Inkshed

Inside Inkshed

> ". . . any reform movement such as process pedagogy,
> by making the entire educational enterprise seem
> fairer, more open, and more relevant to success
> outside school, while not altering the relative
> disadvantage of different groups within the overall
> class structure of society, may work to the detriment
> of those groups by legitimatizing the efforts of those
> best positioned to succeed."
>
>   -- Myron C. Tuman, "Class, Codes, and Composition:
> Basil Bernstein and the Critique of Pedagogy." CCC 39
> (February 1988): 49.

WRITING PROGRAMS: PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO /// Judy Segal

We're now well into the second year of an undergraduate program in Rhetoric and Professional Writing and the first year of a Masters program in Language and Professional Writing (there was some feeling when we began the graduate program that the businesses and institutions which would hire our MA's might not be prepared to see themselves as hiring rhetoricians). The RPW (undergraduate) program has a strong co-op connection: students take courses in report writing, rhetorical history and theory, document design, linguistics . . ., then go off on work terms as technical writers, manuals writers, publications assistants . . ., come back and take more courses. The LPW (graduate) program has added to the usual departmental course offerings in literature, linguistics, literary theory, stylistics, courses in rhetorical history and theory, composition theory, professional writing, and rhetoric of science. An interesting note about the MA program: we are offering it not only on campus, but also part-time, on-site at IBM in Toronto. And not only that--we have proposed and are continuing to plan a new Ph.D. program that would integrate literary and rhetorical studies, composition, and technical writing. So things are lively here. Anyone wanting more information can write me or the Department Head, Gordon Slethaug, Department of English, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1.

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, MT. ST. VINCENT UNIVERSITY /// Susan Drain

The past year has seen the approval and beginning of a sequence of writing courses within the English department. This sequence has had the department's approval for some time, but university approval has only just been granted. In our current economic climate, instituting new courses requires the dropping, or less frequent offering, of existing courses, so the approval means that there is real backing for our initiatives and a real, if slight, shift in emphasis. We are still primarily a literature department.

The programme is a sequence of three one-term courses: English 120, 220 and 330. English 120 (The Theory and Practice of Writing) is a first-year composition course that was introduced over eight years ago. Required in some programmes, and an elective for many other students, it focusses on expository writing in university and business contexts. Currently nineteen sections are offered annually, including summer school; enrolment is limited to twenty-five per section. Instructors include both full- and part-time faculty all teaching to the same objectives and within the same general structure of assignments and evaluation; there are common textbooks (Hall's Writing Well and a reader) but no common exam. A writing sample pre-test at the beginning of the course identifies students who require more fundamental instruction; these students are required to take a non-credit course in addition to 120.

The second course in the sequence (220: Advanced Composition) was offered for the first time in January 1988. It is an elective course, required for no programme and counting toward no major or minor. The course is concerned primarily with argument and persuasion, including elementary logic, and with stylistics. In addition, various language issues are discussed, such as the idea of "correctness", sexist language, and the language of politics and advertising. The prerequisite is the permission of the instructor, and so far (midterm!) the class is both exciting and enjoyable.

Just approved is the third-level course (330: Seminar in Writing Theory); it will be offered in alternation with 220 as neither course is expected to be overwhelmed. Several precedents have been set with the approval of this course: first, unlike either of the other writing courses, it will count toward a major or a minor in English; second, the use of computer facilities for word-processing as part of the course has been accepted. Our facilities are overstretched, and priority has generally been given to the science and business side, but we are glad to have the humanities' claim on technology recognised.

Considering the constraints under which we operate, our department is pleased to have been able to introduce a rational sequence of courses to meet not just the general clamour for basic writing improvement, but also the persistent requests of some students for further study and practice of writing. How well the programme works remains to be seen, but we think it's promising.

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF WRITING, MCGILL UNIVERSITY
/// Anthony Paré

Much of the news in education is gloomy these days: budget cutbacks, declining enrolment, bureaucratic administrators. English educators face all of these and a host of other horrors: departmental politics, the exploitation of part-time instructors, inappropriate calls for remedial English courses, back-to-basics bandwagons, and more. While we at McGill continue to struggle with all of the above, we can report some good news, a modest success story which may serve to cheer up our colleagues.

