

## Hieroglyphic World: A Review of Five Background Readers for Novice Writing Teachers

Richard Haswell

'Tis education forms the common mind,  
Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined.

—Alexander Pope, *Epistle to Cobham*

McDonald, James C., ed. *The Allyn and Bacon Sourcebook for College Writing Teachers*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000. 433 pages.

Villanueva, Victor, ed. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*. 2nd edition. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2003. 883 pages.

Vandenberg, Peter, Sue Hum, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon, eds. *Relations, Locations, Positions: Composition Theory for Writing Teachers*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2006. 606 pages.

Johnson, T. R., ed. *Teaching Composition: Background Readings*. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. 592 pages.

Miller, Susan, ed. *The Norton Book of Composition Studies*. New York: Norton, 2009. 1,750 pages.

Remember term-paper sourcebooks? They had pretty much departed the English-department citadel even before the internet arrived, but in college classrooms of the 1960s, they helped keep everyone within the pale. Collecting a few primary and secondary works on topics such as the American Constitution or Consumer Rights, they served as trusty bailiff for teachers who wanted to read research papers less troubled with plagiarism, citation style, invented sources, and other problems of thinly stacked libraries and thinly prepared students. In their day term-paper sourcebooks were rife. *College Composition and Communication* reviewed them annually from

1962 to 1967. So in 1976 when Richard L. Graves published his anthology of background readings for “prospective” writing teachers and called it *Rhetoric and Composition: A Sourcebook for Teachers* (Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden), he chose a generic epithet that still had a certain resonance.

To what extent do current, in-print collections of background readings for sapling teachers still serve to keep them within the disciplinary pale? Every one of the five I discuss here say, in one way or another, that they are “directed especially to composition teachers *early in their careers*” (McDonald, “Foreword,” emphasis added). It makes intuitive sense that such apprentice-teacher guides would shape as well as guide, in their selections, their omissions, their commentary. “Just as the twig is bent . . .”

Understand that I am sympathetic to this kind of anthology. For years in my seminar for new teaching assistants I used Tate and Corbett—not their groundbreaking 1967 *Teaching Freshman Composition* (New York: Oxford UP), I hasten to say, but the 1981 revamping they called *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*.<sup>1</sup> The chief goal of this review is comparison of five current anthologies, to help WPAs choose from among them. But what will WPAs be getting regardless of their choice? What are all these books telling new arrivals to the profession about the profession, and not telling? I'm just encouraging a second look before the leap. To anticipate with one instance, it may give readers of this journal pause to note that these five anthologies under review reprint a total of 221 pieces and not one first appeared in *Writing Program Administration*.

#### PROFESSIONAL SKEWS

As a bit of historical baseline to gauge these five, here is a hasty summary of Tate and Corbett's 1967 anthology and Graves' 1976 anthology—the first two in the field, I believe. Unabashedly, their primary audience is the graduate student in English, although they admit “experienced practitioners” may benefit as well. Their main interest is in the teaching of composition classes, with practical classroom applications forming the largest group of their selections. For theory they rely mainly on linguistics, cognitive psychology, and classical and new rhetoric, yet they devote some space to empirical or data-gathering studies. Their publication sources are heavily in-discipline, with fully three quarters of their selections coming from journals and books published by NCTE. As for disciplinary role model, the picture is monolithic masculine: 29 of the 30 authors in Tate and Corbett are male; 35 of the 39 authors in Graves are male (this tally includes co-authors and editors). The model is also single authorship: only four pieces in Tate and Corbett are coauthored, only three in Graves. As for the recent-

ness of the selections, strangely Tate and Corbett has only one piece less than a decade old at the time of its publication in 1967. In contrast, over three quarters of the pieces in Graves were first published within ten years of the volume's release in 1976. There is also little agreement on scholars or scholarship. Of a total of 65 pieces, only seven authors and two pieces appear in both anthologies. Finally, something of the aim of these collections can be seen in their main sections. Tate and Corbett divide their book into overviews of composition teaching, the literary approach to composition, the linguistic approach, the rhetorical approach, theme assignments and evaluation, stylistics (the largest section), and teacher attitudes. Graves divides his into motivating student writing, the sentence, the paragraph and beyond, the pedagogy of composition (the largest section), and the uses of classical rhetoric.

