruthless villain. As the plot progresses, Drake develops from a self-interested rogue into an unsuspecting hero, as signified by his final act: pushing the eponymous fortune into the ocean in order to ensure the safety of his companions and thwart the antagonist.

For a majority of the game, a player takes control of Drake in order to navigate ruins and exchange fire with enemy forces. The gameplay design is such that a player learns how to navigate complex ruins and shoot down increasingly imposing enemies.
The ludonarrative dissonance arises when, all of this in mind, a player watches one of the non-interactive, cinematic portions of *Uncharted*. For example, a player might watch a scene in which Drake admonishes the antagonist for threatening to murder someone. Although Drake is capable of claiming the moral high ground during the narrative portion of the game, pacifism not an option when a player is in control, and tasked with killing a number of enemies in order to progress. The narrative of *Uncharted* makes the argument that Drake is a treasure-hunting Everyman capable of developing a strong moral compass, but the game’s process argues that Drake is an acrobatic one-man army who amasses a body count numbering in the hundreds. Even still, games media will flippantly refer to Drake as a mass-murderer.

Once again an audience is intended to inhabit a role that is portrayed differently between narrative and process—seemingly capable of anything in the former, and restricted to predetermined processes in the latter. Students and videogame players alike can (and often do) learn how to shift between these two perspectives, but ludonarrative dissonance can nevertheless arear so as to summarily pull someone out of an intended experience. Ideally, an activity could be both modeled and practiced in such a way that students find no substantial disconnect between either mode of instruction. In this way, agency available to a student would better match that of the abstract writer.

So far, this section has identified the gap between narrative and process as a matter of acknowledging agency. But how is the gap created in the first place? I find that the gap is produced as a result of stretching methodology of the rhetorical situation, and
its application to composition coursework, too thin. In a basic visualization of the rhetorical situation, both narrative and process are prescribed via diagram (see fig. 2).

![Basic Rhetorical Situation Diagram](image)

**Fig. 2. Basic Rhetorical Situation Diagram.**

Narrative begins with the setting or, more specifically, the rhetorical space suggested by this diagram. Narrative, in this sense, could mean a writer choosing to draft a letter regarding his internet connection, a student working through a course, or even a treasure hunter embarking on an adventure. In any scenario, narrative indicates the space that joins together writer, audience, message, purpose, and context. Process then develops a narrative by structuring actions that unfold within this space. For example, when a student completes an assignment for class, the process informs a narrative, and a precedent is created: If students are in a classroom, their actions unfold as such. This is an example of the algorithmic model that often develops from practical applications of the rhetorical situation—if X, then Y.
The figurative gap is widened when narrative and process, in presenting these kinds of algorithmic models, argue for different ways of understanding participants (which is to say the writer and audience participants). For example, course readings understand a writer as an *active* participants. A writer’s actions unfold within the space of an article. The article’s audience is understood as *passive* participants—mediators of change at most, detached assessors of a message, at least.

When students write in response to an article, the argument changes. In this case, an audience (i.e., an instructor) is capable of shaping the actions of an author (i.e., a student) by way of assignment prompts. The audience is now understood as an active participant, with the ability to pre-empt writing in ways that were unavailable to students during the reading process. It’s not as if a student has the opportunity to approach the author of an assigned reading and say, “Begin your article with a topic sentence. Afterward, be sure to introduce each source in a unified and coherent manner. An article longer than 1500 words is okay, but anything shorter than that will be marked down.” Accordingly, the argument for understanding an active writer participant has also changed. A writer’s choices are now subordinated to the decisions made by an audience.

How best to close the gap made so apparent by my first-day lecture, then? As indicated by ludonarrative dissonance, a potential solution must account for both narrative and process. Although the common rhetorical situation diagram addresses narrative and process, its application is stretched so thin that problematic inconsistencies arise. Therefore, a revised methodology is necessary. Although procedural rhetoric can
helpfully inform the design of persuasive processes, it’s important to remember that a process is meaningful only to the extent that it’s contextualized by narrative. The process of arranging *Battleship* pieces, for example, is germane only when two people are actually playing the game. Through play, the process is contextualized by a narrative of imagined naval warfare. In this sense, a design-only approach to coursework would be insufficient. Assignment prompts don’t exist in isolation but rather structure processes within a rhetorical space.

In the following section, I expand on possible revisions to rhetorical situation methodologies.

**Rhetorical Situations, Rhetorical Ecologies, and the Magic Circle**

Because play is a tool for establishing rhetorical context, it is not altogether dissimilar from the rhetorical situation. In terms of theory, both play and the rhetorical situation identify a space in which rhetorical elements (i.e., exigence, rhetor, audience) are contextualized. In practice, both suggest a process for interacting with rhetorical elements. An important difference, however, is the rigidity of processes suggested. By utilizing play as a methodology, one can reconsider the efficacy of the rhetorical situation as a process, as well as the actions and responses available to process participants. The issue at hand in this section is how the rhetorical situation structures authority in ways that are not always conducive to student participation and agency. By reconsidering the rhetorical situation through play, instruction-writers can implement a less rigid model for rhetorical action and set the stage for persuasive and practical coursework.
In the previous chapter, I charted a progression of critical responses to process-based pedagogy as a parallel to the criticism leveled at procedural rhetoric. In both cases, critics expressed concern over the autonomy of a subject within a process. Whether in response to Flower and Hayes’ cognitive rhetoric process theory or Bogost’s revision of procedurality, the following questions arose: How could a constructed process ask participants for anything other than compliance? Is it possible to recognize the audience as something other than a receptacle for the rhetor’s message?

Turning to scholarship on the rhetorical situation, this trend continues. The debate between Lloyd Bitzer and Richard Vatz, over whether situations or rhetors determine exigence, has inspired a comparatively recent wave of scholarship in rhetorical theory which seeks to complicate the standard structure of the rhetorical situation. In particular, rhetorician Jenny Edbauer offers rhetorical ecology as an open-model supplement to the (closed-model) rhetorical situation. Whereas the rhetorical situation collects elements of rhetoric so to organize them within a specific context, rhetorical ecologies locate elements of rhetoric within multiple, overlapping, and concurrent contexts--participants are simultaneously rhetor and audience. What follows is an overview of the transition from Bitzer to Vatz to Edbauer, their perspectives on rhetorical discourse as process, and the pedagogical implications of these perspectives.

In an attempt to maintain clarity, I proceed now with the following abbreviations: The Rhetorical Situation Framework (RSF) and The Rhetorical Ecologies Framework (REF). I hope that these abbreviations will clarify when I’m referring to rhetorical situations or ecologies as concepts as opposed to specific contexts.
In 1968, Bitzer sought to reintroduce to rhetorical theory the importance of rhetorical situations. In his article “The Rhetorical Situation,” Bitzer argues that rhetorical discourse is both defined and prompted by its historical context. In general terms, this means that the rhetor’s message is brought about by his or her literal and conceptual surroundings. According to Bitzer, the rhetorical situation is a “natural context of persons, events, objects, relations, and an exigence which strongly invites utterance.” Bitzer also notes that, by joining with a situation, an utterance “obtains its meaning and its rhetorical character” (5). For Bitzer, the rhetor, message, and audience are all existent within a situation that shapes discourse. Rhetorical situations engender discourse by way of addressing some sort of need—a student answering a question, for example, or an organizer delivering a speech at a rally. Effective and persuasive communication is measured by a rhetor’s ability to identify an exigence (or exigences) and express what Bitzer terms a “fitting” response (10).

Applied to a pedagogical setting, Bitzer’s RSF emphasizes reasons why an instructor and student are drawn to act. The instructor-as-rhetor’s actions are determined by her location (a classroom), as well as her relationship to students and course material. Her exigences, it stands to reason, are outlined by learning outcomes and the teaching process. Similarly, the rhetor-student’s actions are determined by his relationship to instructors and course material. His exigences are likewise outlined by learning outcomes insofar the outcomes establish expectations for assessment and skill development. All of these factors manifest in larger rhetorical situations, like academia writ large, as well as
smaller situations, like individual conversations between an instructor and a student. In every instance, rhetorical situations shape the discourse between students and instructors.

Bitzer’s argument is challenged by Vatz, who essentially argues the inverse. Discourse is not shaped by a situation. Rather, the situation is shaped by discourse. According to Vatz, the weakness of Bitzer’s argument is rooted in phenomenology. Bitzer views context as something that can exist and exhibit specific characteristics outside of the subjective gaze—it is with the caution befitting scientific objectivity, then, that a rhetor approaches a situation in order to observe and identify the situation’s parts. Vatz argues, however, that a situation cannot be identified objectively by rhetors or otherwise. More specifically, situations do not exist without the discourse that defines them. For example, a large gathering could be described as a rally, a mob, or both. Different factors enter the rhetorical situation depending not on objective characteristics but rather how the situation is identified subjectively. In his article “The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation,” Vatz claims that “no situation can have a nature independent of the perception of its interpreter,” nor can it exist “independent of the rhetoric with which [one] chooses to characterize it” (154). To illustrate his point, Vatz cites the Vietnam War as a situation during which conflicts were identified in various and often dissonant ways. Even as a historical event, the Vietnam War is understood differently between veterans, textbooks, politicians, and other subjective sources. For Vatz, the existence of inescapably subjective sources is proof that situations are characterized through deliberate choices rather than empirical observations.
Returning to the classroom setting, an application of Vatz’s RSF would suggest that the situation of a classroom is primarily established by the “evocative language” of an instructor (157). That is, a situation is shaped by the way an instructor uses language to translate and construct meaning. Learning outcomes exist only to the extent that an instructor chooses to write them out in a syllabus, reiterate them during a lecture, or incorporate them into coursework. Even then, the communication of learning outcomes is a matter of deliberate translation on the part of an instructor who determines how to express the conceptual basis for learning outcomes. This is not to say that an instructor finds no influence from the discourse of her department, her university, or academia in general, but that an instructor (rather than a situation) is responsible for how a message is expressed.

The debate between Bitzer and Vatz is, in one sense, a matter of determining a position of authority in rhetorical discourse. When Bitzer claims that situations invite discourse, he ascribes authority to the situation. When Vatz argues that rhetors should be held responsible for exigences made salient, he places authority with the rhetor. A note of caution is due here, however, since neither Bitzer nor Vatz ascribe much responsibility or authority to a rhetor’s audience. One reason for this could be the often political supporting evidence used by both authors. Bitzer draws from historical events with influential speakers in positions of authority and Vatz uses similar examples in turn (e.g., Abraham Lincoln after the Battle of Gettysburg, or John F. Kennedy after the 1960 presidential election). But these are examples with static, already defined audiences.
When Bitzer imagines a rhetor without an audience (proffering someone who writes
eulogies for people who never existed), he claims that the messages are therefore
“unrhetorical” (9). For Bitzer and Vatz, an audience either doesn’t exist, or exists solely
as a “mediator of … change which the discourse functions to produce” (8). In either case,
a situation or a rhetor holds the authority to make something salient—the only option
available to an audience is whether or not change is then mediated.

The danger of ascribing authority to one source, be it situation or rhetor, is that
the RSF becomes a process with limited options available to its participants. To put it
another way: the RSF, implemented as a process wherein students comprise an audience,
risks inhibiting student agency. When Bitzer describes the rhetor’s actions as task-
oriented, it is evident that he’s observing the RSF as a process:

A situation, whether simple or complex, will be highly structured or
loosely structured. It is highly structured when all of its elements are
located and readied for the task to be performed. … On the other hand,
consider a complex but loosely structured situation … the plight of many
contemporary civil rights advocates who, failing to locate compelling
constraints and rhetorical audiences, abandon rhetorical discourse in favor
of physical action. (12)

In essence, Bitzer suggests that a rhetor follows the process of rhetorical situations in a
manner similar to how a player follows the process of board game instructions. In the
case of a highly structured situation, the instructions are clear: determine a fitting
response given variables X, Y, and Z. If the situation is unclear, or if a rhetor does not
engage with a highly structured situation, the rhetor is no longer participating in
rhetorical discourse. Likewise, a player who fails to acknowledge board game
instructions would no longer be playing the game.

If one continues to read “The Rhetorical Situation” with attention to process,
much of Bitzer’s argument comes across as a set of instructions and rules. For example,
he explains that a single situation “may involve numerous exigences,” that exigences in
the same situation “may be incompatible,” that “at any given moment, persons
comprising the audience of situation A may also be the audience of situations B, C, and
D” and so on (12). Like a board game structures play, Bitzer’s lists structure rhetorical
action; to act within either structure is to engage with a process. As a term, Bitzer’s
“fitting response” serves to label a successful interaction with a process. Indeed, Bitzer’s
apparent goal is to create a more procedural approach to rhetorical discourse. In his
conclusion, he anticipates the development of rhetorical theory as a discipline with,
among other things, “procedures by which we effect valuable changes in reality” (14). In
a sense, Bitzer’s text proves Vatz’s challenge—a rhetor shapes the process of a situation
in much the same way that Bitzer works to shape process in “The Rhetorical Situation.”

At a certain point, the RSF vis-à-vis Bitzer and Vatz enters composition
classrooms as a tool with which someone successfully or unsuccessfully inspires an
audience to take action. This approach isn’t altogether unhelpful, but it stops short of
describing how an audience takes action, and what such action entails. More importantly,
the RSF doesn’t sufficiently represent the fluidity of discourse in a pedagogical setting, in
which the rhetor (e.g. an instructor) is sometimes an audience, and the audience (e.g. a
student) is sometimes a rhetor. In short, the RSF doesn’t acknowledge an audience’s ability to shape a message.

For example, as an instructor, I find that I’m constantly negotiating meaning with my students and the course material. Every time I revise a policy in my syllabus, or clarify the instructions for an assignment, I do so as an indirect response to the student(s) who made it evident that revision was necessary in the first place. In some cases, I might also consult another instructor about their policies or assignments. When my revised syllabus or prompt then reaches a new set of students, it arrives as a message that has been determined collectively and discursively as a result of its circulation through other audiences and contexts. Situational exigences and individual rhetors are still factors in these revisions, but neither factor singularly determines the new document.