In 1978, McGill's Faculty of Education opened a Writing Centre which offered a writing tutorial service and term paper-writing workshops. Since then, the Centre has added writing courses for graduate business students (MBA), continuing education students, and undergraduate students in a variety of departments and faculties. In addition, the Centre has conducted off-campus workshops and short courses for teachers at the elementary, secondary, and college levels as well as for business and industry.

In 1985, in recognition of its interests and activities in both theory and practice of writing, the Centre changed its name to the Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing. The Centre's various courses are now compulsory in graduate and undergraduate management, electrical and mechanical engineering, social work, and continuing education. There are, as well, several sections in which students from most of McGill's faculties enroll voluntarily. From five sections serving 100 students in 1980, the Centre's offerings have grown to approximately fifty sections enrolling 1,400 students in the current academic year.

Although Linda Flower's <u>Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing</u> (Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1985) is the Centre's basic text, staff draw heavily on a wide range of current textbooks in writing as well as on the many journals in the field. Through weekly meetings and frequent staff seminars, the Centre's policies, procedures, and a philosophy have evolved in a dynamic and cooperative environment. Practices developed by individual teachers or borrowed from the literature are tested in the classroom, discussed with colleagues, and adapted to meet the Centre's theory and the reality of McGill's students. As a result, the Centre's courses incorporate many of the most innovative and interesting aspects of current writing instruction, including journal writing, collaborative learning, peer editing, and writing conferences. The ongoing experimentation and staff interchange are invigorating and make the Centre a gratifying place in which to teach.

Finally, although program development has taken (and continues to take) considerable time and effort, some members of staff as well as graduate students attached to the Centre have pursued or are pursuing independent research in the following areas:

- the role of the journal in the writing class
- the place and use of expressive writing
- the relationship between speaking and writing
- the transfer of writing abilities to the workplace
- the effect of self-generated topics on secondary school students' writing
- teaching ESL students
- writing about literature
- writing with the computer

A number of other projects are in the works, including an evaluation of the undergraduate writing program which will employ a variety of assessment methods, including pre- and post-course protocol analysis.

There are a number of problems left to solve. For one thing, despite our efforts to the contrary, we are seen by some as a remedial writing service--a kind of grammatical SWAT team ready to swoop down on graduate engineers. For another, we have yet to discover a successful approach to ESL students, even after years of experimenting. Perhaps worst of all, our part-time instructors remain underpaid and overworked. Still, we believe we have made important gains. We are an enthusiastic and committed group, and the feedback we receive from students and staff of the faculties in which we teach is extremely encouraging. If the fruits of our labors are turning up in lab reports, business letters, and term papers, can better salaries, offices with windows, and other forms of recognition be far behind?

Faculty of Education
McGill University

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY   /// Phyllis Artiss

I pondered the Editor's request for information on the writing program at Memorial. Do we have a writing program? The English Department offers what we call writing courses, but what do we mean by writing courses? Some colleagues say that all English courses worthy of the name are courses in writing. I pondered further. The best definition I have been able to come up with is "one which places the students' own writing at the centre." The problem with this as with many other flawed definitions is that it leaves out some courses I'd like to include and includes others I'd like to leave out. But it's the best I can offer for the moment, and provides a starting point for this survey.

Our first writing course, as defined above, was offered twenty years ago to a small group of students who had flunked out of first year and were being given a chance to redeem themselves in special remedial classes in Math, Science and English. The teachers, full of evangelical zeal, met every Friday afternoon to discuss the progress of each student in the program. The students, predictably, did well. This pilot project was used as an incentive for restructuring both the first year program at Memorial and the semester system for the entire university. A direct descendent of this first writing course survives in our one-semester, non-credit course in basic writing, English 100F (unfortunate nomenclature: students still assume, unless their instructor remembers to disabuse them of the idea, that the F stands for failure). As far as I know there has been no problem finding instructors to teach the course; it has been taught by at least as many fulltime tenured members over the years as by temporary faculty.

Ten years after English 100F got off the ground the department was asked to approve two second-year courses in "Comprehension, Writing and Prose Style." Debate ensued, no doubt of a kind all too familiar to many Inkshedders. Should we give credit for such courses? Should they count toward our major? our Honours degree? Weren't we in danger of becoming a service department to the rest of the university? The courses were introduced, on a trial basis at first, and later as part of our regular offerings, counting towards our major (but not the honours degree).

From the beginning the courses were popular with students, those who were headed for university medals as well as those who were struggling to produce writing barely acceptable in most academic courses. These courses still flourish in a variety of forms, their emphasis varying according to instructor, class size, interests of students, and so on, but the main emphasis of most sections could be described as rhetorical.

