Writing Program Administration

Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators

WPA: Writing Program Administration is published twice a year—fall/winter and spring—by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and the Department of English at Illinois State University.

Volume 19,
Number 3
Spring 1996

Council of Writing Program Administrators

The Council of Writing Program Administrators is a national association of college and university faculty who serve or have served as directors of freshman composition or writing programs, coordinators of writing centers and writing workshops, chairpersons and members of writing-program-related committees, or in similar administrative capacities. The Council of Writing Program Administrators is an affiliate of the Association of American Colleges and the Modern Language Association.

For membership information, please see page 112.

Author's Guide

WPA: Writing Program Administration publishes articles and essays concerning the organization, administration, practices, and aims of college and university writing programs. Possible topics include the education and support of writing teachers; the intellectual and administrative work of WPAs; the situation of writing programs, within both academic institutions and broader contexts; the programmatic implications of current theories, technologies, and research; relationships between WPAs and other administrators, between writing and other academic programs, and among high school, two-year, and four-year college writing programs; placement; assessment; and the professional status of WPAs.

The previous list is meant to be suggestive, not exhaustive, but contributions must be appropriate to the interests and concerns of those who administer writing programs. The editor welcomes empirical research (quantitative as well as qualitative), historical research, and more theoretically, essayistically, or reflectively developed pieces.

The length of submissions should be approximately 2000 to 5000 words, although the journal occasionally will publish shorter or longer pieces when the subject matter warrants. Articles should be suitably documented using the current *MLA Style Manual.* Please submit three copies of manuscripts, with the author identified only on a separate cover letter. Include a self-addressed stamped envelope if you would like a copy returned. Submissions are anonymously reviewed by the Editorial Board, and the editor aspires to a response time of approximately ten weeks.

WPA publishes reviews of books related to writing programs and their administration. Publishers are invited to send appropriate professional books to the Editor, who assigns reviews. *WPA* also publishes an annual review of textbooks; publishers should contact the Managing Editor.

Authors whose works are accepted for publication will be asked to submit final versions in both print and electronic form. *WPA* is produced with Pagemaker 4.2 for the Macintosh. (Articles submitted in Word for the Macintosh will greatly facilitate production, although we have the capability to translate among many Macintosh and PC programs.) Authors will also be asked to submit a 100-word biography for inclusion in the "Notes on Contributors" section of the journal.

Article deadlines: Fall/Winter issue, April 1; Spring issue, September 1.

Relevant announcements and calls for papers are also acceptable. Announcement deadlines: Fall/Winter issue, September 1; Spring issue, January 1.

Address articles and editorial correspondence to Douglas Hesse, Editor, *WPA*, 4240 Department of English, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61790-4240. E-mail: ddhesse@ilstu.edu.

Address subscription and membership inquiries to Jeffrey Sommers, Secretary-Treasurer, WPA, Department of English, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056. (See subscription and membership form at the back of the journal.)

Address advertising inquiries to the Editor at the address above.

Address inquiries about the WPA consultation/evaluation service to Ben W. McClelland, Department of English, University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677.

The Council of Writing Program Administrators

Invites you to the

1996 Summer Workshop for New WPAs

July 29-August 1, 1996

&

Annual WPA Summer Conference

August 1-4, 1996

To be held at lovely Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Workshop for Writing Program Administrators
(Limited to 25 Participants)

- Workshop Leaders: Kathleen Blake Yancey and David Jolliffe
- Fee of $550 includes all materials, meals, coffee breaks, and three nights' lodging on the Miami of Ohio campus.
- *Early Registration is strongly encouraged.*

Summer Conference for Writing Program Administrators

Conference Theme: The Intellectual Work of the WPA

- Fee of $185 includes all materials, coffee breaks, an opening reception, one dinner, and a Sunday brunch.
- *Early registration is strongly encouraged.*

Guest Speakers include

Keith Gilyard, Syracuse University

Andrea Lunsford, Ohio State University

And national WPAs from around the country

For Program Information: Write to: Charles I. Schuster, Department of English, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201

For Conference Information: Write to: Jeffrey Sommers, Department of English, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056

WPA
Writing Program Administration
Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators

Contents

Letter from the Editor

Last Monday I spent half an hour reading the names of the Holocaust dead, a group of us taking turns on the quad, in a grey April rain. The easiest way to read such a list is to read the names as pure names, to concentrate on pronouncing the German and Polish consonants. Do not see the columns that list the places these people lived and the places they were killed. Do not see the column that gives ages, or you will surely find people the age of your children, your parents, or you. When it was more than rain on my face and I could no longer read, I'm glad that my sociology colleague Barbara was there to hug me before she began.

Analogies to the Holocaust are inevitably cheapening and cheap. But I thought how the dozens of TAs and thousands of students in our writing program are often but pure names to me. Probably it is the case that we could not long endure being conscious of the full lives of so many people. Far easier—even necessary—to imagine them in categories: new TAs, doctoral candidates, plagiarists, first generation students, dyslexics. And yet. Near the end of *Darkness at Noon*, Rubashov hopes that one day "perhaps they will teach that the tenet is wrong which says that a man is the quotient of one million divided by one million, and will introduce a new kind of arithmetic based on multiplication."

The best WPAs manage regularly to see people in their programs as more than pure names, more than categories. Doing so is sometimes wrenching. Graduates do not get jobs. Students get ill or have their hearts broken. Reading the many columns of peoples' lives burns us out, I'm sure. We should seek and value, all of us, the friends and acquaintances within WPA who are there when our voices falter.

❦

I bid farewell to Ann Greenseth, editorial assistant beyond compare. Not only is Ann a pagemaking wizard, she's clairvoyant. How else to explain her abilities to decipher my editor's markings? Eric Martin will continue as Managing Editor but from afar, as he becomes Director of WAC at The University of Findlay next fall. Eric has been Assistant WPA at Illinois State this year, and I'll sorely miss his good daily counsel and friendship. Ann and Eric: Godspeed!

❦

This issue of *WPA* has two clusters. Kate Latterell provides a much-needed review of TA training programs across the country; Wendy Swyt critiques a common teacher-training strategy, and six scholars from The University of Dayton furnish an annotated bibliography of TA training. In a second cluster, Kathleen Yancey reflects on reflection, a print version of the keynote address she gave in Bellingham last summer, and Gay Lynn Crossley and Wendy Bishop demonstrate the values of reflection as they re-narrate and interpret a pivotal and revelatory period in a WPA's life. Duane Roen reviews another important contribution to the WPA professional literature, and Eric Martin presents the annual annotations of new textbooks.

❦

I hope to meet and re-meet many of you in Oxford in August.

Doug Hesse

Training the Workforce: An Overview of GTA Education Curricula

Catherine G. Latterell

Teacher-training programs for graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) serve several important roles in rhetoric and composition studies. They hold historical significance because training workshops and pedagogy courses were often the only graduate-level composition courses offered in many English departments during the first 50 years of this century. Additionally, courses in teaching writing currently are required for graduate students who teach *any* course (regardless of their disciplinary specialization) in nearly all graduate programs in departments of English.[1] Thus, not only do these courses serve as an introduction or gateway to rhetoric and composition studies for most graduate students, but they are also the only site in a majority of graduate programs in English studies concerned with preparing teachers. Consequently, they play a significant part in preparing future scholars and teachers in rhetoric and composition and in preparing graduate students to assume the particular teaching tasks of an individual English department.

As a discipline we know very little about the general assumptions underlying GTA education programs. I, therefore, surveyed writing program directors to learn the kinds and range of writing pedagogy courses required for teaching assistants.[2] Scholars writing about WPA issues or about the history of teaching college writing often claim that the training of teaching assistants has vastly improved over the last 20 to 30 years (cf., Bridges, Donovan and McClelland, Gere, Hartzog). Corbett's description of his preparation for teaching writing illustrates how most people describe training in writing instruction before such improvements:

> The English teachers of my generation were mainly, if not exclusively, trained to take over a literature class. . . . But for the teaching of writing, which supported their graduate studies, usually the only training they got was in a rather desultory practicum, which met once a week and which dealt chiefly with the nuts-and-bolts aspects of the writing course. (445)

Now, Corbett and others say, our GTA education programs are much improved. For instance, Paul Connolly and Teresa Vilardi, in their 1986 study of college writing programs, note that graduate teaching assistants "are more thoroughly trained and supervised than in the past, through courses, staff meetings, and classroom observation" (3). Certainly, they are right. Given the recent growth in rhetoric and composition graduate programs and the vitality of many teachers and scholars in this field, we can generally claim that GTA education programs are doing more and are doing a better job. What I sought to learn, however, is how we specifically approach GTA education: What

patterns, if any, can be discerned in the primary instructional goals of required pedagogy courses at different institutions. From this overview emerges a set of concerns or challenges that GTA educators and writing program administrators need to consider as our curriculum and sense of the discipline continue to evolve.

Background

To examine how we commonly prepare GTAs as writing teachers, I solicited a number of documents from writing program administrators working in graduate programs that grant doctoral degrees in rhetoric and composition. In determining which programs to contact, I relied on the survey of the field published in the spring 1994 issue of *Rhetoric Review* titled "Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition: A Catalog of the Profession." This survey reports that, as of 1993, 72 doctoral programs in English studies offer a specialization in rhetoric and composition (Brown et al., 240). From these 72 programs, I requested the following information regarding their GTA education curricula:

- descriptions of courses that form the GTA education curriculum, including goal or purpose statements of the program;
- orientation and course materials (e.g., policy statements and syllabi) from required teaching practica or pedagogy courses;
- a copy of the TA handbook, if one existed.

In all, writing program administrators from 36 institutions provided some or all of the information I requested, which represents 50% of those programs included in Brown et al.'s "Catalog of the Profession" (see Table 1).

Importantly, my purpose in conducting this research was not to account for and describe every possible approach to preparing GTAs for teaching writing. Each program administrator inevitably develops practices and procedures unique to the specific needs and constraints of the composition curriculum existing in their institution. Rather, I was interested in broadly examining the kinds and range of approaches to GTA education that we are currently employing, and in identifying common perspectives on how we represent the activity of teaching writing to the newest members of the rhetoric and composition field—GTAs.

Table 1

Institutions of Faculty Responding to Survey
(All Offer a Degree in Rhetoric and Composition)

Institution	Name of Ph.D. Offered
U Arizona	English, concent. in Rhetoric, Composition, & Teaching of Writing

continued

Institution	Name of Ph.D. Offered
Arizona SU	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition
Ball SU	English, concent. in Composition
Bowling Green SU	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Writing
U Cincinnati	English
U Connecticut	English
East Texas SU	Ed.D. in College Teaching of English
Florida SU	English
U Illinois, Chicago	English, spec. in Language, Literacy, & Rhetoric
Illinois SU	D.A. in English
U Kansas	English
Louisiana SU	English, option in Rhetoric, Composition, & Linguistics
U Louisville	Rhetoric & Composition
U Maryland, College Park	English
U Massachusetts, Amherst	English, emphasis in Writing & the Teaching of Writing
U Miami (Ohio)	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition
Michigan Tech U	Rhetoric & Technical Communication
U Minnesota, Twin Cities	English, spec. in Composition Studies
U Minnesota, Twin Cities	Rhetoric and Scientific & Technical Communication
U Nebraska, Lincoln	English, concent. in Composition Practice & Theory
New Mexico SU, Las Cruces	Rhetoric & Professional Communication
U North Carolina, Greensboro	English, spec. in Rhetoric & Composition
U Oregon	English
Pennsylvania SU, Univ Park	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition
U Southern California	Rhetoric & Composition
U Southern Mississippi	English, spec. in Rhetoric & Composition
Syracuse U	English, minor in Composition & Cultural Rhetoric
U Tennesse, Knoxville	English
U Texas, Arlington	Humanities, concent. in Rhetoric/Composition/Criticism
U Texas, Austin	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition
Texas A&M U	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition, Discourse Studies
U Utah	English (Communication or Educational Studies), emphasis in Rhetoric and Composition
U Washington	English, concent. in Language & Rhetoric
Washington SU	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition
U Waterloo (Canada)	Literature & Rhetoric
U Wisconsin, Milwaukee	English, concent. in Rhetoric & Composition

An Overview of GTA Education Curricula

What is immediately noticeable about the descriptions of GTA education programs I received is their rough similarity given a wide range of programmatic possibilities. Of the 36 programs represented in this survey, 23 locate their teacher preparation program in a single course, which may or may not be repeated throughout each term of a GTA's initial year of teaching. Another seven programs have developed a combination of courses which fulfill their teacher preparation requirements, and two more have developed extensive mentoring programs in combination with a course requirement. Four programs offer some combination of apprenticeships and/or workshops in place of formal course offerings. Mentoring programs which involve experienced GTAs, part-time instructors, and/or full-time faculty in the professional development of first-year GTAs exist in varying degrees in all programs. Additionally, nearly all the programs (32) reported that they require a fall orientation for new GTAs: One program stated that it holds no orientation and three did not answer this question. Of the 32 programs requiring an orientation, half stated that it lasted five days or more—with two programs reporting that GTAs enroll in required writing pedagogy courses during the summer. Five programs operate a one-day orientation. Moreover, many of the courses comprising these GTA education programs evaluate GTAs on similar tasks and writing assignments—the most common of which is ateaching portfolio frequently required as a final project.

The following discussion concentrates on the course descriptions and rationales comprising the core of most GTA education programs. In order to examine the range of curricular approaches in these programs, I categorized courses according to their primary instructional goals. Although other ways of categorizing these courses exist, this approach allowed me to focus on common pedagogical methods and curricular strategies. Using this scheme, most courses fell along a continuum which, as it moves from left to right, becomes more theoretical and removed from the first-year writing classroom (see Figure 1).

Figure 1

Continuum of GTA Education Courses

Apprenticeships—Practica—Teaching Methods courses—Theory seminars

This continuum represents a general method of categorization. Clearly, discussion of writing theory does happen in many of the practica described, just as practical issues arise in theory seminars. However, generally speaking, the priority of a practicum is practical and immediate training in teaching strategies, and the priority of a theory seminar is to explore historical contexts and philo-

sophical issues related to writing instruction. Also, many GTA education programs offered several courses and/or implement mentoring programs, thus developing their own continuums for dealing with complex issues of practice and theory within its GTA education programs.

Finally, I must stress that these course descriptions represent snapshots of how each program executed their GTA training in a particular term or year. Many writing program administrators willingly shared these materials so that we might glimpse the range of writing pedagogy existing in GTA education programs nationally. Their generosity provides us with an opportunity to freeze-frame an on-going, ever-evolving activity of the field.

Apprenticeships

Apprenticeship, or preceptorship, programs vary based on a number a factors. Perhaps the most important factor shaping the design of such programs is how apprenticeships relate to, and are positioned within, a broader pedagogical curriculum. At the University of Oregon and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville (UTK), for instance, prospective teaching assistants, or teaching fellows as they are called at Oregon, participate in a year-long apprenticeship program prior to teaching their own classes. At both institutions, this apprenticeship program is integrated into a GTA education program that includes coursework in writing instruction. In both programs, new graduate students work individually with a teacher experienced in the program, spending a set amount of time observing the supervising teacher's class and meeting together outside of class, thereby gaining practical experience prior to teaching.

Other institutions use an apprenticeship program with GTAs who are teaching immediately in their first term—offering this experience as the primary source of pedagogical information. The writing program at the University of Arizona operates a preceptorship program in which first-year GTAs are assigned a Teaching Advisor with whom they meet in small groups and individually on a regular basis. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst similarly places Teaching Associates in instructional teams which are led by a Course Director who is a member of the writing program staff and/or a member of the English faculty. The program handbook from UMass Amherst states that during these meetings, "the team discusses various aspects of teaching as well as various issues that arise in class: for example, conducting peer-response sessions and student conferences, presenting the 'documented essay,' setting appropriate goals, and evaluating student writing." At the University of Waterloo, graduate students are apprenticed in their first year of support to a faculty member who is teaching a large undergraduate writing course. The duties of the apprentice in this program commonly include "leading tutorials, responding to students' writing, grading students' writing, conferring with students, attending course lectures, and compiling final marks."

Methods of evaluating the performance of GTAs in apprenticeship

programs are best exemplified by the following description provided by the GTA educator at the University of Arizona:

Preceptorship Requirements

A. Submit to your TEAD [Teaching Advisor]:
   1 syllabus and course policy
   2 assignment sheet for each essay
   3 copies of all class handouts
   4 two sets of graded papers (1 before midsemester, 1 after)
   5 midsemester self-evaluation of teaching
   6 semester grades
B. Attend all preceptorship and colloquium meetings called by TEAD, Course Director, and Composition Director
C. Respond promptly to all memos.

How Your TEAD Will Evaluate You

A. Visit 2 classes (announced);
B. Review 2 sets of graded papers;
C. Confer with you after each visit and paper review;
D. Respond in writing to self-evaluation;
E. Write semester evaluation.

The purpose of these apprenticeship programs is often stated in practical terms. Apprenticeships provide GTAs with a support person, someone experienced in the teaching of writing and knowledgeable about the particular institution and writing program. For example, the purpose of the apprenticeship program in the English department at the University of Tennesse-Knoxville is "to introduce the graduate assistants to the specific philosophy—and a variety of methods for teaching in—UTK's composition program, as well as give them first-hand experience working with UTK [first-year students]." Similarly, the composition teachers' handbook from the University of Oregon states that the goal of the apprenticeship is to provide "practical experience in every aspect of teaching." It adds that apprenticeships provide supervising teachers (themselves often also graduate teaching fellows) "the opportunity to discuss their class and teaching methods with an eager student and to receive constructive criticism." In addition, therefore, GTA educators stress that apprenticeships can be rewarding learning experiences, given their highly individual character. These programs smooth first-year GTAs' transition into a writing program and their role as teachers.

Practica

Many titles are given to the type of course I categorize as a practicum. Workshop, proseminar, colloquium, and staff meeting are all descriptions used in GTA education materials. The primary instructional focus of these courses is to provide practical support for GTAs in their first term (and sometimes repeated through their first year) of teaching. Although within this grouping some courses are more practical than others, their common denominator is that a majority of time in these classes is spent dealing with the immediate questions and concerns

new GTAs have regarding their current teaching. Courses in this category constitute the largest group within the continuum of GTA education curricula. Although several programs combine a practicum with teaching methods courses or writing theory seminars (e.g., Illinois State, Florida State, and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln), many rely on a practicum as the primary source of pedagogical instruction for GTAs.

Within this category, courses range from those described as support groups and staff meetings to those in which GTAs are asked to develop teaching philosophies grounded in current writing pedagogy. In those programs where this course is offered in consecutive terms during GTAs' first year of teaching, the character of the course frequently changes during second and third terms to concentrate on rhetoric and composition theory (e.g., Michigan Tech, Penn State).

Because these courses range in their level of practicality, let me begin by describing those which specialize in providing GTAs with weekly practical assistance. One educator of such a course described it as a teacher community where GTAs can "trade stories as well as share problems, strategies, and plans." Not all first-year GTAs may be required to attend these practica, only those who have not taken a pedagogy course at another institution. As another GTA educator wrote, "Theory is not emphasized in these courses." These practica frequently focus on problem-solving and idea-sharing, as descriptions from GTA educators at Illinois State, the University of Kansas at Lawrence, and Syracuse University respectively illustrate:

- The proseminar meets "weekly for 50 minutes to answer questions, address problems, share strategies, and in general try to meet practical teaching needs."
- "This course . . . normally consists of weekly meetings, directed by a senior faculty member, at which relevant pedagogical matters—from disciplinary problems and grading standards to assignment topics and rhetorical theory—are discussed."
- "Teaching Practicum requires that you attend and participate in two-hour, small-group meetings each week throughout the semester. . . . You will be able to talk about what to do in the classroom, develop course plans, share ideas with other first-year and experienced teachers, and work out whatever problems or questions you might have on weekly basis."

Also, in this type of course, GTA educators may organize the practicum syllabus to follow the standard syllabus used by GTAs in their first-year writing classes, often keeping just ahead of it. Syllabi from two such courses state that together the GTAs and their instructor will prepare assignments, read students' drafts, grade papers, "practice techniques of evaluation and peer-editing," and discuss teaching problems when they occur. When time permits, more general issues of the teaching of writing are addressed. And, as a final activity, one program invites first-year students "into the seminar to tell us what we've done right or wrong."

Those courses that present introductions to rhetoric and composition studies, while still remaining primarily focused on providing GTAs with immediate practical assistance, close the gap along the continuum of curricula between the most practical practica and those courses which address teaching methods. The Composition Instructors' Workshop at Bowling Green State University, which addresses ways new instructors might "integrate current rhetoric and composition theory in the classroom," as well as courses at Texas A&M and the University of Louisville, exemplify versions of this kind of practica. While explaining that the course will discuss "some composition theory, but not much," course materials from Texas A&M state the following goals:

(1) learn to teach English in a college environment;

(2) understand issues that affect the teaching of English in college;

(3) become a better writer yourself;

(4) manage your teaching and your students so that you and your students benefit from your semester together.

Similarly, a course offered at the University of Louisville provides "a very brief overview of traditional and contemporary rhetoric and of current research in composition theory and pedagogy, all illustrated with reference to English 101 and 102 at the University of Louisville." This approach allows GTAs to address the practical issues of syllabus design, assignment writing, commenting on students' writing, and leading class discussions with some reference to broader theoretical contexts.

Methods of evaluating GTAs in these types of courses combine classroom observations, examining sets of graded papers, peer observations, participation, and teaching journals or notebooks. The following list of requirements is used for a course taught in the writing program at Michigan Tech:

(1) **A teaching notebook** in which you not only record but reflect upon your teaching practice—this includes reflection on planning or on articles you have read or discussions you have had about practice or that somehow inform your teaching.

(2) **A portfolio of your work this term**—including syllabus, assignment sheets, at least three student papers that represent a range of abilities and include your responses, and a final statement on your teaching for the quarter.

(3) At least **two peer observations** and a follow-up conference with me.

(4) **Participation** in the seminar in terms of leading discussions, being prepared for discussions, and bringing student writing (or other work) in as assigned.

Teaching Methods Courses

Courses grouped into this category form a bridge between practica, which concentrate on immediate teaching questions and concerns, and theory

seminars, which concentrate on historical contexts and exploring rhetoric and composition theories. Teaching methods courses are full-credit courses (as opposed to one-credit or partial-credit practica) and often consciously mimic methods courses taught in education departments. The primary instructional goal of these courses is to immerse GTAs in the language and methods of a program's writing pedagogy. These courses seek to imbue GTAs with practical teaching strategies, pedagogical texts, and most of all, a language for talking about teaching. In a teaching methods course, new teachers approach teaching from a number of perspectives. They engage in a variety of writing activities designed to model practices they will use in their own classrooms. They read and discuss not only student papers but also the professional literature of composition theory and writing pedagogy, becoming familiar with a language of teaching and the contexts out of which it developed. They observe teachers—even apprentice to them—help grade papers, conference with students, and may teach a class session. They work in writing centers tutoring first-year students for a limited number of hours. They engage in teacher research and produce (often collaborative) final projects for the course.

The theory presented in these courses is specifically pedagogical in nature and supports programmatic imperatives. For example, a course taught at Washington State University titled "Seminar in the Teaching of Writing: The Methodology of Composition" is organized to help GTAs "study, evaluate, and practice methods currently used in the teaching of composition, methods such as conferencing, heuristics, collaboration, peer-group critique, writing across the curriculum, epistemics, free writing, and others." Another course, offered at Ball State University, lists the following goals:

Students will attempt to

- Become acquainted with the history and current aims of composition teaching;
- Become familiar with the special demands of the Ball State Writing Program; and
- Learn about problems in composition pedagogy and explore possible solutions.

Those also in the Teaching Preparation Program will

- Study course organization and assignments in detail;
- Become acquainted with methods of experienced teachers; and
- Learn design issues and procedures for a typical composition course.

Both of Florida State's required summer courses, Teaching English as a Guided Study and Teaching English in College, with their focus on helping GTA's develop both specific teaching practices and teaching philosophies grounded in current composition theory, demonstrate the immersion of GTAs in both hands-on training and pedagogical discussion that characterizes teaching methods courses. Course materials from Teaching English in College state that GTAs will examine composition theory, "especially cognitive, developmental,

and process approaches within the dynamics of social and expressivist theories of language," in order to help them develop a statement of teaching philosophy as well as the course materials they will use to teach their first classes in the fall. In addition to seminar discussions and writing workshops, GTAs also intern with instructors who are teaching summer-term writing courses.

Materials from Teaching English as a Guided Study, the second required course at Florida State, describe a course that examines three issues in tutoring and teaching: response, revision, and evaluation/grading. The primary instructional goals of this course include helping GTAs "develop a theory-based set of response, revision, and evaluation practices;" providing GTAs with experience in a writing workshop classroom by "participating in activities similar to those experienced by first-year writing students;" and obtaining "practical tutoring experience by tutoring two hours a week in the FSU Reading/Writing Center."

Theory Seminars

At the farthest right end of the continuum are those courses which most closely resemble a graduate seminar, asking GTAs to explore the reaches and possibilities of theory's influence on teaching philosophies and practices. In all cases, these courses represent the second in a series of required courses within a program's GTA education curriculum. These types of courses differ from practica in central ways: although practical issues may be addressed, they concentrate on theoretical debates and on broadly historicizing the teaching of composition.

Moreover, these types of courses differ from teaching methods courses: theory seminars do not provide many moments for practical application, instead inviting GTAs into dialogue with contrasting theoretical perspectives. These courses range broadly over rhetorical and composition theories which may not all be directly pedagogical in nature or directly applied to teaching practices in class discussion. Importantly, the theories discussed in these courses are not limited to composition or rhetorical theories. As courses offered at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and Illinois State demonstrate, theory seminars frequently include reading from other traditions such as psychology, education, linguistics, philosophy, feminist theory, critical theory, and politics.

Some courses within this category bring local concerns into dialogue with broader issues in theory important to writing instruction. Such a course, taught at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, brings into dialogue local and national contexts of writing instruction: "This course serves two purposes. . . . The first purpose is to introduce you to the philosophy and practice of composition teaching at UNL. The other purpose is to provide an introduction and overview of the field of composition and rhetoric, to invite you into some of the debates that energize the field, and to explore connections between the teaching of writing and the discipline of English as a whole." Similarly, a course at the University of Connecticut also stresses a double emphasis on theory and practice:

> On the one hand, the course is designed to provide a grounding in the day to day practice of teaching writing, and on the other hand, in order for such a practice to be meaningful and dynamic, the course requires critical reflection on teaching practice; in short, one assumption behind the course is that practice and theory are not dichotomous.

These courses typically ask GTAs to consider the following: (1) the ways in which writing teachers inflect their instruction with philosophical/theoretical biases; and (2) what consequences such biases have on the nature of learning in the classroom. One GTA educator explained that the goal of this course is to explore "what philosophies tacitly or overtly underlie certain teaching practices and what theories we can consciously use to strengthen our own teaching and writing." Another GTA educator, from the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, writes that "the goal of the course, quite simply, is to cultivate critical and reflective practice. To that end, the course addresses theoretical issues and questions—where did college composition come from? What is its mission?—as well as practical ones—How do we respond productively to student writing? How do we go about preparing students to work in peer response groups?" Yet another GTA educator writes even more strongly that

> As teachers, I think, we always feel a centripetal pressure that centers our attention on the mechanics of the classroom. What should we assign today? . . . What should we ask our students to write about? By what objective standard should we grade our students' work? But when we consider the context—institutional, disciplinary, social, and personal—of our students and ourselves, we feel a range of centrifugal pressures that complicate what at first glance seems to be the safely enclosed world of the classroom. Those centrifugal pressures make it impossible to see the classroom as a neutral site of learning where the key questions are about the effective presentation and objective evaluation of material. The classroom is not a safe haven; it is a contested site where learning results from an active process of questioning, dialogue, and negotiation.

This type of course presents a particular challenge to new writing teachers—asking them, as a GTA educator from East Texas State University puts it, "to make what is known about composition an integral part of their own approach to teaching writing." Also, however, some of these courses extend beyond this concern, asking GTAs to consider the ways in which their practices are embedded in cultural contexts that texture the learning experiences of their students.