Thus, one explanation for why the RSF risks inhibiting student agency is because the Bitzer model assumes static components—the rhetor is X, the audience is Y, and the exigence is Z. If these components are merged or removed, the situation is no longer rhetorical. As evidenced by my coursework example, though, the rhetor often represents a combination of X, Y, and Z. The authority over meaning in a rhetorical situation is not traceable to a single source because, in practice, rhetorical elements interact in complex ways and are rarely static. Although Vatz adds complexity to the relationship between rhetor and exigence, his argument falls short of complicating other relationships in the rhetorical situation.

A broader perspective had been adopted by rhetorician Jenny Edbauer, who argues that rhetorical ecologies—sociocultural spaces comprising many variable,
overlapping, and circulating rhetorical situations—more readily reveal the fluidity of rhetorical exigences and audiences. In her article, "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies," Edbauer notes that previous studies have not dealt with the RSF as a model operating "within a network of lived practical consciousness or structures of feeling." Placing the model within such a network, she explains, "destabilizes the discrete borders of a rhetorical situation" (5). In other words, the RSF offers a veritable snapshot of rhetorical discourse within a particular context, but this snapshot comes at the cost of obfuscating continuous circulations of meaning that inform a situation's parts (i.e. rhetor, message, audience, exigence, context). Crossing the threshold of a classroom, instructors and students don't become Lockean tabula rasas or fixed rhetorical elements. Rather, instructors and students temporarily enter one context within the "network[s] of lived practical consciousness or structures of feeling" that Edbauer describes (5).

The interconnectedness of networks is important to note because it significantly revises the standard role of an audience in a rhetorical situation. By way of example, Edbauer recalls the influx of big business chains in Austin, Texas during the late 1990s. Buying out the spaces of locally-owned and operated businesses, these national chains drew the ire of many Austinites. In protest, two independent bookstore owners created and sold bumper stickers that read “Keep Austin Weird, Support Local Businesses” (16).

Edbauer goes on to describe how “Keep Austin Weird” entered cultural circulation to such an extent that “weird” rhetoric was used in local radio fundraisers, plastered on merchandise, and formally recognized by Austin’s city council (as “the
reality of ‘weird Austin’”). Over time, the phrase was co-opted by local colleges (“Keep Austin Liberal Arts”), libraries (“Keep Austin Reading”), and even a corporate cell phone company whose billboards included the phrase, “Keepin’ Austin weird” (17-18).

Edbauer’s example therefore complicates Bitzer’s argument that the rhetor “alters reality by bringing into existence a discourse of such a character that the audience, in thought and action … becomes [the] mediator of change” (“The Rhetorical Situation” 4). Austinites are the audience for “Keep Austin Weird,” but they are also the rhetors in radio fundraisers, city council meetings and corporate advertisements. That is, “Keep Austin Weird” exists within specific rhetorical situations as well as rhetorical ecologies. The latter expands on the former by highlighting exactly what “changes” are mediated by audiences. In the case of “Keep Austin Weird,” changes included reproducing the message as a form of protest, co-opting the message for an advertisement, or resignifying the message as a political implement.

A connection can be made between Edbauer’s concept of rhetorical ecology and Huizinga’s concept of the magic circle. Huizinga, like Edbauer, uses the magic circle to observe how meaning is transformed by overlapping rhetorical spaces, and what participants (rhetor and audience alike) bring to a situation. More specifically, Huizinga and Edbauer are interested in how individual experiences lead to the transformation of meaning within a space. Consider the circulation of “Keep Austin Weird”—depending on variation of experiences between rhetors and audiences, the phrase can mean “support local business,” “support local libraries,” or “buy cell phones,” and yet any permutation still exists within the spaces of “weird” rhetoric (and Austin, and billboards, and bumper
stickers, and so on). The magic circle understands play through a similar approach. As a cultural theorist, Huizinga is especially attentive to play’s role in the development of culture. Play creates the magic circle, Huizinga reasoned, as a site for connected and overlapping cultural spaces, attitudes, and behaviors. If one were to combine the tenets of Huizinga and Edbauer’s work, and compare them to a standard rhetorical situation diagram, the result would look something like what is shown in figure 3.

![Fig. 3. Magic Circle (left) and Rhetorical Situation (right) Framework Comparison.](image)

To a certain extent, the magic circle and the rhetorical situation identify the same space. The crucial difference is that the rhetorical situation presents that space as a self-contained context, whereas the magic circle presents that space as a cross-section of multiple contexts. For the rhetorical situation, context is a snapshot of a specific, fixed combination of outside elements—the writer, audience, and message are known only in relation to that snapshot. By contrast, the magic circle is a combinatory approach. The writer, audience, and message exist within the magic circle, but they also exist within a number of other rhetorical spaces at the same time. The magic circle doesn’t present a snapshot of a space but rather an open structure within a cross-section of spaces.
Rhetorical elements and processes are present but not fixed, so the experiences carried over from one rhetorical space influences another, and another, *ad infinitum*.

If neither process nor rhetorical framework recognize a space for multiple contexts and lived experiences to circulate and shape meaning, the audience becomes a fixed element left to observe rather than interact. This is the scenario in which participants are asked for compliance, and audiences are recognized solely as receptacles for rhetorical messages. The aforementioned disconnect between process and narrative is exacerbated by this dynamic.

For instance, when students work through an assigned reading, they examine the rhetorical situation by asking questions about a writer’s choices. Students piece together potential answers by considering influential factors like an author’s personal perspective, historical context, or potential audience. Conversely, when students work through an assignment prompt, they find answers to a series of implicit questions about a writer’s choices. The assignment isn’t a matter of sussing out a rhetorical situation but rather illustrating how all of the discrete, predetermined elements shape a writer’s interaction with a situation. If such elements were truly intrinsic to rhetorical situations, as Bitzer suggests, I could reasonably expect a number of identical “fitting responses” because every student has received the same assignment sheet, and every student has been asked to interact with a fixed rhetorical situation through the same set of processes.

Of course, the reality of the matter is much less concrete. The assignment sheet actually serves as a sort of crossroads at which a student and I interpret meaning embedded in the language of instruction. Vatz claims that the rhetor should be held accountable for
how he or she makes an exigence salient, but this describes only one point in the
circulation of a rhetorical message—at another point, an audience is tasked with
interpreting a message and, in doing so, shaping the salience. Without an audience’s
interpretive work, Vatz’s rhetor is no different from the Bitzerian eulogist. The
circulation of rhetorical discourse is continuous and collaborative. An audience is not
always passive, nor is it always fixed. Rather, writer and audience are always in flux, and
any appearance of fixity is temporary. Thus, in order to make a stronger argument for
student agency, it is necessary to revise the rhetorical situation methodology so to better
represent the continuity of discourse, and the actions of all participants in the process of
co-creating meaning.

I propose a revised diagram which combines the rhetorical situation, rhetorical
ecologies, and play (see fig. 4). Elements of the rhetorical situation persist, identified
here as Context, Audience, Rhetor, and Message, though they are now presented among
(and within) a network of rhetorical ecologies. Importantly, the arrows connecting each
section represent the circulation of rhetorical discourse. Though there is no definite
starting point, let’s begin with Rhetor and Audience. When Rhetor and Audience engage
in discourse, they arrive at Message simultaneously. In this diagram, Message refers to
any sort of symbolic expression (i.e., written text, oral communication, imagery) that
joins a rhetor and an audience.
From Message, a rhetor and an audience enter the Magic Circle. It is here where the bulk of interpretive work is carried out. Interpretation (by both participants) can be influenced by persuasive Textual, Visual, or Procedural rhetorical strategies. In other words, once participants engage with a particular text (or conversation), they interpret the textual, visual, or procedural argument that text makes. In some cases all three strategies could be in effect. A stop sign, for example, makes its argument through the word “STOP,” the color red, and the process of stopping. In this way, a magic circle functions as a filter—when a rhetor and an audience carry a message through a magic circle, they leave with interpretations of the message’s rhetorical features.

These interpretations cross through a network of Rhetorical Ecologies before arriving back at the salient Context. Along the way, a rhetor and an audience might consider other situations wherein they’ve encountered a stop sign or its rhetorical
elements. The possible associations here are practically infinite. Perhaps one participant recalls a picture of a stop sign from a driver’s ed class, and another remembers a stop sign from a cartoon. If not the stop sign in full, one participant might associate the visual and procedural elements of a stop sign with a red traffic light, or brake lights. Each association further shapes a rhetor and/or an audience’s interpretation of a text.

Having now considered a message and its rhetorical strategies, as well as any experiential associations, a rhetor and an audience cycle back around to reevaluate Context. (E.g., previous experience with a stop sign can inform a participant’s current interaction with a traffic light.) The newly considered Context further informs the Rhetor and Audience roles in relation to the Message.

Importantly, the reconsidered Context could bring about a shift in occupied roles. Let’s imagine that the former Audience has become the new Rhetor, or vice versa. These participants, having shifted roles, meet again at a message and proceed through the rest of the diagram—each cycle further develops discourse.

Ultimately, this revised diagram illustrates a process through which all participants continuously evaluate their interaction with discourse. I don’t intend for the lines in this diagram to indicate any supposed duration of time between each step in the process. (In fact, I think any indication of time would limit the applicability of the diagram.) Rather, I hope for this diagram to illustrate audience as a necessary, active component of rhetorical discourse. Put into practice, I believe such a revision can offer students a process through which they are invited to understand themselves as co-creators of meaning rather than merely conduits for successful or unsuccessful rhetoric.
To conclude, I want to return to game scholars Eric Zimmerman and Katie Salen’s outline for the cognitive stages of understanding rules in games. These stages helpfully summarize the transitions from Bitzer to Vatz to Edbauer. In the first stage, Zimmerman and Salen describe a player who perceives the space and rules of a game to be random, focusing instead on understanding and interpreting interactions. This perspective describes Bitzer’s concern at the beginning of “The Rhetorical Situation.” Bitzer acknowledges the standard tools of rhetorical criticism to be audience, speaker, subject, occasion, and speech, but he implores readers to stop focusing on interactions, and to examine instead the space and rules of rhetorical discourse (1).

The second stage described by Zimmerman and Salen is when the rules of a game are apparently determined ex nihilo and can’t be disregarded or altered. A player who doesn’t follow the rules is no longer playing the game. This describes Bitzer’s general argument, and lines up with his hypothetical civil rights activist who, upon failing to locate the situation, no longer engages in rhetorical discourse. Challenging this perspective, Vatz argues that rules aren’t created out of nothing, but rather applied by a rhetor. Rules still exist, but a rhetor has the ability to shape and implement them.

To offer an analogy: a pick-up game of basketball is only played when someone brings a basketball, and it ends when that person leaves with the basketball. The rules for playing basketball still exist, but the person with the ball has the ability to decide when and how those rules are pertinent.

In the final stage of cognitive development, the space and rules of a game are understood to be socially constructed and negotiated between participants. Edbauer’s
approach to the rhetorical situation adopts a similar perspective. Rhetorical discourse isn’t determined by a set of unalterable rules, nor should it be conceptualized in such a way that one person determines and enforces those rules. Instead, the rules of rhetorical discourse are negotiated, in part, by all of the participants. In this case, a game of basketball is shaped by all of the players, even if only one player brought a basketball to the court. As each of these players watch basketball games or play with other groups, they accrue expectations for how the game is played—their experiences shape context as well as process. In this way, the space and rules of a basketball game are always in flux, and always shaped collectively by everyone involved.

**Rhetorical Analysis**

To assess how methodology might inform design, I’ve turned to rhetorical analysis. On the whole, I’m not concerned with how design mechanics shape an assignment. That is to say, my goal isn’t to craft assignments without requirements like secondary sources, word counts, formatting, and so on. Instead, I’m interested in how the textual, visual, and procedural rhetoric of an assignment sheet work in tandem to persuade an audience. To that extent I am attentive to logos, ethos, and pathos appeals as they appear in board game instructions and assignment prompts. I suggest that, along with enthymeme, rhetorical appeals are the tools with which to establish a magic circle and create persuasive coursework. Rhetorical analysis, it follows, helps to show how rhetorical strategies have (or have not) been used to this effect in *Trivial Pursuit* instruction sheets.
My use of rhetorical analysis is heavily informed by Carol Berkenkotter’s text “Analyzing Everyday Texts in Organizational Settings.” Rhetorical analysis is defined by Berkenkotter as a qualitative form of analysis concerned with the “strategies through which arguments are made in written, oral, or electronic texts …. [as well as] the situational, sociohistorical, and discursive contexts in which the text appears” (48–49). For this reason, rhetorical analysis is well suited to answer questions about rhetorical arguments as they appear in Trivial Pursuit instruction sheets, as well as how these arguments adapt to different social contexts and situations.

I view rhetorical analysis as an interpretive act. In agreement with Berkenkotter, I use “interpretive” here, in one sense, to recognize the subjectivity of my research process and findings. Undeniably, I approach my object of study with a set of questions shaped by personal motivations. I want to know how Trivial Pursuit instructions can inform my pedagogy, and I’ve developed research questions based on my personal experience teaching composition at the postsecondary level. Bitzer’s interest in empirical procedures for objective rhetorical situations was similarly inspired by his personal response to the rhetorical theory scholarship he’d been reading. Like Bitzer, I acknowledge that the work I present here is shaped by my personal experiences with, and responses to, scholarship surrounding rhetorical theory, pedagogy, and play.

In another sense, “interpretive” is a term used here to acknowledge that even ubiquitous texts are open to interpretation. Writing from a Technical Communication background, Berkenkotter argues that organizations are “so dependent on the production and consumption of written records and other organizational texts” that they constitute a
veritable “documentary reality” (51). That is, everyday texts are so embedded with social and contextual meaning that they effectively shape the reality of an organizational setting and, equally important, the kind of knowledge that fits into that setting. A similar effect is found in the ways that board game instructions and assignment prompts indicate appropriate forms of knowledge for a particular context.