Classes examine a wide range of writing, including that produced by the students themselves; they learn to pay attention to a text's functions (including a writer's seeming aims, their own responses as readers, and other aspects of context); they learn to analyze a text's tropes, syntax, organization and logical structures, and to show how these are inextricably linked to a writer's assumptions and goals. Students write about their interests and experiences, including their own writing processes; most instructors place a strong emphasis on revising; most use some form of collaborative activity and some assign journal writing in addition to the more formal writing assignments. The first of these courses, English 2010, has always been a prerequisite for the second, English 2020, which provides a more advanced study of rhetoric and style.

For the past two years English 2010, slightly modified and renamed English 1110, has been offered to first year students. (All Memorial students are required to pass two courses in English; up until now this meant two courses in English Literature). This semester we have eleven sections of English 1110 (one of these a CAL course taught in the department's computer lab), three sections of 2010, and one section of 2020, with an average of twenty students per class.

Two years ago we offered, at the third year level, our first course in creative writing. This proved so successful it was replaced by two separate courses: fiction writing and poetry writing. Next came a course in playwriting (which is offered as part of a drama specialization) and this term we are also offering a fourth year course in creative writing. An increasing number of publications, public readings and dramatizations have arisen from the work produced in these classes.

In addition to these writing courses, we offer two course in English as a Second Language, both of which place a heavy emphasis on writing. One is a non-credit course; the other is a first-year credit course which may be used to fulfil half of the English requirement for most degree programs.

Strong support to all our writing courses, including those in ESL, is offered by the Writing Centre. Opened in 1984 and funded by General Studies (a unit administratively separate from the English Department) it has four part-time student assistants, all of whom have completed English 2010 and 2020, in addition to its fulltime director. The Centre offers individual help with writing to students from all departments, sometimes in response to referrals from professors, sometimes on the initiative of students themselves. Last semester two hundred and twenty-five students made use of the service in a total of over eight hundred tutorial sessions.

Finally it is perhaps appropriate to mention here that the second graduate course in Rhetoric is now being considered by the English Department, and if approved will go ahead in the Spring Semester of this year. Last year we offered a graduate course in the History of Rhetoric; this year we are proposing to offer Twentieth Century Rhetoric. Though this course does not quite fit the definition of a writing course I offered above, it will provide students an opportunity to study theories of writing and discourse.

All this and more to explore with colleagues at Memorial when you come to Inkshed in August!

WRITING PROGRAM, UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

The University of Winnipeg has historically focussed on undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences. As the smaller of the two universities in Winnipeg, it has actively attempted to retain a characteristic intimacy both in and out of the classroom. The University has always been a place where lively debate and discussion flourished; the three-year period ending in September 1985, however, saw the University's enrollment increase 40% with no equivalent increase in resources. With the forced increase in class size, the intimacy actually offered seemed at times to correspond more to the intimacy of the Tokyo subway than to our traditional ideal. Professors complained that classes were becoming increasingly passive. Our confidence in the expressive abilities of our students was ebbing as larger classes forced a reduction both in the amount of work assigned and the ability of the professor to have a formative influence.

At the same time, our students--especially our best students--were confirming that their reasons for choosing the University of Winnipeg had to do with our traditional strengths. The Dean's Office held informal luncheons for scholarship winners to better understand the factors which influenced their choice of school and to learn how the students were finding university. The students who had small classes valued them highly. In addition, these very talented students expressed a desire to develop their expressive and analytic skills. A study of a random sample of some 500 first year students found that 66% felt that development of writing skills was of critical importance. In fact, the development of writing skills ranked ahead of all variables including computer literacy, proficiency in mathematics and proficiency in science in students' ratings of the importance of educational outcomes for their career goals.

Thus, we were aware both that enrollment increases were jeopardizing the intimacy and intellectual vitality of the University and that these traits were as highly valued as ever. We also had at this time several groups looking at one or another dimension of the curriculum. These groups were examining either the structure of departmental majors or the possibility of a core curriculum. For the most part, the analyses focused on curricular content within disciplines. Given the commitment that academics have to their disciplines, this is hardly surprising. However, some of the faculty unease expressed outside of the curricular review process was calling into question the validity of one of the traditional assumptions of liberal education. Specifically, some faculty members were challenging the assumption that development of an appropriate set of cognitive, analytic, and expressive skills would devolve automatically from education in our established curriculum.