Not surprisingly, the methods of evaluating GTAs in these courses resemble evaluation methods commonly used in graduate seminars. Class presentations, short papers (often responses to or reflections on the assigned readings), and a single formal research paper comprise the most common methods of evaluating GTAs. Often, writing assignments are collected in teaching portfolios at the end of a term, and one of the most common types of writing assignments included in this portfolio is a statement of teaching philosophy.

The Most Typical Curricular Requirements —and Three Concerns

While this continuum presents the range of course types that constitute GTA education programs across the country, it also illustrates that most programs (three fourths of those represented in this overview) rely on a practicum to prepare new teachers of writing. To summarize the common characteristics of a practicum, the following comprises a typical GTA education program in rhetoric and composition studies:

- One course that meets once a week, sometimes repeated each term of a GTA's first year of teaching but more often not, totaling an average of three credit-hours.
- Taught by the director of the writing program or another member of the writing program committee.
- Focuses on the immediate needs and concerns of GTAs who are teaching in the program for the first time. Provides new teachers with discussion-leading strategies, guidelines for writing assignments and responding to student writing, as well as space for problem-solving and idea-sharing.
- Presents a brief overview of composition and rhetorical theories.
- Requires very minimal reading, focusing instead on first-year writing course materials and samples of first-year students' writing.
- Requires attendance, and participation is graded.
- Requires GTAs to keep a journal or teacher's notebook in which they record and reflect on lesson plans, assignments, and their students' progress.
- Requires GTAs to be observed by the Practicum instructor, and possibly also to observe another instructor's class.
- Requires GTAs to turn in all teaching materials as well as sets of graded papers or a selective sample of graded papers for evaluation by the Practicum instructor.

Based on these characteristics, the primary approach to preparing new teachers of writing is to supply a structure within which they can productively operate. That structure typically provides new teachers with standardized teaching materials, supervised practice in responding to and evaluating student writing, and practical guidance in the day-to-day procedures of classroom instruction. Given the distress many graduate students experience when faced with their first teaching assignments, as well as the concomitant concerns of GTA educators/WPAs to maintain consistent standards in all writing classes, this approach to preparing GTAs is understandable and necessary.

In fact, such practical instruction has a number of advantages. First, it provides an immediate program of action for inexperienced teachers, a way of behaving as a teacher. Second, this kind of course helps GTA educators assert a

defining influence over the instructional goals and pedagogical philosophy of a writing program. Third, practical training, a kind of "Here's how I do it" approach, can lay the groundwork for incorporating coaching and learning by doing approaches in GTA education (see, for example, Donald Schön's work on educating the reflective practitioner). Finally, given the multiple strains on the time and energy of both WPAs and GTAs, practical training appeals to both their needs to give and receive concrete guidance.

However, despite the usefulness of this approach to GTA education, it raises some important questions. The prevalence of this type of course may suggest that the rhetoric and composition field teaches teachers within a pedagogical model that relies on translation-based approaches to theory and writing instruction and on one-way modes of communication: GTA educator to GTAs, GTAs to first-year students. This presents at least three concerns.

First, by relying primarily on practica that are skills-based, we are encouraging a notion that writing courses are contentless and that teaching writing requires minimal expertise. If writing 'happens' and the most we can do is provide the best environment for it and the right kind of encouragement, then a skills-based curriculum for GTAs makes some sense. However, compositionists and literacy theorists have recently questioned the contentless argument, contending that it reinforces class divisions by privileging those students who are already familiar with the literate practices they are expected to acquire in these courses (cf. Faigley, Miller, Delpit, Shor). Moreover, there is a danger that these practica devolve writing pedagogy from a critical practice with an epistemological grounding to sets of lesson plans and activities disconnected from a teaching philosophy.

Second, this type of teacher preparation perpetuates traditional administrative power structures that may neutralize the discipline's efforts to redefine teaching and administrative activities for tenure and promotion cases as well as for the professionalizing of the discipline. Several programs participating in the survey encourage the active involvement of tenured, tenure-track, and part-time professional faculty; however, most rely on a single writing program administrator to deal with GTAs. An assumption of such an approach may be that centralizing a writing program in one position helps departments designate an established resource for dealing with writing issues. However, Jeanne Gunner has suggested such WPA-centric models maintain "a troubling degree of division" between WPAs and the writing instructors and GTAs who constitute their writing programs (8). She argues that such an "anti-democratic" division of authority disconnects writing teachers from the curriculum they teach, undermining their skills and helping departments justify "using literature graduate students and faculty to do a composition job" (13). WPA-centric programs striate authority in a top-heavy fashion and fix communication channels as one-way: top-down. Although, as Gunner argues, one person cannot simply transmit knowledge to others "via a prescribed syllabus, a preselected textbook" (13) and a set of teaching strategies, these are prominent characteristics of GTA education curricula.

Third, the emphasis on skills training in the majority of GTA education programs may encourage a perception compositionists have long battled: Teaching writing is not valued, even by the rhetoric and composition field. By dispensing "training" in one to two hour doses once a week for one (possibly two) terms, this model encourages the passing out of class activities and other quick-fixes—an inoculation method of GTA education. We need to examine the message we are sending GTAs and our other colleagues in English studies by maintaining such practices.

Countering these concerns will require GTA educators and WPAs to build pedagogy courses and education programs that are more balanced, nested in teaching communities, and extended beyond the participation of first-year GTAs and a single faculty member.

Striking a Balance Between Practical and Theoretical Frameworks

GTA education curricula should strike a balance between providing GTAs with practical skills and advice and helping them understand the writing theory and pedagogy grounding those skills. It would be a serious mistake to completely discontinue providing first-year GTAs with concrete and practical advice for teaching writing. What we need, then, is to find ways to balance these "whats" with "whys": We need to contextualize that advice by providing GTAs with the theoretical frameworks shaping them. Certainly, one step toward producing this balance includes a re-consideration of the kinds of reading (or lack of it) we require for GTAs in these courses.

Balancing these needs is the difference between providing GTAs with a vocabulary of key words and teaching them a language. For instance, teaching GTAs how to help students work through different stages of writing as they draft a single essay gives GTAs a set of process-based practices and key words from which they can teach. It gives them a vocabulary they can use with their students and with each other. It's a useful starting place. In addition, however, pedagogy courses need to help GTAs develop a language for teaching writing, which means contextualizing these key words within the discussions in rhetoric and composition studies about the goals and purposes of writing process approaches to teaching, about the debates over what that means, and about the evolution of those concepts. Bringing this kind of context into pedagogy courses helps new teachers gain an understanding of the complexity of writing instruction. It will help many of them fight the urge to dismiss students (or their own abilties) when an assignment or a class activity goes awry. What's more, grounding the teaching strategies shared in a practicum in a broader theoretical framework gives GTAs more tools for thinking about what's happening in their classrooms and for arriving at their own solutions to problems.

Incorporating discussion of and reflection on writing theory and pedagogy essays or texts is an important step in preparing GTAs to become profes-

sional teachers. By engaging in dialogues with a body of literature and with other composition specialists, GTAs can begin to develop a language to articulate why they grade papers in a certain way or why they believe in certain kinds of assignments and not others. By promoting such dialogues, we prepare GTAs for the future when they will need to know how to find answers to concerns we can not predict during a practicum.

Developing Teaching Communities

Those GTA education programs that seem most impressive introduce first-year teachers to their writing pedagogy from multiple perspectives. They combat the damaging notion that teaching is an isolated activity—a private act between students and teachers occurring behind closed doors—by promoting community-building activities among new GTAs, advanced GTAs, instructors, and tenure-track faculty. On a grand scale are those programs in which GTAs participate in apprenticeship programs, tutor in writing centers, and enroll in pedagogy courses. These programs cultivate teaching communities in which first-year GTAs are immersed in multiple forums and conversations about teaching. Although developing such an extensive GTA education curriculum may not be possible in many programs, it should be our goal to develop an atmosphere where teaching or pedagogy is not viewed as the lowly concern of one administrator or one group of brand-new teachers.

Writing programs can cultivate teaching communities, in part, by multiplying the places and the people GTAs interact with as they develop their own teaching practices and philosophies. Some programs pair new and advanced GTAs together, asking them to visit each other's classes for a term and meet to discuss them. Some programs require GTAs, at some point in their first year, to work in a writing center tutoring students. Some programs organize regular grading workshops for small groups of faculty, part-time instructors, and GTAs. Some programs use the fall orientation as a place to showcase experienced teachers' talents by encouraging them to develop workshops or lead discussion sessions. Some programs have developed task forces consisting of writing teachers of all levels to advise the GTA educator and/or WPA on particular curriculum issues. Some programs encourage first-year and advanced GTAs to develop research groups, team-teach, draft conference abstracts and presentations, develop and run colloquia, and participate formally in the writing program by sitting on committees or acting as assistants to the writing program administrator.

By introducing GTAs to writing pedagogy and practice from many avenues and many people's perspectives, they learn to view teaching as a vibrant, constantly evolving, and valued practice. Additionally, GTA education programs that are anchored in such communities promote on-going teacher education which extends well beyond a GTA's first term or year of teaching.

Engaging More Teachers in Pedagogy and GTA Education

More than anything else, and before much else can happen, GTA education programs will need the support and active involvement of many more people than this overview indicates are involved in preparing graduate teaching assistants. Tenured faculty, advanced GTAs, writing center professionals, instructors, and undergraduate students are under-utilized resources in most GTA education programs. Moreover, current administrative structures which, in many cases, place too many administrative burdens on one person—the WPA—will need re-thinking. Some programs have split this position, creating a separate GTA educator position, having both positions held by tenured or tenure-track faculty. Some programs require all tenured or tenure-track faculty in rhetoric and composition studies to rotate writing program responsibilities—including teaching or team-teaching required writing pedagogy courses. Unless or until pedagogy is a part of the regular conversations of many people in a department, instead of only one WPA and one group of new GTAs, writing teachers will struggle to combat their isolation and education programs will continue to over-emphasize skills-based models of writing instruction.

Although current curricula for educating GTAs ranges from apprenticeships and practica to combinations of methods and theory courses, the majority of writing programs continue to rely on one course—the practicum—for preparing graduate students to teach writing. Maintaining this primarily skills-based approach to educating GTAs helps ensure that the first-year students in their classes receive similar writing instruction, meeting or at least approaching programmatic standards. However, such a curriculum raises concerns regarding the shape and direction of writing pedagogy in rhetoric and composition studies and the long-term preparation of GTAs as professional teachers. By offering this overview as well as these three challenge areas, I hope to promote on-going discussions about what we are and are not achieving in our efforts to prepare new writing teachers and to introduce graduate students to rhetoric and composition studies.[3]

Notes

1. How many English departments require GTAs to complete courses in writing instruction? According to Carol Hartzog's 1986 study, 83% of schools responding to her study require such training programs and another 10% answered that courses in writing instruction were optional (Hartzog 48-49). More recently, in a 1994 study titled, "Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition: A Catalog of the Profession," 56% of the 72 programs listed a writing pedagogy course as a "core or required course"—this despite the authors' contention that they found little consistency in core requirements among the programs (Brown et al.).

2. This article is a condensed version of the second chapter of my dissertation, "The Politics of GTA Education in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." This larger project constructs a portrait of GTA education in rhetoric and composition studies and complicates common approaches to preparing GTAs by outlining a set of initiatives for broadening the field's writing pedagogy. The dissertation's

central argument is that GTA education programs are an important site of disciplinary formation and have much to tell the field about the processes through which writing pedagogies are produced. Methodologically, it relies on a variety of interpretative and qualitative approaches. Beyond Chapter Two which is represented here, Chapter Three examines commonplace narratives which emerge from a review of the professional discourse on GTA education. Chapter Four analyzes course materials, writing program materials, and in-depth interviews with four GTA educators and generates a series of principles and practices which constitute alternatives for preparing graduate students as writing teachers and as members of the rhetoric and composition field. Finally, Chapter Five articulates a number of programmatic challenges that remain constant for GTA educators.

3. I would like to thank Chris Burnham, Rebecca Moore Howard, Marilyn Cooper, and Diana George for their helpful responses to drafts of this essay. Also, I thank Cynthia Selfe and Stuart Selber—my mentors, teachers, and friends—for their generosity and support of this project.

Works Cited

Bridges, Charles W., ed. *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1986.

Brown, Stuart C. et al. "Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition: A Catalog of the Profession." *Rhetoric Review* 12 (1994): 240-389.

Connolly, Paul and Teresa Vilardi. *New Methods in College Writing Programs*. New York: MLA, 1986.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "Teaching Composition: Where We've Been and Where We're Going." *College English* 38 (1987): 444-52.

Delpit, Lisa. D. "The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children." *Harvard Educational Review* 58 (Aug. 1988): 280-98.

Donovan, Timothy R. and Ben McClelland. *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1980.

Faigley, Lester. *Fragments of Rationality: Postmodernity and the Subject of Composition*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1992.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. "Teaching Writing Teachers." Rev. of *Rhetoric and Composition*, by Richard Graves. *College English* 47 (1985): 58-65.

Gunner, Jeanne. "Decentering the WPA." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 18 (Fall/Winter 1994): 8-15.

Hartzog, Carol P. *Composition and the Academy: A Study of Writing Program Administration*. New York: MLA, 1986.

Miller, Susan. *Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1991.

Schön, Donald A. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass P. 1987.

Shor, Ira. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Teacher Training in the Contact Zone

Wendy Swyt

In his *College English* essay "Fault Lines in the Contact Zone," Richard E. Miller uses a student paper describing the harassment of a gay man and vicious beating of a homeless person in order to address an important question: "what exactly are we to say or do when the kind of racist, sexist, and homophobic sentiments now signified by the term 'hate speech' surface in our classrooms?" (391). As part of his answer, Miller calls on Mary Louise Pratt's concept of the "contact zone," a social space "where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other" (34). In his essay, the contents of the student's paper and the circumstances surrounding it emerge in successive fragments because Miller deliberately withholds "vital contextual information" in order to replicate what he calls "the partial, hesitant, contradictory motion [that] defines how business gets transacted in the contact zones of our classrooms and our conferences" (391).

At each stage of the essay as we learn a bit more about the details of the student and his paper, we are confronted with the question, "what would you do?" First we learn about the student's essay, "Queers, Bums, and Magic." In response to an assignment on group behavior, a student described his trip to San Francisco to study "the lowest class . . . the queers and the bums" where he and a group of friends harassed a gay man and ended up in an alley kicking a homeless man (Miller 392). Then we learn that the instructor who received the essay is gay, making the paper a challenge to the authority of an openly gay instructor and possibly an act of gay bashing itself. Finally, we learn that the student writer grew up in Kuwait, English was his second language, and he wrote the paper during the Gulf War.

The student paper and its circumstances provide a powerful portrait of the challenges of diversity in our college writing classrooms. As Miller notes, after this student paper was mentioned in a 1991 MLA workshop on "Composition, Multiculturalism, and Political Correctness," two other panels addressing the paper followed at the 1992 and 1993 CCCC. In effect, this student essay became an occasion of teacher training for the instructors who discussed it in heated debates at national conferences and for those of us who read Miller's article.

The question that I pose is this: does the strategy by which Miller presents the student's essay offer the best way of training teachers, specifically new composition TAs, about issues of diversity and conflict in the classroom? Should we be replicating the fragmented, decontextualized presentation that Miller describes as patterned after "the contact zone of national conferences" (391)?

Test scenarios like the one that Miller describes are often used in training workshops to allow teachers to rehearse questions of practice and to put peda-

Teacher Training in the Contact Zone

Wendy Swyt

In his *College English* essay "Fault Lines in the Contact Zone," Richard E. Miller uses a student paper describing the harassment of a gay man and vicious beating of a homeless person in order to address an important question: "what exactly are we to say or do when the kind of racist, sexist, and homophobic sentiments now signified by the term 'hate speech' surface in our classrooms?" (391). As part of his answer, Miller calls on Mary Louise Pratt's concept of the "contact zone," a social space "where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other" (34). In his essay, the contents of the student's paper and the circumstances surrounding it emerge in successive fragments because Miller deliberately withholds "vital contextual information" in order to replicate what he calls "the partial, hesitant, contradictory motion [that] defines how business gets transacted in the contact zones of our classrooms and our conferences" (391).

At each stage of the essay as we learn a bit more about the details of the student and his paper, we are confronted with the question, "what would you do?" First we learn about the student's essay, "Queers, Bums, and Magic." In response to an assignment on group behavior, a student described his trip to San Francisco to study "the lowest class . . . the queers and the bums" where he and a group of friends harassed a gay man and ended up in an alley kicking a homeless man (Miller 392). Then we learn that the instructor who received the essay is gay, making the paper a challenge to the authority of an openly gay instructor and possibly an act of gay bashing itself. Finally, we learn that the student writer grew up in Kuwait, English was his second language, and he wrote the paper during the Gulf War.

The student paper and its circumstances provide a powerful portrait of the challenges of diversity in our college writing classrooms. As Miller notes, after this student paper was mentioned in a 1991 MLA workshop on "Composition, Multiculturalism, and Political Correctness," two other panels addressing the paper followed at the 1992 and 1993 CCCC. In effect, this student essay became an occasion of teacher training for the instructors who discussed it in heated debates at national conferences and for those of us who read Miller's article.

The question that I pose is this: does the strategy by which Miller presents the student's essay offer the best way of training teachers, specifically new composition TAs, about issues of diversity and conflict in the classroom? Should we be replicating the fragmented, decontextualized presentation that Miller describes as patterned after "the contact zone of national conferences" (391)?

Test scenarios like the one that Miller describes are often used in training workshops to allow teachers to rehearse questions of practice and to put peda-

gogical lore to critical use. In a recent *WPA* article, Anson, Jolliffe and Shapiro promote the use of narrative accounts as case studies in order to address "the growing importance of weaving together both theory and practice" (24). These accounts, they claim, transform "some thorny general issue" into pedagogical questions that are "real and tangible" for teacher training discussions (24).

I agree with Anson, Jolliffe and Shapiro, but I think we need to be careful about how such "real life" stories are used in our TA training sessions. Although this method can provide a valuable opportunity for new TAs to rehearse their responses, I want to argue that the "contact zones" that Miller describes, places where a pedagogical account emerges in a fragmented, decontextualized manner, might not be the most productive sites for discussing diversity and authority. In order to illustrate some of the risks in the "real life scenario" approach, I will examine an incident in which the use of scenarios was n*ot* effective. In the second half of the essay I suggest a training strategy, informed by Patricia Bizzell's proposal for a multicultural rhetoric, that might replace or complement a decontextualized scenario approach. Finally, I explore how the unsuccessful training session and my alternative provide insights about TA training and about diversity and authority in the writing classroom.

"Diversity Day"

At the university where I teach, a tactic similar to Miller's presentation of the homophobic student paper has been used during training for new teaching assistants in the expository writing program. During a two week orientation held before classes begin, TAs discuss the assignments they will use for English 101 and the pedagogical issues that might emerge in a writing classroom. This training is conducted by the director of the expository writing program, a faculty assistant, and three graduate students who serve as both trainers and mentors for new TAs.

Part of this orientation has included a workshop that TAs have come to call "Diversity Day." In this workshop, new teaching assistants discuss issues of diversity in the classroom using sample scenarios. When they receive a scenario, TAs divide into small groups, discuss the situation and possible solutions, and then report back to a larger group discussion. The motivations for this exercise are varied. For the director of the expository writing program, the reasons are primarily legal. He wants to make sure that teaching assistants are aware of the importance of diversity in their classrooms, especially conflicts that might result in harassment complaints. Other considerations are practical: to get TAs thinking about how conflicts might affect their classrooms in concrete situations and allow them to "practice" their responses. And, finally, there is also somewhat of a consciousness raising agenda.

During one Diversity Day session, TAs encountered several situations. For example, they were asked to respond to a scene where a male student approaches the teacher and asks if she discriminates against the Greeks because he belongs to a fraternity and will drop the course if she does. How will the

teacher respond? In another, the teacher is faced with a quiet Asian female student. How will the instructor encourage this student to participate? In the situation that produced the most heated debate, a student walks into the classroom wearing a T-shirt that reads "Homophobic and proud of it."[1]

Although there was conflict around all of the situations, the last one provoked intense debate. Several suggestions emerged in the large group discussion: 1) Take the student aside privately and ask him not to wear it again; 2) In front of the class, require him to leave; 3) Take the student aside and tell him: "I find that offensive. . . . Don't wear it in my class;" 4) Ignore it, and wait for an opportunity to call the student on behavior related to his written performance. The discussion quickly polarized. Several instructors felt strongly that making an example of the student would create an unsafe environment in the class and even risk violating the student's freedom of speech. Some instructors felt that to take the student aside would be to privatize an issue that, as an act of discursive violence, should instead be publicly recognized. Two TAs explained that as gay instructors, they could not and would not tolerate it. Other instructors thought that these positions were unreasonable. It was a charged debate that ended pretty much in a standoff.

Many of the people involved in this "Diversity Day" incident—both TAs and trainers—left the training session upset by the conflict that had occurred. After the session, the people who participated described feelings that ranged from "silenced" and "angry" to "threatened," "exposed" and "frightened." Although like bell hooks, I think a discussion about differences should not be a conversation in which everyone comes away in agreement, feeling happy and united, I think the discomfort surrounding this training was not necessarily productive.

Though it might have served as a creative way to rehearse pedagogical decisions, the "Diversity Day" approach did not move the TAs to a constructive interrogation of conflict, authority and accountability in their assignments and classrooms. The approach risks creating a "talk show" discussion of teaching, centered primarily around the immediate emotionally charged question: "what would you do?" The rhetorical stance that this method invites is suggestive of the questions that begin the more popular talk shows: "What if you found out that your husband had been married to two other women? What if you found out that he was still married to two other women? Well, on our show today are two women. . . ." Promoting controversy for the sake of controversy, these situations often become forums for the presentation of personal opinion characterized by their lack of preparation or reflection. Rather than allowing participants to clarify their positions and observations, the use of such scenarios can privilege a decontextualized emotive performance that forecloses critical analysis and shared discourse. Although the "Diversity Day" conflict didn't move to the extremes that we might see on an episode of the Ricki Lake show, the problems that emerged with this training strategy strongly resemble the limitations of the talk show forum.

The training session that I have described erased important contextual information and produced what one TA described as "highly essentialized situations." Difference was articulated as deviance so that all interpretations and explanations were read through the foregrounded difference. With all contextual factors reduced to "quiet Asian female," the identity of the student in the scenario became highly one dimensional and stigmatized. Such scenarios that encode unchallenged stereotypes like "silent Asian female" also implied on some level that the teacher was white and facing a problem with the recalcitrant Other. A TA that I spoke to argued, I think correctly, that what really needed to be questioned was the scenarios that were presented. As one of the graduate trainers reflected after the training incident, "this kind of training treated students as problems that we must fix with the right technique."

The approach also leaves the teacher's position unquestioned so that, as with the talk show, responses are framed in ways that erase the speaker's position. While the scenarios reductively describe who the student is, the implied teacher becomes a cipher, a blank in the pedagogical story. As one TA said, "Rather than questioning, 'What are my goals, how does my presence as a white woman from an upper middle class background, a lesbian and a Jew produce a specific teaching environment?,' I was supposed to solve the problem." Yet at the same time, the TA responses to the scenarios become highly personalized. The same TA explained to me, "I felt like I was asked to simultaneously ignore where my response was coming from and at same time validate my response by coming out." In the ritual space of the sample scenario, some subjectivities are highly politicized and personalized while others remain passive. As with a segment of the Oprah show, some of us may ultimately shut off the T.V. and breath a sigh of relief that it hasn't happened to us.

Beyond creating static roles for both student and teacher, the way that these scenarios are often used for training TAs suggests a problematic division between form and content in composition pedagogy. In other words, the content of diversity is separated from the strategies for teaching writing, a division indicated by the way that TAs sardonically nicknamed the training "Diversity Day" as though it was a Hallmark holiday. The diversity workshop existed separately from sessions on writing assignments, responding to student papers, conferencing, and grading. This separation and the scenarios that were used suggested that diversity was a matter of student behavior modification. In a writing course, incidents of homophobia and struggles over authority are more likely to involve interactions with student essays than our judgments of their clothing. The man with the T-shirt, the quiet student, and the fraternity member all suggest a struggle with student selves as problems to resolve rather than as the dissension inherent in classroom practice.

Rhetorical Contact Zones

In place of or perhaps in preface to a scenario approach, I'd like to suggest another way to bring the "contact zone" into TA training. My strategy is

much influenced by Patricia Bizzell's discussion of multicultural rhetoric in the composition classroom. Rather than teaching composition as the transmission of contextless tools or skills, Bizzell argues that in order to teach students to become "effective communicators in a multicultural democracy," the writing course should focus on rhetorical strategies developed around "experiences of negotiating differences at various moments in American History" ("Theories" 8, 9). Here she suggests that we organize course materials "around historical moments that present what Mary Louise Pratt calls 'contact zones' where cultures meet, struggle and mingle" ("Theories" 8). With personal and academic essays from different rhetorical locations, she proposes that students examine the variety of discourse situations that a multicultural democracy presents, an idea that she has also discussed in a recent issue of *WPA*. (See Shamoon, Schwegler, Trimbur, and Bizzell, "New Rhetoric.")

In her own course at Holy Cross, Bizzell assembled materials about the debate in antebellum America surrounding the assertion in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal." Students in her course contrasted selections from European American defenders and African American attackers of slavery in order to examine the different rhetorical uses of the Declaration and how each writer engaged with other arguments.

Rather than replicating the fragmented, decontextualized "contact zone" that Miller describes and mimics in the structure of his essay, I propose that we bring Bizzell's notion of a rhetorical "contact zone" to our teacher training occasions. Instead of "a student walks into class wearing a T-shirt saying 'homophobic and proud of it'—what would you do?", we might offer clusters of essays that depict some of the complex negotiations of difference in the writing classroom. The first four are a group of that I've given to TAs who have expressed interest in the issue of sexuality in the classroom:

"'So What Do We Do Now': Necessary Directionality as the Writing Teacher's Response to Racist, Sexist, Homophobic Papers." David Rothgery argues that with the antifoundational movement we lose sight of the "necessary directionality for the human condition and the condition of the planet we inhabit—that of alleviating human suffering." From this foundational truth, he argues, we can judge student responses that are homophobic, racist, and sexist.

"Lesbian Instructor Comes Out: The Personal is Pedagogy." Janet Wright describes the act of coming out to her class as a strategy aligned with her feminist critical pedagogy—her self-disclosure, she claims, opens the possibility for "sane, connected, respectful, critical dialogue" with students.

"Homophobia and Sexism as Popular Values." David Bleich describes the many violently homophobic responses that he received in response to an assignment about sexuality in a college expository writing class and demonstrates the manner in which sexism underscores the homophobia in his students' language.

"Breaking the Silence: Sexual Preference in the Composition Classroom." An essay by the six teaching assistants (Berg, *et al.*) who worked with Bleich. As straight-identified teachers, they examine the heterosexual bias built into the assignment question that they used and how it actually provoked the homophobic responses that they received.

What I like about this group of essays is the different experiences and rhetorical stances that each presents. But they are similar in their arguments against the expression of homophobia in the classroom. In order to create a contact zone in Bizzell's terms, I complicate this collection with additional essays:

"Diversity, Ideology and Teaching Writing." The controversial essay in which Maxine Hairston argues that in many first year writing programs, dogma often comes before diversity and politics before craft.

"Johnny's Interview." An ethnographic essay written by a student who interviewed a friend about what it was like to grow up gay and combined this material with research on gay teenagers and homophobia.

"Gays and the Military Just Don't Mix." An editorial written by a student who argues that "gays and perverts" should not be allowed in the armed forces.

And finally, I'd add Miller's "Fault Lines" piece. I recommend that we use these essays in a training session with an approach that is similar to Bizzell's proposal for undergraduate writing courses. To have TAs examine their positions in relation to such a collection would produce a more productive session than "Diversity Day" workshops. Part of this examination should include an opportunity for TAs to write themselves into a specific position on classroom conflicts. As a writing instructor, I've found that undergraduates often take extreme, dogmatic positions in papers because "they are the easiest to argue," as one student confided to me. A discussion of the rhetorical complexities of location and authority in writing and how to teach this in writing courses is, I think, especially important for TA training. From this exchange, new instructors might discuss how their theoretical investments play out in practical contexts, using a case study approach.

