NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. According to Parks, the arguments that created a more conservative view of writing teacher were successful in part because “they cast ‘60s teachers’ as naive” (217). As I will illustrate in chapter three, similar arguments are used by people who cast process teachers as naive in their attempts to position “post-process” theory as the best ground for contemporary composition studies.

2. Parks uses Donald Murray’s “Finding Your Own Voice: Teaching Composition in the Age of Dissent,” and his “Teach Writing as Process Not Product” among others to show how Murray’s arguments repress what the student writing of the Free Speech Movement illustrates students do know about political discourse so that a picture of the student as a depoliticized subject can emerge as central to the teaching of writing. Parks explains:

Having ignored the actual political content of the first Free Speech Movement, and given the perceived lack of “legitimate” political discussion occurring, Murray (1969) argues that students need to learn what free speech and political speech imply. (Any sampling of the actual extended documents produced by the Free Speech Movement would have demonstrated a knowledge of legitimate political discussion by the participants). (79)

This allows Murray, and others, to position teaching students the correct, “legitimate” way to write political discourse as something that must precede their engagement in political discourse, and discourse about political issues more generally.

When combined with Murray’s skewed picture of the student power movement as resting upon “rhetoric that is crude, vigorous, usually uninformed, frequently obscene, and often threatening,” an agenda for the writing classroom emerges; the teacher must fight this rhetoric with workshops on “civic
responsibility” that begin from the false assumption that student power comes from and will assume such “crude” discursive practices unless it is contained by the lessons about free speech and political speech that students are taught in the writing classroom (79). Parks goes on to illustrate the ways that this approach to the teaching of writing and the assumptions upon which it rests must construct students as individuals with their own voices whose individuality and power are obstructed—rather than enriched—by their lives as members of communities with shared language patterns and practices. Ultimately, Parks argues, in approaches based upon these assumptions, “the writing classroom becomes the cutting edge of activism by teachers” (85). For students in this scenario “politics becomes personal liberation, not the dynamics of group organization toward a political goal” (86). Organization toward goals—and the definition of goals themselves—are the business of teachers.

3. The details of North’s proposal can be found in his book.
4. This book is written using many of the invention, arrangement, and revision concepts and strategies developed from the same approach to engaging process discussed in chapter three.

CHAPTER ONE

5. For an approach that suggests that we begin classes by asking students about their ideas concerning what good writing is, see Ira Shor’s Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change.

6. I explore the suppression of our experiences in writing classrooms at length in “I Was a Process-Model Baby.”

7. We have, I think, been better at addressing writing in the discipline issues outside of our profession than within our profession.

8. See “Reconfiguring the Grounds of/for Composition: Alternative Routes to Subjectivity in the Work of James A. Berlin.”

9. For an early extended discussion of the ways that first-year writing has been constructed to favor mastery see chapters 5, 6, and 7 in Richard Ohmann’s English in America: A Radical View of the Profession.” For a different, but equally compelling view of the ways that modernism challenged the mastery narrative surrounding literacy see Raymond Williams “Writing in Society.”
10. For an extended discussion of the ways that selecting and reading texts that start from very different assumptions about rhetorical matters than those informing first-phase process models, see Jacqueline Jones Royster’s “Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African American Women.”

11. Travis is a computer science major and a writing minor; he will graduate in the spring of 2004.

12. Starting next year the students in my Critical Writing, Reading and Researching I classes will engage in the kind of analysis the student consultants helped me develop here. Student consultants included: Linda Osborne is a forty-five year old English Literature major who has long-standing interests in class issues and in lesbian theory, fiction, and practices. She describes herself as a radical lesbian socialist feminist. I first met her when her advisor suggested that she talk with me about ways to understand the codes of higher education at work in her new environment when she transferred to Millikin after finishing her Associates Degree at the local community college; she graduated with her Bachelor’s degree in May of 2003. Jennifer Eason is a traditional age student whose primary interest has been creative writing. Although not an English Education major, she was a teaching assistant in a first semester Critical Writing, Reading and Research (IN 150) course in the fall of 2002 (many of our students who are considering going to graduate school spend a semester working with a professor of that course). Jennifer graduated in 2003. Kathy Klemesrud has been both a political science major and an English major. She is a currently a political science major with a writing minor, and will graduate in May of 2004. Kathy is interested in drama, as a playwright, as a theorist, and as a rhetorician; she is also interested in entertainment law. Meg Schleppenbach is an English Education major who has also been a teaching assistant in IN 150. She will attend graduate school in an Education department next year. Her primary interests concern secondary education in America, especially the ways that that system fails large portions of our population and how we might go about making real improvements. Nicole Cassidy is a junior English Writing major with a Spanish minor; she is interested in English as a Second Language and is planning a
career in that field. As I write, she is in the Dominican Republic for a semester abroad. Carrie Owens is an English Secondary Education major who is interested in beginning her career as a high school teacher upon graduating in spring of 2003; she has been a teaching assistant in IN 150. I met with these students in two groups on subsequent days to accommodate their schedules. Carrie, Meg, Kathy, Travis and I met together on the first day; Linda, Jennifer, Travis and I met together on the second day. Both sessions were taped and subsequently transcribed by my generous colleague, Dianne Devore, who teaches one of the GED classes that my students and I tutor in each year.