In short, I don’t hope to find a definite, universal set of answers to the questions I raise in my research, but rather to demonstrate a) the significance of rhetorical elements in assignment prompts, b) the importance of critically assessing instruction documents in genres parallel to academic coursework, and c) Trivial Pursuit’s unique potential as a source of inquiry for this kind of research.

Research Questions

So far, my thesis has covered the broad questions that initiated and developed my research. Several of these questions have come from scholarship surrounding similar conversations about process, rhetoric, pedagogy, and play. Others were the result of my own responses to these conversations, or my own experience with these disciplines. To review, my research began with the following questions:

1. How might board game instructions be able to inform the design of academic assignment prompts?

2. What rhetorical strategies facilitate the construction of prompts that are both persuasive and practical?
3. How can a process be constructed in such a way that it is neither highly restrictive nor inattentive to its participants?

Starting with these questions, I studied a variety of English-language board game instructions with publication dates spanning the 20th century. I was already familiar with scholarship surrounding play, Game Theory, rhetoric, and procedural rhetoric, but board game instructions prompted me to focus my research on the conventions of instruction-writing in particular. I began to notice similarities between the discussions surrounding game theory and design, and those surrounding pedagogy and assignment design.

For example, both game designers and pedagogues frequently mull over how to design something that not only captures an audience’s interest but also helps an audience to develop particular skillsets. In an episode of their podcast Ludology, Geoff Engelstein and Ryan Sturm discuss common game design goals. An excerpt from the conversation follows:

We [game designers] all want to get our players in a situation--so that we put an interesting situation in front of them, one where they have information and they’ll make a choice, or several choices, in order to win the game. Not because they’ve seen this game a hundred times or they’ve memorized it … but because somehow, using these different rules of thumb that they’ve developed, they’ve discovered a way to win. (“Lucky Break”)

Engelstein and Sturm’s discussion suggests a concerted effort to design a situation where, drawing on preexisting skills, players are asked to make choices and develop new strategies for accomplishing tasks they might otherwise consider to be trivial. In her book
A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers, Erika Lindemann echoes similar goals for writing assignments:

[S]tudents wed to five paragraphs incorrectly assume that all topics, especially in the academic context, must be made to fit the mold they have learned. … Students who cling to the [five-paragraph essay] model usually do not know that they have choices about form, what those choices are, or how to choose wisely. We need to encourage them to listen to their material and help them discover options for organizing it. (133)

More and more, I began to notice these moments of crossover in a lot of the scholarship surrounding composition instruction and play. Of course, scholars have been making this connection for decades--Zimmerman, Salen, Gee, and Bogost have all written extensively on the similarity of learning objectives found in games and education—but these findings bolstered my interest in board game instructions and assignment prompts as sites for communicating goals. After all, Engelstein and Lindemann’s discussions preface the actual work of creating a product or process to reflect these goals.

I also noticed that methodological principles and design goals are not always discernable in the documents they’re meant to produce. Or, if these factors are present and clear, they can often be utterly unconvincing. Associating board game instructions with my enthusiasm for games in general, I problematically assumed that game instructions were universally effective in ways that standard assignment prompts were not. Further research showed me that this was far from the truth, but I think my initial assumption speaks to a common pitfall for board game and assignment designers alike—
familiarity with, and passion for, methodological foundations does not guarantee an effective product.

In fact, in many cases, heuristics for design can be much more persuasive than the products they inform. In *The Longman Teaching Assistant’s Handbook*, a heuristic for designing assignment sheets asks instructors to consider “what students are supposed to learn by completing the assignment,” “what you will learn about your students as they complete the assignment,” and “how the assignment fits larger course goals” (Wilhoit 67). These considerations gain a lot of value from methodological subtexts. They connect to an instructor’s implicit consideration for things like classroom pedagogy, student needs, or course design. That is, the design heuristic becomes more persuasive because it addresses the concerns of its intended audience (i.e., instructors). The following is an excerpt from the sample product designed through the aforementioned heuristic:

In this paper, you will analyze an argument, locating and describing its essential elements. … When writing this assignment, you will learn how to work with two essential elements of argument: claims and grounds. We will also discuss a third element, warrants. Completing this assignment will prepare you for the next step in our class. (Wilhoit 73)

Certainly students are concerned with what they’re supposed to be learning, and how assigned work fits into the larger theme of a course, but, on the whole, students don’t read a text through a pedagogical lens. So even though this assignment prompt reflects the goals of a design heuristic, it becomes much less persuasive when the value of those goals aren’t inferred by an intended audience. Likewise, board games can come to fruition through brilliant design goals but still fail to persuasively communicate those goals in matching instructions. As a result, players might be persuaded by the mechanics
of a process but not its rationale. (Side note: This problem is essentially compounded in
*Jeopardy*-style review activities. Two familiar sets of instructions—how to play
*Jeopardy*, how to demonstrate knowledge of course materials—might persuade the
students to participate, but neither set does much to convince them of the activity’s
pedagogical value.)

After these preliminary findings, my research questions and scope became more
focused. I chose to work with instruction sheets from only one board game franchise
(*Trivial Pursuit*, for reasons I discuss at the end of this chapter) so to limit the variety of
design goals and processes communicated through instructions. My data set comprised
instruction sheets from 18 different editions of *Trivial Pursuit*, published between the
years 1990 and 2009. All of the instruction sheets were retrieved from Hasbro’s official
website. I revised my initial research questions in order to better guide my analysis.
Informed by Berkenkotter’s text “Analyzing Everyday Texts in Organizational Settings,”
I drafted more specific research questions (55). I used these questions to both shape my
analysis and expand on my initial, broad questions:

- How are *Trivial Pursuit* instructions communicating the work of a process?
- What textual, visual, and procedural rhetorical elements are present? How do
  these elements function to influence audience(s)?
- How do these instructions fit into a larger context of procedural and rhetorical
  practices?
- Are there characteristics of *Trivial Pursuit* instruction sheets that have been
  altered or developed over time?
- Is it evident that social, cultural, and historical factors influence the language and/or presentation of these instructions? Are intended audiences discernable?

**Methods and Design**

My analytical procedure was both inductive and iterative. Although I had questions in mind, I wasn’t sure what findings would help to answer them. That is to say my research was exploratory—I repeatedly worked through the data set, looking for content that could inform or further develop my questions. For my first pass, I marked each set of instructions with handwritten notes and observations. I discovered common structural and rhetorical elements between instruction sheets, and I used those commonalities to create tentative categories for the proceeding readthrough.

During my second pass, these categories organized my typed analyses for each set of instructions: brand/title, headings, visual appearance, pronouns/audience, verbs, punctuation, tone, arrangement, publisher, notes (for general observations, or anything that didn’t fit into another category). These are the elements that I felt most directly set the rhetorical tone for each text. The regal *Trivial Pursuit* brand established ethos, for example, or the headings and arrangement of information established logos. Sentence-level findings revealed measured uses of verbs and second-person pronouns, both of which pointed to enthymematic arguments. Over the course of two months, I alternated between freehand annotations and typed categorization.

Ultimately, I determined several options for arranging my data set. I began with an arrangement according to publication dates, but other viable metrics became apparent over time, including:
• Game type (the primary *Trivial Pursuit Genus* editions, DVD editions, licensed editions, etc.)
• Ownership (Horn Abbot Ltd., Parker Brothers, Hasbro)
• Digital/analog (PC game versions, handheld electronic versions, traditional cardboard versions)
• Intended audiences and age groups (children, teenagers, adults)
• Document titles (instructions, rules of play, etc.)

I found that each of these potential arrangements were indicative of a confluence of rhetorical ecologies. In the following section, I discuss my rationale for selecting *Trivial Pursuit* instruction sheets as my object of study.

**Object of Study: *Trivial Pursuit***

There are three major reasons why, despite the breadth of board games, I’ve chosen to analyze *Trivial Pursuit* in particular. First, the basic structure of *Trivial Pursuit* is parallel to certain methods for learning assessment. Second, *Trivial Pursuit* relies on a variety of social, cultural, and historical knowledge more directly than most other popular board games. Finally, the design of *Trivial Pursuit* has been fundamentally affected by the advent of smart phones and mobile internet access in ways that provide insight for similar concerns in the realm of academic work.

**The Question-and-Answer Design Model**

The process of playing *Trivial Pursuit* is not wholly dissimilar from the standard trappings of knowledge assessment in a classroom setting. Players navigate the game board in order to reach spaces where they’re required to demonstrate knowledge on a
particular subject, be it literature, pop culture, history, sports, music, or general trivia. If the player answers a question correctly, he gains a colored Scoring Wedge to place into his Pie Base. If he is not able to answer the question, he proceeds around the board until such a time that he is able to attempt answering a question a second time.

Though the question/answer dynamic could be applied to written coursework, it’s important to remember the social element of *Trivial Pursuit*—players must verbally demonstrate their knowledge in a group setting. Roles within the rhetorical space shift as each player takes turns asking questions, answering questions, or watching question/answer exchanges take place. Experiences and associations with other rhetorical spaces bleed into the process of playing *Trivial Pursuit*. (A player whom everyone knows to be a history buff, for example, might utilize her knowledge for this new setting.) The general experience, then, involves people learning about each other, the content (i.e. questions), and demonstrating knowledge through social, question/answer processes in order to achieve a common goal.

Certainly other board games can teach players about themselves and each other, but *Trivial Pursuit* uniquely combines content and processes in ways that better match the classroom space than, say, a game of poker. Admittedly, the match is not perfect. Rolling a die and navigating a narrow track are not standard features of a classroom (foregoing any attempt at metaphorical connections). But the process of *Trivial Pursuit* is close enough that the language of instruction sheets need not be contorted in order to find applicability with academic coursework. Likewise, significant portions of the *Trivial Pursuit* process already exist within the classroom space. Combined with the franchise’s
80+ editions released over the course of its 33-year history, *Trivial Pursuit* stands out among other popular board games as a viable source of inquiry.

**Social, Historical, and Cultural Contexts**

The content of *Trivial Pursuit* adapts to and integrates—if not outright depends upon—a range of social, historical, and cultural contexts. This is especially evident in any licensed edition of the game, for which categories, questions, and visual designs are altered to better match the licensed property. The pictures in figure 5 offer a comparison of the same section between two different sets of instructions. The left excerpt is from *Trivial Pursuit Genus IV*, the fourth entry in *Trivial Pursuit*’s standard line of games. The right excerpt is from *Trivial Pursuit: The Lord of the Rings: Movie Trilogy Collector’s Edition*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The categories are color-coded:</th>
<th>THE CATEGORIES ARE COLOR CODED…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue..........................People</td>
<td>Green..........................Good Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink.....................Entertainment</td>
<td>Blue.....................Evil Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow.....................History</td>
<td>Orange.....................Things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown.....................Places</td>
<td>Red..........................Place &amp; History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green.................Sports &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>Yellow.....................Warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange.....................Wild Card</td>
<td>Brown.....................Making Movies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The fundamental process of *Trivial Pursuit* remains intact between these editions, but the content taps into different rhetorical ecologies. In *Genus IV*, questions from the “Pink” category rely on the circulation of discourse surrounding entertainment—specifically entertainment-related discourse in the United States as of 1993. To recall: In 1993, films like *Jurassic Park* and *Schindler’s List* were first debuting. The TV show *Cheers* had just ended. John Grisham had released only four novels. By tapping into these kinds of events, *Trivial Pursuit* questions not only justified a *Genus IV* edition, but also
attempted to meet the expectations of Trivial Pursuit players circa 1993. (To say nothing of Trivial Pursuit editions released in other countries around the same time.) In other words, the content informing Trivial Pursuit’s process necessarily recognizes social, historical, and cultural contexts.

Turning to the excerpt from Trivial Pursuit: The Lord of the Rings: Movie Trilogy Collector’s Edition (TPLoTR) it’s evident that the circulation of visual content is also important to the overall design of Trivial Pursuit editions. Because TPLoTR specifically involves the contemporary trilogy of Lord of the Rings films, many of its visual elements borrow from that source—“CATEGORIES ARE COLOR-CODED” adopts the font associated with the movies, and the front page of the instruction booklet reproduces the logo used for each film. (See Appendix A, 99.) The categories have changed (though the same six colors are used) to include a map-like legend for new visual elements. Taken in whole, the visuals added for TPLoTR suggest a contemporary relevance. The fonts and imagery are, like Genus IV questions, drawing from a cultural zeitgeist. The process doesn’t merely allow for participants to associate lived experiences with Trivial Pursuit but, through deliberate textual and visual rhetoric, outright invites it.

Technological Influences

For much of its history, the Trivial Pursuit franchise continues to adapt relevant textual and visual information to its process—trivia is updated, fonts are altered, and so on. Occasionally the medium changes so that Trivial Pursuit isn’t played on a table but rather through a DVD or a handheld electronic gaming device. The way a player interacts with the game is different, in such cases as a DVD or handheld, but the game’s process is
fundamentally intact: demonstrate knowledge in order to win. Although *Trivial Pursuit* has a long track record of tapping into the circulation of information (visual or otherwise), the advent of internet-capable mobile phones has dramatically altered the way information circulates in general. Should everyone decide to use smart phones while playing *Trivial Pursuit Genus IV*, for example, the game would be almost unrecognizable. The process of demonstrating knowledge would be supplanted by the process of accessing knowledge. Within the past 10 years, *Trivial Pursuit* editions have expanded the traditional process of demonstrating knowledge by adding value to different kinds of knowledge (e.g., interpersonal, strategic) and creating different options for engaging with the standard process.