How does this picture compare with contemporary background readers? Eccentric as this choice of traits may be, it highlights some central differences among the current anthologies (see table, next page).

McDonald and Johnson maintain the focus of Tate and Corbett and Graves on the brute teaching of composition, with a large portion of pieces observing the classroom or giving teachers practical advice. Villanueva and Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon explicitly say, in their titles and in their proportionate selection of pieces, that they are interested in theory first. Meanwhile Miller's book, which has by far the most selections and the lowest percent of classroom applications, is centered on composition studies (or as I would prefer to say and as she sometimes says, writing studies). She deals with the field in its largest scope, which includes history of rhetoric, disciplinary genres, research methods, textual and cultural and women's studies, and much more not necessarily connected with the teaching of first-year writing. Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon stands as a special case that illustrates this ongoing give-and-take between practice and theory. In their introduction to the "prospective teacher," they say their centering on post-process critical theory may lead "far afield from the college writing classroom." To make their theory pieces "relevant," they commissioned seven scholars to write new pieces that "create a sense of praxis" (17). The dissonance is odd yet familiar.<sup>2</sup> As a field we decamped literary studies and its captivation with heady theory and yet have become enraptured with our own theory, which still attracts editors, foments discussion, and (it seems) sells anthologies. Theory is primary, practice is tacked on.<sup>3</sup>

Respect for empirical studies does not cut the same way. Johnson's classroom-based book has the largest share of pieces that report case-study, textual-feature frequency, and other kinds of hard-data investigations (and that does not include two pieces in Johnson summarizing data-based

Selections	Tate & Corbett	Graves	McDonald	Villaneuva	Vandenberg, Hum, & Clary-Lemon	Johnson	Miller
Publication date	1967	1976	2000	2003	2006	2008	2009
Number of pieces	30	35	30	43	20 (27)*	30	101
Classroom how-to application	37%	49%	37%	9%	10% (37%)	47%	6%
Pieces with empirical data	13%	11%	7%	12%	0% (0%)	23%	16%
NCTE publications	70%	77%	43%	84%	45% (60%)	60%	41%
Female authored or edited	2%	10%	40%	49%	59% (62%)	35%	46%
Co-authored pieces	13%	9%	13%	12%	20% (15%)	13%	13%
Decade or less old at time of publication	3%	74%	50%	26%	75% (81%)	53%	31%
Authors in other related collections	23%**	20%**	33%***	63%***	25% (19%) ***	40%***	34%***
Pieces a decade or less younger at time of publication	7%**	6%**	33%***	30%***	5% (4%) ***	23%***	9%***

\*Vandenberg, Hum, & Clary-Lemon adds seven new pieces written especially for the anthology. My calculations are based on both the 20 reprinted pieces and, in parenthesis, the full 27 pieces.

\*\* Comparing only Tate and Corbett and Graves.

\*\*\*Comparing only the five 21<sup>st</sup>-century anthologies.

research), yet Miller, which has the smallest portion of classroom pieces, has a hefty package of data-based studies, and my count doesn't include the reprint of Mary Sue MacNealy's chapter on "Concepts Basic to Quantitative Research." For young professionals in rhet-comp, all of the books save one replay Tate and Corbett and Graves' picture of the field embracing,

tepidly, empirical study. The exception is Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon, which cuts it cold.

Where is the center of rhet-comp? Miller says, and I concur, that we belong to “a field whose center has become difficult to find” (xlv). All these anthologies recommend looking for it within the National Council of Teachers of English fold. In them *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* provide more pieces than do any other sources by far. Yet, except for Villaneuva, these current anthologies push the circumference of the field much farther beyond NCTE bourns than did Tate and Corbett and Graves. McDonald looks to university presses and to independent journals such as *Rhetoric Review* and the *Journal of Basic Writing*. Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon adds *JAC* and books published by (gasp) the Modern Language Association. But it is Miller who departs the farthest from the NCTE matrix, and not just because she has comparatively so many more selections. As an editor, Miller is willing to tap exoteric sources such as *Across the Disciplines*, *American Journal of Education*, *American Speech*, *Community Literacy Journal*, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Literacy Web Australia, the National Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy, and at least twenty different book publishers including Baywood, Chicano Studies Institute, and Taylor and Francis. If these five anthologies are background readings in rhet-comp, Miller gives the most accurate portrait of how far-flung and multifarious that background really is.