Instead of the talk show format of "Diversity Day," the strategy that I propose *begins* by examining how we create positions for ourselves in the classroom politically, personally, historically and rhetorically. In *Critical Teaching and The Idea of Literacy*, C. H. Knoblauch and Lil Brannon explain that "Critical Teaching begins . . . not with a power struggle over preferable readings, but with the reading of those readings, contextualized by the life experiences of those who produced them" (62). Although Knoblauch and Brannon are referring to ways of encouraging undergraduates to reflect back on their own interpretations, I think their argument could and should be applied to a consideration of our positions as teachers around issues of diversity.

For example, new instructors might explore how David Rothgery's assertions of a foundational truth that "lies in that *groping* beyond the imprison-

ment of our situatedness" (246) are problematized by Janet Wright's feminist claims to empowerment and critical pedagogy through situated knowledge. Hairston's essay challenges the very subject of both works. Have we, as she charges, put "dogma before diversity, politics before craft, ideology before critical thinking, and the social goals of the teacher before the educational needs of the student" (180)? New TAs should consider the theoretical and political investments that shape their own responses to these issues. I am not advocating pedagogical pluralism as the goal of teacher training. Instead, I am suggesting that, for example, new instructors who agree with Hairston that politics don't belong in the classroom could see how a range of rhetorical positions politicizes the very stance that they adopt.

Another difference between my proposal and the "Diversity Day" approach is that it places the content of diversity directly in relation to teaching writing classes, classes about language and rhetoric. How do the ways that we assign and respond to student papers inherently shape our approaches to diversity and our claims to rhetorical authority as teachers? Pairing Bleich's essay with the one by his six teaching assistants generates insights about the ways that our authority interacts with student claims to authority in essay responses. Bleich reads student essays from his class as gay bashings influenced by sexism and dominant constructions of masculinity, but there is no indication that students were encouraged to read or reflect on their own readings. Although Bleich cites studies of religious history in order to contextualize his students' use of Christianity to support their homophobia, there is little sense that he allowed students to read these studies. His graduate students, on the other hand, begin their essay "Breaking the Silence" with a critical reading of their CCCC conference presentation on sexuality and writing pedagogy in order to foreground how their own investments affected their pedagogical approach to sexuality in the classroom: "By describing the patterns we saw in our students' writing—in effect viewing our students' virulent homophobia as a phenomenon to analyze—we were distancing ourselves from what was perhaps too painfully obvious; we had raised an issue that we as teachers were unprepared to deal with" (29). They explain how, as straight-identified instructors, they had replicated societal and institutional prejudices in their assignments and related pedagogical practices.

The two student essays that I've suggested prompt important questions about the split between form and content in our pedagogy. During a training session, TAs should have a hand at examining what Bleich's graduate teaching assistants did—how the very assignment structures student responses. In "Johnny's Interview" the student uses interview material and studies on sexuality to counter assumptions that school provides a comfortable nurturing environment for all teenagers. "'Passing' through high school," he argues, "is not a wonderful learning and growing experience." Especially when published "authorities" on sexuality might sustain homophobic assumptions, the student's use of interview material to make his argument suggests alternative forms of rhetorical authority. The other student paper, "Gays and the Military Just Don't Mix," was a response to an assignment in which students were to write an

editorial about "an issue within the community." This essay presents the type of argument-as-personalized-rant that we might hear on an ultraconservative talk show: "Should gays or perverts be allowed in the military? No they should not!" Using the tools of argumentation that he's learned, the student draws on analogy ("Gays in the military do not mix, much the same way alcohol and driving don't mix") and uses key quotes from authorities ("Major Daniel A. Pass of the United States army had this to say on homosexuals in the military, 'In a cohesive military unit which needs to function as one well oiled body the presence of homosexuals in a unit disrupts this operation to the point of disarray'.") Although the student attends to the strategies for argument that he's learned in class, the essay is rife with problematic assumptions and stereotypes about homosexuality. Clearly, we must consider not only how decontextualized rhetoric shapes conversations about diversity in our training, but how an isolated editorial approach to complex issues affects student responses in writing assignments.

The materials that might be included in an examination of this discursive contact zone are broad. Consider institutional documents on discrimination, harassment, and free speech, or excellent essays like "Religious Discourse in the Academy," in which Ronda Leathers Dively suggests strategies for productively challenging dogmatic, dualistic perspectives that appear in student essays. Because sincere religious convictions are often the basis for arguments that deny rights to gays and lesbians, Dively's essay provides important insights for a discussion of sexuality in the writing classroom. The list goes on. This proliferation of materials suggests, I think, that our discussion of diversity should be situated in complex, overlapping contexts rather than in decontextualized scenarios. And of course, the approach that I propose is not limited to sexuality in the classroom. We might use a similar group of essays addressing race, gender, religion or any related issue of diversity in the classroom.

Toward a Critical Genealogy

My argument and strategy indicate larger issues that should be addressed in training new TAs, issues implicit in recent debates about classroom authority. Critical pedagogy and the process paradigm have produced visions of a decentered pedagogy—visions that often invoke nervousness or guilt about being too directive or "appropriating" student texts. In response to these concerns, another strand of the authority and empowerment argument has emerged in recent scholarship. Critics like Bizzell argue that, to be honest, we have always had the power, so why not claim it and use it responsibly? In place of the "persuasive" power of decentered pedagogy or the "coercive" power of current traditional pedagogy, Bizzell offers us "authority":

> Authority is exercised by A over B instrumentally in the sense that sometimes B must do what A requires without seeing how B's best interests will be served thereby, but A can exercise such authority over B only if B initially grants it to A. ("Power" 57)

Bizzell outlines a "two-stage process" in which students are persuaded through a dialogic interaction to grant the teacher the authority to "direct their course of action"—a course of action which will then serve a "liberatory educational project" ("Power" 58).

Although I find Bizzell useful in the ways that she complicates rhetorical situations by bringing historical contexts to argumentation, in this instance her proposal lacks an appropriately full context. As educational theorist Jennifer Gore points out in her book *The Struggle for Pedagogies*, discourses about authority do not function *in general* (139). Gore argues, I think correctly, that we need to go beyond an examination of our arguments about pedagogy to closely examine "the pedagogy of our arguments." In her words, we should scrutinize "what we are as particular kinds of educators . . . how we have come to be this way, and the ramifications and especially, dangers of our actions—not just reflecting on our reality but on how our reality has come to exist" (148). This kind of reflection should be part of our teacher training occasions.

When I gave a earlier version of this paper at a recent conference, one man at the presentation insisted that in the classroom he was a teacher first and all other matters came second. He told a story of a student who walked into his classroom wearing a T-shirt that said "Politically incorrect and proud of it." He explained that he responded to this by making a sarcastic comment that evoked laughter from the other students in his class and seemed to chasten the student. But in some sense his response and the pedagogy of his argument are embedded in whether he perceives "political correctness" as a matter of behavior modification, a glib joke, or a central site of the struggle about language and authority. His approach and its effectiveness emerge also, I think, from his very situated experiences as an older, white, male professor. At the same conference, I attended a panel about gender and authority in the writing classroom. Three women from Virginia Tech spoke of the effects that the ideals of decentered pedagogy had on TAs, specifically white women and women of color, who perceived their authority in the classroom as *already* decentered.

In these contexts how does what seems a simple matter of A persuading B to give A authority play out? To return to Gore's argument, we need to engage in a "critical genealogy" of the ways that we have constructed our authority as teachers in writing classrooms and the ways that institutional authority constructs us as WPAs, instructors, and TAs in order to test our assumptions and discourses and to understand our own involvement in them.

In her essay "Rend(er)ing Women's Authority in the Writing Classroom" Michelle Payne begins this work. Payne examines how her gender and education in composition theory have shaped "a rather interesting, sometimes frustrating, always conflicting inner dialogue about my own authority (and authority in the abstract)" (100). Payne explains that although her decision to decenter her authority in the classroom initially seemed to be the "ideal libertarian pedagogy," this approach was situated in powerful contexts:

> From the perspective of a woman who was socialized to have what poststructuralists call a 'split subjectivity,' who already commands from

> most students less authority and power than a man, yet who has embraced pedagogies and poststructuralist theories that decenter authority, and who also sees the value of 'apprenticing' students into the academy, asking students to question my authority was overwhelming at best, debilitating at worst. (100)

According to Gore, the kind of reflection that Payne demonstrates is more of a "historical tracing of what it means to be a teacher in specific contexts than [just] a personal or biographical account" (151).

Despite his claims that he is replicating a fragmented, decontextualized contact zone, Richard Miller also offers a critical reading of the kinds of authority that produced different instructional responses to the homophobic paper. Some of the responses, he argues, "dramatize how little professional training in English Studies prepares teachers to read and respond to the kinds of parodic, critical, oppositional, dismissive, resistant, transgressive, and regressive writing that gets produced by students writing in the contact zone of the classroom" (394). He advocates encouraging students to interrogate the conflicts that the homophobic student paper invokes, conflicts about "writing's performative aspect—how does it work, what its imagined project might have been, and who or what might be the possible subjects of its critique" (395).

As with Payne's and Miller's critical reflections, an analysis of my own pedagogy as a WPA shaped this essay. As the director of the university's Education Opportunity Writing Program, I had become concerned with issues of sexuality in the writing classroom. The conflict that had emerged with "Diversity Day" training indicated that we were overlooking an important aspect of writing instruction. And more recently, a TA had come to me with her concerns about a student paper. Her student had written an extremely homophobic editorial essay, and as a lesbian the instructor felt both threatened and hurt. She discussed with me her plans for coming out to her class. I expressed my support of her position and her decision to come out, but as a straight-identified woman I was unsure if I could have or should have done more to address her concerns.

I am only beginning to examine the ways that my position as a straight-identified instructor has remained an invisible, authorized element of my pedagogy and that rather than remaining a supportive observer, I need to interrogate the ways that heterosexuality shapes an imperceptible norm in writing classrooms. The issue, as I am realizing, is more complicated than announcing a position or "coming out" in the classroom. In a recent *College English* article Richard Miller describes a session in which new teachers aired a variety of responses to "coming out" in the classroom, a discussion further complicated when one graduate teacher "came out" as a Christian ("The Nervous System" 278-81).

As my colleague Kirk Branch says, teaching is messy. The response I propose to the "Diversity Day" approach only begins to address the problems of diversity in the writing classroom. Payne's genealogical exploration of her gendered authority does not provide her with any easy resolution. And despite

our best efforts to create assignments and classrooms that encourage productive, sensitive responses to issues of diversity, we still will receive disturbing homophobic papers. But to discuss with new TAs—TAs who often want the answer to such pedagogical dilemmas—the heterogeneity of approaches and positions surrounding classroom conflicts seems essential to me. Miller's strategy is similar, although not identical to Bizzell's notion of a rhetorical contact zone: "Once the student writer recognizes that all texts . . . are heterogeneous in their production as well as their reception, it becomes possible to talk about the range and kinds of choices available during the acts of reading and writing, and this, I would argue, is the most important work that can be done in a composition course" ("Fault" 403-4). I think that we can make a parallel statement about teacher training: when teaching assistants realize that pedagogies are heterogeneous in their production as well as their reception, it becomes possible to talk about the political, personal, rhetorical locations of our teaching strategies, and this, I argue, is the most important work that can be done in TA training.

Note

1. I want to distinguish between this scenario approach and the kind of work that has been done with case studies. As Anson, Jolliffe and Shapiro describe them, case studies are "rich retellings of real classroom events" that "encourage teachers to move beyond the 'idea' of a teaching issue by seeing it played out in a particular context enmeshed in various related circumstances" (26). In the scenario approach that I describe, the scenario remains more on the level of an idea.

Works Cited

Anson, Chris M., David A. Jolliffe, and Nancy Shapiro. "Stories to Teach By: Using Narrative Cases in TA and Faculty Development." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 19.1/2 (Fall/Winter 1995): 24-37.

Berg, Alison et. al. "Breaking the Silence: Sexual Preference in the Composition Classroom." *Feminist Teacher* 4.2/3 (Fall 1989):29-32.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Power, Authority and Critical Pedagogy." *Journal of Basic Writing* 10.2 (Fall 1991): 54-70.

___. "Theories of Content."Conference on College Composition and Communication. Convention Center, Nashville, 19 March 1994.

Bleich, David. "Homophobia and Sexism as Popular Values" *Feminist Teacher* 4.2/3 (Fall 1989): 21-28.

Brannon, Lil and C. H. Knoblauch. *Critical Teaching and The Idea of Literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1993.

Dively, Ronda Leathers. "Religious Discourse in the Academy: Creating a Space by Means of Poststructuralist Theories of Subjectivity." *Composition Studies* 32 (May 1994): 91-101.

Gore, Jennifer. *The Struggle for Pedagogies.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Hairson, Maxine. "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 43.2 (May 1992): 179-192.

Miller, Richard E. "Fault Lines in the Contact Zones." *College English* 56.4 (April 1994): 389-408.

___. "The Nervous System." *College English* 58.3 (March 1996): 265-286.

Payne, Michelle. "Rend(er)ing Women's Authority in the Writing Classroom." *Taking Stock: The Writing Process Movement in the '90s.* Ed. Lad Tobin and Thomas Newkirk. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1994.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession 91.* New York: MLA, 1991.

Rothgery, David. "'So what Do We Do Now?" Necessary Directionality as the Writing Teacher's Response to Racist, Sexist, Homophobic Papers." *College Composition and Communication* 44. (May 1993): 241-247.

Shamoon, Linda K., Robert A. Schwegler, John Trimbur, and Patricia Bizzell. "New Rhetoric Courses in Writing Programs: A Report from a Conference for New England Writing Program Administrators." *WPA* 18.3 (Spring 1995): 7-25.

Wright, Janet. "Lesbian Instructor Comes Out: The Personal is Pedagogy." *Feminist Teacher* 7.2 (Spring 1993): 26-33.

Regional Affiliate Meeting

The Southern California WPA Regional Affiliate will hold a conference on October 5, 1996, at California State University, Los Angeles. The theme is "Composition Southern California Style: Where Are We Now, Where Are We Going?" The meeting will feature well-known compositionists in the morning, will honor Ross Winterowd at lunch, and will offer a variety of workshops, roundtables, and interest group meetings in the afternoon. All welcome. For more information, contact Alice Roy at <aroy@calstatela.edu>.

TA Training in English: An Annotated Bibliography

Timothy Catalano, Will Clemens, Julia Goodwin, Gary McMillin, Jeff White, and Stephen Wilhoit

In a recent national survey of writing program administrators employed by both private and public universities (*WPA* 18.3 [1995]: 53-73), Sally Barr-Ebest found that 70-90% of the WPAs working at doctoral institutions were responsible for training graduate teaching assistants in their department. At comprehensive universities (those offering Masters degrees), 20-60% of the WPAs listed training TAs as one of their regular duties (56). Barr-Ebest also found that most WPAs received no formal training for their position; instead, they tended to learn on the job. Only 12% of the men and 3% of the women responding to the survey indicated that they relied on reading and research to learn how to perform their duties (54).

Perhaps one reason so few WPAs rely on reading and research to develop and refine the skills they need to perform their duties is the sheer difficulty of locating some material. While the *CCCC Bibliography* and various computer data bases have made research in rhetoric and composition administration easier, material on TA training in English can still be hard to locate and obtain, as we found when we began compiling this bibliography almost two years ago. Prior to the 1980s, only a few books on TA training in English had been published; in reference works, articles could be indexed under a range of headings; and relevant book chapters often escaped indexing altogether.

Over the last 10 to 15 years, though, a number of important books have been published on TA training in English, TA training has been a popular topic for presentations at conferences such as CCCC, and an increasing number of important journals in the field have published work on the topic. This bibliography includes many of the articles, book chapters, and conference presentations published on TA training since 1980 (plus a few older pieces), readings we found especially helpful as we reviewed and restructured our TA training program.

The annotations are purely descriptive; we have made no attempt to evaluate the quality of the material. For the sake of convenience, we have also grouped the readings under several headings: TA Training and Evaluation Techniques, Program Descriptions, Teaching Duties, Employment Issues, and History.

Readings under "TA Training and Evaluation Techniques" offer suggestions on how to train TAs and evaluate their performance. The material included under "Program Descriptions" addresses similar topics, but is more narrowly

focused, offering in-depth discussions of training programs developed at particular institutions. Several readings located under these headings discuss how to structure TA training programs (Comley; D'Angelo; Gracie; Guinn; Humphries; Roberts; Weimer, Svinicki and Bauer; Weimer; Wilhoit, "Toward"), describe and categorize different types of programs currently in existence (Angelo and Cross; Haring-Smith), or discuss the results obtained from surveys of training programs across the country (Cooper and Kehl; Diamond and Gray; Puccio, "Graduate"; Ruszkiewicz, "Doing"). Most, though, address specific training and evaluation techniques, such as peer coaching (Cooper and Kehl; Hairston, "Training"; Puccio, "Graduate"), faculty mentorships (M. P. Baker; Hansen, Snyder, Davenport, and Stafford; Hayes), team teaching (Simpson), internships (Smith and Smith), videotaping classes (Baker and Kinkead; Puccio, "TAs"), role-playing (Strickland), and developing teaching portfolios (Webster). A few describe how to recognize and reward good teaching among TAs (Langford; Jackson), reduce anxiety about teaching (McBroom; Williams), address TA burnout (Hunt), encourage professional development among TAs (Davis), improve faculty-TA interaction (Dunn; Reagan, "Practicing"), conduct research (Angelo and Cross; Wilhoit, "Conducting"), and link training efforts with various stages of TA development (Staton and Darling; Tirrell).

Under the heading "Teaching Duties" are articles that suggest how to prepare TAs to teach courses other than introductory composition (Allen; Comprone; Cox) or work in a campus writing center (Blalock; Broder). Under the heading "Employment Issues" are articles that address TA stipends (Gething), taxes (M. J. Baker), workload (Gething), grievance procedures (M. J. Baker), and general working conditions (Minkel). Two address collective bargaining arrangements among TAs (Carlson; Craig, "University"). Finally, articles that examine training efforts of the past or discuss how current programs came to assume their present form are included under the heading "History of TA Training."

While reading and discussing this material on TA training, we have noted several trends. First, and not surprisingly, most of the readings offer practical advice on TA training: they discuss specific aspects of writing instruction TA supervisors should include in training programs and suggest how to cover that material. Only a few articles, most published in the mid- to late-80's, suggest that teacher training programs should also include instruction in composition theory (Haring-Smith; Hesse).

We also found surprising uniformity in the structure of the TA training programs described in the readings. Most involve preservice and in-service workshops, with support provided by more experienced TAs, faculty, or the TA supervisor. A few authors, though, have begun to question the theory and structure of TA training programs, raising a number of interesting questions: Who runs these programs? For what end? What is the role of the TA in these programs? What alternatives are available? (see, for example, Chism, Cano, and Pruitt; Cooper and Kehl; Dunn; Kelly et al.; Webster; Weimer, Svinicki, and Bauer; Weiser, "Teaching").

We were also surprised by some almost uniform assumptions concerning the audience of these pieces. First, only a few articles addressed the role of WPAs at smaller, comprehensive universities (Foster; R. Smith). Barr-Ebest's survey found that many WPAs at these schools are responsible for TA training; their particular interests and concerns might not be getting adequate attention in the literature. Second, in almost every case, this material seems to be written by and addressed to WPAs or other interested faculty. Very few of the articles on TA training—even those examining employment issues—were written by or addressed to TAs themselves. While many of the pieces offer retrospective accounts of the author's experiences as a teaching assistant, very few works were written by currently employed TAs. Also, almost all of the articles narrowly focused on training new TAs to teach introductory composition courses. We ran across only a few articles that described other teaching duties or that examined how to prepare experienced TAs to teach introductory literature or advanced composition courses. Finally, only a few pieces seriously examined TA employment issues. WPAs hoping to find in the literature serious, varied discussions of TA work load, salaries, and benefits may be disappointed.

TA Training and Evaluation Techniques

Abbott, Robert D., Donald H. Wulff, and C. Kati Szego. "Review of Research on TA Training." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s*. Eds. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, and Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. 111-124. Summarizes research on the components of TA training programs and the relationship between TA classroom behavior and student course evaluations. Concludes that the field needs more empirical study of TA training and offers suggestions for further research.

Angelo, Thomas A., and K. Patricia Cross. "Classroom Research for Teaching Assistants." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s*. Eds. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, and Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. 99-107. Contends that training programs can better prepare TAs for their future role as college instructors by encouraging TAs to become teacher researchers. By closely studying their students' work and behavior in class, TAs learn to construct research projects as they improve their own teaching. Reviews how TA training programs are commonly structured.

Baker, Mark A., and Joyce A. Kinkead. "Using Microteaching to Evaluate Teaching Assistants in a Writing Program." *Evaluating Teachers of Writing*. Ed. Christine A. Hult. Urbana: NCTE, 1994. 108-119. Explains Utah State University's use of microteaching to evaluate TAs. After the TA and WPA discuss the skills the TA needs to teach a certain portion of a class, only that portion of the class is videotaped. The WPA reviews the tape with the TA to offer instruction, encouragement, and advice. Discusses problems with and advantages of this evaluation technique.

Baker, Moira P. "Mentoring as Teaching and Learning." Conference on College Composition and Communication. San Diego, 31 March-3 April 1993. ED

358 459. Provides personal narrative describing the need for good relationships between mentors and graduate teaching assistants. Focuses on aspects of this relationship at Radford University that improved both the TAs' and the mentors' teaching practices. Emphasizes that the benefits of such relationships will be felt in all courses, not just composition classes.

Border, Laura. "Producing a TA Newsletter." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants.* Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 140-143. . Discusses how a TA newsletter can improve communication among TAs and describes how to put together such a publication. Discusses content ideas including professional development as well as teacher training and support services.

Bridges, Charles W. "The Basics and the New Teacher in the College Composition Class." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition.* Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 13-26. Describes a training program which incorporates theory and practice in developing teachers capable of creating a "student-centered writing curriculum." Discusses five aspects of writing instruction which must be developed in new teachers (process vs. product, peer collaboration, assignment making, response vs. evaluation, and dealing with errors). Presents possible readings and assignments.

Chism, Nancy Van Note, Jamie Cano, and Anne S. Pruitt. "Teaching in a Diverse Environment: Knowledge and Skills Needed by TAs." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s.* Eds. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, and Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. 23-36. Argues that faculty must take a leading role in preparing TAs to teach an increasingly diverse student body. Training programs should address how to teach ethnic minorities, returning adult students, students with disabilities, women, gay and lesbian students. Offers a number of ways TA training programs can be modified to meet these goals.

Comely, Nancy R. "The Teaching Seminar: Writing Isn't Just Rhetoric." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition.* Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 47-57. Argues that freshman composition teacher training programs should synthesize work in literary theory, creative writing, and composition rather than continue to separate these aspects of English studies. Discusses strategies and texts for combining reading and writing in the composition classroom and in teacher training programs.

Cooper, Allene, and D. G. Kehl. "Development of Composition Instruction through Peer Coaching." *WPA* 14.3 (1991): 27-39. Advocates the use of collaborative coaching, especially for novice TAs who may feel a sense of isolation in the classroom. Maintains this isolation can be reduced through organized active cooperation among experienced TAs and newcomers. Presents results of a nation-wide survey of TA training

which indicated substantial interest in collaborative training techniques. Describes and evaluates the program developed at Arizona State University.

D'Angelo, Frank J. "Strategies for Involving Graduate Students in the Teaching of Composition." *ADE Bulletin* 54 (1977): 34-36. Suggests several strategies for helping TAs primarily trained in literary criticism use that knowledge to improve the writing instruction they offer: give TAs the historical context for modern composition instruction, focus on the study of form and structure in writing, demonstrate how literary criticism can inform composition instruction, demonstrate how composition theory can inform literary criticism.

Davis, William E. "TA Training: Professional Development for Future Faculty." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants.* Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 129-131. Asserts that training programs do not adequately emphasize TA professional and career development. Claims that TAs respond more favorably to training programs that emphasize preparation for future careers in teaching. Discusses a professional development series offered at the University of California, Davis, and mentions possible directions for other professional development programs.

Diamond, Robert M., and Peter J. Gray. "A National Study of Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants.* Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 80-82. Discusses results of research into the background, responsibilities, and preparation of TAs from research institutions across the country. Includes statistics from a five-part survey that consisted of questions on demographic information, teaching responsibilities and supervision, teaching preparation and support programs, training international TAs, and general comments and suggestions.

Dunn, Richard J. "Teaching Assistance, Not Teaching Assistants." *ADE Bulletin* 97 (1990): 47-50. Addresses a central contradiction in the treatment of TAs: on one hand, the institution considers graduate appointments a means of financial support; on the other hand, the graduate assistantship is a form of apprenticeship. Recommends departments do all they can to bridge the gaps between faculty and TAs or administration and TAs. To accomplish these goals, suggests increasing pay, decreasing workload, integrating graduate studies and the TA position, and abolishing "post-doctoral" appointments.

Foster, David. "Training Writing Teachers in a Small Program." *WPA* 10.1-2 (1986): 43-49. Maintains that larger composition programs should model their TA training practices on those commonly used in smaller programs which foster among TAs a sense of freedom, individuality, and collegial-

ity. Suggests that larger composition programs allow TAs greater freedom in designing courses and selecting texts, organize small TA/faculty discussion groups, establish TA/faculty mentorships, and invite TA participation in department activities.

Gebhardt, Richard C. "Unifying Diversity in the Training of Writing Teachers." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 1-12. Addresses training writing teachers in general, not just TAs. Suggests the diversity of needs among different client types within a training program can be overcome by emphasizing "unifying concepts." Explains three "unifying ideas" that should be addressed in teacher training programs. Acknowledges the need to balance theory and practice in training instructors.

Gracie, William J., Jr. "Serving Our Teaching Assistants and Our Profession: Teaching Graduate Students to Teach Composition." Conference on College Composition and Communication. San Francisco, March 1982. ED 214 170. Voices a concern that gains recently made in composition studies will be lost unless more attention is given to training TAs adequately. Good training programs should include sensitivity to the job market, course work in composition theory taken for credit, training in research methodologies, guest speakers, and teaching awards. Describes training program author developed at Miami University of Ohio.

Guinn, Dorothy Margaret. "Freshman Composition: Developing Teaching Assistant Teaching Potential." Conference on College Composition and Communication. San Francisco, March 1982. ED 215 359. Outlines some obstacles to teaching assistant training such as instructors' backgrounds in literary studies, little facility with teaching grammar, and lack of time for proper training. Discusses program at Southwestern University designed to address these problems through pre-service training in administrative concerns, classroom policies, evaluation procedures, and a one-semester graduate seminar and workshop to develop composition teaching skills by giving TAs a greater understanding of composition as a discipline.

Hairston, Maxine. "On Not Being a Composition Slave." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 117-124. Discusses how contemporary theories of and guidelines for responding to student writing can help college composition teachers—especially TAs—avoid being overwhelmed when grading papers. Describes how to combine grading with student-teacher conferences.

Haring-Smith, Tori. "The Importance of Theory in the Training of Teaching Assistants." *ADE Bulletin* 82 (1985): 33-39. Divides TA training programs into three categories: (1) a Basic Training approach, (2) an Observation/Apprenticeship approach, and (3) an Advanced Writing Seminar approach. Describes how instruction in composition theory is omitted from all three approaches. Argues that a knowledge of theory helps TAs understand how the students in their classes compose essays, provides

TAs with a meaningful framework in which to teach, alleviates TA burnout, and provides a means for effective TA self-evaluation.

Hesse, Douglas. "Teachers as Students, Reflecting Resistance." *College Composition and Communication* 44 (1993): 224-231. Examines why several students in a graduate composition theory course voiced frustration over theoretical readings. Argues that students may find some readings "difficult" because they lack sufficient knowledge of the field. Suggests that teachers ought to encourage their graduate students to reflect on why they find certain theorists difficult to understand and urge them not to reject new ideas out of hand. Claims that provocative theoretical texts encourage new and experienced instructors to confront their "common sense" notions of teaching.