Beginning in 2008 (one year after Apple’s first iPhone hit the market), *Trivial Pursuit* released a number of editions that significantly revised the game’s standard formula. In 2008, *Trivial Pursuit Family* introduced “Roll Again” and “Shortcut” spaces, along with suggested “House Rules” under the heading, “Mind Games.” *Trivial Pursuit Triple the Fun for Everyone!* added outside tracks to the signature wheel-shaped board area, along with “Track Pawn” pieces, and four new zones (“Face-off Zone,” “Slow It Down Zone,” “Easy Cheezy Zone,” and “Freebie Zone”). On the instruction sheet, these changes are described in a section called “The Twist,” which reads, “If you’re familiar with *Trivial Pursuit*®, all you need to know is ‘the twist.’” In 2009, *Trivial Pursuit Bet You Know It, Trivial Pursuit Steal*, and *Trivial Pursuit Team* were released, all of which served as revisions to the original *Trivial Pursuit* process.
Importantly, each revision builds onto the question-and-answer process by expanding player choice. In *Trivial Pursuit Bet You Know It*, players can answer questions as per *Trivial Pursuit* tradition, or they can choose to forego answering and instead place bets on which of the other players are most likely to know the answer to a question. By incorporating additional choices, the process argues for the value of different kinds of knowledge. A player who doesn’t know much about world history can still utilize his familiarity with the knowledge of other players. In other cases, like *Trivial Pursuit Steal*, the process argues in favor of different skillsets. Players can answer questions or use “Steal,” “Double Steal,” “Block,” and “Buzz” cards to influence the game’s progression. A player who is excellent with trivia might not win without utilizing the cards, just as a player who skillfully uses every card might not win without some knowledge of general trivia, but both players still find their way into the process. In other words, *Trivial Pursuit*’s revised processes are attentive to participants, and no longer restrictive (insofar as participants either know an answer or not).

Of course, it’s impossible to know precisely why the design of *Trivial Pursuit* changed in the ways that it did. The answer is likely some combination of many distinct factors: The board game industry became crowded after experiencing a boom in the 2000s, when digital and global shipping became increasingly viable distribution models; the rapidly developing videogame industry threatened to render board games obsolete; a general influx of new games bolstered the significance of Game Theory scholarship, which had long been puzzling alternatives to the question-and-answer game formula.
Regardless of the impetus, though, *Trivial Pursuit* has remained relevant due in large part to a combination of textual, visual, and procedural rhetorical strategies. When used effectively, these strategies can invite players to work out a process within a space open to sociocultural and historical influences. In the following chapter, I present findings from my analysis of the persuasive strategies used in *Trivial Pursuit* instruction sheets.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Up to now, this thesis has discussed the recent development of procedural rhetoric, a pedagogical justification for utilizing procedural rhetoric, and an object of study that could help explicate a practical application of rhetorical processes. I’ve suggested composition coursework as a site for implementing persuasive and practical instructions, and the viability of *Trivial Pursuit* as a source of inquiry towards what such implementations could look like. In this chapter, I present the results of my research as they apply to the overall focus I’ve just outlined.

I separate the data into categories according to the following modes of communication: textual, visual, and procedural. Whereas the Textual Data section focuses on phrasing and the Visual Data section on imagery, the Procedural Data section highlights the design and presentation of processes. Each section is further divided into two sub-sections for common and uncommon elements respectively. A visual overview of this chapter’s structure is shown in figure 6.

![Fig. 6. Results Chapter Structure.](image_url)
My goal is to create a throughline for this chapter which prioritizes the rhetorical elements of *Trivial Pursuit* instruction sheets and the extent to which those rhetorical elements have changed throughout the past thirty years. Secondary to that throughline, I intend for the structure of this chapter to illustrate a truncated version of my research experience—the repetition I’d noticed and the unexpected findings that followed. In retrospect, the most productive moments of my research were when I had two very different entries for the same category—these kinds of discrepancies often made clearer the rhetorical strategies at play. Presented in this way, the results of my rhetorical analysis therefore point to revision opportunities for instructional documents, which I discuss in more detail in chapter four.

**Coding**

For each table in this chapter, I apply coding labels to the data according to applicable rhetorical strategies. Strategies include logos, ethos, and pathos appeals, as well as enthymematic arguments and procedural rhetoric. My application of these strategies has been informed by the sources I’ve discussed in the previous chapters, and is restated in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Strategy/Argument</th>
<th>Informed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logos, Ethos, Pathos</td>
<td>Aristotle, Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthymeme</td>
<td>Bogost, Brock, Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural rhetoric</td>
<td>Bogost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I’ve found that these strategies are rarely used independently of one another—an
instruction sheet may appeal to logos in one section and ethos in another, or both logos and ethos in the same section. For each table of results, I note whichever strategy or strategies are most applicable. For examples of instruction sheet elements and the rhetorical strategy they indicate, see table 2.

Table 2

Indicators of Rhetorical Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Ethos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions for a process</td>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphanumeric lists</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory (e.g. game pieces)</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconography (e.g. keys or legends)</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Legal disclaimers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enthymeme</th>
<th>Procedural Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second-person pronouns</td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If, … then” statements</td>
<td>Sub-processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player roles (e.g., leader, teammate)</td>
<td>Presence of choices within a process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action verbs attributed to player actions</td>
<td>Presence of control over a process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Data

*Common Textual Elements*

My analysis of textual elements included headings, written instructions, and tone. The standard sections of an instruction sheet consisted of a title for the document itself (often “Rules of Play”), an explanation for how to play the game (under the heading “Object”), and the necessary conditions for winning the game (under the heading “Winning the Game”). I found that, over the span of twelve editions and twenty years, the same language was used for each of these sections (see table 3.) For the sake of space, I’ve truncated the “Winning the Game” section, though the omitted paragraph is similarly consistent with the rest of the excerpted text.
### Table 3

**Common Textual Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Instruction Sheet Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><em>Young Players</em>®</td>
<td>Rules of Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td><em>Young Players</em>® 2nd Ed.</td>
<td>“Object”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td><em>The 1980’s Edition</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>All American</em></td>
<td>“Winning the Game”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Genus III</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td><em>Genus IV</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td><em>Warner Bros. All-Family Edition</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>Millennium</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><em>20th Anniversary</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Lord of the Rings</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>The 90’s Edition</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>Book Lover’s</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primary Rhetorical Elements

- Logos, Enthymeme

The language used in “Object” and “Winning the Game” alike appeal to logos insofar as processes are described. Enthymeme appears in the “Object” section as an argument deduced by the reader:
a. The object of the game is to navigate the board and answer questions.

b. The game is won when a player or team finishes navigating the board and correctly answers a final question.

c. (Implied) Players or teams win by engaging with and completing the objective.

This enthymematic argument is bolstered by the second-person “you” in the “Winning the Game” section. The logic here operates on the assumption that a reader is playing the game in order to win, and the language matches accordingly. Secondary to logos and enthymeme, pathos appeals vis-a-vis exclamation points add emphasis to the completion of the process.

Although the titles of each edition indicate different audiences and audience interests, players are uniformly addressed by the “Object” and “Winning the Game” sections. The implied audience found in these instruction sheets reflects the basics of game theory, which assumes that all players act rationally, logically, and with the intention of winning. Tables 4, 5, and 6 illustrate instances when players are addressed in ways that point to different ideas of audience temperament.

*Uncommon Textual Elements*

*In Pursuit*’s “Object of the Game” section likewise operates under the assumption that players intend to win, but rationality is not guaranteed by players who “must do whatever it takes to achieve a lone victory” (see table 4). The dramatic tone and second-person “you” shows a combination of pathos and enthymeme, both of which argue for a different way of understanding the participant.
Table 4

Uncommon Textual Elements (*inPursuit*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Instruction Sheet Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><em>inPursuit</em></td>
<td>Rules of Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Object of the Game”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>In Pursuit™</em> is a new twist on classic trivia game play. It is played by individuals who must do whatever it takes to achieve a lone victory…do not be fooled by the team atmosphere. To win, you must be the first leader in the Finish space to answer a question correctly. Plan ahead and ensure that you are on the right team and in the right position (leader) when your team enters Finish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Winning the Game”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first leader in the Finish space who answers a question correctly wins the game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Rhetorical Elements</td>
<td>Pathos, Enthymeme, Logos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar though indirect attention to participant variety is evident in the instructions for *Trivial Pursuit DVD for Kids* (see table 5). The language is far less complex, and standard headings are adapted for the intended audience. (E.g., “How do I win?” instead of “Rules of Play.”)

The acknowledgment of a young audience has precedent in the 1984 *Young Players®* edition and the 1987 *For Juniors* edition. In the former, one of the “Notes on Play” is a reminder that “[y]ounger players should remember that making a guess is always better than not answering at all. Players often amaze themselves with what they know!” The matching section in the *For Juniors* edition shifts from “younger players” to
the second-person “you”: “Guessing is better than not answering at all. You probably know a lot more than you think you do, so have a try!” (The For Kids edition released in 2004 maintains the phrasing with a small exception: “You probably know a lot more than you think you do, so take a guess!”)

Table 5

Uncommon Textual Elements (*DVD for Kids*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Instruction Sheet Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><em>DVD for Kids</em></td>
<td>How do I win?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“What you do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill your wagon wheel with as many different colored scoring wedges as you can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“How you win”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the end of the episode, each player counts up the different colored scoring wedges in his/her Wagon Wheel; the player with the most different colors wins. If it’s a tie, see who has the most “extra wedges” in his/her pile. If it’s still a tie, then you have a tie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Rhetorical Elements

Logos, Enthymeme

In addition to the revised edition titles—from *Young Players®* to *For Juniors*, and, finally, *For Kids*—the instruction sheets trend towards simplified language and brief instruction. In 2009, *Trivial Pursuit Team* follows suit with only one-sentence descriptions for “Object of the Game” and “How to Win” sections. These descriptions are transcribed in table 6.
Table 6
Uncommon Textual Elements *(Team)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Instruction Sheet Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>[No Title]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Object of the Game”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Move the farthest along the path by earning points for answering questions correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“How to Win”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The team that is farthest along the path after the final card is played wins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Rhetorical Elements

Logos, Enthymeme

Overall, textual enthymematic arguments were found in three forms: omitted premises, second-person pronouns, and language which explicitly or implicitly argues for understanding players in particular ways.

Visual Data

Common Visual Elements

I restricted my analysis of visual elements to only the visual information on instruction sheets proper. This means that I didn’t analyze designs (or pictured designs) of game boards, packaging, or game pieces. Instead, I examined visual elements of document design (arranged columns, bold font, etc.), color design, and branding. In particular, the *Trivial Pursuit* logo design showed a clear chronological progression (see table 7).

The original *Trivial Pursuit* logo, found in editions published between 1984 and
1994, establishes a nearly regal ethos. The wide cursive loops and surrounding ornamentation are aristocratic, and a minimalist depiction of the “Pie Base” piece anchors the bottom center of the logo.

The revised logo design closes the cursive loops and abandons the surrounding ornamentation. This shift seems to correspond with an increase in licensed *Trivial Pursuit* editions throughout the late ‘90s and early 2000s. Many of these editions blended the *Trivial Pursuit* logo with licensed property. (Examples can be found in the Appendix A, 95).

Table 7

Common Visual Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Trivial Pursuit Logo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Young Players® For Juniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Young Players® 1980’s Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Trivial Pursuit (CD-ROM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>The Year in Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>All American Genus III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Genus IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>NFL (Hand-held Electronic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Warner Bros. All-Family Millennium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20th Anniversary Disney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>DVD Pop Culture For Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>90’s Edition Book Lover’s Disney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>DVD for Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Often the ethos of a revised *Trivial Pursuit* logo is secondary to the ethos of something like Warner Bros. or NFL emblems, the Disney logo, or even cartoon characters resting against the *Trivial Pursuit* logo. For example, the NFL emblem appeals the authority of the National Football League, and that ethos bolsters the trivia content of the game. The same is true for the *Trivial Pursuit: The Lord of the Rings* edition. In the rest of the 2000s, three additional variations on the *Trivial Pursuit* logo were published. These variations are shown in table 8.

Table 8

Uncommon Visual Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th><em>Trivial Pursuit</em> Logo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>In Pursuit</em></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="In Pursuit Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><em>Master Steal Bet You Know It</em></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Master Steal Bet You Know It Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td><em>Team</em></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Team Logo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Rhetorical Element

Ethos
Uncommon Visual Elements

*In Pursuit* is the first major variation in branding for an edition with no additional, outside intellectual property attached. Arguably this branding utilizes the rhetorical device of antithesis—the entirely lowercase, sans serif lettering, with no space between “in” and “pursuit,” relies on its dissimilarity to the ornamental *Trivial Pursuit* logo underneath.

Although such a contrast isn’t explicitly presented in the *Trivial Pursuit* design used for *Steal, Master,* and *Bet You Know It* editions of the game, a marked difference from the typical logo is still evident. As with *In Pursuit,* this rebranding appeals to a contemporary aesthetic. The uniform precision of lettering (along with computer-generated background graphics) acknowledges the relevance of digital design, unlike the preceding faux-cursive *Trivial Pursuit* logo. The six triangles above the logo represent six different Pie Wedge pieces, all of which are arranged with a similar attention to prevision, and transparent white rectangles further organize the composition. Unattached to licensed material, this *Trivial Pursuit* logo makes an ethos appeal by adopting an aesthetic characteristic of the 21st century.

The *Trivial Pursuit Team* design, finally, comes forth as a middle ground between the original, ornate *Trivial Pursuit* logo and the exceedingly modern look of the design used for *Steal, Master,* and *Bet You Know It.* This design still appeals to the authority of
faux-cursive lettering, but that authority is undercut by an askew arrangement of visual elements. Borrowing *In Pursuit*’s sans serif look for “TEAM,” and the Pie Wedge pieces from *Steal, Master, and Bet You Know It*, this design is not so self-serious as its predecessors.

Of all the types of data, I found visual data to be most closely linked to matters of contemporaneity and ethos.