In two ways, the five books cannot be much distinguished. All depart radically from Tate and Corbett and Graves’ male-suffused scene of three or four decades ago. In exemplary fashion, Villaneuva selects exactly half male and half female authors, and only the presence of the single male editor tips the balance. But as for multiple-authored pieces, the portion remains level from Tate and Corbett and Graves’ time. Despite twenty-five years of calls to teach collaboration in student writing (some reprinted in these anthologies), the scholarly writing of the field (at least as represented by these anthologies) remains stubbornly mono-authored—a critical irony that borders on the hypocritical.

When we ask how respected or famous are the pieces chosen, however, solid differences emerge. Naturally, the more current the anthology wishes to be (as signaled by the portion of recently published pieces), the greater the number of novel authors and infrequently reprinted pieces. Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon pushes the most toward currency, as befits its agenda of dwelling on “post-process” theory. Villaneuva marks the other extreme, as befits its stated preference for the “most frequently cited” pieces (xi) and therefore its paucity of scholarship dating from the current century. But note how Miller has a goodly percent of authors appearing in the

other anthologies along with a goodly portion of older pieces and yet nearly the highest percent of original pieces. Johnson, a shrewd editor, combines a high portion of familiar names with a high portion of first-time collected pieces. The real mystery, of course, is why there are relatively so few repeated names and titles across all five books, when the books all claim to collect the top work in the field (the “leading scholars,” as the back covers put it), a curiosity to which I will return.

Which to choose? It depends on the intended use. If you are teaching a graduate introduction to composition studies with emphasis on scholarly approach, Miller stands head and shoulders above the crowd, with Amazon-sized sections on history of the field (435 pages), theories of composition (504 pages), “Revisions and Differences” or critique of older theory and approach, from part-time job conditions to Amerindian discourse, from Geoffrey Sirc to Lynn Worsham (344 pages), and “Worldwide Project” or recent influx of theories, issues, and methods from outside the USA, including critical discourse analysis, world Englishes, globalization, and cultural contact zones (396 pages). If you are teaching a graduate introduction to composition studies with emphasis on theory, Villaneuva offers a discipline-traditional or discipline-centrist collection with sections on process, discourse, human development, society, self, and reevaluations. If you are teaching a practicum for new or soon-to-be-new teaching assistants, McDonald and Johnson are much alike in providing discussion of drafting, peer groups, audience, revising, reading-to-write, computer use, assignments, response, and other nuts and bolts on which novice teachers are so desperate to lay their hands—although McDonald’s selections strike me more as staking their claims in the middle of the professional field and Johnson’s more as contesting set practices, in part because Johnson, more current, has so thoughtfully combined classic pieces (e.g., Bartholomae’s “Inventing the University,” Booth’s “The Rhetorical Stance”) with more unexpected and disruptive pieces from equally known scholars (e.g., Elbow’s “Closing My Eyes as I Speak,” Slevin’s “A Letter to Maggie”). And if you are teaching a course in comp theory and out to prod the student lagging behind the curve, Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon will give you solid pieces on the contextuality, site specificity, and positionality of discourse and composing—although Miller is a more sizeable, varied, and transgressive collection if you are truly out to goggle the crowd with exotic beasts.

---

## PROFESSIONAL ZOOS

The Mexican poet Carlos Isla once said to me that poetry anthologies were like zoos: “Esas antologías son jardines zoológicos.” I knew what he meant (which was not always the case). It’s one thing to read a poem within the energy field of the live audience, the little magazine, or the small-press chapbook where it first breathed air, another to read it bordered on either side by the cages of other “leading” poets, each categorized docent-wise with explanatory labels. Isn’t there a contradiction when these five essay collections choose, extract, transfer, sort, and display so many pieces that originally argued for context as constitutive in discourse, pieces such as Marilyn Cooper’s “The Ecology of Writing” (Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon) or Gesa Kirsch and Joy Ritchie’s “Beyond the Personal: Theorizing a Politics of Location in Composition Research” (Villanueva)?