Hunt, Maurice. "Essay Evaluation As a Framework for Teaching Assistant Training." *Freshman English News* 14.2 (1985): 19-21. Stresses the need for emphasizing evaluation techniques in TA training workshops. Maintains that proper instruction in evaluation is central to effective training: to properly evaluate a paper is also to begin to learn how to help the student improve as a writer.

___. "Preventing Burn-out in Teaching Assistants." *Freshman English News* 15.1 (1986): 12-15. Describes the symptoms and causes of TA "burn-out" then recommends several steps WPAs can take to help TAs manage their work load successfully. Suggestions include discussions of the importance of writing instruction, establishing faculty-TA mentorships, encouraging interactive pedagogy, and urging TAs to share their own work with their students.

Kelly, Kathleen Ann, et al. "To Have or Have Not: The Foucauldian Quandary of Control in Teacher-Training." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Cincinnati, March 1992. ED 348 674. Includes comments originally part of three talks on Foucauldian power/knowledge relationships. Suggests methods for encouraging teaching assistants to discuss openly and to question their pedagogical preferences.

Langford, Thomas A. "Recognizing Outstanding Teaching." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 132-33. Describes the TA recognition program designed to boost graduate student moral and enhance professional development at the Graduate School at Texas Tech. Discusses some of the program's benefits for TAs and the graduate school.

Larson, Richard L. "Making Assignments, Judging Writing, and Annotating Papers: Some Suggestions." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 109-116. Provides suggestions on how new teachers of writing can develop their own assignments then evaluate and respond to their students' writing.

Lawrence, Joyce V. "Fostering and Monitoring TA Development: What Administrators Can Do." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants.* Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 44-46. Discusses levels of interaction between graduate students and the university and how that relationship can become more positive through careful planning on the part of the graduate school. Examines the need for orientation, plans for performance evaluation, knowledge of graduate school's advocacy and support, and service assistance. Lists seven steps administrators can take to foster and monitor TA development.

Lunsford, Ronald F. "Planning for Spontaneity in the Writing Classroom and a Passel of Other Paradoxes." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition.* Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 95-108. Based on the author's own experience and study, suggests that the advantages of peer group editing outweigh the disadvantages, especially when the teacher acts as a consultant, moving from group to group, offering advice when called upon. Suggests short- and long-term training methods to prepare students to participate successfully in peer editing and revising.

McBroom, Geraldine L. "A New Crop of Teaching Assistants and How They Grew." *WPA* 15.3 (1992): 62-68. Traces the development of a group of TAs from novices to "emerging teachers" based on comments they made in journals during their first year as instructors. Describes how these TAs overcame their initial anxiety about teaching by developing individual teaching styles, forming more realistic expectations about their jobs and their students, and learning about composition instruction from peers and faculty mentors.

Mauksch, Hans O. "The Context of Preparing Teaching Assistants." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants.* Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 14-18. Says teaching becomes devalued for both professors and teaching assistants when too much emphasis is placed on natural talent rather than practice and work. Discusses several assumptions harmful to teachers, including the idea that the ability to teach is an innate gift.

Puccio, Paul M. "Graduate Instructor Representation in Writing Programs." Conference on College Composition and Communication. St. Louis, March 1988. ED 297 333. Presents the results of a survey of TA training techniques employed in 50 writing programs which revealed widespread interest in and reliance on peer support. Discusses the advantages and drawbacks of peer training and questions whether peers offer any insights not available from more experienced instructors.

Reagan, Sally Barr. "Practicing What We Preach." *CEA Forum* 20 (1990): 16-18. Suggests that TA training can be improved if supervisors move beyond the traditional instructional methods of reading, discussing, and lectur-

ing. Offers as an alternative a training program that stresses practical experience and collaboration with faculty. Describes a program where new TAs observe and evaluate faculty-taught composition and literature courses which stress collaborative learning.

___. "Teaching TAs to Teach: Show, Don't Tell." *WPA* 11.3 (1988): 41-51. Outlines a seven-step process developed at Drake University for showing TAs how to modify their classroom practices to meet the needs of different types of students. Describes how the TA supervisor used the Myers-Briggs Personality Inventory, interviews, course evaluations, and meetings to help TAs appreciate how different types of instruction affect different types of students. Provides results and caveats derived from the initial trial of the program.

Recchio, Thomas E. "Parallel Academic Lives: Affinities of Teaching Assistants and Freshman Writers." *WPA* 15.3 (1992): 57-61. Argues that graduate teaching assistants have much in common with the students they teach. The transition one makes from undergraduate to graduate school is, in many ways, similar to the transition students make from high school to college. These similarities help TAs sympathize with the difficulties first-year students face in class as they are confronted by new information and critical concepts. Offers suggestions on how TAs may better understand their tasks as teachers of "critical consciousness."

Roberts, David D. "Survival Prosperity: TA Training Colloquia." *Freshman English News* 10.3 (1982): 4, 12-14. Identifies two goals often overlooked in TA training programs: TA prosperity and TA survival. In addition to stressing the theories behind rhetoric, organization, language acquisition, etc., training programs should also stress practical steps TAs should take to survive.

Ruszkiewicz, John J. "Doing What I Do: How New Teachers of Writing Compose." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Minneapolis, April 1979. ED 172 211. Presents the results of an informal survey of new TAs concerning their plans for teaching. Found that most TAs plan to base instruction in their composition classes on how they themselves compose essays and need to find better ways to cover pre-writing and grammar.

___. "The Great Commandment." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 78-83. Suggests that, above all, writing teachers should teach writing. Emphasizes as goals for a writing course teaching invention, structure, style, audience analysis, assessment, and revision. Recognizes the difficult task TAs face and suggests they can overcome some problems by treating their students as apprentice writers.

Schenck, Mary Jane. "Writing Right Off: Strategies for Invention." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 84-94. Argues that TAs' desire to maintain control in the

classroom may limit their students' opportunity to explore certain invention techniques. Suggests that composition classes should use movies or current events to generate discussions in the classroom and should emphasize responding to and analyzing what students have read or seen. Urges TAs to consider using journals, free-writing, heuristics, and collaboration as invention activities.

Simpson, Isaiah. "Training and Evaluating Teaching Assistants through Team Teaching." *Freshman English News* 15.3 (1987): 4, 9-13. Argues that TAs are primarily *teachers* rather than *assistants*. Outlines the benefits of "team teaching"—having faculty and TAs teach a course together. Discusses the strengths and weaknesses of such programs, explaining how they help train and evaluate new teaching assistants. Describes program developed at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, where faculty work with TAs teaching one course a year.

Smith, Eugene, and Marilyn Smith. "A Graduate Internship in Teaching." *Teaching English in the Two-year College* 16 (1989): 197-200. Describes an internship program developed by the University of Washington and North Seattle Community College which places TAs at a two-year college to observe teaching practices and to provide basic assistance. Discusses benefits to the graduate students, faculty, and students. Provides a basic outline for instituting a similar program at other universities and two-year colleges.

Smith, Ron. "The Supervisor of In-service Training in Small Programs: A Basic Job Description." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Philadelphia, March 1976. ED 128 806. Argues that supervising TAs in smaller graduate programs differs from supervising them in larger programs. Suggests that supervisors in smaller programs must act as the TAs' manager, teacher, and friend, roles that sometimes conflict. Describes the qualifications effective TA supervisors must possess and outlines the primary duties and responsibilities they must meet.

Sprague, Jo, and Jody D. Nyquist. "TA Supervision." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s*. Eds. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, and Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. 37-53 . Argues that TA supervisors must play several roles: manager, professional model, and mentor. Argues that supervisors can better succeed in these roles if they understand the changes TAs undergo as they move through several "phases" of development: senior learner, to colleague in training, to junior colleague. Suggests how TA supervisors can best help TAs at each stage of development.

Staton, Ann Q., and Ann L. Darling. "Socialization of Teaching Assistants." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s*. Eds. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, and Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. 15-22. Discusses the difficult position of TAs in the academy: being both student and teacher poses potential problems for new teaching assistants.

Describes how TAs undergo both "role" and "cultural" socialization as they learn to work with their colleagues, succeed in graduate school, succeed as teachers, and advance in the academy. Suggests how training programs can facilitate successful socialization among TAs.

Strenski, Ellen. "Helping TAs Across the Curriculum Teach Writing: An Additional Use for the *TA Handbook*." *WPA* 15.3 (1992): 68-73. Stresses the importance of a well-crafted TA handbook. Suggests that authors of TA handbooks are often too preoccupied with plagiarism and grading standards. Although these issues are important, other issues, such as time management, assignment design, and essay response should also be addressed in a TA handbook.

Strickland, Karen Syvrud. "Planning and Facilitating a Group Workshop." Conference on Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants. Columbus, OH, November 1986. ED 285 501. Discusses modelling and role-playing as tools for teaching new TAs. Suggests organizing informal gatherings to help TAs become familiar and willing to share ideas with one another.

Tirrell, Mary Kay. "Teaching Assistants as Teachers and Writers: Developmental Issues in TA Training." *Writing Instructor* 5 (1986): 51-56. Examines student and TA growth in light of the developmental theories expounded by Piaget, Vygotsky, Perry, and Bruner. Suggests that composition classes should be based on an understanding of students' cognitive and social growth. Explains how TA supervisors can use mentor programs, peer coaching, and journal writing to aid TA development.

Tremmel, Robert. "Beyond Self-criticism: Reflecting on Teacher Research and TA Education." *Composition Studies* 22.1(1994): 44-64. Explores how work in "reflective practice" developed in teacher education programs can be used to improve TA training programs. Reviews efforts to improve TA training, noting relatively little attention has been given to the importance of "self-reflection" as a learning tool. Offers several suggestions on how to develop more reflective, self-critical TAs.

Webster, Janice Gohm. "Composition Teachers: No Experience Necessary?" *ADE Bulletin* 92 (1989): 41-42. Argues against having inexperienced TAs teach composition classes. Suggests instead that all tenured faculty teach at least one composition class a term so TAs are free to take a course preparing them to be instructors.

Webster, John. "Great Expectations: Introducing Teaching Portfolios to a University Writing Program." National Council of Teachers of English Meeting. Louisville, November 1992. ED 361 748. Discusses how, at the University of Washington, a teaching portfolio system was implemented not only to assess and review the TAs' progress, but also to help the TAs in the job market. Describes the content of the portfolios and the four-year process they followed to implement the program. Examines the strengths and limitations of portfolios and offers model criteria and assignments.

Weimer, Maryellen, Marilla D. Svinicki, and Gabriele Bauer. "Designing Programs to Prepare TAs to Teach." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s*. Eds. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, and Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. 57-70. Offers a series of questions that must be addressed by anyone beginning or evaluating a TA training program: (1) who should provide training; (2) if there are different providers, what should be the relationships among them; (3) how long should the program be and when should it occur; (4) what sorts of follow-up activities should be offered; (5) do international TAs need separate and more extensive preparation; (6) how should training be evaluated?

Weiser, Irwin. "Surveying New Teaching Assistants: Who They Are, What They Know, and What They Want to Know." *WPA* 14.1-2 (1990): 63-71. Contends that TA training programs could be improved if supervisors gained a better understanding of the TAs' experiences, needs, concerns, and questions before they begin any orientation activities. Advocates sending a survey to all new TAs to gather this information and describes the findings resulting from a survey of new TAs at Purdue University. Includes a copy of the survey form.

___. "Teaching Assistants as Collaborators in Their Preparation and Evaluation." *Evaluating Teachers of Writing*. Ed. Christine A. Hult. Urbana: NCTE, 1994. 133-146. Argues that involving TAs in their preparation and evaluation contributes to their success in meeting the goals of a TA training program. Describes three ways TAs specifically contribute to their training and evaluation: they complete pre-orientation surveys, evaluate their mentors, and help choose which questions appear on the end-of-term student evaluations for the courses they teach.

Wilhoit, Stephen. "Conducting Research: An Essential Aspect of TA Training." *Kentucky English Bulletin* 39.1 (1989): 48-55. Outlines how TAs can join the teacher-research movement by conducting studies of their students. Suggests seven types of research projects TAs can undertake, examining the strengths and limitations of each. Argues that undertaking research projects is an important part of TA training.

___. "Toward a Comprehensive TA Training Program." *Kansas English* 78.2 (1993): 66-74. Argues that effective TA training programs must focus equal attention on teaching, graduate study, and professional development. Suggests specific skills TAs need to acquire to become successful teachers, students, and scholars.

Williams, Linda Stallworth. "The Effects of a Comprehensive Teaching Assistant Training Program on Teaching Anxiety and Effectiveness." *Research in Higher Education* 32 (1991): 585-598. Reports the results of a comprehensive study of how training programs affect TA anxiety. Twenty-seven TAs at the University of Oklahoma were divided into two groups: both participated in a pre-service training program and in-service theory and pedagogy course, but the experimental group also participated in a

consultant observation and peer mentor program. TAs in the experimental group experienced lower levels of anxiety. Neither group, though, demonstrated an increase in teaching effectiveness ratings from students at the end of the term.

Program Descriptions

Altman, Howard B. "TA Training at the University of Louisville: Creating a Climate." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants.* Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 174-76. Describes the contents of the University of Louisville program's pre-academic orientation for new TAs and the series of professional pedagogical seminars held twice a semester where TAs meet with outstanding faculty members to discuss pertinent issues. Evaluates the program by discussing the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of certain procedures and mentions future plans for training.

Bloom, Lynn Z. "Finding a Family, Finding a Voice: A Writing Teacher Teaches Writing Teachers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9.2 (1990): 3-14. Discusses the circumstances which lead to changes in the TA training program at Virginia Commonwealth University. Stresses the importance of teaching writing instructors to focus on their own composing processes as a means of better understanding how to teach writing. Advocates forming a personal bond, a "community of writers," among professors and graduate students. Uses quotations from students' journals to illustrate the effectiveness of the program.

Diogenes, Marvin, Duane H. Roen, and C. Jan Swearingen. "Creating the Profession: The GAT Training Program at the University of Arizona." *WPA* 10.1-2 (1986): 51-59. Describes the TA training program at the University of Arizona which attempts to treat TAs as junior colleagues in the department by developing a sense of shared purpose. Includes information on Arizona's teaching handbook, class visitations, small group workshops, and successful TA/faculty collaborative publishing efforts.

Gefvert, Constance J. "An Apprenticeship for Teaching Assistants." *Freshman English News* 10.3 (1982): 16-19. Describes the TA apprenticeship program developed at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. This program involves a reduced teaching load for new TAs so they can participate in an extensive preservice workshop, complete course work in composition theory and pedagogy, participate in small advising groups led by faculty advisors, and work in at least one specialized setting (i.e., the Writing Center, a community college, etc.). Explains how the English Department obtained adequate institutional support for their program revisions.

Hairston, Maxine. "Training Teaching Assistants in English." *College Composition and Communication* 25 (1974): 52-55. Describes the TA training program at the University of Texas, Austin, and its extensive use of peer counselors. Explains how, because of the large number of new TAs entering the department each year, the program began forming 5 or 6 new TAs into peer support and training groups lead by experienced TAs. These "counselors" meet weekly with the new TAs to design course goals, answer questions, and discuss grading standards. Describes how the program benefits the department, new TAs, and the counselors themselves.

Hansen, Kristine, Phillip A. Snyder, Nancy Davenport, and Kimberli Stafford. "Collaborative Learning and Teaching: A Model for Mentoring TAs." *The TA Experience: Preparing for Multiple Roles*. Ed. Karron G. Lewis. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, 1993. 251-259. Discusses the TA training program at Brigham Young University which relies heavily on collaborative learning and faculty mentoring. After their initial training, TAs teach first-year composition courses then have the opportunity to team-teach large advanced writing courses with faculty. Other aspects of training include peer mentoring and class visitations. Provides assessment information suggesting the team-teaching model achieves good results.

Hayes, Darwin L. "Integrating Supervision, Evaluation, and Training: Graduate Student Internships in Teaching Composition." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 227-229. Describes the graduate student writing internship program at Brigham Young University. Students are prepared to teach upper-level English courses by being paired with faculty mentors, observing the faculty member teach the course before assuming sole responsibility for the class the following term. Maintains that the program improves the TAs chances for employment and promotes collegiality.

Humphreys, W. Lee. "The TA Seminar and TA Support Services at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. " *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 171-173. Describes the two main objectives of the TA training program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville: to enhance the instruction offered on campus and to help TAs develop their professional skills for future university teaching jobs. Discusses the format and content of the training seminar and lists other support services.

Irmscher, William F. "TA Training: A Period of Discovery." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 27-36. Describes the training program at the University of Washington. Argues that the similarities between the situations faced by new TAs and first-year students can be used to establish a sense of community

in the classroom. Discusses the benefits of peer observation among TAs. Highlights the role of the director of training.

Jackson, William K. "Support Services for Graduate Teaching Assistants at the University of Georgia." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 158-59. Describes support services for TAs offered at the University of Georgia, such as a TA handbook, optional training program, international student screening for assistantships, and recognition of outstanding TA performance.

Puccio, Paul M. "TAs Help TAs: Peer Counseling and Mentoring." Conference on Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants. Columbus, OH, November 1987. ED 285 502. Describes how the University of Massachusetts Resource Center provides experienced TAs as volunteer counselors for new TAs. Peer counselors use videotaping to make new TAs more aware of their teaching style. Suggests ways to train TA counselors so their relationship with new TAs remains friendly and productive.

Robinson, William S. "Teaching Composition Teachers How to Teach Writing." *Composition Chronicle* 3 (December 1990): 4-6. Describes the "Certificate in the Teaching of Composition" program at San Francisco State University. Focuses on the evolution of the program from a one course seminar to a full-fledged MA degree. Argues that obtaining the certificate has helped students gain entrance into postgraduate programs and earn positions as writing program administrators.

Smith, Philip E., II. "A Pedagogy of Critical and Cultural Empowerment: What We Talk about in Graduate Teaching Seminars." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Seattle, March 1989. ED 307 617. Outlines the philosophy behind the University of Pittsburgh's graduate program and graduate teaching seminars. Describes content and emphasis of training seminars on teaching reading and writing, giving examples of readings employed. Includes excerpts of graduate student papers discussing teaching.

Smith, William L. "Using a College Writing Workshop in Training Future English Teachers." *English Education* 16.2 (1984): 76-82. Describes the University of Pittsburgh's Writing Workshop and the three-stage, highly structured internship program future writing teachers complete as a practical component to a required methods and theory course. Describes how the program gradually leads to the intern becoming an independent tutor before doing any actual classroom teaching. Lists five effects which the tutorial internship has been observed to have on interns' and former interns' teaching.

Van DeWeghe, Richard P. "Linking Pedagogy to Purpose for Teaching Assistants in Basic Writing." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 37-46. Outlines the TA training

program at the University of Colorado, describing both the theory-based orientation meeting and the more practical series of workshops held throughout the school year. Provides detailed descriptions of three sample workshops illustrating how they combine theory and practice.

Teaching Duties

Allen, O. Jane. "The Literature Major as Teacher of Technical Writing: A Bibliographical Orientation." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 69-77. Asserts that in the future, TAs will likely teach lower-level technical writing classes which have become increasingly popular among students and increasingly hard to staff. Claims that if TAs are to succeed as teachers of technical writing, technical writing must be placed in the context of other types of writing. Provides bibliographic material on four points of emphasis: definition, audience analysis, visual aids, and collaboration. Concludes with suggestions for research in technical writing.

Blalock, Susan E. "The Tutor as Creative Teacher: Balancing Collaborative and Directive Teaching Styles." *The TA Experience: Preparing for Multiple Roles*. Ed. Karron G. Lewis. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, 1993. 348-352. Describes how, at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, graduate teaching assistants also work in the university writing center. Lessons learned working with students one-on-one in the writing center transfer to teaching strategies in the composition classroom and helped TAs address the individual problems of students in their classes.

Broder, Peggy F. "Writing Centers and Teacher Training." *WPA* 13.3 (1990): 37-45. Provides a general description of how working as tutors in writing centers can provide invaluable experience for prospective classroom teachers. Includes affirming comments from former tutors who have since become classroom teachers.

Comprone, Joseph J. "Managing Freshman English: Are We Really on the Right Track?" Conference on College Composition and Communication. Cincinnati, March 1992. ED 344 209. Questions whether TAs are best served by being put in charge of 25-30 students in a composition class of their own. Offers as an alternative having TAs meet with students in discussion sections of a much larger composition class taught by a professor. Describes how he designed such an experimental course at Michigan Technological University (113 first-year students, 9 TAs). Includes assessment techniques employed to evaluate the class, discusses student and TA response to the course, and suggests how schools can design similar courses.

Cox, Don R. "Fear and Loathing in the Classroom: Teaching Technical Writing for the First Time." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana: NCTE, 1986. 58-68. Examines the fears

some teaching assistants have when asked to teach technical writing courses. Attributes these fears to stereotypes and misconceptions concerning technical writing. Identifies and explores solutions to some of the problems TAs face when teaching these courses.

Employment Issues

Baker, Marilyn J. "Grievances and Taxes." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 49-52. Asserts that TAs need to be aware of grievance procedures and that those procedures should be tailored to the TAs' peculiar needs as both students and employees. Outlines grievance procedures at the University of Southern California, discusses common complaints, and recommends specific measures to avoid them. Discusses tax laws and suggests ways to lessen their impact on TAs.

Carlson, Charles E. "A Negotiator's Perspective." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 60-64. Discusses future of collective bargaining for the University of Wisconsin, Madison, after legislation passed extending collective bargaining privileges to TAs. Gives background on his experience as a professional negotiator with the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and the TAA (Teaching Assistant Association) discussing pros and cons of the arrangement. Elaborates on the difficulties TAs will encounter in bargaining with a state agency and discusses how the new legislation will effect all parties.

Craig, Judith S. "An Administrative Perspective." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 53-60. Gives background on what led to collective bargaining between the TAA (Teaching Assistant Association) and the administration at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and discusses some of its consequences for graduate students and the university. Talks about common issues that surfaced during bargaining such as wages and benefits, workloads, evaluation processes, grievance procedures, course content and pedagogy, and jurisdiction. Lists advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining.

___. "University-level Policies for TAs: Experience at the University of Wisconsin, Madison." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 38-43. Discusses origins, structures, problem areas, and strengths of teaching assistant policies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Gething, Thomas. "Stipends and Workloads." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 47-49. Describes how the University of Hawaii handles TA stipends and workloads. Discusses five areas of concern for TAs and administrators: setting stipends, adjusting stipends, establishing variable rate stipends, deciding workloads and overloads, and obtaining comparative national data.

Minkel, C. W. "The Formulation of University Policy for Graduate Assistantship Administration." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 35-37. Presents results of a survey on teaching assistant conditions in 46 major universities based on those universities' policies and procedures. Recommends that universities use a "model policy" for graduate assistant administration that focuses on issues such as training, teaching goals, qualifications, outside employment, and academic standards.

Weiser, Irwin, and Karen Dwyer. "The CCCC's 'Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing': Implications for Writing Program Administrators and Teaching Assistants." *The TA Experience: Preparing for Multiple Roles*. Ed. Karron G. Lewis. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, 1993. 19-24. Discusses the problems of applying standard, universal guidelines concerning the teaching of writing to particular institutions, using as an example the author's efforts to apply the CCCC's guidelines to the writing program in place at Purdue University. Special attention is given to the four guidelines that most directly apply to the role of graduate teaching assistants in the department. Argues that the CCCC's standards work best as guidelines, not as blueprints for program reform.

History of TA Training

Marting, Janet. "A Retrospective on Training Teaching Assistants." *WPA* 11.1-2 (1987): 35-44. Traces similarities and differences among the concerns addressed in various discussions of TA training since 1930. Identifies historical shifts in opinion, especially on the question of whether academic or pedagogical preparation should be emphasized in training programs. Describes the fruitful mix of scholarship and pedagogy that characterizes the content of most current TA training programs.

Parrett, Joan L. "A Ten-Year Review of TA Training Programs: Trends, Patterns, and Common Practices." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987. 67-79. Describes a study of teaching assistant training programs

that centered on training program patterns, training methods, and training formats from 1976-1986 across academic disciplines at a number of institutions. Issues addressed include curricular planning, TA participation, professionalism, TA duties and problems, instructional aids, student learning patterns, and general education.

Pytlik, Betty P. "A Short History of Graduate Preparation of Writing Teachers." National Council of Teachers of English Meeting. Louisville, November 1992. ED 355 545. Sketches the history of writing-teacher education in the United States. Identifies several reasons why the 1950s was a decade of academic reform in English, emphasizing how it proved to be a crucial transition period that greatly affected the way graduate students were trained to teach.

___. "Teaching the Teacher of Writing: Whence and Wither?" Conference on College Composition and Communication. San Diego, March 1993. ED 355 541. Discusses some of the academic and administration changes brought about by World War II and the enactment of the G. I. Bill of Rights in 1944. Describes the freshman composition programs into which returning war veterans were placed. Describes, too, some of the few graduate methods courses offered during the forties, fifties, and sixties, as well as the typical training program for TAs entering the profession at that time.

___. "Teaching the Teachers of Writing: Evolving Theory." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Cincinnati, March 1992. ED 345 273. Discusses the culture-versus-efficiency debate that took place in the early decades of this century and from which TA training emerged. Identifies seven early twentieth-century assumptions about teacher preparation that still exist today.

Portfolio as Genre, Rhetoric as Reflection: Situating Selves, Literacies, and Knowledge

Kathleen Blake Yancey

In a hushed, almost basement-like second-floor auditorium at 8:30 am on a Saturday in late July, I stand before my colleagues at the 1995 WPA Conference: to share with them some of the observations I've made about reflection—based on theory, on practice, on reflection itself. I think I have something to say that is worth hearing. What I don't understand is what I will learn, what new directions this piece will take as a direct function of its being, at one point in time, this talk.

Chuck Schuster—and by extension, the WPA—has been gracious enough to invite me to talk to you for about 40 minutes, and what I'd like to do during this time is to examine, somewhat discursively, the topic of reflection: to consider what kinds of reflection there might be, to outline what we gain by including reflection in our classrooms and in our evaluations, and to raise some of the questions about reflection that have yet to be addressed.

I want to begin this thinking about reflection by observing that quite apart from portfolios, reflection is valuable in and of itself. It's almost always been a part of my life—in much the same way, and with the same ritual-like regularity and tempo and value—as has been planting, then harvesting, and then putting to bed a spring and summer garden. At the end of every school year, for as long as I can remember, I have spent some time "figuring up": thinking about what I've done well as a friend, a student, a teacher, a parent, and a human being; about where I've fallen short and why, and how I might have done better; and about the kinds of questions that seem to be motivating my current thinking. Sometimes I share this reflecting with someone close to me, perhaps with my best Indiana friend Carol or my husband; sometimes it's for me alone. Sometimes—quite often—I share small pieces of this reflective project with different friends and colleagues. Just the process of "figuring up," of articulating what is important to me and what I value, seems to locate me—relative to where I've been, to where I'm going, to the communities of whom I am a part.

In the 1970's (and into the 80's, too, I think), we talked about getting "centered," which I take to mean being balanced and thoughtful and reflective. These reflective rituals are, in part, what center me, help me see when I should stay the course or take a detour, enable me to see that perhaps I should change the directions I've set to suit the selves I seem to be becoming.

So what I want to say here is that reflection—like all learning—is personal and is for the personal learner first, the academic learner second. (I'm not sure they are can be separated and bracketed off this way. But each deserves specification.)

That's my starting point.

It's also true, however, that reflection has come to represent something more than just personal retrospective ruminations on one's quality of life, or projections about the direction in life one wants to take. In schools of all sizes, with students of all kinds, from small schools like Eckerd College in Florida and Hampton Sydney in Virginia to large state institutions like the University of Michigan and the University of Alaska Southeast, students are creating portfolios that are distinguished from folders primarily by a single feature: reflection.