**Procedural Data**

*Common Procedural Elements*

When I analyzed the procedural elements of instruction sheets, my attention was drawn to the presentation and description of sub-processes. Whereas the textual data section presented earlier in this chapter spoke to how participants engage with a process, the sub-processes that follow indicate the options for *shaping* a process.

The most common sub-process option is “Variation for a Shorter Game.” In most cases, this means omitting some of the standard rules. Players have the option of collecting *any* six wedges, instead of one wedge from each category, or simply answering trivia without navigating the board. These variations and their respective editions are shown in the table 9.

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Gameplay Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Young Players®</td>
<td>Variation for a Shorter Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>The 1980’s Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>All American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Genus III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Genus IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These sub-processes argue that players have choices about the time they invest into the act of playing *Trivial Pursuit*. Or, more accurately, that the value of changing *Trivial Pursuit*’s process is measurable by the amount of time saved. Unacknowledged results motivated by this sub-process include changes to game play strategies, unfamiliar approaches to familiar activities, and the revealed arbitrariness of standard *Trivial Pursuit* rulesets.

In a broader sense, the sub-processes argue that the only control a player has over the process of playing *Trivial Pursuit* is the amount of time he or she chooses to invest. In the uncommon procedural elements shown in table 10, the range and complexity of choices increase.

Table 10
Uncommon Procedural Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gameplay Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>In Pursuit</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Team Challenge, Jump Ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Disney</em></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Sorceror’s Hat, Short Game, House Rules, Winning Streak, Pick and Choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DVD Pop Culture</em></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Variation for Party Play, Variation for a Shorter Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lord of the Rings</em></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Expert Fan Rules, The One Ring, Ringwraiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>90’s Edition</em></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Alternate Game Play Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Triple the Fun for Everyone!</em></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The Twist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Trivial Pursuit editions published during the 2000s, sub-processes shape the overall Trivial Pursuit process in ways that aren’t always directly attributed to time-saving measures. Although that option still exists verbatim in the DVD Pop Culture edition, other editions describe the option instead as a “Short Game” or “Quick Game.”

The Trivial Pursuit Lord of the Rings edition includes new sub-processes like “Expert Fan Rules,” “The One Ring,” and “Ringwraiths.” In terms of procedural rhetoric, these processes use pathos appeals to argue for different ways of using a Lord of the Rings knowledgebase. The description for “Expert Fan Rules” addresses players who “have a high level of familiarity with the 3 films and the works on which they are based,” adding that “[t]hese rules will provide a challenging game where evil can consume you and it is a race to the finish!” These rules reconfigure the space of Trivial Pursuit. Players must collect Pie Wedge pieces in addition to The One Ring, and the center space is reidentified as Mount Doom. If a player fails to answer a question, she doesn’t lose but is, rather, “consumed.” In other words, players have options for how the game space functions, the meaning inherent in player actions, and the primary objective of the game.

Importantly, the procedural structure of Trivial Pursuit is still in place. The core mechanics of the game haven’t changed by way of subtraction (as with the omission of
different categories in shorter game variations) but rather addition. This is true in *Trivial Pursuit Team*, as well, wherein players have the option to “Make Your Own Cards.” This sub-process uses an enthymematic argument to indicate the significance of players’ personal knowledge:

a. Trivia cards are necessary for playing *Trivial Pursuit*.

b. Players can make their own cards.

c. (Implied) Players can contribute to what’s necessary for playing *Trivial Pursuit*.

Procedural data is significantly different when the *Trivial Pursuit* medium changes. Most importantly, instructions for playing the game are subordinated to instructions for *operating* the game. In table 11, I’ve excerpted a portion of the instructions included with the CD-ROM version of *Trivial Pursuit*.

Like *Trivial Pursuit Team*, the CD-ROM version of *Trivial Pursuit* allows for players to create their own questions. That aside, these instructions are more technical than previous versions of *Trivial Pursuit*. Instead of “Object” or “Rules of Play,” the primary heading instructs players on how to play, load, copy, and start “the computer game.”

Technical instructions similarly predominate the instruction sheet for *Trivial Pursuit NFL Electronic Hand-Held Game* (see table 12). In this instance, the first and last instructions a player encounters are in regard to operating the handheld device.
Table 11

Uncommon Procedural Elements (CD-ROM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instructions for Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Trivial Pursuit</em> (CD-ROM)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>HOW TO PLAY THE COMPUTER GAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO LOAD THE PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insert the program disk into Drive A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Press [ENTER]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For additional information (such as copying onto your hard drive):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the A: prompt, type TYPE README.DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Press [ENTER]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To start game:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you have a CGA monitor, at the A: prompt, type TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ENTER]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you have an EGA monitor, at the A: prompt, type TP EGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ENTER]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO SET UP A GAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Players:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type in players’ names, or pick your computer opponents by typing in their numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: Player #1 must be a human. The computer opponents will play by themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Rhetorical Elements
### INTRODUCTION

With this hand-held, electronic *Trivial Pursuit® NFL* game, you can play four different games:

- *Trivial Pursuit Knockout Multiple Choice*
- *Trivial Pursuit Knockout Traditional*
- *Team Play*
- *Just Questions and Answers*

In each game, the computer will ask questions from the following categories:

- PLAYERS
- TEAMS
- HISTORY
- POST SEASON
- SUPER BOWL
- WILD CARD

### RESET

Use a toothpick in the RESET pinhole to reset the game. This:

- Cancels the demonstration mode;
- Cancels any previous score;
- Puts you at a different starting point in the Q&A database.

---

**Table 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Trivial Pursuit NFL Electronic Hand-Held Game</em></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td><strong>IMPORTANT! If this game malfunctions, push in RESET or try new batteries.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:** Press RESET to cancel the demonstration mode and play the game.
Primary Rhetorical Elements

Logos, Procedural Rhetoric, Enthymeme

Despite the strict guidelines for operating the handheld or CD-ROM versions of *Trivial Pursuit*, these editions outline more available options than many of the analog *Trivial Pursuit* editions published during the 90s.

To conclude the procedural data section, I turn to the “Object” and “How to Win” portions of *Trivial Pursuit Bet You Know It* (see table 13).

Table 13

Uncommon Procedural Elements (*Bet You Know It*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Instruction Sheet Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><em>Bet You Know It</em></td>
<td>Rules of Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Object of the Game”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be the first player to collect all six wedges (one of each colour) and answer a final question to win. You earn a wedge by answering a question correctly—or by buying it with chips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“How to Win”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once you have collected six wedges (one of each colour), you must wait until your next turn to answer a final question to win. 1. The other players choose the category and the topic from those in the Mixologist envelope without looking at the question. However:  a. Pay 15 points to the bank to choose either the category OR the topic.  b. Pay 30 points to the bank to choose the category AND the topic.  2. All other players place bets (0-10) as on a normal turn.  3. The player to your left reads the question to you. <strong>If you answer correctly</strong>, you win! <strong>If you answer incorrectly</strong>, all players who bet WRONG double their bets and are paid out by the bank. Your turn is now over—try again on your next turn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Rhetorical Elements
Procedural Rhetoric, Logos, Pathos, Ethos, Enthymeme

The *Bet You Know It* edition stands out as version of *Trivial Pursuit* which incorporates procedural rhetoric elements (i.e. options for play) into the main process, as opposed to sub-processes. Players can utilize points to exert control over how questions are chosen, and how much point value is placed onto the final question. Losing and winning therefore doesn’t affect only one player but all of the players, in varying degrees of importance, depending on how much they contributed to the process.

Notably, *Bet You Know It* is a proper version of *Trivial Pursuit*, as opposed to *In Pursuit*, which is a game “from the makers of *Trivial Pursuit.*” Furthermore, *Bet You Know It* is an analog version of the game, unlike CD-ROM and electronic handheld iterations, and it incorporates no outside material a la *Lord of the Rings* or *Disney*. That is, *Bet You Know It* adds player choice onto the foundational process of playing *Trivial Pursuit*. The instructions utilize logos via alphanumeric lists, pathos by tone and emphasis, ethos by applying the standard *Trivial Pursuit* brand, and finally enthymeme through second-person pronouns and player roles.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

At the end of chapter two, I listed research questions that I’d hoped to answer through research. To organize the discussion of my results, I return to those questions now.

**Rhetorical Strategies in Persuasive and Practical Instructions**

*How do Trivial Pursuit instructions fit into a larger context of procedural and rhetorical practices?*

I use “larger context” here to define procedural and rhetorical practices outside of *Trivial Pursuit* instruction sheets. In terms of rhetorical practices, board game instructions find connection with prevalent uses of the appeals and enthymeme. In terms of procedural practices, board game instructions fall into the category of activities for which communicated processes are an absolute necessity.

For example, instructions define the process of playing Tic-Tac-Toe, and the way these instructions are communicated can vary. A player might first encounter the process of Tic-Tac-Toe by listening to someone explain the rules; afterward, the process might be communicated via circumlocution when that player draws an X outside of the grid and
receives a confused look. The process of Tic-Tac-Toe is thus distinguished from
instinctual activities like breathing or running. Certainly there is a wealth of instructional
material for breathing and running alike, but one needn’t internalize arbitrary rules and
instructions before engaging in either of these activities. To recall Bernard Suits: “[Play]
is the voluntary attempt to overcome unnecessary obstacles” (The Grasshopper). The
unnecessary obstacles in Trivial Pursuit are arranged when players voluntarily engage
with the process.

What textual, visual, and procedural rhetorical elements are present? How do
these elements function to influence audience(s)?

The results of my research indicate a combination of logos, pathos, ethos,
entymeme, and procedural rhetoric. Logos appeals were found in both the organization
and content of written instructions. Pathos appeals were present, if subtle, in early
editions of Trivial Pursuit, amounting to the exclamation, “you win!” In later versions,
like In Pursuit, pathos appeals dramatized the process by indicating ruthless participants.

In this way, pathos seemed most effective when used in conjunction with
entymeme and procedural rhetoric, as in the Trivial Pursuit: Lord of the Rings edition.
The instructions communicated a process with a heightened sense of fictional danger,
recognized players as capable participants, and allowed for variations on the game’s
process.

Avoiding Restrictive and Inattentive Processes

Is it evident that social, cultural, and historical factors influence the language
and/or presentation of these instructions? Are intended audiences discernable?
The results of my research indicate that social, cultural, and historical factors have regularly influenced the design of instruction sheets. Whether in the case of licensed editions addressing specific subcultures such as fans of Disney or the NFL, or recent technological advances influences the visual and procedural elements of *Trivial Pursuit*, the instruction sheets illustrate the acknowledgment of sociocultural and historical factors.

Of note is the progression of *Trivial Pursuit* editions aimed at younger audiences. Initially, the *Young Players® Edition* was released in 1984, and introduced much of the same language used in *Trivial Pursuit For Juniors*, released three years later in 1987. When *Trivial Pursuit Young Players® Edition* was released again in 1989, it contained the following copyright note: “Rules © 1984, revised 1989 Horn Abbot Ltd.” A similar note can be found in the *Trivial Pursuit For Kids* edition released in 2004: “© 1987, revised 2004 Horn Abbot Ltd.” These were the only instructions in my data set with stated revisions.

The specifics of such revisions might be identified in the incremental simplification of instructional language. *Young Players®* and *For Juniors* share the standard “Object” description (“To move around a circular track …”), whereas the *For Kids* edition describes the object of the game as follows: “Be the first player to collect a scoring wedge in all six colors and answer a game-winning question at the hub.” This language is further simplified two years later in *Trivial Pursuit DVD for Kids*: “Fill your Wagon Wheel with as many different colored scoring wedges as you can.”

Ultimately, the results show that there is room for deliberately integrating
sociocultural and historical influences into the space of an instruction sheet. While it’s difficult to conclude whether these factors successfully persuade audiences, it is evident that rhetorical strategies help to tailor a process for specific audiences, or even the same audience over the course of twenty-two years. By integrating these strategies at the level of instruction, a process can remain mechanically similar and still be shaped so to make arguments about what it means to be a participant, and what the actions of a participant entail. As the language of an instruction sheet is revised to further meet the expectations of an intended audience, it reveals a space in which audiences can take ownership of the material and engage in self-directed activities. That is, the trappings of a process blend with rhetorical spaces wherein participants understand themselves differently, as capable younger players or expert *Lord of the Rings* fans, and are able to bring those identities into an activity.

**Implications for the Design of Academic Assignment Prompts**

*Are there characteristics of Trivial Pursuit instruction sheets that have been altered or developed over time? How are the Trivial Pursuit instructions communicating the work of a process?*

I find that the results carry two substantial implications for the design of academic assignment prompts. First, replicating a process for novel technology—such as videogames or computer programs—does not imbue the process with inherently persuasive characteristics. As the results show, transitioning *Trivial Pursuit* to different mediums does more to change the process of *interaction* rather than the activity’s process specifically, and while the process of interaction might be more interesting, there is no
clear indication that the game itself has become more rhetorically persuasive.

In the cases of *Trivial Pursuit* on CD-ROM and *Trivial Pursuit NFL Electronic Hand-Held Edition*, instructions for operating technology overshadow instructions for engaging in the *Trivial Pursuit* process. In other words, instructions communicate how to use a CD-ROM rather than how to play *Trivial Pursuit*. In several cases, fundamental portions of the process wouldn’t translate back to other versions of *Trivial Pursuit*. The ruleset of *Genus IV*, for example, doesn’t allow players to tell the game whether they answered a question correctly, to play against computer opponents, or to rename the opposing players.

This is not to say that the digital versions of *Trivial Pursuit* preclude persuasive elements. The CD-ROM version allowed players to create their own questions almost seventeen years before the same option was officially recognized in *Trivial Pursuit Team*. Likewise, the handheld version offered four different game types at a time when analog versions only offered “Variation[s] for a Shorter Game.”