But then anthologies create their own local field. Decontextualization is itself a context, at least according to standard postmodern theory. What has been said about members of a privileged social class applies equally well to these composition sourcebooks: “In reality they all lived in a kind of hieroglyphic world, where the real thing was never said or done or even thought, but only represented by a set of arbitrary signs.” What is the background of these background readers? Can the books’ “hieroglyphic world” and “arbitrary signs” be translated? If so, what is the hidden message to novice teachers? Obviously, I’m outlining a project much too large for my space at hand, but for the nonce let me list a few directions.

1. Most obvious is the contradiction between avowed selectivity and actual selection. McDonald chose the “most useful” articles (“Foreword”), Villanueva the “most frequently cited” (xi), Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon “some of the best teacher scholars” (17), Johnson the “leading scholars of the field” (back cover), Miller “landmark texts” (xxxii). Yet comparison across the anthologies maps a terrain that is more demotic than distinguished. Of a total of 199 different authors, 152 (76%) appear in only one anthology, 31 appear in two, 13 in three, and only 3 in four, with no one appearing in all five. Of a total of 191 pieces, 177 (93%) appear in only one anthology, 11 appear in two, 2 in three, and only 1 in four, with none appearing in all five.<sup>4</sup> Yet these sourcebooks were published within eight years of one another. We are telling the neophyte to writing studies that there are leading scholars in the field and famous works, implying that it is possible to become one and to write the other, when in fact leading anthologists can’t much agree on who or what. Or we are saying that scholarship will last (“landmark,” “most frequently cited”), when in reality the huge majority of

it evaporates from the collective disciplinary memory within a few decades (only *two* pieces in Tate and Corbett and Graves appear in any of the later anthologies). Or maybe the message is that we are the Lake Wobegon of academic disciplines, where everyone is a leading scholar.

2. The notion of selectivity is further contradicted with the explicit statements of comprehensiveness. In fact, omissions are egregious and systematic. Take disciplinary journals, narrowly defined. I mean those that regularly publish pieces involving the pedagogy or study of writing in college. I have mentioned that these five sourcebooks fail to reprint anything from WPA. Also absent is any piece from *Assessing Writing, English for Specific Purposes, Freshman English News* or *Composition Studies, Issues in Writing, Journal of Business and Technical Writing, Journal of Teaching Writing, Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, Journal of Writing Assessment, Teaching English in the Two-Year College, Technical Communication Quarterly, WAC Journal, Works and Days, Writing Center Journal, Writing Instructor, Writing on the Edge*, and any of the numerous regional journals loosely associated with the NCTE. Also absent would be *Journal of Second Language Writing, Across the Disciplines, Written Communication, Computers and Composition*, and *Composition Forum* were it not for one piece from each, all selected by Miller. *Kairos* would be absent were it not for one piece in Johnson. Even *Research in the Teaching of English* would be absent were it not for two pieces, both from the 1970s. What is going on here? Space is not the answer, since the five anthologies found room to reprint 42 pieces from *College English* and 81 pieces from *College Composition and Communication*. One easy answer, too easy, is quality. The message to entry professionals is that *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* are the top journals in the trade. That is where the best pieces go. If so, the “arbitrary sign” couldn’t be more distant from the “real thing.” No one who has followed the journals mentioned above can believe in a better to worse ratio of 81 to 1, even 42 to 1.

3. More must be going on, and to my mind part of it has to do with the soiling of hands. The tacit message is that the honorable or vital or prestigious center of the discipline lies some distance from the functional or administrative moil and muck of the discipline. Consider the absence of pieces from *Assessing Writing* and *Journal of Writing Assessment*. Villanueva, who is forthright about the areas his anthology leaves out, makes a very insightful comment about why he doesn’t cover “evaluation”: the subject “is large, almost another theoretical sphere, more concerned with what you do with writing in the classroom than with what writing is or even what writing