The reflection leading to and accompanying these portfolios can take various forms. Sometimes it's focused on a student's sense of "literate self." It asks, what kind of reader are you? What do you like to read, and when, and where, and why? What kind of writer are you? Of which of your writings are you most proud, and why? What goals would you like to accomplish as a writer? What are the relationships between your reading and your writing? Between your reading and your writing and your selves?

> *I've never really thought about myself as a writer [one student says]. I know I do a lot of writing in and out of class, but I never thought of myself as a writer.*

Sometimes reflection can include students talking about what they've learned about writing, and about their writing *practices*. Sometimes that learning involves how writers turn to different genres on different occasions. And sometimes reflection involves *uncertainty*, presenting what Polyani calls a real problem, a real question:

> *The poem "Last Bows" was written at the time that I was deciding what college to attend. It seemed like I had to plot my whole life before high school graduation. . . . I remember feeling a great sense of relief after I had completed "Last Bows." This was when I discovered that writing could be therapeutic. The curious thing about this selection is, at that time I had not written poetry in years, and since that time I have not written poetry at all. It seems strange to me that I should turn to such an unfamiliar form when I was feeling so uncertain.*

Sometimes reflection is focused on a specific text. We can use companion pieces of the kinds described by Jeff Sommers—what he calls Writer's Memos. We can use letters of the kind described by Sam Watson. We can use what Tom Hilgers calls post writes: reflective pieces that talk about the processes that went into the text. We can use what I've called Transmittal Forms, which include the writer's sense of what worked and what didn't, what questions are still unanswered, the composer's sense of what difficulties were evoked in the writing. In

asking students to complete these companion pieces, we invite them to examine their writing processes in action; that gives us one perspective. We see the product produced by the processes; that gives us another. Both have something to offer.

Borrowing from Peter Elbow, we can ask for yet another kind of reflective companion piece, for a self-assessment that includes both believing and doubting: believing that the writer's text is terrific and writing about that, doubting that it's very good and writing about that, in the process maintaining simultaneously what Carl Sagan calls "dual modes co-habiting in the mind."

> *I believe that I have narrowed a possible focus for the article. I have opened some doors for data collection, and I have a clearer idea of the kinds of data that need to be viewed. I believe I have found a comfortable academic voice that is not so academic, and I intend to develop it even more. . . .*
>
> *Other than my horriblr proofreading skills, I still have doubts about whether or not I am heading in the right direction in terms of how I view what we have accomplished in this class and a realistic/pertinent research goal.*

Sometimes reflection can invite a student to talk about what she learned and how she used that learning in a piece, and then to show us first, how that learning became a part of the piece and second, a means of representing in her composing repertoire. We begin to see the learning-in-action as a text is shaped by it, quite consciously.

> *A dramatic example of my new consciousness of voice developed within the first month of class and is included in the newspaper clippings portion of this portfolio. I wrote the cover story for Cabarrus Neighbors. The story dealt with a family taking care of its Alzheimer-stricken grandmother. Feeling was a necessity in this story to portray it in the way it deserved. I applied what I had learned by thinking more about who my audience for the story would be, about who the writer was (me with a grandfather of my own who has Alzheimer's) and about what the most dramatic quotes were to create the strongest voice. . . . I told the story through her pained voice. A quote from the woman caring for her mother that told it all read:*
>
> > *OFTEN I AM ANGRY, FRUSTRATED, AND EXASPERATED. AND THEN ONCE IN A WHILE, YOU HAVE A GLIMMER—MAYBE A LAUGH OR A SMILE—THAT REMINDS YOU OF WHAT YOU HAD. IT'S LIKE THE SUN POPPING OUT DURING A RAINSTORM. AND THEN IT'S GONE.*
>
> *I used a direct quote, so the learning was not so much in how to fabricate good voices through the words and thoughts that I chose; but rather to choose the most characteristic and telling quotes and events from the 20-30 pages of notes I often gather in an interview.*

And sometimes the reflection is geared quite specifically to the portfolio: just the process of thinking about how it might represent the learner suggests new ways of knowing, new connections for representation—some visual as well as verbal.

It helps the students see that meaning comes from multiplicity, from diversity, from connecting what goes on *outside* our classrooms with what goes on *inside*.

> *Then I got to thinking . . . Does everything I put into my portfolio have to be written? Does it have to be written by me? What are the limits to the creative aspect of this? Honestly, I would love to put this [video of a TV show] in my portfolio with a rationale, because I think it could tell more about what kind of teacher I want to be than a lot of the things I have written in the class.*

Forms vs. **Kinds** of Reflections

We have many *forms* of reflection: companion texts, predictive texts, retrospective texts. What we don't have is a classification of these *kinds* of texts—or more to the point, a classification of the kinds of reflection that we see in these texts and that contribute to these texts. To undertake this task, I'll begin by calling upon Donald Schön's work in reflection, what we have generally come to know by the tag *reflective practice*.

Schön, the author of *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, distinguishes between knowing-in-action and reflection-in-action. Many problems, Schön explains, are well defined, permitting (perhaps even encouraging) a "routinized" response. Such a response reveals knowing-in-action:

> [a knowing which] may be described in terms of strategies, understandings of phenomena, and ways of framing a task or problem appropriate to the situation. The knowing-in-action is tacit, spontaneously delivered without conscious deliberation; and it works, yielding intended outcomes so long as the situation falls within the boundaries of what we have learned to treat as normal. (28)

But much of writing, as we know, falls outside those boundaries, calls for novel responses based on new ways of seeing the situation, the purpose, the audience, the genre, and hence the material. Thus, the need for what Schön calls reflection-in-action:

> Reflection-in-action has a critical function, questioning the assumptional structure of knowing-in-action. We think critically about the thinking that got us into this fix or this opportunity; and we may in the process, restructure strategies of action, understandings of phenomena, or ways of framing problems. (28)

Put in my language, Schön's point: If I write something, it becomes real. I cannot take it back; I cannot forget it or deny it or pretend it doesn't exist. I have to acknowledge it, engage with it, account for it, challenge it: explore what it *means*, to me, to others. That's reflection.

Through reflection, we can circle back, to return to earlier notes, to earlier understandings and observations, to re-think them from time present (as

opposed to time past), to think how things will look to time future. Reflection asks that we explain to others, as I try to do here, so that *in explaining to others, we explain to ourselves*. We begin to re-understand.

Reflection is thus recursive and generative. Reflection is thus also thoroughly postmodern; it's not either a process/or a product, but both processes *and* products.

If what Schön is calling reflection-in-action brings with it vague echoes from the past, that's because it seems to be what researchers of composing processes used to call the processes of "reviewing" and "monitoring" and revising as a single text is written. Although these processes weren't identified or defined as *reflective* in past models of composing, what is currently called reflection-in-action was identified as crucial to the composing processes studied and described by Linda Flower and John Hayes, Nancy Sommers, Sondra Perl, and Susan Miller. Regardless of the ways these researchers framed their observations, they all found the same thing: expert writers rely on this reviewing during composing and between drafts, finding in it (1) a means of invention and (2) a way to read as the other in order to communicate with him and her.

Perl constructed her reflection-in-action by dividing the process into two components, almost like two selves, calling the one retrospection, the other projection, calling them collectively the "alternating mental postures writers assume as they move through the act of composing" (369). The first—retrospection—she says,

> refers to the way in which the writer turns back to lay hold of and take forward the sense, however, inchoate, of what is already there to say. Writing is the carrying forward of an inchoate sense into explicit form. This proceeds further when what has been written can be read, sensed anew and used to provide a further differentiation of the sense one has now of what one wants to say. (Perl and Egendorf 260)

In contrast to retrospective structuring, Perl says, projective structuring

> depends on a writer's capacity to distinguish between a felt sense of what is being intended and the formulations devised to say it. Only through this distinction can projective structuring proceed. One must be able (a) to lay hold of the sense of one's intention and (b) to compare it with one's sense of what readers will need to be told before they can grasp it, so as (c) to assess whether a given set of formulations provides an adequate vehicle for translating a private datum into publicly accessible form. (Perl and Egendorf 260)

For Perl, the dual modes of mind are focused both on the relationship between the writer and the text, and on the relationship between the reader and the text.

During this same period in the early 1980's, Nancy Sommers also posited two writers within the rhetor. Again relying (as was the custom then) on the

expert writer for the model of felicitous practice, Sommers observed that

> experienced writers imagine a reader (reading their product) whose existence and whose expectations influence their revision process. They have abstracted the standards of a reader and this reader seems to be partly a reflection of themselves and functions as a critical and productive collaborator—a collaborator who has yet to love their work. The anticipation of a reader's judgment causes a feeling of dissonance when the writer recognizes incongruities between intention and execution, and requires these writers to make revisions in all levels. (378)

Sommers thus also seems to be positing two actors working together within a single writer; the distinction between them is not only clear but necessary, forcing a detachment of the writer from the text, even as the text is being produced, a detachment that makes possible another perspective on the text.

Asking our students to reflect in these ways invites them to behave as expert writers when they compose: to read their emerging texts not only as writers but also as readers, to consider what strategies can be useful, to determine what truths they are to tell. The forms of reflection identified above thus invite writers to construct and verbalize these other selves and this other knowledge, as they compose. This, then, is one kind of reflection: reflection-in-action.

Constructive Reflection

At the beginning of this paper, I said that reflection *seems always* [to have] *been a part of my life—in much the same way, and with the same ritual-like regularity and tempo and value—as has been planting, then harvesting, and then putting to bed a spring and summer garden.* Upon reflection, I see that one problem with this metaphor is that its image of the garden suggests that reflection is *natural*, that like a healthy plant (and almost effortlessly, but predictably), it will grow, produce fruit, and benefit human beings. Isn't it pretty to think so?

About reflection, we know better: we look at our general culture, filled with racial tension, with hate crimes, with poverty and hunger. We look at our schools, often as unreflective as the culture from which they cannot be divorced, and we see that if we want students to be reflective, we will have to invite them to do so, may need to reflect with them. Reflection, it seems (so Vygotsky would have us believe, and Schön concurs) is social as well as individual. Through reflection, we learn to tell our stories of learning: in the writing classroom our stories of writing and of having written and of will write tomorrow. This story-making involves, as Bakhtin suggests, our taking a given story, and our lived stories, and making it anew. And I suppose I think this reflection is so important because without it, we live the stories others have scripted for us: in a most unreflective, unhealthy way. The stories we make construct us, one by one by one, cumulatively. So I think it's important to tell lots of stories where we get to construct many selves for us to attempt, some we continue to inhabit.

I think this is part of what Jim Berlin meant when he talked about the portfolio as a place to explore the competing discourses that make up any writer:

> [t]he portfolio in a postmodern context enables the exploration of subject formation. As students begin to understand through writing the cultural codes that shaped their development, they are prepared to occupy different subject positions, different perspectives on the person and society. The narratives of their developments as writers recommended by the portfolio become accounts of their larger intellectual, personal, and social growth. (65)

In other words, through reviewing texts in multiple genres and through choosing which of those to share in a portfolio, a student constructs an identity. These texts are what Chris Anson calls primary and secondary—in the case of writing, the primary texts are the final drafts, the secondary texts all kinds of texts: journals, quick freewrites, peer responses, research notes, companion pieces. Through reviewing all these texts, the writer sees herself assuming various subject positions. Pat Belanoff makes the same point when she talks about the portfolio as a place for "a polyvoiced statement whose voices are not necessarily harmonious": "We are forced," she says, "to face the writer, not just the writing" (23).

So: here we have a second kind of reflection, one based in multiple texts, one whose purpose is to construct a tentative, polyvoiced identity, a reflection I'm going to call *constructive*. An important kind of reflection, I think, but also one really quite different from reflection-in-action. Reflection-in-action tends to be embedded in a single composing event, tends to be oriented to a single text, its focus squarely on the writer-reader-text relationship and on the development of that text. But when we begin to ask writers other kinds of questions—"who writes here?" "is that the same writer who wrote earlier?" and "how does this writer know?"—we are asking questions that are as autobiographical as they are reflective.

Constructive reflection is like autobiography, where as William Gass tells us, the self divides, not severally into a recording self, an applauding self, a guilty self, a daydreaming self, but into a shaping self: it is the consciousness of oneself as a consciousness among all these other minds, an awareness born much later than the self it studies, and a self whose existence was fitful, intermittent, for a long time, before it was able to throw a full beam upon the life lived and see there a pattern, as a plowed field seen from a plane reveals the geometry of the tractor's path (51).

This is the kind of reflection—on a *shaping self*—that we ask of our students when we ask them to think about who they are as writers, when we ask them to discern patterns among subject positions they have taken, when we ask them to plot their own cumulative development as an increasing accretion of writing selves.

Not that this is an easy thing: quite the reverse. And, as important, it's quite different from reflection-in-action. For one thing, it requires different skills, as Schön explains: "Clearly, it is one thing to be able to reflect-in-action and quite another to be able to reflect on our reflection in action so as to produce a good

verbal description of it; and it is still another thing to be able to reflect on the resulting description" (31). So what we are doing when we ask students for multiple texts is not only asking them to make choices that begin to construct a writer but also choices that lend themselves to a *good verbal description* that *itself* can be reflected upon.

Reflection-in-Presentation

Which of course leads me to a third kind of reflection, that good verbal description, what I'm going to call *reflection-in-presentation*. In some ways, this is the reflection we are most familiar with, regardless of the form it takes: the introductory "Letter to the Reader" that fronts the portfolios used for exemption at Miami University; the annotations upon single pieces that accompany selections in the Missouri Western portfolio-in-the-major; and the final reflective essay that summarizes the exhibits we often see in classroom portfolios. All of this reflection is presentational, though as Laurel Black, Don Daiker, Jeff Sommers, and Gail Stygall point out, what's valued in these presentations shifts from context to context. Part of that context is the situation within which a portfolio is read. Is the course or program grounding the portfolio one that favors cultural critique, for instance, or is it oriented more to issues of voice and expression? This context will have much to do with what is valued in the reflection-in-presentation.

Another part of that context is the *genre* within which the reflection-in-presentation occurs, a factor that is among the less-examined issues in portfolios and thus one that I'd like to consider briefly here. As Berlin suggests, any genre always excludes more than it includes, and nowhere is this more true than in the two most popular genres for reflection-in-presentation: the introductory letter and the final essay. The introductory letter is marked by several features: it welcomes a kind of personal address to the reader; it overviews the portfolio contents, which the reader presumably has not yet read; it provides a place to tell various kinds of stories, particularly about the writer developing (often from writing occasions long since passed); and it sets a context for the reader and thus may considerably influence the reading of the rest of the portfolio. The reflective essay, on the other hand, typically comes at another point in the reading process—after the "evidence" of primary (and perhaps secondary) texts has been presented. It's both more analytical and interpretive in nature, more typically academic, more single-voiced and single-pointed. In terms of gender, the letter seems more oriented to the female, to the writer whose textual identity has historically been composed of personal writings like diaries and journals and letters, whose sense of self is located between and among relationships, as biographers of women like Linda Wagner-Martin will attest. The essay, by contrast, seems more objective, more school-like, more oriented to the texts themselves and to the institutions framing them.

Given these observations, which genre should we assign our students? Asked differently, which discursive site is more hospitable to reflection? One response is to envision the essay more capaciously than I've done here, to see it as a site less rather than more scripted, to use it for exploration as well as for assertion, for associational thinking as much as for thrust and parry, for connecting as well as prioritizing, to do with the essay what Wendy Bishop recently did in a *CCC* interchange with David Bartholomae and Peter Elbow: work around and between and among the issues they raised to get at the issues she was interested in, in collage-like, associational, multi-vocal modes. Such an essayist genre would allow the kinds of insights characteristic in the introductory letter, would resist the control exercised by a unitary governing mind. In Belanoff's terms, it would be multi-vocal. A second suggestion is entailed in Berlin's observation about why we value education in the first place:

> The point of education in a democracy is to discover as many ways of seeing as possible, not to rest secure in the perspective we find easiest and most comfortable or the perspective of those currently in power. (66)

If this is indeed our aim in education, and if genre is (as Kenneth Burke argued) a way of not seeing as much as it is of seeing, then perhaps we ought to ask our students to do both kinds of reflection-in-presentation: the one that sets the stage for our reading and the after-one that interprets the contexts and develops evidentiary claims for an over-riding argument.

In both cases, we will get more writer, because that is what portfolios inevitably invite. Nor is such a move new in the composition curriculum or in the assessment of student writing. As both Lester Faigley and Jim Berlin have demonstrated, American English teachers have taught writers since at least the middle of the last century. At Harvard it was an aesthetic reader and writer, one who knew what the upper classes knew about literature. As Faigley reminds us: "literacy instruction was closely associated with larger cultural goals, and writing teachers were as much as or more interested in whom they wanted their students to be as in what they wanted their students to write" (113). Much more recently, English teachers shifted from the writ*er* to writ*ing* as they moved to holistically scored single samples of writing. This shift was seen as appropriate—we were no longer evaluating the person, but rather the performance. The hitch was that when we looked only at a this sample and tried to match it with a scoring guide, what we got was *the match with the scoring guide.* It didn't seem to look much like writing. We didn't get the writer or the writing or thinking or any of the other things that we seem to think we and our students and education are about.

So now we shift again, asking for multiple writings in multiple genres and reflections on that writing, and what do we get? It's more what we don't get, in the first place. Multiple texts make it more and more difficult to get at "just" the texts. The criteria governing those assembled texts are more difficult to articulate, given the variables involved. What we *do* get is a writer who emerges from the texts. The very multiplicity of those texts, combined with the invitation to construct a governing intelligence creating those texts, a reflection, makes plain a *writer*

The question, as Faigley suggests, is which writer we acknowledge, which we encourage, and which we reward. And that of course takes us back to genre; the genre we permit, and the way we define that genre, will itself also construct the writer—as finally, do we, for we are the ones who issue the assignments, award the A's, and valorize the truths and the selves telling those truths. We are the ones who decide which reflections-in-presentation—often narratives of uninterrupted progress, narratives of (interminable) revision, and narratives of academic salvation—will be permitted, will be seen as universal truths. Portfolios and reflections don't change these conditions of teaching and learning within the academy. They just complicate it considerably.

In the July 1995 issue of *Harper's*, G. J. Meyer excerpts from his then-forthcoming book *Executive Blues* an article entitled "Dancing with Headhunters: Scenes from the Downsized Life." You get the idea: he's lost his job (in this case as a public relations/communications executive), he has a year's severance pay to find another job, and the pickings, he finds, are thin indeed. This prompts a good deal of reflection on Meyer's part: about how he grew up, went to school, and found himself earning annually, as nearly as I can tell, more than most of us will in the next three years. His terminal degree? An MA in English.

What's interesting to me about the piece are several things. First, the guy writes well. When Meyer describes himself in the midst of searching for a new job, we see a man in the process of having his identity dismantled—and it's a disconcerting, unsettling picture that is all too easy to identify with.

> Ten working days at most [until I would hear from the recruiter, he writes]. Late on Monday afternoon, at the end of the first day of the week when nothing can possibly happen, I tear a long, narrow strip from the edge of a sheet of yellow legal paper. I tape one end of the strip to the bottom edge of a picture frame across the room from my desk. It hangs there like a ribbon, like some award I've given myself for getting through a whole day of final-phase waiting. On Tuesday afternoon I do the same thing. And on Wednesday. When the week is finally over, five shreds of paper hang like a row of miliary decorations, one for every twenty four hours of agony endured. It pleases me to look at them. They represent the only kind of achievement that seems to be within my grasp these days.
>
> The next five ribbons come harder. (56)

Not that Meyer can't see himself as more and other than the melancholic victim this excerpt suggests. He tracks both complications and implications of jobs and job loss in general, and of executive positions in particular. When he in fact "loses" a job prospect to a woman, and then another to an African-American, he sees the larger picture, the one where social justice might this time count him, as a white male, out. Likewise, and more poignantly, he also writes of the cost of executive careers:

> Ultimately, having given away almost everything that matters we end up defining ourselves by our possessions. Gradually we become incapable of imagining goals higher or more meaningful than a fine house or a fine car. We abandon hope without even realizing we've done so. (44)

But what Meyer doesn't do is every bit as remarkable. He doesn't position himself except within the rather small community of executives. Accordingly, he doesn't see that perhaps getting paid a six-figure sum for hawking seed corn or farm implements is unreasonable, and that's why his former employer doesn't need him anymore. He doesn't make the connection between his situation and that of an unskilled laborer who has also lost his job forever, in spite of his having been very good at it. He doesn't see the larger economic picture, the capitalistic system that rewards and punishes arbitrarily. Ultimately and most personally, he doesn't see how to rewrite this story—*his own story*—that has gone so awry.

What Meyer does is hope. In defending his refusal to do more than this, he settles on the word responsible to characterize his rhetorical stance:

> After some experimentation I settle on the word responsible as particularly good. . . . It seems to suggest that although I am, of course, rich in options, and although, of course, I know the right thing for me would be a spot in academia or in the world of authors (someplace where I would be free not only to share my wisdom with the human race but to do so in sneakers and a sweatshirt), I also need to remember my obligations to wife and children and all that.
>
> Declining to suggest these things would involve an admission that I have at present no options at all, that as a matter of hard fact I would grab the first really solid job opportunity that came along, regardless of whether it was back in the defense business or back in the agency business or at East Jesus Community College. But I don't seem capable of that kind of truthfulness. I can't admit how naked I feel and how helpless, can't admit that if anyone gave me one more shot at the fat-cat world I would snatch at it like a hungry beggar snatching at a dollar bill. (46)

Rather like the Great Gatsby or the Ancient Mariner (choose your trope), Meyer cannot invent a new story, can only cling to the old story, to his narrative of progress rudely derailed. He cannot get outside himself to see the contradictions, the associations, the incongruities that inhabit the new story he is living but that he still doesn't quite grasp. Indeed, as well-written as they may be, these reflections are little more than the reverberations of victimhood. It would be interesting, informative, and instructive to know, for example, what Meyer would make of his story for *Mother Jones* or the *Village Voice*. But such story-making, such reflection is not in evidence. In sum, this writing may be "good" in the conventional sense of the word: it is clear, its images are evocative, it's got a point of view that is consistently developed. On the other hand, that's part of its problem, for me: *it's got a single point of view, it's got a single story, and it's got a single voice*. The author seems unable to generate multiple versions of his own (life) text.

It may be, of course, that Meyer achieves a richer reading of his story—a more complicated, problematized reading—in his book-length volume. And to be fair, one thing I've learned in this analysis is that I think Meyer is at a decided disadvantage. I think he is missing a critical element here: more than a single community in which, through which, and against which he can locate and create himself.

Without such inter-textual communities, it's difficult to see how he could, in fact, say anything meaningful at all.

To be meaningful, reflection must be *situated*: the writer creates meaning in context, in community. So, too, in writing assessment: it too occurs *in situ*. This idea—that writing assessment itself should be located within a community, and that in order to be valid it should consider its effects on community—is a late-in-the-day idea. But as it becomes more the stuff of currency, we should make use of it. Alan Purves puts it this way:

> The importance of communities is that they restore us to that important state of union or communion with the other . . . that we have lost in our misguided attempt to be individual, to have a career at the expense of others.
>
> So it should be in the world, in the classroom, and in life. So it should be in the assessment of writing. Assessment is a matter of community . . . . (19)

In my language: reflection offers writers the opportunity to tell multiple stories in multiple genres for others in community to hear, to respond to. The *others' hearing* is crucial, for Meyer and for our students and for us, for our own reflections and for our own stories.

So: three types of reflection that contribute to this story-making:

(1) *reflection in action*, the process of reviewing and projecting and revising, which takes place within a composing event;

(2) *constructive reflection*, the process of developing a cumulative, multi-selved, multi-voiced identity, which takes place between and among composing events; and

(3) *reflection in presentation*, the process of articulating the relationships between and among the multiple variables of writing and the writer in a specific context for a specific audience.

And we know that for reflection (as for other kinds of knowing) genre is crucial: the genre we privilege will have a great deal to do with the kind of

reflection-in-presentation students will compose, and accordingly with the kinds of constructive reflection they engage in.

This reflection upon reflection marks only the beginning of what we know, however. We have much to learn. I'm interested in how we foster the ability to see a text from different, competing, and complementary perspectives, how we create multiple stories from a single text. I'd like to know more about how we might respond to reflection so that it becomes as rich and generative as our hopes for it. I'd like to see the reflective essay pushed to its limits—wherever those are. I'd like to know what I'm supposed to *do* with reflection. Read it? Respond to it? *Evaluate* it in a gentle way so that it "improves?" And how would I know what that improvement looked like? (What is, after all, "good" reflection? Is there such a thing as bad reflection?) What's the relationship between that improvement and a person's learning? A person's multi-vocality? A person's sense of self-knowledge? What happens to our assessment when we include such reflection? And what will happen to our curricula when we invite our students' lived experiences—their other stories—into our schools?

These are the questions that provide my point of departure for more thinking more about reflection, for my reflective project.

❦

Back in that hushed auditorium, now alive with conversation, at 9:45 a.m. . . .

A text only means in context: the context for this talk is provided by thoughtful, reflective colleagues. Chris Farris asks about what Bartholomae has called student "road to Damascus narratives" and about how to discourage them in student reflection, how to get beyond them at least: *rule out effort and time as evidence*, I say. *Integrate reflection into the curriculum; don't graft it onto what exists.* Donna Qualley: What about the reflexivity that we look for? Isn't that a better word than reflection? *Good point, and you can choose your word, I say. If we want to call it reflexivity, that's ok by me, but the point here, for me, is to generate those multiple interpretations.* David Joliffe wants to know if we have to dichotomize between primary and secondary texts: if there are tertiary texts out there as well. *Yes, many texts; many* ***kinds*** *of texts. That's the idea, not the categorization.* Diana George: But some students do find the road to Damascus. Who are we to deny them that? *Ah, yes. But is it Damascus as terminus or Damascus as a site on a journey going elsewhere?* I ask. Then Chuck: are we looking for reflection in the writing, or reflection apart from the writing? *Bothand*, I say. The one, we hope, will lead to the other.

❦

Six weeks later. I'm home in Charlotte now, walking and running my favorite 6 mile course, listening to NPR, and hearing Meyer being interviewed.

The book is out, he's found a job, life is good. Perhaps my story of Meyer is wrong.

It turns out not. When asked why he couldn't find a job, Meyer explains that no executive really could, that they were all "swimming against the stream" of "outplacement, downsizing, lean and mean." That he had turned the "magic age" of 50, and we don't understand that kind of discrimination. Meyer is asked if he couldn't have used the opportunity of joblessness—particularly given $100,000 to support it for year—to invent a new life. He hastens the answer: he was glad to consider inventing—going back to school; starting a business; looking seriously (very seriously) at teaching. What he doesn't say: those inventions will not support $800 handmade suits. When asked if he had learned anything, Meyer reveals that he too has travelled on the road to Damascus: he's learned something he says he knew all along but forgot, that in the eyes of God a beggar has the same value as a CEO.

I wish I'd been wrong.

❦

So. I stop now. The essay (if that's what it is) is already longer than the recommended length for publication in *WPA: Writing Program Administration.*

But I want to say: perhaps the most important thing I learned in this reflective project is how collaborative reflection is, how we need communit*ies* within which to work and talk and think—and even laugh. And that what we are looking for in our writing as well as in our students' writing is twofold: text that is more reflective as well as reflective texts per se. Perhaps reflection is merely a vehicle to the first end. But I don't think it's either/or; it's bothand.

That, at least, is my reflection upon reflection, today.

Works Cited

Anson, Chris. "Portfolios for Teachers: Writing our Way to Reflective Practice. *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment: Reflective Practice, Critical Theory, and Large-Scale Scoring.* Eds. Laurel Black, Donald Daiker, Jeffrey Sommers, and Gail Stygall. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1994.

Belanoff, Pat. "Portfolios and Literacy." *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment: Reflective Practice, Critical Theory, and Large-Scale Scoring.* Eds. Laurel Black, Donald Daiker, Jeffrey Sommers, and Gail Stygall. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1994.

Berlin, James. "The Subversions of the Portfolio." *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment: Reflective Practice, Critical Theory, and Large-Scale Scoring.* Eds. Laurel Black, Donald Daiker, Jeffrey Sommers, and Gail Stygall. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1994.