But none of these innovations on the *Trivial Pursuit* process are specific to the opportunities afforded by digital media. Rather, such innovations were made apparent by reconsidering the *Trivial Pursuit* process against the circulation of technological knowledge—the ability to write and rewrite data on a PC or program multiple processes on a handheld device. Translating an activity to a different context, be it a social context or the context of a medium, is not a solve-all but rather an opportunity for reflection.

This perspective is useful for critically assessing recent discussions regarding the role of technology in academic settings. In 2013, the Alliance for Excellent Education
livestreamed an event via YouTube called “Digital Learning Day: Digital Town Hall 2013.” The event was constructed to showcase individual educators and the work being carried out in digital education environments throughout the United States. A common argument throughout the event was that technology made coursework more “engaging.”

Don Hohimer, the principal for Cajon Valley Middle School in California, explained that his faculty and administration are “all about bringing engagement strategies to kids,” noting that it’s “not okay anymore, with today’s learner, to just talk to [kids] about content and expect them to understand and know it” (23:55). Cutting to footage of students in a computer lab, a teacher at Cajon Valley Middle School noted, “It’s so much more meaningful for them to be on computers than to be writing in a journal just for me, or just for themselves. This is keeping them engaged” (24:10).

Empty rhetoric surrounding the value of educational technology does little to explicate so-called “engagement strategies.” Instead, the effect is a privileging of digital activities over analog counterparts. Consider the following truncated transcript of California state representative George Miller:

[W]e have the possibility now with technology to really leverage everybody’s talents, and to leverage the ability of students to engage with their own learning … allowing us to customize and engage [a] student in the learning process. … And the wonderful thing about technology is that it’s not judgmental. Very often we see students engaging in games and operating technology outside of the school room … [W]e see a level of persistence. They’re not told, “You got it wrong, stupid. You got it wrong and you’re humiliated in front of the class.”

We watch them get engaged … in a very intense way, in a very exciting way, where they’re teaching themselves, outside of the school area, in the gaming world. Someone said, “In every classroom there oughta be a scoreboard and a clock,” because, you know, it’s one of the things we’re looking at, is how these children stay engaged. So that’s the federal role, is to bring that opportunity, to
bring those resources, and we have been falling down on that role in this last decade. (33:45-37:10)

As digital versions of *Trivial Pursuit* have shown, technology can certainly provide an opportunity to reconsider how the learning process is constructed, but the popular conversation surrounding that opportunity needs to change. Miller’s retroactive demonizing of in-person learning, as well as a common lack of critical attention to process design and what it means for something to be “engaging,” both serve to characterize educational technology as snake oil at best and an unclear threat to non-digital education at worst. The history of *Trivial Pursuit* provides a sobering alternative—the work of customizing a process for different audiences and media is a matter of trial, error, and constant revision.

Regarding the design of academic assignment prompts, the second implication of my research is that there is a lot of room for shaping and communicating the work of a process. I’ve drawn from surface-level concepts in rhetorical theory, game theory, and play, but there are myriad alternative (and viable) approaches I haven’t accounted for. To conclude, I’ll briefly discuss two composition activities that I’ve redesigned using the theory and methodology discussed in this thesis. The first activity is an adaptation of exercises from Cheryl Glenn and Loretta Gray’s *Harbrace Essentials* textbook. (See figure 7.)

For this revision, I relied heavily on Huizingian concepts of play. Using visual and procedural design, as well as narrative, my goal was to present an activity that felt separate from normal coursework, even if the fundamental coursework was left mostly unchanged.
Specifically, this activity asks students to proofread an excerpt so as to insert or remove commas where necessary. The work is divided between two students who sit at opposite ends of the (11x17) sheet, and the task is contextualized by the narrative of an author and proofreader (i.e. editor) approaching the same piece of writing with different motivations. One student, identifying herself as a "Best-Selling Author" on the depicted business card, is presented with the following instructions: "Your proofreader indulges
the opportunity to re-explain comma usage whenever you’ve foregone revision. Spare yourself the lecture by inserting commas where necessary. There are 6 commas missing in the excerpt to the left. Insert any necessary commas and prepare to explain why each comma is needed.”

The student at the other end of the assignment sheet identifies himself as a “Proofreader” and is presented with the following instructions: “The author claims to have added extra commas ‘just to be safe.’ Great. However, some sentences may not require commas. There are 6 unnecessary commas in the excerpt to the left. Circle a comma to indicate its removal, and prepare to lecture this author on proper comma usage.”

In terms of procedural rhetoric, I attempted to blend the work of a student with the work of accomplished authors and professional editors so that the process doesn’t argue for grammar practice as exclusive to the lived experience of a student. By situating a student across from someone who is simultaneously a classmate and an “author/editor,” this process disrupts the standard conception that grammar exercises are only made salient by instructors. To a lesser extent, narrative is intended to further shape the process by arguing that proficiency with grammar can benefit others as well as oneself.

In the second redesign I focused more on creating sub-processes for a grammar exercise (see fig. 8). The original activity asked students to read through the excerpt and identify dependent clauses, as well as coordinating, correlative, subordinating, and adverbial conjunctions. Working in pairs, students can choose to immediately collaborate on diagramming the excerpt. Alternatively, students can first review types of
conjunctions and clauses by jointly identifying the examples shown on the dark and light gray cards lining the right and bottom borders. (These would be cut out and folded in order to make six double-sided cards.)

Fig. 8. Redesigned Grammar Activity 2. Adapted from Harbrace Essentials (267).

Cards are positioned so that students alternate between who can see the sample sentence (i.e. question) and who can see the corresponding definition (i.e. answer).
Discussing their reasoning for why a sentence might indicate a particular clause or conjunction, students are encouraged to nudge each other in the right direction. My goal is for this added sub-process to equally disperse the work between two students. Additionally, I’ve designed this exercise so that both students have immediate access to partial solutions, but they can only utilize those solutions by effectively tutoring each other on the content. As with the previous exercise, this process argues for the value of grammar beyond student/instructor dynamics.

Finally, yes--it’s easy to overlook the persuasive strategies used in board game instructions. However, with further research on the textual, visual, and procedural elements that comprise a process, we can not only reveal the strategies at play but also utilize them. It is through this work that we can redirect popular conversations on educational processes and productively consider opportunities for revising the design and implementation of academic coursework.
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APPENDIX A – *Trivial Pursuit* Instruction Sheets

The materials in this section have been reproduced by permission from Hasbro, Inc. I acknowledge that Hasbro, Inc. is the sole and exclusive owner of all pertaining to *Trivial Pursuit*.

*Trivial Pursuit All American Edition Master Game* (Front)
answer a question and then re-enter the hub again — by exact count! — for another question.
NOTE: Since a player continues his or her turn until a question is answered incorrectly, it is possible for one player to move around the board and collect all six scoring wedges, then move into the hub and win the game — all on one turn. If this happens, any player who has not yet had a turn is permitted a chance to duplicate the feat and create a tie.

VARIATION FOR A SHORTER GAME
Determine before you begin that you will collect just four or five wedges (instead of the full six) before moving to the hub for the final, game-winning question.

NOTES ON PLAY
• Players will collectively decide how long a person has to answer a question, and how specific the answer must be. For example, is a last name enough, or must the player give both the first and last name? You are not required to give the explanatory information that appears in parentheses after some answers.
• Players should remember that making a guess is always better than not answering at all. Players often amaze themselves with what they know!

• The TRIVIAL PURSUIT® game lends itself well to team play for as many as 24 players. Disperse those considered strong in various categories among the teams. Teammates decide how a question should be answered; to avoid confusion, the team captain should give each answer.
• All TRIVIAL PURSUIT® Master Games may be played with cards from other Master Games, Card Sets, Travel Packs, or Annual Editions. The colored dots on the question-and-answer cards are always arranged in the same order to facilitate interchangeable play.

For more trivia-packed fun, look for these other TRIVIAL PURSUIT® Master Games, Card Sets, and Annual Editions, each sold separately...

FAMILY EDITION
Ages 8 to adult

TV EDITION
Ages teen to adult
Make those happy hours in front of the tube pay off as you test your TV memory in these categories: Classics, Sitcoms, Drama, Kids & Games, Stars, and Wild Card.

YEAR IN REVIEW
Annual Edition
Ages teen to adult
The highlights of the past year are captured in this special format game, in these categories: Personalities, Entertainment, In the News, Around the World, Sports & Leisure, and Wild Card.

TRIVIAL PURSUIT FOR JUNIORS®
Ages 7 to 10
The same fun format with specially-written questions in these subjects: Every Day, Fun, Science, Stories & Songs, Nature, and Games.

Pink........Entertainment Green........Sports & Leisure
Yellow........History Orange........Wild Card

Answer the question correctly, and you win! Answer it incorrectly and you must wait for your next turn, leave the hub.
Trivial Pursuit Bet You Know It (Front)

CONTENTS
1 gameboard • 6 movers • 36 wedges • 68 chips • Mixologist envelope • 1 die • 1,900 fascinating questions on 365 cards

OBJECT OF THE GAME
Be the first player to collect all six wedges (one of each colour) and answer a final question to win. You earn a wedge by answering a question correctly — or by buying it with chips.

GET READY
1. Set out the gameboard, movers, wedges, chips, cards, die and Mixologist envelope.
2. Each player chooses a mover and places it on a matching space on the outer ring of the board. For a group of more than 6 players, you can play in teams.
3. Each player gets 15 points to start (for example, five 5-point chips and two 5-point chips). Keep the extra chips handy in the back — you’ll need them throughout the game.
4. Place four question cards in the Mixologist envelope without looking at the questions or answers. Make sure the topic is visible.
5. Now you’re ready to play! Choose who goes first.
**ON YOUR TURN**

1. Roll the die and move in either direction. If you roll 1, you can move to any space on the board.
2. On a **BUY or ROLL** space, you may either buy a wedge by paying the bank 10 points or roll again. If you buy a wedge, your turn is over.
3. On a **WEDGE** space, answer a question in the category you landed on. Look at the topics on the four cards in the Microlist envelope and choose a card. Do not look at the question.
4. All other players bet whether you will get the question **RIGHT** or **WRONG** by placing 0-10 points on the inner circle that matches the colour of their move.
5. The player to your left reads the question to you.
6. If you answer correctly, you earn the wedge and keep all the chips that were bet on **WRONG**. (If you already have the wedge, you earn 5 points from the bank.) All players who bet **RIGHT** double their bets and are paid out by the bank.
7. If you answer incorrectly, you earn nothing. All players who bet **WRONG** double their bets and are paid out by the bank. All chips placed on **RIGHT** go to the bank.
8. Draw a new card and place it in the Microlist envelope.
9. Now it's the next player's turn.

**HOW TO WIN**

Once you have collected six wedges (one of each colour), you must wait until your next turn to answer a final question to win.

1. The other players choose the category and the topic from those in the Microlist envelope without looking at the question.
2. If you answer correctly, you win.
3. If you answer incorrectly, all players who bet **WRONG** double their bets and are paid out by the bank. Your turn is now over and you go on to your next turn.

**IF YOU RUN OUT OF CHIPS**

On any wedge space you may choose to answer a question for 5 points instead of a wedge.

**CATEGORIES**

- Geography
- Art & Literature
- Entertainment
- Science & Nature
- History
- Sports & Leisure

**Other new TRIVIAL PURSUIT games to check out...**

**TRIVIAL PURSUIT MASTER EDITION 1**

Think you know it all? Trivial Pursuit Master Edition has 3,000 all new questions to show off how smart you are. With the classic way to play and a new timer to keep the pace!

**TRIVIAL PURSUIT STEAL**

The first TRIVIAL PURSUIT card game combines traditional questions and answers with the strategy of stealing your opponent's wedges, all in a quick-play card game.

---

TRIVIAL PURSUIT, the associated logo, the distinctive design of the game board, the wedge, question cards, and the wedge shape are trademarks of Hasbro.

© 1989, 2008 Hasbro. All rights reserved.

Distributed in the United Kingdom by Hasbro UK Ltd., 30/31 Staines Road, Slough, SL1 5NN. Distributed in Australia by Hasbro Australia Limited, 157 Beresford Road, Hornsby, NSW 2174. Distributed in New Zealand by Milton Toy Products, 42 Kaitiaki Street, Auckland 1. Distributed in South Africa by Milton Toy Products, P.O. Box 30092, Newlands 0001. Distributed in Canada by Milton Toy Products, 5975 friesen Way, Mississauga, ON L4W 5C7. Distributed in all USA by Milton Toy Products, 5975 friesen Way, Mississauga, ON L4W 5C7. Distributed in all USA by Milton Toy Products, 5975 friesen Way, Mississauga, ON L4W 5C7.
Trivial Pursuit DVD Pop Culture 2 (Front)

AGES: ADULT

2 to 4 players or teams

OBJECT
To move along the circular track and the spokes correctly answering questions, and to collect colored wedges for correctly answering questions in each of the six category “headquarters” (at the base of each spoke). To win, a player (or team) returns to the hexagonal hub and correctly answers the game-winning question from the DVD.

EQUIPMENT
TRIVIAL PURSUIT® gameboard • 1 DVD • Question-and-answer cards in card storage box • 1 Die • 4 Pop Culture tokens on bases • 24 Scoring wedges

SETUP
• Select one of the Pop Culture tokens and six scoring wedges, one in each of the six category colors.
• Roll the die; the high roller goes first.
• All players start in the hexagonal hub at the center of the board and move down one of the spokes and out onto the circular track. Play moves in either direction around the track, clockwise or counterclockwise.

Place the DVD into your DVD player. After the opening introductions, the DVD will wait for you at the Game Selection Screen. If your DVD player does not automatically start the DVD, press the PLAY button to start the intro. Select a player to be in charge of the remote control during the game. For more information on navigating through the DVD, please refer to The Category Selection Screen section of the rules.

GAME SELECTION
Trivial Pursuit DVD Pop Culture 2 comes with 16 pre-planned games. This means you can play Game 1 through Game 16 and never see the same question twice! The DVD case includes a checklist of all the games so you can keep track of which games you have already played. At the Game Selection Screen select a game you haven’t played and you’ll be off and running.