This assumption appears to be on shaky ground for at least two reasons. One is that students who are attending university are a much more diverse and diversely prepared group than they once were. A second is that the increased numbers of students have changed the nature of instruction. As a consequence, class formats are moving toward the lecture and away from the discussion/seminar in which both expression and analysis were fostered. Fewer and shorter written assignments are given. Many professors feel that they are able to correct content but are not able to form expressive skills. It became increasingly clear that specific attention had to be paid to the intellectual and expressive skills which have traditionally been identified as the broadly adaptive, enabling consequence of liberal education. This recognition obtained not only at the University of Winnipeg with our relatively large numbers of non-traditional students. For example, at just this time, Derek Bok was announcing the importance of an examination of intellectual and expressive skills for curriculum development at Harvard ("Toward Education of Quality," Harvard Magazine, 1986). Examination of the various possibilities for skill development convinced us that the greatest gains could be had through a writing program which would develop expressive, analytic, and organizational skills simultaneously. We also felt that expressive competence and self-confidence were central to active participation in the intellectual life of the university and of society.

Thus, the motivation for the writing program came from an intersection of a desire to redress some of the effects of growth, a desire to respond to the expressed wishes of students, and a desire to insure that our students derive both knowledge of specific disciplines and an appropriate set of skills from the curriculum. The form of the program has come from

the faculty. As previously noted (<u>Inkshed</u> 4.3.:8), a report outlining the nature and scope of writing programs across North America was circulated to the faculty along with a request for input. Responses were integrated by the Dean's Office with the help of several key members of the English Department--most notably, Murray Evans. The form of the program desired took shape. The program must not confuse remediation with development at a university level. The program must make accommodation for the very best student writers. Because a newly developed skill will surely wither and die if not exercised, the program must not stop with the first-year course. The program must be universal.

Hence, we decided to approve several structural parameters within which the program would develop. Evaluation of all incoming students would result in each student's assignment to a regular or developmental (remedial) section. Students placed in developmental sections would be required to also take the regular course when ready for it. All students would be required to take an additional 2.5 courses which are writing-intensive--that is, courses which include significant written work and in which there is a commitment to form expressive competence. These courses are to be drawn from all of our departments. Advanced courses would also be developed as electives. Throughout, it has seemed best for the faculty to loosely specify parameters and goals and let the expertise within the English Department articulate them programmatically. It is heartening to observe that the program passed the Faculty Council of Arts and Science, the Senate, and the Board unanimously.

The Writing Program, which is housed in the English department, has two major components: first-year writing courses and writing intensive courses. Students must successfully complete a first-year writing requirement before they can enroll for an eleventh full course. After they have passed this first-year writing requirement, students will then take the equivalent of two-and-one-half full courses that are designated as writing intensive. Every discipline in the university will offer writing intensive courses.

All first-year writing courses are half-courses. With the exception of a small percentage of exempted students, all entering regular-status students enrolled in at least three full courses will be placed in some version of a first-year writing course.

Those students who do not have current high school scores will be placed automatically in Developmental Rhetoric unless they choose to take a challenge exam. Students who scored 59 or below in high school English 300 or who scored 69 or below in English 301 will be required to take a Developmental Rhetoric course, and subsequently they must pass a second writing course, Rhetoric I. Special sections of Developmental Rhetoric and Rhetoric I have been designed to accommodate ESL students. The major instructional objectives of Developmental Rhetoric are for students to achieve competency in a number of specific areas: to demonstrate the ability to write standard English; to learn strategies for organizing information in written form; and to master basic writing skills such as limiting and establishing a thesis, logically developing ideas, and supporting arguments with evidence or concrete examples.

Those students who scored 60 or above in English 300 or from 70 to 79 in English 301 will enroll directly in Rhetoric I. Rhetoric I has two versions, A and B. In Rhetoric IA, students will be presented with a mature model of the composing process that includes a range of predrafting,

drafting, and revision strategies. Students will learn to analyze and write for homogeneous and heterogeneous audiences, and they will become reliable critical readers of their own writing and the writing of their peers. Students also will be introduced to research procedures. Rhetoric IB has the same content and objectives as Rhetoric IA, but it is to be taught in the Text Processing Laboratory. Students in this version of the course will learn to integrate a mature composing process with the word-processing capacity of computers. All major papers will be drafted and revised on computers.