Berlin, James. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984.

Black, Laurel, et al. "Writing Like a Woman and Being Rewarded for It: Gender, Assessment, and Reflective Letters from Miami University's Student Portfolios." *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment: Reflective Practice, Critical Theory, and Large-Scale Scoring*. Eds. Laurel Black, Donald Daiker, Jeffrey Sommers, and Gail Stygall. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1994.

Elbow, Peter. *Embracing Contraries: Explorations in Teaching and Learning*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Faigley, Lester. *Fragments of Rationality: Postmodernity and the Subject of Composition*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1992.

Gass, William. "The Art of Self: Autobiography in an age of narcissim." *Harpers* (May 1994): 43-52.

Hilgers, Tom et al. "The Case for Prompted Self-Assessment in the Writing Classroom." *Self-Assessment and the Development of Writing*. Eds. Jane Smith and Kathleen Yancey. Forthcoming, Hampton Press, 1996.

Meyer, G. J. "Dancing with Headhunters: Scenes from the Downsized Life." *Harpers* (July 1995): 37-56.

Perl, Sondra. "Understanding Composing." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (1980): 363-70.

Perl, Sondra and Arthur Egendorf. "The Process of Creative Discovery: Theory, Research, and Implications for Teaching." *The Territory of Language: Linguistics, Stylistics, and the Teaching of Composition*. Ed. Donald McQuade. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1986. 251-68.

Purves, Alan. "Adimadversions on Writing Assessment and Hypertext." *Assessing Writing* 2.1 (Spring 1995): 5-21.

Schön, Donald A. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass. 1987.

Sommers, Jeffrey. "The Writer's Memo: Collaboration, Response, and Development." *Writing and Response*. Ed. Chris Anson. Urbana: NCTE, 1989. 174-86.

Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Adult Experienced Writers. *College Composition and Communication* 31 (1980): 378-88.

Vygotsky, L. *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.

Vygotsky, L. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962.

Watson, Sam. "Letters on Writing—A Medium of Exchange with Students of Writing." *Teaching Advanced Composition: Why and How*. Eds. K. Adams and J. Adams. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1991.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Portfolios in the Writing Classroom: A Final Reflection." *Porfolios in the Writing Classroom: An Introduction*. Ed. Kathleen Blake Yancey. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1992.

How to Tell a Story of Stopping: The Complexities of Narrating a WPA's Experience

Wendy Bishop
Gay Lynn Crossley

The ending tripped us up, changed the story we'd set out to tell. Our plan was to spend a year learning the details of a WPA's life so that we could capture and understand the realities of that life.[1] From January 1992 to December 1992, Wendy would keep daily time logs and write regular journal narratives, Gay Lynn would categorize and tabulate Wendy's daily activities and respond in a weekly journal to the issues she saw raised in Wendy's narratives. We were to follow a simple plot revolving around the day-to-day, moment-to-moment experiences of a WPA in her second year directing a program at a large state institution. We followed the plan at first, documenting activities that filled the day,

> . . . Tomorrow —talk to Elizabeth, teach, talk to Charles Nicholson [department chair] about talking to Elizabeth, teach, be interviewed by one of my class researchers, go to Gregory Ulmer's talk, drive home, lie on the floor moaning to relax my back or walk if possible, let the kids and cats bounce on me, eat, go to rhetoric group (which I'm greatly looking forward to as a simple pleasure). Friday, I'll be picking up pieces slowly—avoiding a huge stack of personal correspondence, trying to get the Writing and Therapy, WPA as Therapist essay finished . . . . (Wendy's Journal, February 18)[2]

reading into a daily schedule,

> . . . You've made notes about talking with students, teaching assistants, office staff, other administrators within the department, colleagues in the department, administrators across the university, job candidates. It seems that a large part of the job involves establishing relationships with so many different types of people. Add to that a concern for the nature of many of those relationships (I'm referring to your concern about how you interact with the office staff, and how you work to remember to make a personal connection with GTAs) and you've accounted for a good chunk of the time and energy expended on this job, time and energy not easily documented in terms of hours and minutes. It seems then that the job easily becomes consuming. . . . (Gay Lynn's Journal, Week One)

searching moments for insight,

> . . . I decided that the more I teach the less open I am to talking to others

> about teaching in the sense of being interested composition director/ sympathetic listener. That is my classes consume me and I want to talk about my teaching ideas and find it hard to shift to guide or decide for others. . . . (Wendy's Journal, January 16)

That's how we started, as if following in the tradition of the realists. For over three months we kept our focus, felt a sense of control even as we knew we were watching the project take a shape of its own.

These early months were not without their tensions. It was a time of choosing a successor to take over the writing program after Wendy fulfilled her four-year commitment as WPA (including an initial year of training), a time of arguing for the candidate Wendy felt could be entrusted with the program she'd developed, and as a result, a time for Wendy to become even more aware of her identity as a WPA. Her emerging identity as a WPA was shaped largely by her commitments to the writing program, the teachers it employs, and the students it serves: in particular, her beliefs that there could be no valid graduate rhetoric program without a strong writing program and that a "strong" writing program is staffed by teachers educated to work toward the objectives of a coherent, theoretically-informed, student-centered curriculum. That her identity developed along these lines is not surprising. Wendy did not stumble into writing program administration. She had studied writing program administration as one of her qualifying exam areas. Her interest in administration was motivated by her sense that curriculum development was the site where writing research, theory, and practice could merge. Her intention to work in administration grew out of an early commitment to teacher education. Further, these commitments were a long time in developing. She had already been an administrator at other academic institutions—running a program for underprepared students and then a university writing center. Through these early experiences, Wendy had noticed a tension between her own concerns as an administrator and those of other university administrators. Other administrators were concerned with what she saw as managerial issues, while she was concerned with educational issues. In short, her identity as a WPA grew directly out of our profession's national discussions about the teaching of writing and writing program administration. For Wendy, then, her authority rested in her expertise to develop a respected writing program, not in her ability to maintain a quiet program.

In April of 1992, however, her loyalties to the writing program, teachers, and students were tested. After having worked for sixteen months to decrease her job responsibilities, the department chair explained a need to increase the size of the writing program:

> The day which ended at 4:40 PM with Charles [Department Chair] telling me the Dean and Provost want us to hire five more GTAs—program up to 75 and prepare for 3100 freshman—I've never overseen more than 2400. And I just looked at him and said I knew there were reasons it was good for the program but absolutely no, that I could not take on the supervision of another single GTA—Anita [First-Year-Writing Program

> Secretary] could not do the work, we might not have Danielle [Director of the Reading/Writing Center], we have no office spaces, I have no time to talk to the 70 GTAs I'm responsible for, no no no. Cole Daniels [Director of Undergraduate Studies] looked at me in amazement—he was in the office—and said the upper level classes could use them. (Wendy's Journal, April 2)

Such moments seem far from unusual in a WPA's life. Since writing programs often house the only course required of all students, writing program administrators are constantly negotiating between their concerns for quality composition programs and fiscal realities, between their responsibility to argue for an exploited work force of instructors and GTAs and to meet student needs. The result of such moments is often to strengthen a WPA's alliance with GTAs and to remind her of the range of roles she assumes in her relationship with GTAs—boss, supervisor, advocate, and mentor. Not surprisingly, institutional and economic pressures won this battle. Since 1992, the writing program at this university has grown to serve 3200 students; there are now 86 GTAs.

In Wendy's mind, such growth—projected then, realized today—jeopardized the integrity of the program. The job of WPA became unacceptable, and the year of study ended with Wendy's early resignation as WPA in November 1992. This ending didn't surprise us. Warning signs appear throughout Wendy's journal entries:

> I had an overwhelming sense that Eliot Cage [Director of Graduate Studies] sees me and the composition program as upstart . . . . I had this terrible feeling that I might not want to be here in a few years with the composition backlash beginning . . . The new memo—FYW has to release four GTA units to literature this fall—was in my mailbox and rather hateful. First of all Charles Nicholson [Department Chair] does but Eliot does not admit that GTAs are hired first to staff the first-year writing program. (Wendy's Journal, July 7)

> I thought of the department advertising rhetoric as a Ph.D. area with three faculty and Literature with 28 faculty and three more to be hired this year. I continue to realize both how threatening and how alien rhetoric is, particularly because faculty here do not (and never will) teach writing. . . . I spent the night thinking about whether I was willing to try to bring this issue up as a discussion topic at the upcoming department retreat or whether I'd just disappear from issues here entirely. I feel like I've half left. . . . and there's an angry part of me that wants to just come in with a resignation. (Wendy's Journal, September 10)

April's conflict over program size proved to be a preamble to future conflicts over the writing program, the teaching staff, and the valuing of rhetoric and composition in general. In November, after Wendy's decision not to release a first-year GTA from his training so that he could grade for a member of the literature faculty was overruled, she became convinced that the authority she had worked to establish for herself didn't reach far:

> I closed the door and asked Brenda Ericson [the previous WPA] if I was hallucinating that she trained me to protect the autonomy of the FYW staff and the teacher-education program, and she said no I wasn't. Charles Nicholson should have told Cole Daniels that ignoring senior GTAs in order to hand pick a beginning teacher was impossible. . . . They don't respect pedagogy. They see FYW as working for them, not for FYWriters. . . . I'm going nuts—all year Charles Nicholson has not supported rhetoric—he's backtracking and he started this whole damn program. . . . I keep thinking, to hell with it, don't fight it, it's all [the next director's problem soon], but I can't exist like that. I'm at that "how many times can I quit" feeling. (Wendy's Journal, November 10)

Repeatedly that year, the message was that Wendy's expertise in composition and rhetoric and writing program administration carried little influence. Although she had the autonomy to develop a program curriculum and although this program had earned a strong Board Of Regents, external review, her concerns and values as a WPA did not fall within the department's priorities. The year, then, ended with a dramatic punch that changed the story we would tell:

> It's odd to go to work and not "belong" in the main office. I sit on a chair and sort mail like other faculty members, say a word or two and leave without anyone needing to know where I am. . . . it's odd to see my old office inhabited by Rachel—I sure am a pack-rat comparatively, hers is empty and open. I gauge from her note that she's looking forward to it all—it's all upbeat and business forward. (Wendy's Journal, December 23)

Since December 1992, we've struggled to tell this ending, to narrate Wendy's story in ways that do not build to a shrill Movie-of-the-Week climax, that avoid the sensationalism of a daytime talk show.

According to many of our early reviewers, we have not met the challenge. At best, the stories we have written read as naive:

> Administrators simply must acquire a certain amount of distance from their jobs, perhaps even a kind of fatalism, a clear sense that you win some and lose some and have lots of ties, skill in distinguishing administrative failure from inevitabilities of the situation, an ability to not take things personally (even when they are "personal"), a thick skin and a long memory. For example, many battle-hardened WPAs might suggest that Wendy should have recognized up front that the plan to add 5 GTAs was a done deal, that she was being informed rather than consulted (probably in the same way the dean "informed" the chair) and that the proper response would be to help the chair figure out—and not in a passive/aggressive way—what resources (offices, supplies, mailboxes, etc.) would be necessary to accommodate the increase, to work with the chair to develop a proposal to get additional resources for the department . . . . There was no place in the journal entries cited where Wendy acknowledged that there might be some advantage to having 5 new teaching assistantships in the department: new resources, more support

> for graduate students and thus improved recruiting power, more opportunities for students to teach and learn what they really need to know in order to get jobs, and so on. (Anonymous Review)

At worst, we have been perceived as buying into a discourse of victimization:

> I am disturbed at how easily the authors permit themselves to present this story as another victim-narrative that you hear so often in accounts of composition, of WPAs, and even of women WPAs. . . . The whole story is framed in a way that I see as rather tiresome—WPAs are heroic but unrewarded professionals working to perfect programs in the face of great odds; they are victimized by Bad People who conspire to make WPAs lives miserable. . . . (Anonymous Review)

Certainly, there have been many times when we have felt both naive and tiresome since this project began. Beyond the moments in Wendy's journal when she's questioned her own naiveté, we have had many occasions since the project to wonder, individually and together, over our naiveté. We have been aware enough of state and university politics to know that there are seldom "Bad People," just people situated, like ourselves, in a university climate created by decreasing budgets even as student demand increases.

As we look back on our struggle to tell this story, though, we find it significant that despite our efforts we still created "naive" stories and "victim" narratives. Further, we find it telling that the reviewer saw the story we told as "*another* victimization narrative that *you hear so often* in accounts of composition, WPAs, and even women WPAs" (emphasis ours). Our professional journals and conferences are significantly populated with articles recounting the marginalization and feminization of composition studies and writing program administration (Bishop & Crossley; Bloom; Holbrook; and Shell). And when these stories are shared at national conferences, it is not at all uncommon to hear audience members, as they file out of the room, note how comforting it is to learn that others share their experiences. At this point, then, rather than shame ourselves out of our naive victim-narratives, we think it would be worthwhile to understand what is prompting the apparent need for such narratives.

Further, in retrospect, the timing of this project seems significant. In 1992, at a time when experts were still forecasting a healthy future for the academy (based on predictions of a large faculty turnover by the year 2000), Wendy's institution (like some other institutions across the country, in Ohio and California, for example) was beginning to feel the effects of substantial budget cuts. Since then, the economic pressures that defined the year of this study have affected almost all institutions. Currently, most institutions are somehow facing fiscal restraints, whether through the threat (or reality) of increased class size, a push for accountability, or a pressure to "re-engineer" curriculum in order to teach more students for less money. What, then, have we to learn from Wendy's experience this year since it seems to reflect the experiences of a steadily increasing number of WPAs?

We want to examine further both of these issues and their relationship: why have victim narratives become a characteristic way of telling our professional stories, what impact might the current economic climate have on WPAs, and how is the economic climate simply exacerbating the very conflicts that have led to our sense of victimization all along? So, for this discussion, we take off our realists hats and become postmodernists. We set out to tell the story of the story tellers.

It's a Matter of Training

By 1995, Gay Lynn was into her first year of writing program administration as a tenure-line faculty member. One day, a literature colleague of hers mused, "It must be hard for you. You are your work. The rest of us do our jobs, then go home. Our research on Dryden has little impact on who we are when we go to department meetings or when we even go home. We have distance. But you *are* what you write about and teach." This moment has caused us to pause and consider the truth of this statement and the implications to a WPA of "being" her work. Certainly, it seems to ring true every time WPAs are offended by the odd collegiality of sympathetic remarks at the beginning of a semester: "We couldn't get a better teaching assignment for you than comp?" Or by comments on messy desks and bedraggled expressions and the accompanying question, "When do you find time to work?" With every annual review WPAs are reminded that their time would be better spent outside the program, preferably doing research. The curricular and programatic changes WPAs make are appreciated by handfuls of people who, in general, make daily department life easier. However, most WPAs' efforts to improve programs, or maintain strong coherent programs, are usually only begrudgingly acknowledged. And if WPAs are perceived to be threatening academic "standards" with newfangled changes, they get downright resentment. And, more often than not, WPAs remain offended.

Our training has positioned us to be offended at such remarks. A graduate education in composition studies (or any field, arguably) is as much about adopting a value system as learning our field's history, seminal research, scope, and boundaries. We talk knowledgeably about the ways our students are defined by their knowledge, value systems, and discourse habits. Much of our pedagogy reflects a belief that students' histories should not only be acknowledged but also valued in the writing classroom. Since our identities as compositionists and WPAs are similarly defined, perhaps we should explore how those identities can operate in the larger university context. While we don't assume, of course, that everyone's background matches ours, we do believe that our field has developed very basic principles around which most of us form our philosophies of teaching and of writing program administration.

The recurring themes in our field's canonical texts produced since 1963 suggest a core of basic principles that define our field. In fact, these principles

seem so basic that listing them would be an exercise in stating the obvious. The principles, though, inform the teaching of writing and therefore have implications for how we would administer any writing program. If we place an emphasis on the writing process, for example, we must train our writing program faculty in the theory and practice of writing process-oriented pedagogies. The training of writing faculty requires a credentialed WPA who has the ability and support to develop a training program, hire new staff, create courses and in-service opportunities. Further, this WPA has to be connected at the national level so that she can effectively advocate for these principles to be implemented at the local level. For instance, she has to know about national standards for WPA positions and for adjunct and part-time teaching staff which will—undoubtedly—provide the bulk of the instruction in her program. She has to know about position statements on class size and students' rights to their own language. She has to follow discussions on assessment and standards. She must be a professional working in a professional environment, or she is not a WPA (see "Statement on Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing" and Wyche-Smith and Rose).

Of course, the more professional we are, the more we cost. Professional WPAs would not be untenured assistant professors. Professional WPAs would have some say in their budgets and in the hiring and firing of staff as well as in the contractual nature of that work. Professional WPAs would be advocates for their programs, assuring that training is available and up to national standards. Professionals make decisions about textbook choice, about classroom size, about staff professionalization, working conditions and workplaces. A professional WPA would have the same advocacy function vis-a-vis the writing program as the department chair has vis-a-vis the department.

When Wendy responded to the central administration's directive to increase the writing program, she is the kind of WPA our field has trained her to be:

> I was most taken today by the comp. program position I took again today. Eliot Cage [Director of Graduate Studies] and Charles in my office as they tried to deal with me and the [issue of hiring the] extra GTAs. Both of them, I felt, had talked away my objections with each other and really couldn't believe they were hearing me raising them again. Charles started by saying that maybe (not certainly) we'd have a fifth instructor who could help out (unspecific help) and admitted he wasn't even sure we'd get that help. Then I mentioned offices. He admitted there were absolutely no offices available. I said they couldn't be hired with no offices and these were faculty teaching more students than I teach. Then Charles Nicholson said but the [GTAs] haven't had to teach 25 [students—enrollment averages were around 22 students per class at this time]—i.e. they've had it pretty good. I said, I don't buy the logic of that at all. We all know GTAs have poor conditions and often teach third sections at Tallahassee Community College [to make enough money to live on]. I

> pointed out that we hadn't improved the position for Rachel Hall [the new assistant professor of rhetoric who would take over the FYW program] in the area of secretarial support, etc. That we'd be handing her an enlargened program. I said he could blame it [this resistance] on me [when talking to the Dean] and that I heard the Dean and the Provost say [at a recent meeting with English faculty] that faculty should start saying no, and I was starting. I said I had a different view having come here more recently and I saw no benefit to stretching an already beleaguered program to the point that it would be no good anymore. . . . You can hear the anger in this recital. I'm naive enough to be bothered that I have to make these arguments. I pointed out that I didn't like doing so but there was no other spokesperson for all these people. (Wendy's Journal, April 13)

Her concerns are to protect the writing program faculty and the integrity of the writing program. In her mind, hiring additional teachers to teach more sections for more students was not a simple proposition. Her expertise told her that "more" is not better in terms of educating teachers and establishing a coherent curriculum. The projected growth could threaten the quality of writing instruction unless growth also occurred in the program's ability to mentor and train teachers (areas in which Wendy already felt taxed). The avenue she takes to argue against growth situates her firmly as an advocate for GTAs. She tries to share her estimation of actual conditions, citing space and staff support problems. She tries to point out that she is taking these positions logically—evoking the Dean's comments and her own assigned responsibility to the GTAs. But her arguments are not "logical," of course, when she and the other administrators are working from different premises altogether. For Wendy the WPA is the expert who should have the last word on program decisions, the expert responsible for protecting a program from being "no good anymore." For the department, the WPA should manage the program to support the department.

In "Somewhere Between Disparity and Despair: Writing Program Administration, Image Problems, and *The MLA Job Information List*," Joseph Janangelo claims that WPA job descriptions either reveal "misunderstanding about our field itself" or indicate "an institutional skepticism about the continuing role of writing programs at century's end" (65 & 64). We wonder if the "skepticism" he mentions is more to the point. In fact, we'd like to add to his range of possibilities: perhaps the advertisements that define a WPA's duties reveal no misunderstanding at all and serve to remind us that as WPAs we are to work in service to the university's value system—a large-scale system that, by its nature, is antithetical to our training.

In fact, we do know that the basic value system we've developed as a field remains to be widely accepted. Understandings of our field are built on defining *against* mainstream academic values more than anything else. Isn't it our "difference" that we think of when we hear the good-humored remarks at recent College Composition and Communication Conferences describing how our

initiation into composition studies is often spoken of with something akin to religious zeal? Isn't it this "difference" that makes it possible for us still to hear from students that we've "opened a whole new world" to them? Isn't it this "difference" that invites the new GTA to collapse into our office chairs with relief and gratitude for "finally" finding like-minded people? But defining ourselves against is one thing; daily reminders of our "difference" that serve to alienate us from the very contexts in which we must operate is another. On these occasions, we are tempted to think that "they don't get it," to feel dismissed as being "beyond the pale," to see ourselves as misunderstood.

Conclusion

Perhaps we have a tendency to borrow the discourse of victimization because we've talked about our experiences as largely based on the misunderstanding, or lack of understanding, in English departments and central administration about our evolving field, our interests, our priorities, and the changes in writing instruction and program administration as a result of the last thirty years of evolution. And maybe it's this very way of talking about our experience that reflects our naiveté. We sound naive because on this point we are: it is not "they" who misunderstand. English departments and central administration may very well understand what we are about. They just don't like it, or more likely, do not operate in a political and economic system that can affirm our values.

It's clear to us that the "mis-fit" we experienced continues to play out for graduates. When we participate in interviews to hire new colleagues, we often hear that new graduates in rhetoric and composition have been told not to consider WPA positions by faculty mentors who know that the university is not "misunderstanding" their new hires. In these same interview discussions, we hear our own colleagues still failing to affirm our values, for, in the era of cost-effectiveness a "strong" writing program may come with a price-tag that will not even be considered. These repeated experiences tells us that we might take time to examine our own misunderstanding, a misunderstanding that plays out every time we are confronted with the implications of our identities within the larger culture of the university. Perhaps, we need to understand why there's a part of us that remains surprised at how different we are.

While we would love to take the heroic high-road and encourage incoming WPAs to study, learn, prepare, to find value in this area of the academy that we value (that was one of our original endings) we think that a heroic encouragement does no more good than the victimization narrative. Our story, for now, then, ends here. With a tale of stopping. With more data to review and understand (for one year in the life of a WPA is full and complex). With a continued commitment to writing programs. With a more pragmatic view of what happened and will happen. It is in a study of such complexities that we can find our futures.

Notes

1. The larger story will be found in a book-length manuscript, working title, *The WPA and the Culture of English*, while another rehearsal can be found in "Doing the Hokey Pokey."

2. We have edited these journal entries—removing unrelated private entries; rewording in places, slightly to clarify and contextualize the discussion; expanding abbreviations, and so on. We have attempted to save the tone and meaning of all entries. We created and inserted pseudonyms for members of this English department community. We have retained our own names, names of family members, and names of well-known individuals in the field of composition who are referred to professionally rather than personally.

Works Cited

Bishop, Wendy and Gay Lynn Crossley. "Doing the Hokey Pokey: Why Writing Program Administrators' Job Conditions Don't Seem to Be Improving." *Composition Studies/Freshman English News* 21.2 (Fall 1993): 46-59.

Bloom, Lynn Z. "I Want a Writing Director." *College Composition and Communication* 43.2 (1992): 176-79.

Holbrook, Sue Ellen. "Women's Work: The Feminizing of Composition." *Rhetoric Review* 9.2 (1991): 201-29.

Janangelo, Joseph. "Somewhere Between Disparity and Despair: Writing Program Administrators, Image Problems, and *The MLA Job Information List*." *Writing Program Administration* (1992): 60-66.

Schell, Eileen E. "The Feminization of Composition: Questioning the Metaphors that Bind Women Teachers." *Composition Studies/Freshman English News* 20.1 (1992): 55-61.

"Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 40.3 (1989): 329-36.

Wyche-Smith, Susan and Shirley K. Rose. "One Hundred Ways to Make the Wyoming Resolution a Reality: A Guide to Personal and Political Action." *College Composition and Communication* 41.3 (1990): 318-24.

Review

Resituating Writing: Constructing and Administering Writing Programs

Joseph Janangelo and Kristine Hansen, editors. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann, 1995. 163 pp. $24.50

Duane Roen

Resituating Writing is the most recent work in the Boynton/Cook-Heinemann series CrossCurrents: New Perspectives in Rhetoric and Composition. Collectively, the book's editors and fourteen chapter authors—mostly writing program administrators—have logged more than a century of administrative experience, expertise that is apparent throughout the book. It is evident in the Foreword, where series editor Charles Schuster not only comments on the chapters that follow but also draws on his years of WPA experience to offer useful strategies for dealing with the crises that writing program administrators inevitably face. It is evident in the Preface, where Janangelo and Hansen explain that the collection is designed to help WPAs with the intellectual work that distinguishes WPAs from other campus administrators, ones who don't deal with the knowledge of a field on daily basis. The collection also will prepare current graduate students to enter the field with their eyes opened. Perhaps the best feature of the book, though, is that it should persuade department chairs, deans, vice-presidents, and provosts that writing program administration is as intellectually demanding as any work in the academy.

The first section, "Philosophical Issues and Institutional Identities," is eclectic but intellectually rich. It opens with a fascinating essay by Joseph Janangelo, who uses Derrida's layered term *différance* and Lyotard's theory of "the differend" to explain how writing programs can and should subvert institutional expectations that we simply teach students to write better. That is, we have opportunities and responsibilities to equip students with tools for challenging institutional hierarchies and hegemonies. Kristine Hansen, displaying an admirable *ethos* as she describes some of her experiences working with part-timers, argues convincingly that we need to do a much better job than we have to professionalize adjuncts and to treat them ethically. Reminding us of the promise of the unfulfilled Wyoming Resolution, she shows us through her own ethical actions how we can walk the walk, not just talk the talk, for treating part-timers with dignity and respect. Lester Faigley and Susan Romano explain how computer technology has the potential for disrupting traditional literate practices. We old-timers, though, may be too entrenched in the academy's "essayist literacy," privileging logic, documentation, and a neutral stance. Our graduate students—the young Turks—will need to lead us into the literacy of the twenty-first century. The most distinguishing feature of this essay, by the way, is that

Faigley and Romano go to great lengths to name and pay tribute to the graduate students who have led the charge at the University of Texas. In the final chapter of the first section, Elizabeth Nist and Helon Raines, both community college faculty, offer an interesting history of community colleges and their writing programs. They make readers painfully aware that organizations such as the Council of Writing Program Administrators have long neglected the needs of writing faculty in two-year institutions. They conclude by providing concrete suggestions for actions that the Council, as well as university faculty, should take to foster the work of community college writing programs.

The second section, "The WPA Within and Across Departments," suggests strategies for constructing positive working relationships with academic units. Lynn Bloom offers a practical guide for what WPAs can and should do to strengthen writing on their campuses. To transcend the tedium of shuffling papers, she argues, WPAs need to "take charge of training those who teach in the writing program" (74), resisting the temptation to assign that responsibility to others. Bloom also provides useful strategies for influencing both undergraduate and graduate education, for establishing and enhancing the institution's reputation in the field, and for conducting useful research. Ellen Strenski tackles the sticky issue of recruiting and training composition teachers other than those hired on tenure-track lines. She recommends that the key to a happy hiring season is finding teachers whose pedagogical practices match those of the program. She also suggests ways to encourage teachers to engage in professional development by offering appropriate incentives. Her advice is important given that, "any writing program is really nothing but the people we hire, retrain, and retrain" (97). Molly Wingate, after confessing her own failures in collaborating in institutional change, uses the work of sociologist C. Wright Mills and German historian Werner Rings to analyze the dynamics of a writing center's collaboration with its host institution. She convincingly demonstrates that writing center directors must become politically savvy to help plan for curricular change or they will be victimized by it. In the section's final essay, experienced administrator Susan McLeod explicates a range of metaphors that can describe the roles of WAC directors. Dismissing the roles of conqueror, diplomat, Peace Corps volunteer, and missionary, McLeod suggests that change agent is the ideal metaphor for describing the effective WAC director. She goes on to note strategies for changing curricula and pedagogical theories.