IMPORTANT: These games are represented by various icons. These icons do not reflect the subjects of the questions within the games.

After you select a game, the DVD will wait at the Category Selection Screen.

GAMEPLAY
First Turn
On your first turn, roll the die and select which color/category you want to land on and which of the six spokes you’ll move down. If you roll a 6, you will immediately land on a category headquarters and try for a scoring wedge of that color.

Whichever color you land on, another player will ask you a question in that category: that player draws the first card from the card box and reads the question next to the appropriate colored oval. Answers are on the opposite side of each card. When you are done with the question, place the card in the back of the box, behind the other cards.

If you answer your first question correctly, continue your turn by rolling the die again and moving that many spaces. Keep moving and answering questions until you answer incorrectly. Play then passes to the left.

The categories are color coded:

- Blue.......... TV
- Purple......... Music
- Pink.......... Fangs
- Green......... Movies
- Yellow......... Buzz
- Orange......... Sports and Games

NOTES:
• On each roll of the die, you may select which direction you want to move along the track as you attempt to move towards category headquarters to try for scoring wedges in each of the six colors.
• You may not move both clockwise and counterclockwise on the track for on a spoke in the same move.
• You must move the number of spaces shown on the die.
• Any number of tokens may occupy the same space at the same time.

Roll Again
If you land on a “roll again” space, roll and move again.

Moving Through the Hub
You may cut across the board by moving your token up the spokes to the center hub and out again, moving either straight across the hub, or “turning” and going down another spoke.

If you land by exact count right in the hub — but can’t try to win the game because you do not yet have the wedges in all six categories — you may pick whichever category you want for your question.

Headquarter (HQ) Spaces for the scoring wedge
If you land on an HQ space, you are going for a scoring wedge. Instead of drawing a card from the box and reading a question, you will go to the DVD to select your question.

The Category Selection Screen
This menu screen will display the six categories from which you can select a question (there is also a FOR THE WIN category for the end of the game). To scroll through the categories, use the UP and DOWN arrow buttons on your remote control. Once you reach your category, press the ENTER button to reveal the question.

NOTE: If at any time you discover you’ve selected a game you’ve already played, press the MENU button. This will take you back to the Category Selection Screen, where there will be a small blue orb at the bottom. Select this orb and you will be directed back to the Game Selection Menu.
On the DVD there are hundreds of questions and lots of ways to ask them. You may see a clip from a movie, or you may hear part of a song. There may be an image of an actor or a picture that has been scrambled.

At the start of the question, it is for you and you alone to answer. It's your turn, however, you only get ONE GUESS. Once you answer, you are done for the remainder of the question. At some point during the question, you will hear a sound effect and then the phrase ALL PLAY will come up on the screen. At this point everyone who does not have that colored scoring wedge may shout out the answer. Just like you, they only get one guess. If you still have not guessed, you may guess also.

A few seconds after ALL PLAY appears, the correct answer is revealed. The first player to have guessed the correct answer wins the scoring wedge.

If someone who already has that colored scoring wedge shouts out the correct answer, they must forfeit that scoring wedge as a penalty.

If you are not sure who shouted out the correct answer first, the player whose turn it is gets the scoring wedge (unless that player didn’t answer at all — then the player with the fewest number of scoring wedges gets the wedge).

If it was your turn and you got a scoring wedge, then you can continue taking your turn. But, if it was your turn and you did not get the scoring wedge, your turn is over and the player to your left goes next.

On your next turn you must move out of that category headquarters to a new space before re-entering and trying again for that colored wedge. You do not have to try that category immediately; you may move elsewhere on the board and return to it later.

Headquarters (HQ) Spaces (not for a scoring wedge)
If you land on an HQ space, and already have that category’s wedge, do NOT go to the DVD. Instead, draw a card from the card box and answer a card question from that category.

WINNING THE GAME
Once you’ve collected one scoring wedge in each color, make your way to the hub and try to answer the game-winning question. You must land in the hub by exact counts if you overshoot the hub, pick the spot you want to move down and answer the question in the category you land on; then, on your next move, try again to hit the hub by exact count.

When you do hit the hub, go to the DVD’s Category Selection Screen and select “FOR THE WIN.” You will get a question from a random category that is for you only. The question will appear on the screen. Once you have answered the question, press the ENTER button and the correct answer will appear.

• If you got the answer right, navigate to the “GOED IT” prompt and press ENTER again to celebrate your victory!

• If you answered the question incorrectly, navigate to the “MISSED IT” prompt and press ENTER. You will automatically return to the Category Selection Screen. You must wait until your next turn, leave the hub, answer a question and then re-enter the hub again — by exact count — for another game-winning question.

NOTES:
• If you would like to bypass the credits at the end of the DVD, press the MENU button to return to the Game Selection Screen and start a new game.
• If the DVD is ejected and remounted, it will automatically restart the game.
• Since a player continues his or her turn until a question is answered correctly, it is possible for one player to move around the board and collect all six scoring wedges, then move into the hub and win the game — all in one turn. If this happens, any player who has not yet had a turn is permitted a chance to duplicate the feat and create a tie.

VARIATION FOR A SHORTER GAME
Determine before you begin that you will collect just four or five wedges (instead of the full six) before moving to the hub for the final, game-winning question.

NOTES ON PLAY
• Players will collectively decide how much time a person has to answer a card question, and how specific the answer must be. For example, it is not usually enough, to must the player give both the first and last name. You are not required to give the explanatory information that appears in parentheses after some answers.
• Players should remember that making a guess is always better than not answering at all. Players often amuse themselves with what they know.

Trivial Pursuit® DVD Pop Culture TM 2 lends itself well to teen play for as many as 16 players. Dispose those considered strong in various categories among the teams. Teammates decide how a question should be answered, to avoid confusion, the team captain should guide each answer.

Trivial Pursuit® DVD Pop Culture™ 2 has been designed and engineered to be compatible with as many DVD players as possible. However, as with any software product, it is not always possible to connect a disc that will work with every DVD player.

Should you experience any technical difficulties, we recommend you first clean the disc by wiping it with a soft cloth in straight lines from the center of the disc. If the problem persists when you have re-inserted the disc into your DVD player, please call Hasbro Consumer Affairs at 1-888-836-7025 (toll free) for additional assistance. You may also visit our website at HASBRO.COM for contact information.

We will be happy to hear your questions or comments about the game. US consumers please write to Hasbro Games, Consumer Affairs Department, PO Box 205, Pawtucket, RI 02862 or call 1-800-652-6333 (outside the USA, call 1-508-725-6225). Canadian consumers please write to Hasbro Canada Corporation, 1250 Aspers Avenue, Unit 10, Mississauga, Ontario L5L 1L2. Hasbro Games, Inc. 1993, 1999. Hasbro Games, Inc. Hasbro, and all other trademarks are trademarks of Hasbro, Inc., unless otherwise noted. All Rights Reserved.

© 1999 Hasbro International Limited. All rights reserved. Printed in Hong Kong. Published by Hasbro, Inc., 1999, 06/99 Hasbro Games, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
Trivial Pursuit DVD for Kids

AGES 6-12

For 2 to 6 Players

How do I win?

What you get:
Gameboard • DVD • 6 Wagon Wheels • 36 scoring wedges

What you do:
Fill up your Wagon Wheel with as many different colored scoring wedges as you can.

How it works:
Place the gameboard on the table within reach of all players. You're not going to actually move around the gameboard, instead you're going to use the card to vote during challenges (see right). Every player should have his/her own section of the gameboard to vote on.

Now, each player takes a Wagon Wheel and places it in front of him/her. Insert the DVD into your DVD player and select an episode. The answers within the

episode are the same every time you play, so once you've completed an episode, you'll want to move on to another. Each episode is harder than the one before it.

NOTE: To watch the episodes without quizzes and challenges, tune the Game Show/Challenges Off at the Main Menu Screen.

Each episode features questions and challenges. During a question, each player can yell out one answer. The first player to yell out the correct answer wins the question and gets to place the matching wedge of the correct color in the Wagon Wheel. If you win a wedge of a color that you don't have yet, take one and put it in your Wagon Wheel. If you win a wedge of a color that you already have, take one and place it in front of you. These "extra wedges" will count at the end of the episode if there is a tie, OR you can put them into your Wagon Wheel to replace ones you might have lost along the way.

Should you receive any technical difficulties, we recommend that you first check the troubleshooting section of this guide. If you still encounter problems, please call Hasbro Consumer Affairs at 1-800-338-8940 for further assistance.
**OBJECT**
To move along the circular track and the spokes correctly answering questions and to collect colored wedges for correctly answering questions in each of the six category "headquarters" (at the base of each spoke). To win, a player (or team) returns to the hexagonal hub and correctly answers the game-winning question in a category chosen by the other players.

**EQUIPMENT**
Trivial Pursuit® game board • Creation-and-answer cards in 2 card storage boxes • 1 die • 6 tokens • 36 scoring wedges

**SETUP**
Select one token and six scoring wedges, one in each of the six category colors.
Roll the die, the high roller goes first.
All players start in the hexagonal hub at the center of the board and move down one of the spokes and out onto the circular track. Play moves in either direction around the track, clockwise or counter-clockwise.

**GAME PLAY**
First turn:
On your first turn, roll the die and select which color/category you want to land on and which of the six spokes you'll move down. If you roll a 6, you will immediately land on a category headquarters and try for a scoring wedge of that color.
Whenever you land on, another player will ask you a question in that category.
The other player draws the first card from either box and reads the question next to the appropriate colored oval. Answers are on the opposite side of each card. When done with the question, place the card in the back of its box, behind the other cards.

If you answer your first question correctly, continue your turn by rolling the die again and moving that number of spaces.

The categories are color coded...
Blue: People & Places
Brown: Science & Nature
Pink: Arts & Entertainment
Green: Sports & Leisure
Yellow: History
Orange: Wild Card

**NOTES:**
- On each roll of the die, you may select which die you want to move along the track at your attempt to move towards the category headquarters to try for scoring wedges in each of the six colors.
- You may not move both forward and back on the track (or on a spoke) in the same move.
- You must move the number of spaces shown on the die.
- If you answer incorrectly pay points to the player on your left.
Subsequent turns:
Whenever you answer a category headquarters question correctly, put that colored wedge into your token. But if you answer incorrectly, on your next turn you must move one of that category headquarters for a question before re-entering and trying again for that color piece. You do not have to try that same category immediately: you may move elsewhere on the board and return to it later.

There are 12 "Roll again" spaces on the track. If you land on one, continue your turn by rolling the die and moving again.

NOTE: Any number of tokens may occupy the same space at the same time.

Moving through the Hub:
You may cut across the board by moving your token up the spokes to the central hub and out again, moving either straight across the hub, or "hopping" and going down another spoke.

If you land by exact count right in the hub—but can't try to win the game because you do not yet have color wedges in all six colors—you may pick whatever category you want for your question.

WINNING THE GAME

Once you've collected one scoring wedge in each color, make your way to the hub and try to answer the game-winning question. You must land on the hub by exact count; if you over- or undercount the hub, pick the spoke you want to move down and answer the question in the category you land on then, on your next move, try again to hit the hub by exact count.

When you do hit the hub, the other players select the category of the game-winning question from the next card in the box.

Answer the question correctly, and you win! Answer it incorrectly and you must wait for your next turn, leave the hub,
answer a question and then re-enter the hub again—by exact count—for another question.

NOTE: Since a player continues his or her turn until a question is answered incorrectly, it is possible for one player to move around the board and collect all six scoring wedges, then move into the hub and win the game—all on one turn. If this happens, any player who has not yet had a turn is granted a chance to duplicate the feat and create a tie.

VARIATION FOR A SHORTER GAME

Determine before you begin that you will collect just four or five wedges (instead of the full six) before moving to the hub for the final, game-winning question.

NOTES ON PLAY

• Players will collectively decide how long a person has to answer a question, and how specific the answer must be. For example, is the last name enough, or must the player give both the first and last name? You are not required to give the explanatory information that appears in parentheses after some answers.

• Players should remember that making a guess is always better than not answering at all. Players often amuse themselves with what they know!

• The TRIVIAL PURSUIT® game lends itself well to team play; for as many as 24 players. Divide those considered strong in various categories among the teams. Teammates decide how a question should be answered; to avoid confusion, the team captain should give each answer.

• All TRIVIAL PURSUIT® games may be played with cards from other editions. The colored ovular on the question-and-answer cards are always arranged in the same order to facilitate interchangeable play.

We will be happy to hear your questions or comments about the game.

Write to: Consumer Relations, Parker Brothers, P.O. Box 1012, Beverly, MA 01915, or phone 800-851-8500.
RULES OF PLAY
For 2 to 4 players or teams/ADULTS

OBJECT
To move along the circular track and the spokes correctly answering questions, and to collect colored wedges for correctly answering questions in each of the six category "headquarters" (at the base of each spoke). To win, a player (or team) returns to the hexagonal hub and correctly answers the game-winning question in a category chosen by the other players.

EQUIPMENT
TRIVIAL PURSUIT® The Lord of the Rings™ gameboard • Question-and-answer cards in card storage box • 1 Die • 4 Pewter Character Tokens on Hex Bases • 50 Scoring Wedges • 1 Goldstone Ring • 1 Ringwraith™ Pawn

SETUP
• Select one token and six scoring wedges, one in each of the six category colors.
• Roll the die; the high roller goes first. All players start in the hexagonal hub at the center of the board and move down one of the spokes and out onto the circular track. Play moves in either direction around the track, clockwise or counter-clockwise.

GAME PLAY
First turn:
On your first turn, roll the die and select which color/category you want to land on and which of the six spokes you'll move down. If you roll a 6, you will immediately land on a category headquarters and try for a scoring wedge of that color. Whichever color you land on, another player will ask you a question in that category. The other player draws the first card from the box and reads the question next to the appropriate colored oval. Answers are on the opposite side of each card. When done with the question, place the card back in the box, behind the other cards. If you answer your first question correctly, continue your turn by rolling the die again and moving that number of spaces.