13. See Murray’s “Writing as Process: How Writing Finds Its Own Meaning.” Early in the essay, Murray states: “The process of making meaning with written language can not be understood by looking backward from a finished page” (3). This assertion is questionable on a number of levels. Most important are the questions that arise when the reader of that page is the writer of that page and questions regarding the restrictive notions of analysis implied about reading here. In the first case, the writer is blocked from entering disciplinary discussions about process; in the second case, reading is clearly not analytic or critical. As I explained in my introduction, Murray’s assertions rest on a particular notion of the student as being in need of freedom from others ideas, discourses, etc.

14. Krista Ratcliffe’s work about rhetorical listening promises to add much to our conversations about how to deal with these issues in the classroom.

15. As Royster Notes in *Traces of a Stream*, rhetorical action does not take adaptation as its primary goal.

To focus on the kaleidoscope related to rhetorical action, African American women transform the world they perceive into the worlds they desire through the use of language. In the space between the perceived world and the desired worlds is a hermeneutic problem space, in which there are opportunities for individual writers to use language in a variety of literate acts: making problems visible, clarifying and amplifying imperatives; establishing more useful terministic screens or interpretive lenses; maintaining a sense of mutual interest or common ground;
negotiating and mediating differences. All these literate acts can be categorized as participating variously in the creation of a consubstantial space for the conversion or subversion of interests, for the affirmation of new horizons, and for the facilitation of change in attitude, behavior, or belief. (70–71)

CHAPTER TWO

16. By 1994, of course, theory and theorizing were being positioned more generally as the new center of English studies. Even a cursory look at the scholarship of rhetoric and composition from that period will illustrate how much of that same theory was also being favored by literary studies.

17. More recently, of course, theory is positioned by some as not only a corrective, but also as the thing we lost as the profession became focused on process and more inclusive practices, and as the loss that has squelched the intellectual existence of composition studies and those who teach it. In “Reclaiming Our Theoretical Heritage: A Big Fish Tale,” for example, Jasper Neel states: “By 1950, we had lost our theory of being, and then we lost both our cultural justification and our reason for being” (10). In an essay with no references to the feminist theory of the time, to the theoretical work behind the process movement of the time, in fact, no citations from any texts by women as far as I can tell, Neel asserts the loss of theory. The alternative theories of the fifties, for example feminism and the theories informing and emerging from the civil rights movement, are ignored here as challenges to the “theory of being” and the methods of theorizing about “being” Neel reengages in his essay. Ultimately, then, the question is who is the “we” Neel refers to here as losing their theory of being, cultural justification, and reason for being?

18. I realize that this is not the usual profile of first-year writing teachers. See Helmers 139–148 and Miller “Feminization” for other discussions of the image of the theoretically challenged first-year writing teacher.

19. This alternative story is not so much a fiction as a repressed narrative.
CHAPTER THREE

20. We read the chapter about advanced placement courses from Richard Ohmann’s *English in America* at the point at which these issues arise in the classroom.

21. This is true no matter what kind of first-year writing class I am teaching, honors classes, “regular” sections of the course, or classes for under-prepared students.

22. I have taught basic writing courses in the university very infrequently as my current institution has not historically had separate classes for students who need more individual help, choosing instead to attach a one-hour individual tutoring session to students’ schedules as necessary.

23. For extended discussions of the ways that arrangement has been conflated to matters of textual form, see Berlin, Crowley, and Jarrett.