In the book's final section, "Professional and Scholarly Indentities," four well-respected scholar-administrators offer effective survival strategies for WPAs. The essays in this section should be required reading for WPAs, as well as those administrators and committees who evaluate their work. First, Christine Hult uses Ernest Boyer's four categories of scholarship—discovery, integration, application, and teaching—to construct a convincing case that much of what WPAs do is scholarly. Her chapter should serve many in the field, especially untenured WPAs who have to persuade their sometimes less-than-scrupulous institutions that their administrative duties—often forced upon them—warrant tenure. Next, Edward White, the guru of evaluation, details what to do and what

not to do when evaluating writing programs. Such work, he argues is highly rhetorical and demands substantial investments of time, effort, and money. In the final chapter, Barbara Cambridge and Ben McClelland describe the dozens of roles that WPAs serve on their campuses. They argue that WPAs must have institutional power because "if power is left as close to the action as possible, the writing program administrator will be part of a multitude of partnerships" (156). Partnerships, they note, must exist among all people on campus who want students to learn how to write more effectively. An effective WPA is one who creates the glue, not one who is the glue, for partnerships that lead to synergies.

What is most impressive about *Resituating Writing* is that its authors individually and collectively possess strong *ethos*. The chapters are filled with explicit references to the authors' administrative experience and experiences. Beyond that, though, the chapter authors make clear that they care about students, teachers, writing program administrators, learning, writing, writing programs, and institutions. Having finished reading *Resituating Writing*, I feel fortunate to have spent some time considering advice that I know will serve me well as I perform administrative duties at my institution. I am reminded of the massiveness of the work that I have before me, but I also feel that I'm now a little better equipped to do that work.

WPA Research Grants

The WPA Research Grant Committee, composed of Kristine Hansen (chair), Theresa Enos, David Jolliffe, and Ben McClelland, chose the following persons to receive grants for 1996:

Mara Holt and Leon Anderson, Ohio University, for focus group interviews, one phase of a planned multi-method study of how WPAs manage and negotiate conflict. Amount: $1800.

Susanmarie Harrington, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, for research on placement rating systems that use group reading sessions and rely on teacher experience in the classroom rather than on norming sessions with scoring rubrics. Amount: $978.60.

Amy Devitt and Mary Jo Reiff, The University of Kansas, for an investigation of the role of teaching teams in ensuring continuity among classes in the Freshman-Sophomore English sequence, maintaining standards, and making the work of administration more collaborative and collegial. Amount $2000.

The WPA Annual Bibliography of Writing Textbooks

Eric Martin

Eleven publishing companies submitted 166 entries for this year's list. All of the texts are either new or new editions of previously published texts; all have a 1996 copyright date. The publishers provided the annotations which were edited for brevity and objectivity. Readers will notice a new format for this year's list. We welcome your responses to the new format as well as your ideas for next year's bibliography.

I. Freshman Writing Texts

A. Rhetorics

Axelrod, Rise B., and Charles R. Cooper. *The Concise Guide to Writing*, 2nd ed. St. Martin's Press. Guides students through all phases of the writing process. New chapters on justifying an evaluation, conducting research, citing resources, and critical reading.

Barnet, Sylvan, and Hugo Bedau. *Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument*, 2nd ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Concise guide comprising the text and appendices of *Current Issues and Enduring Questions*, 4th ed. Includes 22 model arguments (8 new). New appendix on arguing about literature. Instructor's Manual.

Bedau, Hugo. *Thinking and Writing About Philosophy*. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Discusses every stage of reading, analyzing, and responding to philosophical texts and arguments. Thorough coverage of the writing process includes 12 readings by prominent philosophers and 13 student examples.

Donald. *Writing Clear Essays, 3rd ed.* Prentice Hall. Follows the rhetorical modes. Chapters organized in three parts with discussions of the writing process, essay structure, and word choice. Includes a new chapter on the research paper and more student essays.

Feldman, Ann Merle. *Writing and Learning in the Disciplines*. HarperCollins. Features interviews with professors from nine different fields as well as primary source readings from those disciplines.

Hanson, Richard H. *Writing Successfully*. Allyn and Bacon. Features detailed coverage of the writing process, a chapter on critical reading, and three

chapters on revision. Illustrates concepts with fourteen student texts, many in multiple drafts.

Hirschberg, Stuart. *Essential Strategies of Argument.* Allyn and Bacon. Covers all aspects of argument with unique chapters on cross-disciplinary argument and the role of language.

Kennedy, X. J., Dorothy M. Kennedy, and Sylvia A. Holladay. *The Bedford Guide for College Writers, with Reader, Research Manual, and Handbook,* 4th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Four composition texts in one: a process-oriented rhetoric, a thematic reader, a research guide, and a complete handbook. Full ancillary package. Two-volume instructor's manual.

Kennedy, X. J., Dorothy M. Kennedy, and Sylvia A. Holladay. *The Bedford Guide for College Writers, with Reader, and Research Manual,* 4th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. A three-in-one version of *The Bedford Guide.* Includes process-oriented rhetoric, thematic reader, and research manual. Manual has 61 MLA and 38 APA documentation models with new coverage of the Internet.

Kennedy, X. J., Dorothy M. Kennedy, and Sylvia A. Holladay. *The Bedford Guide for College Writers, with Reader,* 4th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. A two-in-one version of *The Bedford Guide.* Contains a process-oriented rhetoric and thematic reader. Reader offers 37 prose selections and complete apparatus.

Kolln, Martha. *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects,* 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. (See II.A. Advanced Writing Texts—Rhetorics.)

Mayberry, Katherine, and Robert E. Golden. *For Arguments Sake,* 2nd ed. HarperCollins. Structured around three major phases of writing—focusing, supporting, and reviewing. Presents four types of argument—fact, cause/effect, recommendation, value judgment. Numerous examples and sample student essays.

Murray, Donald. *Write to Learn,* 5th ed. Harcourt Brace. Focuses on the following writing process: focus, explore, plan, draft, clarify. Emphasis on developing student voice.

Podis, JoAnne M., and Leonard A. Podis. *Rethinking Writing.* Allyn and Bacon. Focuses on current research and the empowerment of student writers. Links personal with academic writing and views writing as a social activity. Extensive use of student writing illustrates concepts.

Rawlins, Jack P. *The Writer's Way,* 3rd ed. Houghton Mifflin. Leads students through the writing process in a friendly, conversant tone. Moves from prewriting to drafting to revising using student writing samples. Discusses argumentation, working in groups, and student publishing.

Reinking, Hart, and von der Osten. *Strategies for Successful Writing: A Rhetoric, Research Guide, Reader, and Handbook,* 4th ed. Prentice Hall. Four texts in one. Rhetoric presents various writing strategies using student essays.

Research Guide includes three chapters on research papers. Reader features 45 contemporary and classic essays. Standard handbook. Instructor's edition.

Reinking, Hart, and von der Osten. *Strategies for Successful Writing: A Rhetoric, Research Guide, and Reader*, 4th ed. Prentice Hall. This briefer edition includes everything in the full text except the handbook.

Skwire, David, and Harvey S. Wiener. *Student's Book of College English: Rhetoric, Readings, Handbook*, 7th ed. Allyn and Bacon. A modes-based three-in-one text. New sections on active reading, collaborative activities, and outlining.

Woodson, Linda, and Margaret W. Batschelet. *Writing in Three Dimensions*. Allyn and Bacon. Leads students through eight purposes for writing and teaches the importance of oral (collaborative planning, presentations, etc.) and visual (charts, formatting, etc.) components of the writing process.

Wyrick, Jean. *Steps to Writing Well*, 6th ed. Harcourt Brace. A three-tiered organization covers the basics of the short essay, modes and strategies for writing, and research. Features new material on collaborative writing and research papers.

Wyrick, Jean. *Steps to Writing Well with Additional Readings*, 3rd ed. Harcourt Brace. *Steps to Writing Well*, 6th ed., plus 30 professional essays which model modes and strategies for writing. New chapter provides multipurpose readings for further study.

Yarber, Robert E., and Andrew Hoffman. *Writing for College*, 3rd ed. HarperCollins. Presents writing as a series of manageable steps. Exercises and assignments reinforce and strengthen writing skills, including using computers in writing.

B. Readers

Aaron, Jane E. *The Compact Reader: Short Essays by Method and Theme*, 5th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. A rhetorical, thematic, and "short-essay" reader all in one. Includes 35 (18 new) essays. General introduction to reading and writing includes new annotations of a student essay. Instructor's Edition.

Atwan, Robert, and Jon Roberts. *Left, Right, and Center: Voices from across the Political Spectrum*. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Presents a range of political views in 53 "issue-centered" selections written by prominent American political figures. Includes an introduction on politics and the American language. Instructor's Manual.

Axelrod, Rise B., and Charles R. Cooper. *Reading Critically, Writing Well: A Reader and Guide*, 4th ed. St. Martin's Press. A first-year reader organized by rhetorical aims. Helps students read and write eight kinds of discourse.

New edition includes activities to stimulate student reflection on reading and writing.

Barnet, Sylvan, and Hugo Bedau. *Current Issues and Enduring Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking and Argument, with Readings,* 4th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Concise text includes 22 model arguments (8 new). Reader combines 92 current and classic arguments (25 new) and 11 new literary works. New appendix on arguing about literature. Instructor's Edition.

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers,* 4th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Includes 24 lengthy readings (9 new) by prominent writers like Michel Foucault and Jane Tompkins. Fifteen assignment sequences (3 new) connect reading, writing, and critical thinking. Instructor's Manual.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. *Negotiating Difference: Cultural Case Studies for Composition.* Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. A multicultural reader organized around "contact zones." Explores conflicts in American history by means of 101 primary sources in 6 casebooks. Includes assignment sequences and research kits. Instructor's Manual.

Capossela, Toni-Lee. *Language Matters: Readings for College Writers.* Harcourt Brace. Addresses language origins, language manipulation, labels and naming, language and gender, non-standard dialects, word play, narrative, and technology. Explains the process of field research in language.

Clark, Irene Lurkis. *Taking a Stand: A Guide to the Researched Paper with Readings,* 2nd ed. HarperCollins. Helps students work through the research process and write short research papers by developing a position on a controversial topic and using outside sources to support that position.

Clee, Paul, and Violeta Radu-Clee. *American Dreams: Readings for Writers.* Mayfield. Focusing on the American dream, surveys the writing process and offers 70 selections (primarily essays but also poems, stories, and interviews) to engage college writers and help improve their skills.

Cooper, Aleene. *Thinking and Writing by Design: A Cross-Disciplinary Rhetoric and Reader.* Allyn and Bacon. A cross-curricular reader and mini-handbook. Introduces students to strategies of thinking and writing common to all disciplines. Cross-disciplinary readings chosen to prompt critical thinking.

Costello, Karin. *Gendered Voices.* Harcourt Brace. Emphasizes how issues of ethnicity, race, and class intersect with gender. Includes a variety of writing formats from a wide array of authors. Also offers an extensive pedagogy and writing assignments.

DeMott, Benjamin. *Created Equal: Reading and Writing About Class in America.* HarperCollins. Interviews, personal testimony, autobiographical narratives, stories, essays, and political, historical, and sociological studies explore the issue of social class in America.

Dock, Julie Bates. *The Press of Ideas: Readings for Writers on Print Culture and the Information Age.* Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Examines issues of reading, literacy, technology, and power. Sixty-four readings explore and exemplify print culture. Includes writing and research assignments. Instructor's Edition.

Eschholz, Paul, and Alfred Rosa. *Subject and Strategy: A Rhetoric Reader,* 7th ed. St. Martin's Press. Features 64 readings (half new) arranged in 10 rhetorical chapters. A new "Combining Strategies" chapter discusses mixed modes of discourse. An expanded chapter on argumentation also included.

Flachmann and Flachmann. *The Prose Reader: Essays for Thinking, Reading, and Writing,* 4th ed. Prentice Hall. A rhetorically-organized reader. Includes section introductions, student essays, pre-reading and pre-writing questions, comprehension questions, and writing assignments. New edition emphasizes mixing modes. Instructor's Manual.

Gillespie, Sheena, and Robert Singleton. *Across Cultures: A Reader for Writers,* 3rd ed. Allyn and Bacon. A cross-cultural reader which includes professional and student essays as well as myths and legends. Features 30% new selections, more U.S. ethnic writers, and expanded chapter openers.

Gong, Gwendolyn, and Sam Dragga. *A Reader's Repertoire.* HarperCollins. Focuses on the subject and practice of reading, emphasizing Kinneavy's aims and purposes of writing (expressive, referential, and persuasive).

Goshgarian, Gary. *The Contemporary Reader,* 5th ed. HarperCollins. Offers a diverse selection of essays by modern writers. Topics are pertinent to the time and culture of which students are a part. Essays stimulate discussion and serve as writing models.

Hatch, Gary L. *Arguing in Communities.* Mayfield. Focuses on developing strategies for argumentative writing within particular discourse communities. Stresses careful consideration of the customs, conventions, and "fallacies" of discourse communities.

Hirschberg, Stuart. *Strategies of Argument,* 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. A rhetoric and reader. Covers all aspects of argument and includes chapters on cross-disciplinary argument and language. Readings focus on 11 contemporary issues.

Hunt, Douglas, and Carolyn Perry. *The Dolphin Reader,* 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin. A thematic reader. Covers a range of writing styles including essays, poems, and short stories. (Essays are featured.) "Style Lessons" help students learn from the authors they are reading.

Ibieta, Gabriella, and Miles Orvell. *Inventing America: Readings in Identity and Culture.* St. Martin's Press. A thematically-arranged reader for first-year students. Sixty-four historical/contemporary readings from a wide variety of genres look at immigration and ethnicity in the United States.

Jenseth and Lotto. *Constructing Nature.* Blair Press. A historically-arranged reader. Presents essays, short stories, and poems discussing nature in

America. Includes introductions, headnotes, questions, and assignment sequences. Instructor's Manual.

Kelly, William J. *Strategy and Structure: Short Readings for Composition.* Allyn and Bacon. (See III.B.: Developmental Writing Texts—Readers.)

Kennedy, Kennedy, and Smith. *Writing in the Disciplines: A Reader for Writers.* 3rd ed. Prentice Hall. Features academic writing from Natural Sciences and Technology, Social Sciences, and Humanities. Discusses critical reading, paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting, organizing, drafting, revising, editing, and responding to sources. Instructor's Manual.

Kirszner and Mandell. *The Blair Reader,* 2nd ed. Blair Press. A thematically-arranged reader. Features 116 selections from various racial and cultural viewpoints. Apparatus encourages students to think critically and make contributions to the issues that shape the world. Instructor's Manual.

laGuardia, Dolores, and Hans P. Guth. *American Voices: Multicultural Literacy and Critical Thinking,* 2nd ed. Mayfield. Stresses critical thinking and writing skill. Features 95 thematically-organized readings including essays, articles, interviews, reviews, stories, and poems. "Writing Workshops" follow each thematic section.

Levin, Gerald. *Prose Models,* 10th ed. Harcourt Brace. A rhetoric and reader. Covers major paragraph/essay features (topic sentences, thesis, unity, transitions) and the modes of discourse (definition, comparison and contrast, example). Readings include 28 new writers.

Marx, Paul. *Modern and Classical Essayists: Twelve Masters.* Mayfield. Represents twelve modern and classical essayists in depth with discussion and writing suggestions after each essay. Included: Steele, Ehrenreich, Baldwin, Gordimer, Orwell, White, Porter, Emerson, Hazlitt, Lamb, Bacon, and Montaigne.

May, Charles. *Interacting with Essays.* Houghton Mifflin. A contemporary thematic reader with accompanying software. Encourages students to interact carefully and analytically with good writing. Features 60 essays, 6-10 pages in length.

McDonald, Daniel. *The Language of Argument,* 8th ed. HarperCollins. Collection of 100 readings, advertisements, and illustrations (80 new). Emphasizes "real world" issues and topics.

Meyers, Lewis. *Findings: Readings for Writers,* 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin. A process-oriented reader stressing critical thinking. Features over 80 reading selections in 5 thematic units. Each unit includes a student essay written in response to one of the readings.

Nadell, Judith, John Langan, and Linda McMeniman. *The Macmillan Reader,* 4th ed. Allyn and Bacon. Includes 58 rhetorically arranged essays (12 new), separate chapters on writing and reading, numerous annotated essays, and extensive pedagogy.

Penfield, Elizabeth. *Short Takes: Model Essays for Composition,* 5th ed. HarperCollins. Features short essays depicting the various rhetorical modes, including comprehensive coverage of argument.

Peterson, Linda H., John C. Brereton, and Joan E. Hartman. *The Norton Reader,* 9th ed. Norton. Offers 204 classic and contemporary essays organized thematically. Includes a new section on cultural critique, biographical sketches, an essay on reading and writing, and an index of rhetorical modes. Instructor's Guide.

Peterson, Linda H., John C. Brereton, and Joan E. Hartman. *The Norton Reader,* (shorter) 9th ed. Norton. Offers 118 classic and contemporary essays organized thematically. Includes a new section on cultural critique, biographical sketches, an essay on reading and writing, and an index of rhetorical modes. Instructor's Guide.

Prystowsky, Richard J. *Careful Reading, Thoughtful Writing.* HarperCollins. Process-oriented writing instruction. Alerts students to the demands placed upon writers of personal and academic essays. Moves students from close reading to thoughtful writing.

Raimes, Ann. *Identities: Readings from Contemporary Culture.* Houghton Mifflin. A thematic reader exploring identity and culture. Features 70 contemporary selections by writers from diverse backgrounds. Includes 6 student essays. Introductory chapter discusses the value of active, critical reading.

Schuster and Van Pelt. *Speculations: Reading in Culture, Identity, and Values,* 2nd ed. Blair Press. Features 70 readings grouped into 5 chapters: Growing Up, Music and Morality, Crime and Punishment, Gender Matters, and Struggling. Assignment sequences encourage analysis of issues from various perspectives. Instructor's Manual.

Stubbs, Marcia, and Sylvan Barnet. *The Little, Brown Reader,* 7th ed. HarperCollins. A thematic reader with photographs and art. Comprehensive treatment of critical reading and writing and analyses of professional writing. Expanded coverage of argument.

Trimmer, Joseph F., and Maxine C. Hairston. *The Riverside Reader,* 5th ed. Houghton Mifflin. A rhetorical reader. Covers topics such as the American Dream, animal rights, smoking, welfare, and health. Contains guidelines for reading and writing essays, study questions, and writing assignments.

Valenti, Peter. *Reading the Landscape: Writing a World.* Harcourt Brace. Moves students through the various stages of writing. Examples evolve from the home to the larger world of natural landscape and environmental concerns.

Vesterman, William. *Juxtapositions: Connections and Contrasts.* Mayfield. Juxtaposes from 2 to 5 selections on 24 subjects or themes. Cuts across genre, time, and cultural boundaries to stimulate student writing. Moves students from private to public discourse.

Vitanza, Victor J. *Cyberreader.* Allyn and Bacon. Features readings from both scholarly and popular sources devoted solely to cyberspace and the issues surrounding this technology. A website with additional material will keep this text current.

Youga, Withrow, and Flint-Ferguson. *Readings are Writings: A Guide to Reading and Writing Well.* Prentice Hall. Stresses purposeful writing and pursues issues related to voice, audience, and style. Outlines the writing process and strategies for critical reading. Professional and student writers provide reading selections. Instructor's Manual.

C. Handbooks

Carter, Bonnie, and Craig Skates. *The Rinehart Guide to Grammar and Style,* 4th ed. Harcourt Brace. Revised to serve as a brief grammar/mechanics reference guide. New ESL appendix and section on discriminatory language. Exercises available in separate book.

Carter, Bonnie, and Craig Skates. *The Rinehart Handbook for Writers,* 4th ed. Harcourt Brace. Offers new ESL appendix, discussion of writing a research paper on literature, and updated formats for MLA and APA. Cross-curricular examples included. "Computer Connection" boxes explain technological developments.

Dornan, Edward D., and Charles W. Dawe. *The Brief English Handbook,* 5th ed. HarperCollins. Covers grammar, common sentence errors, rules for punctuation and mechanics, and the elements of paragraphs, essays, and research papers. Includes glossaries for usage and grammatical terms. New ESL chapter.

Fulwiler, Hayakawa, and Kupper. *The College Writer's Reference.* Blair Press. A spiral bound, four-color reference. Discusses grammar, punctuation, and mechanics as "editing" choices. Also discusses research and documentation methods and ESL concerns. Instructor's Manual and Full Supplement Packages.

Hacker, Diana. *Rules for Writers,* 3rd ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. New edition features a graphic reference system. Offers guidance on the writing process, paragraph development, style, usage, grammar, ESL concerns, punctuation, mechanics, argument, and research. Instructor's Edition.

Hairston, Maxine, and John Ruszkiewicz. *The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers,* 4th ed. HarperCollins. A process-oriented, user-friendly handbook. Employs a "troubleshooting" approach which helps students identify and solve writing problems according to severity. Extensive information on technology.

Hult, Christine A. *Researching and Writing Across the Curriculum.* Allyn and Bacon. Provides guidance in research and writing across the disciplines. Discusses primary and secondary methods of research, summarizing and critiquing sources, and technology. Includes sample papers and new MLA and APA guidelines.

Hult, Christine A. *Researching and Writing in the Humanities and Arts.* Allyn and Bacon. Provides guidance in research and writing in the humanities and arts. Discusses primary and secondary methods of research, summarizing and critiquing sources, and technology. Includes sample papers and new MLA and APA guidelines.

Hult, Christine A. *Researching and Writing in Sciences and Technology.* Allyn and Bacon. Provides guidance in research and writing in sciences and technology. Discusses primary and secondary methods of research, summarizing and critiquing sources, and technology. Includes sample papers and new MLA and APA guidelines.

Hult, Christine A. *Researching and Writing in the Social Sciences.* Allyn and Bacon. Provides guidance in research and writing in the social sciences. Discusses primary and secondary methods of research, summarizing and critiquing sources, and technology. Includes sample papers and new MLA and APA guidelines.

Keene, Michael L., and Katherine H. Adams. *The Easy Access Handbook.* Mayfield. A three-part handbook. Part I covers the writing process; Part II addresses the nine most common student writing problems; Part III provides an alphabetical reference to grammar, mechanics, and usage.

Kirkland, James, and Collett B. Dilworth. *Essential English Handbook.* Houghton Mifflin. A brief, spiral-bound reference handbook that summarizes the fundamentals of grammar, punctuation, style, spelling, and documented research. Covers both MLA and APA documentation style.

Lunsford, Andrea, and Robert Connors. *The St. Martin's Handbook,* 3rd ed. St. Martin's Press. Focuses on writing well, not just correctly. Includes chapters on language variety, writing across the disciplines, and using the Internet. Offers expanded research coverage and new materials for ESL writers.

O'Hare, Frank, and Edward A. Kline. *The Modern Writer's Handbook,* 4th ed. Allyn and Bacon. Comprehensive yet compact. Updated edition covers everything that full-size handbooks do.

Pearlman, Daniel D., and Paula R. Pearlman. *Guide to Rapid Revision,* 6th ed. Allyn and Bacon. A practical and visually appealing reference guide arranged alphabetically. A workbook is also available.

Raimes, Ann. *Keys for Writers: A Brief Handbook.* Houghton Mifflin. Full coverage of the writing process and research. Special attention to ESL issues, computers, style, and four types of documentation. Students personalize the text with "KeyTab" cards. Workbook available. Electronic version also

available. (See Flanagan at I.D.: Freshman Writing Texts—Workbooks and Raimes at VIII.: Software and Computer-Assisted Instruction.)

Reagan, Sally Barr, Gerald J. Alred, Charles T. Brusaw, and Walter E. Oliu. *Writing from A to Z: The Easy-to-Use Reference Handbook,* 1995-96 Printing with New MLA and APA Guidelines. Mayfield. Alphabetical organization makes this handbook easy to use. Students need not "crack the code" of a conventional handbook to find information.

Rodrigues, Dawn, and Myron C. Tuman. *Writing Essentials: A Norton Pocket Guide.* Norton. Concise, spiral-bound handbook. Offers practical advice for using computers throughout the writing process (including searching the Internet) as well as standard handbook help. (Windows and Macintosh versions also available. See VIII.—Software and Computer-Assisted Instruction.)

Rosa, Alfred, and Paul Eschholz. *The Writer's Brief Handbook,* 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. Comb-binding and tabs make it easy to access information. Includes complete writing process coverage, word processing tips, and full chapters on library use, formatting, and MLA documentation.

Troyka. *Simon & Schuster Handbook for Writers,* 4th ed. Prentice Hall. A comprehensive handbook. Discusses the writing process as well as grammar, punctuation, and usage. Features revised chapters on critical reading, research, argumentation, and ESL topics. Instructor's Manual and Full Supplement Packages. (See I.D.: Freshman Writing Texts—Workbooks.)

Watkins, Floyd C., and William B. Dillingham. *Practical English Handbook,* 10th ed. Houghton Mifflin. A compact and durable handbook with a sewn binding. New edition includes writing tips for ESL students and updated material on writing the research paper. Workbook also available. (See Watkins, Floyd C., et al. I.D.: Freshman Writing Texts—Workbooks.)

D. Workbooks

Flanagan, Barbara G. *Exercise Booklet for* Keys for Writers: A Brief Handbook. Houghton Mifflin. Offers exercises to accompany *Keys for Writers* by Ann Raimes. (See I.C.: Freshman Writing Texts—Handbooks.)

Troyka. *Simon & Schuster Workbook for Writers,* 4th ed. Prentice Hall. Works in conjunction with Troyka's *Simon & Schuster Handbook for Writers,* 4th ed. (See I.C.: Freshman Writing Texts—Handbooks.)

Watkins, Floyd C., William B. Dillingham, John T. Hiers, and Matthew G. Hearn. *Practical English Workbook,* 6th ed. Houghton Mifflin. Workbook to accompany *Practical English Handbook.* (See I.C.: Freshman Writing Texts—Handbooks.)

II. Developmental Writing Texts

A. Rhetorics

Campbell. *Focus: From Paragraph To Essay.* Prentice Hall. A developmental rhetoric that includes context-based grammar instruction. Moves from paragraph development to essay writing with each chapter introducing a different writing strategy. Includes sample student essays. Instructor's Manual.

Clouse, Barbara Fine. *Progressions,* 3rd ed. Allyn and Bacon. A rhetoric, reader, and handbook. Shows students what to do in every step of the writing process. Reorganized with new multicultural readings, exercises, and added material on computers.

Donnelly, Rory. *Sequence: A Basic Writing Course,* 4th ed. Harcourt Brace. Combines the writing process with grammar. Students write complete essays from the beginning. Assignments designed for collaborative learning and offer topic options.

Edie and O'Harra. *Writing With the Lights On: From Sentences to Paragraphs.* Prentice Hall. Focuses on the contribution that every part of a sentence makes to effective writing. Engages students in the writing process and encourages discussion of writing in academic, professional, and personal settings.

Embree, Jean Anderson. *Practical English Grammar: A Sentence-to-Paragraph Approach.* Mayfield. A textbook/workbook. Uses humor, "memory pegs," "Tryout" and "Practice" exercises, and progressive assignments to help students master the basics.

Parks, A. Franklin, James A. Levernier, and Ida M. Hollowell. *Structuring Paragraphs: A Guide to Effective Writing,* 4th ed. St. Martin's Press. Designed for developmental and introductory courses. Provides clear, accessible instruction through student-written examples and a variety of exercises. Principles of drafting, revising, and editing reinforced throughout.

Reynolds, Ed, and Marcia Huntington. *Confidence in Writing: A Basic Text,* 3rd ed. Harcourt Brace. Provides a flexible, step-by-step approach that includes brainstorming, revision, and editing. Each chapter includes a writing assignment. Stresses development of paragraph within the context of an essay.

Swenson. *Grammar From the Ground Up: Building Basic Skills.* Prentice Hall. Uses student models to explain grammar, writing, and editing skills. Discusses the entire writing process and illustrates key points by means of paragraphs instead of sentences.

B. Readers

Hawkins, Rose, and Robert Isaacson. *Uncommon Knowledge: Exploring Ideas Through Reading and Writing*. Houghton Mifflin. Features classic and contemporary readings divided into five thematic chapters that explore human knowledge. Each chapter includes a story, poem, and essay. Unique "Reading Logo" support journal work.