Students who scored 80 or above in English 300 will be exempt from the first-year writing requirement but will be recruited to take a specially-designed writing course, Rhetoric II. Like Rhetoric I, this course requires that students learn a mature composing process and introduces them to research procedures. The course also deals with the nature of post-modern discourse. Students are asked to consider the constructed and often changing relationships between writer, text, and audience, and to examine the interrelated tensions of these three variables in their own writing and in a limited number of texts.

These rule-of-thumb placement procedures will be validated under controlled conditions in the first week of the term. Students in Developmental Rhetoric and in the Rhetoric I courses will write an in-class essay under timed conditions that are controlled for mode. The Writing Program faculty will rank the essays on a six-point scale in accordance with an agreed-upon set of criteria. Each essay will be read holistically in two minutes, and each will be ranked by two readers. If there is a discrepancy between the two rankings, the essay in question will be read by a third reader who has been identified as particularly reliable. Upon the basis of these holistic rankings, students will be transferred, if necessary, up or down in the sequence of the first-year writing courses. All transfers will have taken place by the beginning of the second week of classes.

After they have satisfied the first-year writing requirement, students will be eligible to begin taking the writing intensive courses offered in each of the various disciplines of the university. The writing intensive courses assume that the students have mastered basic writing skills, are acquainted with research procedures, and have a mature model of the writing process. The courses are intended to reinforce mature composing skills, promote continuing cognitive development, and encourage the acquisition of increasingly complex problem-solving skills.

As the program evolves, the University will develop an increasingly concrete vision of the writing intensive courses. For example, in the summer of 1989 the University will fund a workshop for the faculty with an internationally recognized scholar in the area of writing across the disciplines. On an ongoing basis, the Writing Program will consult with individual faculty members and will offer colloquium-style workshops about writing across the disciplines.

To further the goals of the Writing Program, the University is establishing a Writing Center for students with exceptional writing problems. Any instructor in a first-year writing course or a writing intensive course can mandatorily refer a student at the beginning of the term to the Writing Center. The Center will test the student's reading, writing, and cognitive skills. If the professor's referral is confirmed,

the Center will establish an individualized learning program for the
student, who then will spend four hours a week working on basic skills with
a tutor in the lab.

Finally, it needs to be clearly understood that the Writing Program at
the University of Winnipeg is not a remedial program. We will offer a
course in developmental rhetoric, but the majority of our resources are
dedicated to promoting the cognitive, analytic, and expressive skills
necessary to complex problem-solving in the University and in the world of
work. Ideally, the first-year writing courses and the subsequent writing
intensive courses will serve collectively as a vehicle for knowing what it
is we know.

Neil Besner, Department of English

Roland Huff, Director of the Writing Program

Michael McIntyre, Dean of Arts and Science

UPSTAIRS DOWNSTAIRS, OR WHY "WRITING AND "PROGRAM"
ARE FOUR-LETTER WORDS   /// Michael Moore

What is writing? What is a program? What is a writing program? It
all depends on whom you ask. We can ask each other, if we like. I suppose
that is what devoting a special issue of INKSHED to "writing programs" is
all about. But I am also interested in what happens when we ask other
people, or when they tell us without being asked. And if those "other
people" are the kind whose meanings, deluded or otherwise, really matter
in academic institutions, the assumptions implicit in their answers can be
pretty disturbing. It's not that administrators, students, and colleagues
hold us in contempt or derision. It's worse than that. This is how bad:
they think we're doing a great job . . . whatever it is. Herein the rub.
Whatever it is they think we're doing well is what they mean by "teaching
writing." But it isn't what we mean.

What's in a name? More than we would like, if the name is "writing
program." We tease each other for overusing the jargon word "discourse"
to denote (or is it connote?) our object (or is it subject?) of academic
(is it?) affection. People also smile at the name "rhetoric," for reasons
both good and bad. Still, such terms are accurate and serviceable enough
in a field that is finally defining itself over aginst established cousins
like linguistics, literary studies, and popular culture. Moreover, I don't
think we sufficiently realize that semantic pressures are at the centre of
an ongoing struggle, in Canadian universities and colleges, for ownership
of something I'm afraid our side can no longer afford to call a "writing"
curriculum. Whoever owns the names is going to determine the shape and
scope and status of that curriculum. And we sure don't own the institutional
meanings of "writing" or "program."