24. Ellen Cushman makes a similar observation in “The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change” where she states:

   I am not asking for composition teachers to march into homes, churches, community centers, and schools of their communities. I’m not asking for us to become social workers either. I am asking for a deeper consideration of the civic purpose of our positions in the academy, of what we do with our knowledge, for whom, and by what means. I am asking for a shift in our critical focus away from our own navels, Madonna, and cereal boxes to the ways in which we can begin to locate ourselves within the democratic process of everyday teaching and learning in our neighborhoods. (12)

25. I would like to thank my nephew Peter DeJoy for helping me find a new way to merge my introduction of the place of children’s literature and its role in defining literate subjectivity. Peter introduced me to Doreen Cronin and Betsy Lewin’s *Click, Clack, Moo: Cows That Type*.

26. This theme also emerged in student analysis of data from placement essays in chapter 1.

CHAPTER FOUR

27. Books like McComiskey’s *Teaching Writing as a Social Process* and Wallace and Ewald’s *Mutuality in the Rhetoric and Composition*
Classroom begin discussions about the ways that knowledge-building can be constructed as the business of composition classrooms. However, their approaches favor continuing the construction of composition programs as multiple sections of isolated courses.

28. As Elaine Showalter noted years ago in her discussion of feminist literary theory, recovery, inclusion, and revision can occur separately or simultaneously depending on the purposes and contexts of literacy work aimed at more inclusive practices.

29. This critique is part of the story of the conflict about reading that informs the institutionalization of the process movement. This theoretical and pedagogical story of conflict is less well-known than the textbook versions of process, and it is one of the main gaps addressed by many people who revise process.

30. Although these discussions about writing have informed certain areas of composition studies for some time, the new faculty I work with have rarely been introduced to that scholarship as they were trained to teach first-year writing in graduate school.

31. For another example, see Min-Zhan Lu’s “Reading and Writing Differences: The Problematic of Experience” in Feminism and Composition Studies: In Other Words.

32. The repetition of this particular quote in both the chapter about student discourses and the chapter focused on faculty development issues is meant to emphasize the far-reaching implications of these “streamlining interventions” across composition studies.

33. See chapter three.

34. Once again, Dianne DeVore transcribed the tapes, and once again I have edited them and present them here as they were approved by the other participants. No substantive changes were made to the transcribed versions of our conversation, although participants removed some materials and made some editorial changes before giving their final approval for the work presented here.

35. In What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing, Bob Broad states: “In short, traditional rubrics and scoring guides prevent us from telling the truth about what we believe, what we teach, and what we value in composition courses
and programs” (2). As I noted in earlier chapters, approaches to process, program definition, and faculty development practices that isolate composition teachers and students from one another and from their communities function in similar ways, often by keeping the concerns of first-year writing separate from the concerns of departments and the field more generally.

CHAPTER FIVE

36. Trimbur’s essay is an example of such redefinition. As Flynn notes, Trimbur suggests that the post-process movement is not only a repudiation of the process movement but also an attempt to read into composition the material conditions of the composer and the material pressures and limits of the composing process. Later in this essay, Trimbur speaks of a conception of author-as-producer as a post-process representation of authorship that replaces the process movement’s composer as the maker of meaning (979).

37. The sentence under debate here comes from Olson’s 1998 article “Encountering the Other: Postcolonial Theory and Composition Scholarship,” which appeared in JAC 18 (1988): 45–55. The sentence reads: “While Pratt’s notion of contact zone has been useful in interrogating how teachers exercise power and authority, especially in the multicultural classroom, some compositionists have tended to deploy it in such a way as to defend a kind of liberal pluralism, thereby subverting attempts to come to terms with the truly colonizing effects of the pedagogical scenario.”

38. See, for example, Crowley, Berlin, Paine, Slevin, and Miller.

39. Early in the essay, Worsham states:

The most consequential aspect of writing—of this utopian struggle to make “really free” places, lives, and identities—involves an understanding of the way that ideology works most efficiently and effectively through emotion to bind us to particular ways of life and to place us in the world in ways that make the workings of ideology virtually invisible to us. (104)

“We” might be people who have reached such understanding, who can articulate it in certain forums, and/or who have this
understanding whether they can get people to listen to them or not. Clearly, theory is the thing that gives one access to this understanding, however, so to keep theory away from people is to limit their access to “really free places.”

40. For his discussion of value-driven assessment, see Bob Broad’s *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. For an extended discussion about the ways that assessment “has yet to be claimed for teaching writing” and for suggestions about how to make reading student writing more central to assessment, see Brian Huot’s *(Re)Articulating Writing Assessment for Teaching and Learning* (2).

41. See, for example, Bacon, Cooper, DeJoy and Herzberg.