instruction might be” (xv). This formula does more than define “theory” as abstract and conjectural. It keeps out one entire utilitarian arena of compositions studies, formal evaluation, not only what it does but also what it is and might be. After all, evaluation has its theory, too. In fact, Villanueva’s selected pieces—and this is also true of those in other anthologies—deal with some kinds of evaluation on both a theoretical and practical level (e.g., response to student writing) but not with other kinds (e. g., placement examinations). Similarly, these books tell us little about the utilitarian or programmatic side of ESL, technical writing, WAC, school-college articulation, two-year-four-year college articulation, WPA programs, even the functioning of English or rhetoric departments. Hence the absence of articles from major journals such as *Journal of Business and Technical Writing (JBTW)*, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College (TETYC)*, *WAC Journal*, and the one you are reading. Hence the total absence of top-quality scholars such as Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater, Robert de Beaugrande, David Dobrin, Stephen Doheny-Farina, Christina Haas, Alice Horning, Susan McLeod, Duane Roen, Elizabeth Tebeaux, Edward White, and scores of others who explore the functional in our discipline. Teachers new on the job are not going to run to these background readers when they are asked to advise international students, cook up an exit exam, revise curriculum, redesign a writing center, set up a WAC faculty seminar, teach a course for English education majors, assume the post of WPA, or talk with prospective employers of their students. I won’t go so far as to suggest these editors are perpetuating brahminism. But I will say that to include no piece from *Composition Studies* or *JBTW* or *TETYC*, or only one piece from *Written Communication*, or nothing from *RTE* since 1979—that’s an embarrassment.

4. The omissions take one other systematic direction worth following. Also missing is any piece from the scores of disciplinary journals, such as *College Mathematics Journal* or *Biology Teacher*, that regularly publish discussions and studies of the teaching of writing in college. The unstated rule is that any kind or area of discourse production is allowable but only as seen through the lens of a composition scholar. The result is a virtual exclusion of discourse study conducted by fields in which most composition scholars currently have low interest, fields such as argumentation, communications, literature, philosophy, education. The most radical exclusion is psychology. Whereas Tate and Corbett and Graves had sections on teacher attitudes and student motivation, current sourcebooks will give the nascent professional little inkling of the copious exploration by psychologists into blocking, bibliotherapy, personality type, motivation, monitoring, individuation,

self-efficacy, self-regulation, and many other internal dynamics of composing and interpreting. But the exclusionary tactic is the same for all of these out-discipline fields. Not allowed authorial voice are some of the most influential thinkers in writing studies: Kenneth Burke (sociology), Foucault (philosophy), Pratt (anthropology), Bakhtin (literary theory), Perelman (argumentation), Vygotsky (psychology), Bitzer (communications), Perry (Education). When their words appear, usually quoted or explicated in the most cursory way, it is through the voice of a composition scholar. The message to the acolyte professional is that only we in-professionals can truly speak about our profession.<sup>5</sup>

5. Indeed, “speak about” may be one of the central untranslated hieroglyphs. Miller’s introduction, which is wiser and more productive than some of the pieces it introduces, notes that absent from Norton’s background reader will be “textbooks, writing by students, guidelines for teacher training, teachers’ narratives, and archived ordinary texts whose value may lie in their locales and status as family records” (xli). It’s a curious thought, but only because our thinking has been trained by decades of background readers. What if the “sources” in a sourcebook were student essays, teacher syllabi, course catalog descriptions, language tests, scoring rubrics, textbooks, publishers’ webpages, WPA memos, WAC seminar minutes, state laws, educator blogs, colleague emails, office door advertisements, and other discursive paraphernalia of the trade? Wouldn’t that also constitute a useful introduction for the novice? Instead we get language about the language. We get the “leading scholars” translating the sources for us. The tacit message is not so much that we need scholars as that we need translations. The *deus ex machina* Meta descends to rescue us from the babble. And the other message, not so tacit, is that the newly consecrated teacher will perform the same function for acolyte students, who “are best prepared to write in college and beyond when they are encouraged to develop a self-conscious awareness of the complexity of writing” (Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon, 11).