Can there be much doubt about that "writing" always already really and
incorrigibly means, in practice, in general academic parlance, to other
people: colleagues, administrators, and students? Those folks are not

paying the slightest attention to our benign inclusiveness, and they are
not at all confused. By the phrase "writing program" they do mean something
quite definite, quite simple, quite operational, quite ancillary to real
academic work. Instrumental knowledge (and waive the knowledge part).
Stroke improvement. The quick fix. Surfaces. Skills. Tools. The whole
reductive and patronising lexicon of technique, of the mechanical and
servile arts. Ultimately, polite concessions aside (and they can be
unctuously polite), the term refers to remedial instruction. For "Advanced
Writing" read "Advanced Remedial Writing." For "Technical Writing" read
"Remedial Writing on Complicated Subjects." (In fact, if you think about
it, for "Creative Writing" read "Remedial Writing about Sunsets.") All
admirable efforts, to be sure, "helping" students at one or another level
of inadequacy, and cleverly taught by the genuinely concerned. Real stuff.
Nothing "merely" academic about it. Yessir, "writing teachers" know their
job and know their place, and when the "writing problem" disappears (this
is expected soon), the existing institutional response ("program") can also
come naturally to an end.

It is only as such that administrators, students and academic colleagues
can conceive of "writing" at all, or welcome its presence at the fringes of
Academe. But to be valued for that sort of thing is to be damnned with
faint praise. Never mind that credit courses in writing and language do
NOT promise (or produce) any such thing. Nor is any "remedy" actually

anticipated by anybody, so it's all a gestural affair anyway. Window-
dressing. Sending signals. Appearing to have standards. It doesn't
matter what we actually do or don't do; it's a matter of what our perceived
role is. And I'm not talking about the truth or falsehood of the image;
I'm talking about its power. Anything calling itself a "writing program"
is contaminated, in the dominant discourse, with disabling associations we
can't control and mustn't ignore. Let's not flatter ourselves that we are
really being flattered. It is at best the ambiguous esteem in which a
good butler or maidservant is held by the gentry. Noblesse oblige. Upstairs
downstairs.

I won't deny that the considerable practical virtue of the term "writing"
is that it means nothing in particular (and hence everything, a sea tangle
of pearls and weeds). This sometimes works to our advantage. What they
don't know can't hurt us. But in the long run we have nothing important to
gain from keeping things murky. Or, if murk is indeed the atmosphere in
which we can expect to thrive, let it be a murk of our own devising. Why
would any serious subject area consent to represent itself in everyday terms
so diminished by vulgar misconceptions and by an established tradition of
academic disdain? Is it that we aren't serious after all? In that case
all those "other people" are right.

Hath he practised what he preacheth? Well, yes and no. The question
arose at WLU when we tried to think of a name for the . . . "writing program"
we put together some time ago. The individual courses (some old, some new)
are, in addition to a couple of standard multi-section first-year offerings,
the following (generic rather than actual names): English 106 (Discourse
Theory); English 202 (Theory of Mass Media); English 204 (Rhetoric); English
205 (Stylistics); English 223 (Semantics and Grammar); English 224 (Historical
Linguistics); English 227 (Advanced Skills and Strategies); English 228
(Technical Writing); English 306 (Advanced Literary and Non-Literary Rhetoric);

and English 331 (Creative Writing). Non-English options include Anthropology 311 (Anthropological Linguistics) and 312 (Language and Culture); Classics 202 (Etymology of English Words); Philosophy 201 (Applied Logic and Critical Thinking); and Psychology 209 (Introduction to Cognition). After much haggling we settled on the name STUDIES IN LANGUAGE & RHETORIC. Nothing with "Writing" or "Communication" or "Composition" or "Program" in it was seriously considered, even when (or especially when) we were reminded that choosing familiar terms would be more politic. Sometimes, Alice, the amiable obtuseness . . .

I must add in chagrin, however, that we erred at WLU in one minor respect, foolishly trying at first to have it both ways. We initially called my new introductory course in discourse "Theories of Writing." Well, we learned to our sorrow that nobody on campus could read the crucial "Theories of" part. Nay, they apparently couldn't even see it there. In the process of reading, it went under automatic erasure. Or, if it was seen at all, it was being immediately translated into its exact opposite: "Practice of." Witness the talismanic power of "writing." And of common sense: shucks, how can there be "theories" of "writing"? Needless to say, I had a bemusing first week or so in that class. We soon changed the course title. And in general, yes, we are managing pretty well to avoid lapsing (or letting others lapse) back into the bad old shorthand about a "program" in "writing."