Kelly, William J. *Strategy and Structure: Short Readings for Composition*. Allyn and Bacon. Contains 46 short, rhetorically-arranged readings. Includes chapters on critical thinking and the writing process. Each chapter has annotated examples of each mode plus extensive apparatus.

King, Anne Mills. *The Engaging Reader*, 3rd ed. Allyn and Bacon. Contains 73 thematically-organized readings that reflect a broad multicultural spectrum and encourage students to write. Includes paragraph and essay-length assignments plus a Writer's Guide to writing "survival skills."

Knodt, Ellen Andrew. *Understanding Ourselves: Readings For Developing Writers*. HarperCollins. A multicultural reader for basic writers. Built around the theme of personal identity. Encourages active reading through accessible essays, stories, and poems discussing identity. Links writing with reading.

Lovas, John. *Experiences: A Reader For Developing Writers*. HarperCollins. Presents a critical reading, thinking, and writing program which capitalizes on the life experiences of developmental readers and writers. Topics chosen for their universal appeal and relevance.

Roth, Audrey J. *The Elements of Basic Writing with Readings*, 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. Includes three chapters on the writing process, separate chapters on the patterns of development, a section on grammar, and 18 readings. Motivating tone is sensitive to diverse student populations.

Wiener, Harvey, and Charles Bazerman. *Side by Side: A Multicultural Reader*, 2nd ed. Houghton Mifflin. A multicultural reader emphasizing the skills of reading and writing through its diverse selections. Includes a "Handbook for Writers" based on the authors' *Writing Skills Handbook*.

C. Workbooks

Emery, Donald W., John M. Kierzek, and Peter Lindblom. *English Fundamentals*, 10th ed., Form C. Allyn and Bacon. Concentrates on grammar and sentence writing with some coverage of paragraphs and essays. Includes Practice Sheets with answers, diagnostic tests, and a separate testing program.

Glazier, Teresa Ferster. *The Least You Should Know About English, Form C*, 5th ed. Harcourt Brace. Teaches the essentials of sentence structure, punctuation, mechanics, and the writing of simple papers. Includes essays to summarize. All exercises revised for this edition.

Kirszner, Laurie G., and Stephen R. Mandell. *Windows on Writing: Practice in Context*. St. Martin's Press. Students use their own writing to practice sentence, paragraph, and essay writing skills. Numerous boxes, charts, and lists help students identify and understand key concepts.

Meyers, Alan. *Writing with Confidence*, 5th ed. HarperCollins. Provides instruction and practice at the sentence and paragraph levels. Emphasizes the production of writing rather than the completion of exercises.

Selby, Norwood. *Essential College English: A Grammar and Punctuation Workbook*, 4th ed. HarperCollins. Provides a complete and clear treatment of the rules for grammar and punctuation. Visually appealing with an engaging tone.

Smith, Maggy, and Douglas Meyers. *Springboard for College Writers*. HarperCollins. A worktext that begins with paragraph and essay writing and moves to grammar and usage. Organized in steps from basic principles to more sophisticated concepts.

Taylor, Margaret W. *The Basic English Handbook*. HarperCollins. Begins with coverage of paragraph and essay writing and moves to a detailed overview of problem areas in grammar and usage. Includes numerous examples and cartoons.

Williams, Virginia, and Carl David Blake. *Explorations 2: From Paragraph to Essay*. HarperCollins. A sequel to *Explorations*. This worktext includes process-oriented paragraph and essay writing practice and a grammar review. Examples and exercises focus on discovery and exploration.

III. Advanced Writing Texts

A. Rhetorics

Kolln, Martha. *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects*, 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. This "writer's grammar" explains the rhetorical effects on readers of a writer's choices in sentence structure and punctuation. New chapters on cohesion and punctuation plus new collaborative exercises.

Krieger, Barbara Jo, Paul G. Saint-Amand, and Robert W. Emery. *Dialogue and Discovery: Writing and Reading across Disciplines*. St. Martin's Press. A rhetoric/reader. Integrates critical thinking, reading, and writing.

Includes collaborative and journal writing activities, a guide to the writing process, and chapters on argumentation, research, and documentation.

B. Readers

Sommers, Jeff, and Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson. *From Community to College: Reading and Writing across Diverse Contexts*. St. Martin's Press. A thematically-arranged reader. Features culturally diverse, contemporary readings that address the concerns of both traditional and nontraditional students. Elicits writing in various genres and incorporates collaborative learning and portfolio writing.

Talese, Gay, and Barbara Lounsberry. *The Literature of Reality: Writing Creative Nonfiction*. HarperCollins. Introduction gives guidelines for writers. Includes 29 feature-length articles by masters of literary nonfiction.

C. Advanced Grammar

Klammer, Thomas P., and Muriel R. Schulz. *Analyzing English Grammar*, 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. Combines the applications of linguistic and learning theories. Stresses critical thinking and analysis, not memorization. Contains more inductive exercises and ESL material.

Vaida. *Liberating Grammar*. Prentice Hall. Provides a synthesis of traditional and generative approaches to grammar. Uses the ideas of structure, class, and function to analyze language. Instructor's Manual.

IV. Composition and Literature Texts

Abcarian, Richard, and Marvin Klotz. *Literature: The Human Experience, Sixth Shorter Edition with Essays*. St. Martin's Press. A thematically-arranged anthology. Aids writing about literature through questions, suggested topics, and appendices on reading and writing about literature. Features biographical notes and glossaries of literary terms and critical approaches.

Anstendig and Hicks. *Writing Through Literature*. Prentice Hall. A thematic anthology with subthemes and subject clusters. Combines writing instruction with appreciation of literature. Includes multicultural essays, short stories, poems, and plays. Instructor's Manual.

Barnet, Sylvan. *A Short Guide to Writing About Literature,* 7th ed. HarperCollins. Emphasizes writing as a process and incorporates new critical approaches to literature. Continues to offer step-by-step instruction for improving the effectiveness of student work.

Barnet, Sylvan, et al. *Literature for Composition.* HarperCollins. Additions entail more information on writing (including a section on computer-assisted research), greater emphasis on critical thinking, and two new themes.

Birkerts, Sven P. *Literature, The Evolving Canon,* 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon. Includes 41 short stories, 314 poems, and 14 plays. Emphasizes the reading/writing connection. Several essays debate the canon controversy. Offers new "Responding to" chapters and discussion of using sources.

Callaghan, Patsy, and Ann Dobyns. *Literary Conversation: Thinking, Talking, and Writing About Literature.* Allyn and Bacon. Offers critical thinking, reading, and writing strategies to facilitate successful interpretation of literature. Uses the "conversation" metaphor to show interpretation as a natural activity. Emphasizes collaborative reading and writing.

McMahan, Day, and Funk. *Literature and the Writing Process,* 4th ed. Prentice Hall. Combines a comprehensive rhetoric which explains how to write literary analyses with a generous anthology of fiction, poetry, and drama. Instructor's Manual.

McQuade, Donald, et al. *The Harper American Literature,* 2nd compact ed. HarperCollins. Features classic writings, whole works, and special coverage of Native American and Southern literature as well as writing from other regions. Provides a sociocultural context through "Cultural Landscapes" and "Interiors."

Stanford, Judith. *Responding to Literature,* 2nd ed. Mayfield. Encourages reader response criticism. Features four introductory chapters and eight thematically-organized chapters which include stories, poems, plays, essays, and critical commentaries. "Three American Poets" offers opportunity for in-depth study.

Wingard, Joel. *Literature: Reading and Responding to Fiction, Poetry, Drama, and the Essay.* HarperCollins. An introductory anthology. Offers a diverse selection of literary texts and student responses. Pairs "high" and "low" culture selections as well as traditional and experimental selections. Discusses active reading and critical thinking.

V. Creative Writing Texts

Agostino. *Created Writing: Poetry for New Angles.* Prentice Hall. Features poems written by students and small press poets. Discusses traditional elements of poetry (i.e. rhyme and form) but emphasizes poems that create their own form and music.

Allen. *Hands-On Fiction Workbook.* Prentice Hall. Provides an activity-based approach to writing fiction. Covers all stages of the fiction writing process. Offers tips on "how not to be bad" and how to develop life-long reading and writing plans.

Burroway, Janet. *Writing Fiction: A Guide to Narrative Craft,* 4th ed. HarperCollins. Revised to emphasize the workshop process and focus more closely on "theme." Includes new examples and writing assignments.

Myers. *The Elephants Teach: Creative Writing Since 1880.* Prentice Hall. A text for scholars in creative writing, literary history, the history of writing instruction, and secondary/adult education. This text is part of the Prentice Hall Studies in Writing and Culture edited by Nancy Sommers.

Wallace, Robert, and Michelle Boisseau. *Writing Poems,* 4th ed. HarperCollins. Discusses the creative and technical principles of writing poetry with the beginning poet in mind. Includes an anthology of classic and contemporary poems and serves as a reliable handbook.

VI. ESL Texts

Braine, George, and Claire May. *Writing from Sources: A Guide for ESL Students.* Mayfield. Introduces ESL students to academic writing through a sequenced set of assignments. Moves from personal, expressive writing to informative and persuasive writing. Includes abundant student examples.

VII. Business and Technical Writing Texts

Brusaw, Charles T., Gerald J. Alred, and Walter E. Oliu. *The Business Writer's Companion.* St. Martin's Press. Based on the 4th ed. of *The Business Writer's Handbook.* Includes models for news releases, sales letters, memos, etc. Features revision checklists and lists of editing symbols and commonly misused words.

Brusaw, Charles T., Gerald J. Alred, and Walter E. Oliu. *The Concise Handbook for Technical Writing.* St. Martin's Press. Based on the 4th ed. of *The Handbook of Technical Writing.* Designed for writers in government, science, and industry. Provides models of lab reports, government proposals, feasibility reports, and other writing formats.

Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. *Information in Action: A Guide to Technical Communication.* Allyn and Bacon. Presents a five-step, process-driven method for composing. Students start with short papers and expand them into full-length documents. Emphasizes audience analysis, collaboration, and technology.

Markel, Mike. *Technical Communication: Situations and Strategies,* 4th ed. St. Martin's Press. Prepares students for writing tasks in the working world. Includes new chapters "Writing Collaboratively" and "Usability Testing of Instructions and Manuals." Discusses high-tech tools, ethics, argument, and research methods.

Morton, Gerald. *Effective Business Writing: Principles and Applications.* Harcourt Brace. Focuses on stylistic concerns and formats for business documents. Provides examples for improving writing style. Includes chapter objectives, summaries, exercises, writing assignments, models, and appendices.

Pickett, Nell Ann, and Ann Appleton Laster. *Technical English: Writing, Reading, and Speaking,* 7th ed. HarperCollins. Offers accessible reading selections and leads students step-by-step through all phases of technical English.

Riordan, Daniel, and Stephen Pauley. *Technical Report Writing Today,* 6th ed. Houghton Mifflin. A practical approach to technical and professional communication. Includes a new MLA reference section, expanded models and exercises, increased technology coverage, and a chapter on writing persuasive proposals.

White, Fred D. *Communicating Technology: Dynamic Processes and Models for Writers.* HarperCollins. Covers the process of researching, composing, and designing technical documents. Discusses proposals, procedures, progress reports, empirical research, and correspondence as well as newsletters, brochures, and articles.

VIII. Software and Computer-Assisted Instruction

CommonSpace. Computer software. Sixth Floor Media, a Houghton Mifflin Group. Collaborative writing software. Allows multiple parties from different systems and locations to work on the same document. Ideal for teachers and students, scholars co-authoring articles, committee members, etc.

Crump, Eric, and Nick Carbone. *The English Student's Guide to the Internet.* Houghton Mifflin. A supplement for various writing courses. Provides basic information about communicating online and finding, retrieving, and documenting information. Covers e-mail, USENET, Gopher, the World Wide Web, and Telnet and FTP.

Kirkland, James, and Collett B. Dilworth. *The Heath Electronic Handbook.* Computer software. Houghton Mifflin. A hypertext program based on *The Heath Handbook,* 13th ed. by Kirkland and Dilworth. Covers grammar, punctuation, spelling, mechanics, and the research paper. Includes a search function.

Raimes, Ann. *Keys for Writers Electronic Handbook.* Computer software. Houghton Mifflin. Based on Raimes's *Keys for Writers: A Brief Handbook.* (See I.C.: Freshman Writing Texts—Handbooks.)

Rodrigues, Dawn, and Myron C. Tuman. *Writing Essentials: A Norton Pocket Guide.* Disk Version. Norton. Offers advice for using computers throughout the writing process, including searching the WWW and Internet. Hypertext links aid searches. Windows and Macintosh versions. (Print version available. See I.C.: Freshman Writing Texts—Handbooks.)

Tuman, Myron C. *Norton Textra Connect: A Networked Writing Environment for WordPerfect and Word for Windows.* Norton. Works with Word 6.0, 7.0, and WordPerfect for Windows. Allows instructors and students to share assignments, papers, comments, and messages. DOS version, instructor's disks, and special packages available.

Vitanza, Victor J. *Cyberreader.* Allyn and Bacon. (See I.B.: Freshman Writing Texts—Readers.)

IX. Research Paper Texts

Charnigo, Richard. *Writing Original Research Papers.* HarperCollins. Provides a careful description of 50 writing topics. Contains a sample research paper shown in both APA and MLA formats.

Hubbuch, Susan M. *Writing Research Papers Across the Curriculum,* 4th ed. Harcourt Brace. Self-contained guide that includes four documentation styles. Focuses on the critical thinking processes essential to research and writing. Update on electronic media included. Three new sample papers.

Lester, James D. *Writing Research Papers: A Complete Guide,* 8th ed. HarperCollins. Helps students master research writing from discovering a topic to presenting the finished paper. Tabbed for ease of reference.

Maner, Martin. *The Spiral Guide to Research Writing.* Mayfield. Emphasizes the recursiveness of the research process. Presents research not only as information gathering but as an opportunity to argue fresh positions. Includes extensive coverage of electronic sources.

Spatt, Brenda. *Writing from Sources,* 4th ed. St. Martin's Press. Guides students through the process of using source materials in research papers. Includes expanded instructions in MLA and APA documentation and a section on field research.

Trimmer, Joseph F. *A Guide to MLA Documentation,* 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin. Offers students additional insight into MLA documentation. Includes the 1995 MLA changes with expanded coverage of electronic documentation. Also includes sample MLA paper and an APA appendix.

X. Reading and Study Skills Texts

McWhorter, Kathleen T. *Efficient and Flexible Reading*, 4th ed. HarperCollins. Presents techniques and guided practice in accomplishing reading tasks within an efficient and realistic framework. Integrates reading comprehension, retention, vocabulary development, critical reading, and rate-building techniques.

McWhorter, Kathleen T. *Study and Critical Thinking Skills in College*, 3rd ed. HarperCollins. Offers active learning strategies and techniques for developing proficiency in interacting with text and lecture material. Explores themes of metacognition and critical thinking. New section: "Using Computers and Word Processing."

Miller, Wanda, and Sharon Steeber De Orozco. *Reading Faster and Understanding More*, 4th ed. Books 1 & 2. HarperCollins. Presents strategies for improving reading comprehension and rate. Offers step-by-step instruction and provides opportunities to practice skills. Expanded "Previewing" techniques and new coverage of skimming and scanning.

Reynolds, Jean A. *Succeeding in College: Study Skills and Strategies.* Allyn and Bacon. Covers time management, study methods, reading skills, and research skills. Offers hands-on activities, collaborative exercises, readings, and photos. Separate chapters on studying in science and math.

Skidell, Myrna Bigman, and Sidney Graves Becker. *The Main Idea: Reading to Learn.* Allyn and Bacon. Shows reading, writing, and thinking as interrelated processes. Provides "game plans" to help students understand texts. Readings include familiar magazine and newspaper articles. Also offers content and strategy-based vocabulary instruction.

XI. Professional Texts

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing*, 4th ed. Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. Annotated bibliography of sources for writing teachers. Includes six new subjects: ESL, Literature and Composition, Advanced Composition, Writing in the Workplace, Literacy, and Audience. Introduction outlines the history of the discipline.

Wiley, Mark, Barbara Gleason, and Louise Wetherbee Phelps. *Composition in Four Keys: An Inquiry into the Field.* Mayfield. A theory-of-composition text. Includes 52 essays written in the last quarter century which are organized to make a complex, interdisciplinary field intelligible for novice scholars.

XII. Additional Texts

Beall, Herbert, and John Trimbur. *A Short Guide to Writing About Chemistry.* HarperCollins. Examines chemistry discourse ranging from lab reports to research proposals. Final chapter discusses writing about chemistry for the public. "Survival kit" explains techniques for thinking, reading, and writing like a chemist.

Pugh, Sharon L., David Pace, and Brenda D. Smith. *Studying for History.* HarperCollins. Teaches undergraduate and advanced students the cognitive skills necessary for success in history courses. Attention given to cognitive modeling and the development of critical reading and thinking.

Notes on Contributors

Wendy Bishop teaches writing at Florida State University and has published poetry, fiction, nonfiction and essays in a variety of literary and composition journals. With Hans Ostrom, she edited *Colors of a Different Horse: Rethinking Creative Writing, Theory and Pedagogy* (NCTE 1994) and *Genre and Writing: Issues, Arguments, Alternatives* (forthcoming Boynton/Cook Heinemann). Recently, she edited *Elements of Alternate Style: Essays on Writing and Revision* (forthcoming Boynton/Cook Heinemann) and is completing *Thirteen Ways of Looking for a Poem: A Sourcebook of Form for Writers and Readers.* **Gay Lynn Crossley** teaches writing and rhetoric at Marian College.

Timothy Catalano is a doctoral student in composition and rhetoric at the University of Louisville. **Will Clemens** is working toward his Master of Fine Arts at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. **Julia Goodwin** is an English language instructor at the Catholic University of Korea, Seoul, South Korea. **Gary McMillin** teaches at Chaminade-Julian High School and Sinclair Community College, Dayton, Ohio. **Jeff White** is a doctoral student in composition and rhetoric at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. **Stephen Wilhoit** is an Associate Professor of English and Director of the TA training program at the University of Dayton.

Catherine G. Latterell is completing her doctoral degree in Rhetoric and Technical Communication from Michigan Technological University this spring. In the fall, she will join the writing faculty at Texas Tech University as an Assistant Professor of Composition. Her research interests combine composition theory and critical pedagogy to explore issues in writing program administration—particularly re-theorizing GTA education and examining composition curriculum as a site of knowledge production.

Eric Martin is Assistant Director of Writing Programs at Illinois State University and Managing Editor of *WPA*. In the fall he will become Director of Writing Across the Curriculum at the University of Findlay (Ohio).

Duane Roen is Professor of English and Director of Composition at Arizona State University, where he also directs the graduate program in rhetoric and composition. He has written more than 130 articles, chapters, and conference papers on a range of topics in the field. His published works include *A Sense of Audience in Written Communication* (with Gesa Kirsch) and *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Writers* (with Donna Johnson). He is currently collaborating on several textbooks, as well as a collection of essays on the formation of the field.

Wendy Swyt teaches composition and twentieth century literature at the University of Washington in Seattle. Her articles appear in *The Writing Instructor, English in Texas,* and *MELUS.*

Kathleen Blake Yancey is an assistant professor at UNC Charlotte. She co-founded and co-edits the journal *Assessing Writing*. Her projects have focused on writing assessment, portfolios, voice, email and genre, and—most recently—reflection. In March, she was pleased to join the Executive Board of WPA.

1996 English

First-Year Composition: Handbooks

Bonnie E. Carter/Craig B. Skates
The Rinehart Guide to Grammar and Style
Fourth Edition
0-15-503825-7 1996 Comb 372 pp.

Bonnie E. Carter/Craig B. Skates
The Rinehart Handbook for Writers
Fourth Edition
0-15-503826-5 1996 Comb 576 pp.

First-Year Composition: Rhetorics

Donald Murray
Write to Learn
Fifth Edition
0-15-501986-4 1996 Paper 253 pp.

Jean Wyrick
Steps to Writing Well
Sixth Edition
0-15-501988-0 1996 Paper 467 pp.

Jean Wyrick
Steps to Writing Well with Additional Readings
Third Edition
0-15-501989 1996 Paper 593 pp.

First-Year Composition: Research Paper Guides

Susan M. Hubbuch
Writing Research Papers Across the Curriculum
Fourth Edition
0-15-502655-0 1996 Paper 464 pp.

HARCOURT BRACE

Harcourt Brace College Publishers 301 Commerce Street
Suite 3700 Fort Worth, Texas 76102

WPA E-Mail Directory

Following is a list of e-mail addresses for WPA members who have responded to various calls for addresses. Please send corrections and updates to <ddhesse@ilstu.edu>. —DH

Anne Beaufort	American U	beaufor@american.edu
Linda S. Bergmann	Illinois Inst Tech	bergmann@charlie.acc.iit.edu
Rebecca Blair	Westminster C	rblair@micro.wcmo.edu
Stuart C. Brown	New Mexico SU	sbrown@nmsu.edu
Chris Burnham	New Mexico SU	cburnham@nmsu.edu
Barbara Cambridge	Indiana-Purdue at Indy	bcambrid@indycms.iupui.edu
Ann Cameron	Indiana-Kokomo	acameron@iukfs1.iuk.indiana.edu
Michael Carter	North Carolina SU	mpc@unity.ncsu.edu
Sandra J. Clark	Anderson U	clarks@anderson.edu
Terence Collins	U Minnesota	tcollins@maroon.tc.umn.edu
Don Daiker	Miama U (OH)	daiker_donald@msmail.muohio.edu
Beth Daniell	Clemson U	dbeth@clemson.edu
Amy Devitt	U Kansas	devitt@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu
Ann Dobie	U Southwestern Louisiana	dobie@usl.edu
Sally Ebest	U Missouri, St. Louis	ssbreag@umlva.umsl.edu
Theresa Enos	U Arizona	rhetrev@ccit.arizona.edu,
Sheryl Fontaine	Cal SU-Fullerton	sheryl_fontaine@qmail.fullerton.edu
Diana George	Michigan Tech U	dgeorge@MTU.EDU,
Dona Gorrell	St. Cloud SU	DGORRELL@tigger.stcloud.msus.edu
Katy Gottschalk	Cornell U	kkgl@cornell.edu
Anne Greene	Wesleyan U	agreene@wesleyan.edu
Jeanne Gunner	UCLA	gunner@humnet.ucla.edu
Kristine Hansen	Brigham Young U	HANSENK@jkhbhrc.byu.edu
Susanmarie Harrington	Indiana-Purdue at Indy	sharrin@indyunix.iupui.edu
Doug Hesse	Illinois SU	ddhesse@ilstu.edu
Deborah Holdstein	Governor's SU	gas54rO@uxa.ecn.bgu.edu
John Hollowell	U Cal-Irvine	jwhollow@uci.edu
Rebecca Howard	Colgate U	bhoward@center.colgate.edu
Jeff Jeske	Guilford C	jeskejm@rascal.guilford.edu
David Jolliffe	DePaul U	djolliff@condor.depaul.edu
Mary Kennedy	SUNY-Cortland	kennedym@snycorva.cortland.edu
Edward A. Kline	U Notre Dame	Edward.A.Kline.1@nd.edu
Sherry Little	San Diego SU	slittle@ucsvax.sdsu.edu
Richard Lloyd-Jones	U of Iowa	rljones@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu
Kelly Lowe	Mount Union C	lowekf@SMTPGATE.MUC.EDU
Barry Maid	U Ark, Little Rock	bmmaid@ualr.edu
Ben McClelland	U Mississippi	WGBWM@sunset.backbone.olemiss.edu
Susan H. McLeod	Washington SU	Mcleod@wsuvm1.csc.wsu.edu
John Meyers	Harcourt Brace	jmeyers@harbrace.com
Jonathan Monroe	Cornell U	jbm3@cornell.edu
Judy Anne Pearce	Montgomery C	jpearce@umd5.umd.edu

Mary Pinard	Babson C	pinard@babson.edu
Virginia G. Polanski	Stonehill C	polanski@lcc.stonehill.edu
Randall L. Popken	Tarleton SU	popken@tarleton.edu
Margaret B. Racin		mracin@wvnvm.wvnet.edu
Elizabeth Rankin	U North Dakota	rankin@badlands.NoDak.edu
Duane Roen	Arizona SU	dhroen@imap1.asu.edu
Michael Rosenberg	Harcourt Brace	ROSEY@AOL.COM
Patricia Rossi	HarperCollins	patricia.rossi@harpercollins.com
Carmen B. Schmersahl	Mt. Saint Mary's C	schmersa@msmary.edu
Chuck Schuster	Wisconsin-Milwaukee	cis@csd.uwm.edu
David Schwalm	Arizona SU West	David.Schwalm@ASU.EDU
Mary T. Segall	Quinnipiac C	segall@quinnipiac.edu
Jack Selzer	Penn State U	JLS25@PSUVM.PSU.EDU
Herb Shapiro	SUNY-Empire State	hshapiro@sescva.esc.edu
Tony Silva	Purdue U	silvat@mace.cc.purdue.edu
Anne Smith	HarperCollins	anne.smith@harpercollins.com
Susan Belasco Smith	U Tulsa	smithsb@utulsa.edu
Jeffrey Sommers	Miami U (OH)	JDSOMMERS@miavx3.mid.muohio.edu
Barbara Stout	Montgomery C	bstout@hamlet.umd.edu
Ellen Strenski	U Cal-Irvine	strenski@uci.edu
Gail Stygall	U Washington	stygall@u.washington.edu
Patricia Sullivan	U New Hampshire	pas1@christa.unh.edu
William Sweigart		wsweigar@iusmail.ius.indiana.edu
Mieke Koppen Tucker	Bishop's U	mktucker@arus.ubishops.ca
Irene Ward	Kansas SU	iward@ksu.ksu.edu
Alison Warriner	Sacred Heart U	warriner@shu.sacredheart.edu
Irwin Weiser	Purdue U	iweiser@omni.cc.purdue.edu
Ed White	Cal State San Bernardino	ewhite@wiley.csusb.edu
Janet Whiteaker	Tennessee Tech	jfw4819@tntech.edu
Linda Ziff	Johns Hopkins U	linziff@JHUVMS.HCF.JHU.EDU

Join WPA-L

WPA-L is an international E-mail discussion list intended primarily for individuals who are involved in writing program administration at universities, colleges, or community colleges. Faculty or students interested in program administration are welcome to join.

How do I subscribe?

To subscribe, send the following message to LISTSERV@ASUACAD.BITNET (or to LISTSERV@ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU):

Subscribe WPA-L Your Full Name

As an indication that you have successfully subscribed to WPA-L, you will receive two pieces of electronic mail: a brief note acknowledging your subscription and a longer note giving you some useful tips about using LISTSERV lists. You should store or print this note. If you have difficulty subscribing, you can get help from the network services people at your campus. Or you can send David Schwalm, the list owner, your name and e-mail address, and he will add you to the list.

List Owner: David E. Schwalm, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, Arizona State University West, Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100, EMAIL: IACDES@ASUACAD.BITNET

◆ ◆ ◆

Call for 1997 Research Grant Proposals

◆ ◆ ◆

The Research Grant Committee of the Council of Writing Program Administrators invites proposals to investigate the intellectual work of the WPA. Maximum awards of $2,000 may be given; average awards are $1,000.

A complete proposal will explain the project and how it will address issues of common concern to WPAs; outline how the project will proceed; provide a budget that is realistic, detailed, and specific; and explain how the results will be shared professionally. The descriptive proposal should be no longer than three pages. **PLEASE NOTE**: Because proposals will be blind reviewed, please do not identify yourself or your institution in the project description. Attach a cover letter that gives the names of all investigators. Four copies must be sent to Kristine Hansen at the address below no later than 2 January 1997.

Proposers should contact Hansen for more detailed information. Winners will be announced at the 1997 WPA breakfast.

Kristine Hansen, Chair
WPA Research Grant Committee
English Department
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602

Members: Theresa Enos, David Jolliffe, Ben McClelland

◆ ◆ ◆