6. Finally, I should mention the most pervasive “set of arbitrary signs” in the readers, which is history. It’s a Janus-faced hieroglyph. Sometimes the construction of period and progress is blatant, as in Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon, where they say they are not leaving “process” behind but clearly represent “post-process” as better. Sometimes the scholarship is represented as a “conversation” that does not necessarily get better but that at least has the virtue of not repeating itself and therefore of forming a chronology, “process to cohesion to cognition to social construction to ideology” (Villanueva xvi). Whatever, history is a major schema that the

novice professional must acquire. Miller builds a section on the history of the profession bigger than McDonald, Johnson, or Vandenberg, Hum, and Clary-Lemon. Everywhere works cited are faithfully reproduced. In short, *Historicization 101* is the basic required course. No one is about to dwell on the fact that writing studies, from an outside and longer historical perspective, probably has recorded little significant change during its four or five decade run. My quote about the “hieroglyphic world” and “set of arbitrary signs,” which initially I implied was “postmodern,” actually is from Edith Wharton’s *The Age of Innocence*, published in 1920.

The compulsion to historicize, of course, is one of the goods our profession took with us when we left the literature citadel. I can’t help but see history as an explanation of the ambivalence with which I look at current sourcebooks. Chaos and frame, work and talk, *concordia discors*. The compulsion of the field to indulge in meta talk, to discuss “the social workings of the field *as* a field,” says Miller, is “a sign of the field’s relative youth” (xxxviii). She is right. The field is still an unlicked bear-whelp. In the long run, that may be currently the best thing about it. Entering members will not be faced with a heavy-handed rubricization of their future, their intellectual route blocked out for them. Facing them instead will be a continuing string of sourcebooks, each a “historical artifact” in its own right (Villanueva xi), each sorting out the admissible and dismissible in new ways, each drawing a different map for newcomers to lead them through the labyrinth to a center containing no one knows exactly what.

## NOTES

1. The name Graves, Tate, and Corbett chose for their collections had been around long before the term paper sourcebooks, namely in the sciences, where “sourcebook” indicated a directory of books, articles, journals, supply houses, and research laboratories. “Sourcebook,” of course, is just one of many terms to migrate from the sciences to rhet-comp (“stratification,” “ecological,” and “holistic” are three other examples). While only one of the five collections that I am reviewing (McDonald) uses “sourcebook” in its title, the term is still viable, especially when it is leavened with the magical word “critical,” as can be seen in the stack of recent collections that I omitted from this review because they were on special topics, e.g., the series published by Bedford/St. Martin’s: Ellen Cushman, Eugene Kintgen, Barry Kroll, and Mike Rose’s *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook* (2001); Mary P. Sheridan-Rabideau’s *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook* (2003); Brian Huot and Peggy O’Neill’s *Assessing Writing: A Critical Sourcebook* (2008).

2. Susan Miller, none in the profession more knowledgeable or perspicacious, says that her selection omits “both studies of classroom pedagogies and work that addresses the history and theory of rhetoric applied in composition pedagogy,” and

then four lines later says that her book will support “teaching practica” (xxxii). The idea is that teaching practice should be informed by theory. I agree. But why leave unsupported the idea that theory should be informed by practice? Later she does mention the field’s “interdependence of teaching and the field’s research,” a “functional mutuality” (xi). But why shouldn’t that mutuality be underwritten by asking the novice teacher to study the scholarship of both activities, not just one?

3. In the case of Vandenberg, Hum, & Clary-Lemon, “tacked on” may be more literal than metaphoric. One of the invited contributors implies that it was NCTE editors and readers who requested the “pedagogical insight” pieces (Mary Jo Reiff 158). In their introduction, Vandenberg, Hum, & Clary-Lemon say that their reprinted pieces offer “philosophical principles” “capable of guiding teaching practice in increasingly complex times” (5), but the introduction doesn’t mention the possibility or feasibility of the reverse.

4. Berthoff, Bizzell, and Hartwell appear in four anthologies; Bartholomae, Berlin, Braddock, Bruffee, Corbett, Elbow, Flower, Hairston, Andrea Lunsford, Mike Rose, Royster, Sommers, and Trimbur appear in three. Hartwell’s “Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar” is reprinted in four anthologies; Bartholomae’s “Inventing the University” and Sommers’ “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers” in three.

5. Miller is also very good in detailing the areas omitted: “language philosophy, literary rhetoric and theory, cultural studies of literacy acquisition and language testing, and direct applications of these perspectives” (xii). That writing studies lacks a discipline-wide perspective or research methodology of our own guarantees, of course, background readers with few shared readings.