Let me close by daring to query something Kay Stewart implied in a recent INKSHED review of a conference paper. She seemed to be advising us against listening to uninformed, illiberal, unregenerate "haranguers." Now I'm pretty sure Kay's point was much like mine: that it is futile, unseemly, perhaps dangerous, to play ball with philistine demagogues, or to lend their reductive criteria the dignity of our attention. But I would recommend, on the contrary, that we do listen very closely (if sardonically) to them. Theirs is the dominant discourse. To ignore them is to miss an opportunity to recognize the sound of our chains clinking in their words.

As somebody drolly said here during a recent seminar discussion about defining "good" writing, "the language of the powerful may not always be good, but it is always effective." If its effectiveness serves (and, ideologically, "intends") to trivialize or exclude us, let's at least stop making it so easy for them.

Department of English
Wilfrid Laurier University

EDITORIAL NOTE   /// Kay Stewart

Thanks to your generosity in sending material, this issue could have expanded to thirty pages. But that would have wiped out the bank account. So apologies to Russ Hunt and Rick Coe, and especially to Doug Vipond, whose review of Frames of Meaning has now been held back twice. Remember to send notices of your publications and presentations, as well as conference reviews and other material, by April 15. I promise to print them. Even the masthead will return.

CCCC SESSIONS BY/FOR INKSHEDDERS

Thursday, March 17

12:30-1:45 p.m.

B14.   Negotiating Meaning in Reading and Writing. Patrick Dias and Anthony Paré, McGill University.

   The argument of this presentation is that reading literature or writing together in small groups not only models collaborative processes that occur in actual discourse communities outside school but is also a powerful means for developing and enhancing the writing and reading competencies of participants.   The presentations will advance several arguments for this position.

   Throughout this process of gradually and communally shaping meaning, students identify problems and key issues, frame and reframe questions they consider important, build and test theories, find a language for and compose the texts that embody their understandings and their intentions. They engage in what one might call the social construction of knowledge which characterizes academic and other discourse communities. Together students begin to take ownership of the texts they read and write.

   Following two versions of the above argument--one from the point of view of reading, the other from the point of view of writing--the presenters will provide extensive samples of this collaborative process in the transcripts of a high school group responding to Ted Hughes' poem "The Thought-Fox" and a university group writing together. The procedures that facilitate such collaboration and their pedagogical implications will be discussed. There will be time for questions and discussion.

B21.   Toward a Rhetoric of Scientific and Technical Discourse.

      "Ethos and the Rhetoric of Science."   Judy Segal, University of Waterloo

2:15-3:30 p.m.   C13. Writing under the Curriculum: Learning to Write by Using Writing to Teach.

      "Not the Same Old Stuff: Students Advise Each Other about How to Read Literature," Jim Reither, St. Thomas University

      "Writing Your Way into the Restoration: Collaborative Investigation in a Literature Course," Russ Hunt, St. Thomas University

      "Collaborative Investigation in a Psychology Course," Douglas Vipond, St. Thomas University

5:30-6:45 p.m. **SIG** Canadian Caucus.

A chance to meet other Canadians and to discuss plans for the 1989 Canadian Caucus-sponsored session at CCCC.   ●

Friday, March 18

3:30-4:45 p.m. I20. Critical Thinking: Reconstructing the Students' Development (sponsored by Progressive Composition Caucus).

"Critical Thinking: Does It Exist?" Henry Evans, Hunter College

"Deconstructing the Educational Context: UCLA Apprentice Educators Program," Gary Colombo, UCLA

"Self-Evaluation as Critical Thinking," Jean Sanborn, Colby College

5:00-6:15 p.m.

J23. Teaching Composition in Canadian Universities: Issues of Cultural Context (sponsored by Canadian Caucus)

"Canadian Identity and Canadian Composition Textbooks: A Selective Examination of a Problematic Relationship," Chris Bullock, University of Alberta.