THE CATEGORIES ARE COLOR CODED...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Good Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Evil Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Place &amp; History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Making Movies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
• On each roll of the die, you may select which direction you want to move along the track as you attempt to move towards category headquarters to try for scoring wedges in each of the six colors.
• You cannot move both forward and back on the track (or on a spoke) in the same move.
• You must move the number of spaces shown on the die.
• If you answer incorrectly, play passes to the player on your left.

Subsequent Turns:
Whenever you answer a category headquarters question correctly, put that colored wedge into your token. But if you answer incorrectly, on your next turn you must move out of that category headquarters for a question before re-entering and trying again for that color piece. You do not have to try that same category immediately; you may move elsewhere on the board and return to it later.

There are 12 "Roll Again" spaces on the track. If you land on one, continue your turn by rolling the die and moving again.

NOTE: Any number of tokens may occupy the same space at the same time.

MOVING THROUGH THE HUB:
You may cut across the board by moving your token up the spokes to the center hub and out again, moving either straight across the hub, or "turning" and going down another spoke. If you land by exact count right in the hub, but can't try the game because you do not yet have color wedges in all six colors, you may pick whichever category you want for your question.

WINNING THE GAME
Once you've collected one scoring wedge in each color, make your way to the hub and try to answer the game-winning question. You must land in the hub by exact count; if you overshoot the hub, pick the spoke you want to move down and answer the question in that category. You land on then, on your next move, try again to hit the hub by exact count. When you do hit the hub, the other players select the category of the game-winning question from the next card in the box. Answer the question correctly, and you win! Answer it incorrectly and you must wait for your next turn, leave the hub, answer a question and then re-enter the hub again—by exact count—for another question.

NOTE: Since a player continues his or her turn until a question is
answered incorrectly, it is possible for one player to move around the
board and collect all six scoring wedges, then move into the hub and
win the game—all on one turn. If this happens, any player who has
not yet had a turn is permitted a chance to duplicate the feat and
come back.

VARIATION FOR A SHORTER GAME
Determine before you begin that you will collect just four or five
wedges instead of the full six before moving to the hub for the
final, game-winning question.

NOTES ON PLAY

- Players will collectively decide how long a person has to answer a
  question, and how specific the answer must be. For example, is a
  last name enough, or must the player give both the first and last
  name? You are not required to give the explantory information that
  appears in parentheses after some answers.
- Players should remember that making a guess is always better than
  not answering at all. Players often amuse themselves with what
  they know!
- The Trivial Pursuit game lends itself well to team play for as
  many as 10 players. Dispense those considered strong in various
  categories among the teams. Teammates decide how a question
  should be answered, to avoid confusion, the team captain should
give each answer.

EXPERT FAN RULES
These rules are for players who have a high level of familiarity with
the 3 films and the works on which they are based. These rules will
provide a challenging game where evil can consume you and it is a
race to the finish!

THE ONE RING
The One Ring starts in possession of no one.
When a player gets a scoring wedge, he or she gets The One Ring.
The One Ring is always in possession of the last player to get a
scoring wedge. If you answer a question on a scoring wedge space—
but already have the wedge, you still gain possession of The One
Ring. You now become the ring bearer.

USING THE ONE RING
If you have The One Ring in your possession, you may use it when
you get a question you don’t want to answer. In this case, you get
a new question. If you answer the question correctly, your turn
continues as normal. If you answer the question incorrectly, you
lose a scoring wedge (of your choice). If you do not have any
scoring wedges see “Losing Scoring Wedges” below. You may only
use The One Ring once per turn.

RINGWRATH™
The Ringwraiths start in the center of the board. Once The One
Ring is owned by a player, the Ringwraith will start to move. After
each player ends his or her turn (by getting a question wrong), roll the die.
The Ringwraith will move that many spaces (ignoring the Roll Again
spaced) towards the ring bearer, stopping on the ring bearer space if
it gets there (but passing through other players). Once on the outer
track, the Ringwraith will NOT enter a spoke again but will stay on
the outer track for the remainder of the game.

If the Ringwraith ends its move on a space with any player, that
player loses a scoring wedge. If there is more than one player on
a space, the Ringwraith takes a scoring wedge from the player who
has the most pieces. If there is a tie, the players whose turn just
ended choose.

If the Ringwraith is on the ring bearer space, it stays until The One
Ring moves but does NOT take a scoring wedge.

If a player moves onto the space with the Ringwraith and ends his
or her turn (by answering a question incorrectly) there, he or she
loses a scoring wedge. If he or she answers correctly, they move off
the space with no penalty.

LOSE SCORING WEDGES
If a player is supposed to lose a scoring wedge and has none, that
player is consumed and is out of the game.

WINNING THE GAME
To win, you must have all 6 scoring wedges. The One Ring and
answer a question correctly in the center space (Mount Doom). If
you do not have the One Ring you must go to a scoring wedge space
and answer a question correctly to get The One Ring. (You still get
The One Ring even if you have all of the scoring wedges).
Rules of Play

For 4 to 8 players in teams / Adults

Contents

- Gameboard
- Drawing Cup
- 1 Red Leader Totem
- 1 Blue Leader Totem
- 3 Red Follower Totems
- 3 Blue Follower Totems
- 1 Red Mover
- 1 Blue Mover
- 2 Dice
- Labels
- 400 Question/Answer Cards

The cards and 1 die are color-coded by category. The categories and colors are listed below.

Blue: Who or Where - WW
Pink: Pop Culture - PC
Yellow: Headlines - HL
Brown: Science & Technology - ST
Green: Sports & Games - SG
Orange: Wild Card - WC

Game Assembly

Apply the category labels to one of the dice and the symbol labels to the other, as shown here.

Object of the Game

In Pursuit ™ is a new twist on classic trivia game play. It is played by individuals who must do whatever it takes to achieve a lone victory... do not be fooled by the team atmosphere. To win, you must be the first leader in the Finish space to answer a question correctly. Plan ahead to ensure that you are on the right team and in the right position (leader) when your team enters Finish.

Team Breakdown

In Pursuit has two teams, the Red and the Blue team, competing to get ahead on the gameboard. Each team always has one "leader" and at least one "follower". The team members can change at any time and players should keep in mind throughout the game that only one person is the winner.

Game Setup

1. Load the Drawing Cup with the two tall leader totems and as many short follower totems as necessary so that the total number of totems equals the number of players. (If there are 5 or 7 players, split up the red and blue totems as evenly as possible.)
2. Place the cup in the center of the gameboard and give it a spin.
3. Each player draws a totem and places it in front of them to identify whether they are a "leader" or a "follower" of the blue or red team.
4. Once all totems have been drawn remove the cup from the gameboard and place it out of play.
5. Take the cardbox and place it where everyone can reach it.
6. Place both team movers on the Start space.
Game Play
The leader of the red team starts and play continues to the left (in order of seating). A turn consists of rolling both dice and asking another player (or team) a question from a card. Sometimes this will result in players overthrowing their leader or even switching teams (see “Jump Ship” rule below).

On Your Turn
Roll both dice. You now have a choice of two actions. You may EITHER ask a Team Challenge OR perform the action on the Option Die (Jump Ship or Overthrow).

TEAM CHALLENGE—Ask the opposing team a question.
1. Draw a card and find the question that matches the category die.
2. Ask the question to the opposing team.
3. All members of the team can talk about possible answers, although the team’s leader decides on the final answer.
   • If the team answers correctly, they move ahead one space.
   • If the team answers incorrectly, the opposing team moves ahead one space.

Jump Ship—Attempt to switch teams with someone from the opposing team.
1. Draw a card and find the question that matches the category die.
2. The leader of the opposing team chooses a member of his/her team to answer. The leader may choose him/herself.
3. Ask the question to the opposing team member.
   • If that person answers correctly, his/her team moves ahead one space, and the teams remain the same.
   • If that person answers incorrectly, your team first moves ahead one space. Then you and the person who answered incorrectly switch teams (simply by exchanging tokens).

Overthrow—Challenge your leader to become the new leader of your team.
1. Draw a card and find the question that matches the category die.
2. Ask the leader of your team the question.
   • If your leader answers correctly, your team moves ahead one space.
   • If your leader answers incorrectly, the other team moves ahead one space. Become the new leader by exchanging tokens with your old leader.

Reaching the Finish Space
Once a team is in the Finish space, the following rules apply:
If you are a follower, attempt to Overthrow your leader. Do not roll the dice. You pick the category and ask the question.
   • If the leader answers correctly, he or she immediately wins the game.
   • If the leader answers incorrectly, the other team moves ahead one space, if possible. You become the new leader. Exchange tokens with your old leader.

If you are the leader, on your turn, you get to answer a question in the category of your choice asked by the leader of the other team. If you get it right, you automatically win. If not, the other team moves forward a space, if possible.

If your team is not in the Finish Space, follow regular game play rules.

Winning the Game
The first leader in the Finish Space who answers a question correctly wins the game.

www.hasbro.com
We will be happy to hear your questions or comments about this game. Write to Hasbro Games, Consumer Affairs Department, P.O. Box 200, Pawtucket, R.I. 02862. Tel: 800-333-8500. Canadian consumers please write to Hasbro Canada, P.O. Box 267, Station A, Longueuil, Quebec J4A 3N6.
Trivial Pursuit Team (Front)

Object of the Game
Move the farthest along the path by earning points for answering questions correctly.

Get Ready
1. Set out the gameboard and place the two movers on the START space.
2. Choose a deck of cards and unwrap it. Be sure NOT to shuffle the cards — it's important that they stay in order. Remove the rules card (the top one) and the scorecard (the bottom one) and place them on the table for reference. Place the cards face down in the card holder.
3. Divide up into two teams.

Round One
1. Draw the first card and read it aloud. It contains the rules for Round One.
2. Draw the next six cards and place them face down on the table.
3. The team going first selects a card from the table and the opposing team reads it to them.
4. If your team is successful, move ahead the number of points you earned.
5. Place the card in a discard pile.
6. Now it's the next team's turn.

Repeat for Rounds Two through Four until the card holder is empty.
**Trivial Pursuit Team (Back)**

### The Packs
There are 12 card packs in the game; each one a complete game. These general knowledge packs are comprised of 30 cards: a rules card, a scorecard, 4 cards that divide play into rounds and 24 question cards. The team that is furthest along the path after the last question in Round four is played in the science.

### The Questions
Each card contains one of six types of questions:

- **Multiple Choice**
  - Choose the correct answer from the four possibilities provided.
  - **SCORING:**
    - Get answer on first try: 6 points
    - Second try: 3 points
    - Third try: 1 point

- **Are You the Expert?**
  - Given the category on the back of the card, is one player on your team the expert? If so, let that player go for it by answering the question solo.
  - **SCORING:**
    - Solo answer: 6 points
    - Team answer: 3 points

- **Reference Point**
  - Given the connection, answer three questions that share it.
  - **SCORING:**
    - Each answer: 2 points

- **Name 6**
  - Name 6 things from the given category. You only get six guesses, but you don’t lose points for incorrect answers.
  - **SCORING:**
    - Each answer: 1 point

- **More or Less**
  - Choose to answer either an easy or hard question.
  - **SCORING:**
    - Hard: 6 points
    - Easy: 3 points

- **True or False**
  - Given five questions; decide whether or not the answer is true or false. Each time you answer correctly, you can choose to either stop and keep your points or risk your points by answering another question. If you miss a question, you lose all of your points for this turn, and the turn is over.
  - **SCORING:**
    - Each answer: 1 point

### Rounds
There are four Round Cards per game; these determine which team starts play for the upcoming round and may even offer a chance to earn extra points.

### Questions
Each question falls into one of the 6 classic Trivial Pursuit categories: People & Places, Entertainment, History, Arts & Literature, Science & Nature, and Sports & Leisure. Each card also has a subcategory which is based on the subject matter of the question itself. There are 24 questions in each game (6 in each round), but they aren’t just standard Q&A. In Trivial Pursuit Team, there are 6 styles of questions to answer and different ways to score points as well.

### How to Win
The team that is furthest along the path after the final card is played wins.

### Play on the Go
You can also play Trivial Pursuit Team onto a TV when you are out and about. Load up one deck of cards onto the TV and join in on the fun. You can even make your own cards to take with you.

### Make Your Own Cards
You’ll find 30 blank cards in the game. Use them to create your very own questions—stump your friends, challenge your family—make the game your own!
If you had to describe sound, would you call it a wave? Although sound cannot be seen, people have described it this way, for a long time. In fact, the Greek philosopher Aristotle believed that sound traveling through air was like waves in the sea. Envisioning waves in the air, he hypothesized that sound would not be able to pass through a vacuum because there would be no air to transmit it. Aristotle's hypothesis, was not tested until nearly two thousand years later. In 1654, Otto von Guericke, found that he could not hear a bell ringing inside the vacuum he had created. Thus Guericke established the necessity of air for sound transmission. However, although most sound reaches us through the air, it travels faster, through liquids and solids.
Redesigned grammar exercise from *Harbrace Essentials* section 17e, page 267.

**Exercise 17.4**

If you live by the sword, you might die by the sword. However, if you make your living by swallowing swords, you will not necessarily die by swallowing swords. At least, this is the conclusion Brian Witcombe and Dan Meyer reached after they surveyed forty-six professional sword swallowers. (Brian Witcombe is a radiologist, and Dan Meyer is a famous sword swallower.) Some of those surveyed mentioned that they had experienced either "sword throats" or chest pains, and others who let their swords drop to their stomachs described perforation of their inards, but the researchers could find no listing of a sword-swallowing mortality in the medical studies they reviewed. The researchers did not inquire into the reasons for swallowing swords in the first place.

**Coordinating**

- When you are not sure which one is the main idea, you may use "and" or "but."