The use of "Canadianized" versions of American composition textbooks and anthologies in writing classrooms is an ongoing feature of our postsecondary education system in Canada, and one that raises a number of potentially disturbing issues. In this presentation I will address these issues by examining a series of questions. First, are there valid reasons to be worried about using American textbooks and anthologies in Canadian classrooms? Second, if there are such reasons, is the problem solved by using "Canadianized" versions of American texts? Third, what kinds of texts are "Canadianized," and of what does "Canadianization" consist? If such texts are also not satisfactory, do we have any genuinely Canadian textbooks, or textbooks of a genuinely transnational character? What are the best possible textbooks (presently existing, or imaginary) to use in a Canadian writing classroom? To help organise my discussion of textbooks and anthologies I will use the distinction between expressionist-based, language-based, rhetoric-based and logic-based textbooks developed by William F. Woods in "Composition Textbooks and Pedagogical Theory," College English, 43 (1981), 393-409.

"North American Trends in Business Communication," Nancy Carlman, Vancouver

In the 1980s several forces exert pressure on business people to change some business communication conventions. These forces include the following:

--The entry of women into business at the managerial level and the so-called feminist revolution.
--The proliferation of computers in business.
--The U.S./Canada postal agreement about the two-letter codes for abbreviations of states and provinces.
--The continued emphasis on time-saving and efficiency.

As with all trends, some are more advanced than others, and they vary from region to region and between large firms and small firms. As teachers of technical and business communication, we must monitor these trends and make sure the people who come to us for help with their writing are aware of the range of business communication conventions in use today.

"The Evolution of Composition Instruction: Canada and the U.S.," Henry Hubert, Cariboo College

Both Canadian and American colleges were generally born out of religious interests, and both countries initially used a classical curriculum, shared by all students. Composition was thus a child of rhetoric, a standard course in the classical curriculum, taught to develop "the whole man" within the context of an avowedly liberal rather than utilitarian education. However, the American concern for immediately useful, democratic ideals, combined with a rejection of colonial attitudes, especially after the Civil War, led to a specialized curriculum that included in its "English" component the study of the history of English, English literature, speech and composition. Though English literature came to dominate the curriculum by the first decades of the twentieth century, the other rhetorical concerns survived as discreet studies.

In Canada, a colonial mentality, complete with elitist attitudes in education, at once de-emphasized the utilitarian aspects of rhetoric and intensified the importance of English literature toward the end of the nineteenth century. As a result, speech instruction (elocution) died in most institutions where it had existed, and English literature came to dominate other "English" concerns to the point that composition became an adjunct to literature classes, thereby seriously weakening its inheritance of a broad, practical theory designed to further the pragmatic interests of citizenship in a democracy and utility in commerce.

J12. Reading Theory and the Teaching of Composition. Will Garrett-Petts, University of Alberta.

(Oral presentation with overheads) Revision, a conflation of reading and writing processes, offers a logical starting place to bring together reading and composition theory. In this presentation I will offer a detailed analysis of the "reading" that takes place when writers read

their own compositions. I argue that we need to understand how writers (especially unskilled writers) read and reread their own texts if we are to understand better the complex interrelationship among reading, writing, and the composition of meaning.

Recent discussion of reading and composition seems to assume that the process of reading is always conceptually-driven and is the same for all readers--at all levels of development. The pedagogical extensions of such an assumption are familiar: students are told to focus on meaning rather than form. But if unskilled writers do not "see" incongruities in their own texts--or if they see nothing but incongruities--then asking them to focus on voice, audience, and purpose may be asking them to perform a perceptual impossibility. The problem, as I see it, is twofold: the unskilled writer is an unskilled reader; and the context of reading one's own text tends to exaggerate the influence of prior knowledge. Throughout this presentation I will argue for a more comprehensive model of the unskilled writer-as-reader, and for a re-evaluation of current pedagogical practice.

INKSHED WORKING CONFERENCE V   /// Phyllis Artiss

VALUES AND EVALUATION
August 14 - 16, 1988
Littledale Conference Centre, St. John's, Newfoundland

Thanks to all who made suggestions for Inkshed's fifth annual working conference. The success of this, like other Inkshed conferences, depends on participation from as many of you as possible in the planning as well as at the conference itself.

NEW DATES: AUGUST 14-16
(not August 12 - 14, as indicated in the last Inkshed newsletter). We originally preferred earlier dates, as they would allow Inkshedders to participate in the pre-conference tour with CCTE delegates. Those of us who live here assume that everyone who is coming to Newfoundland in August will want an excuse to stay as long as possible. It seems, however, that eight days of conferencing, even if interspersed with recreational junketings, is too long for many people. So we agreed on a compromise: Inkshed V will take place at the same time as the CCTE pre-conference tour, starting on Sunday the 14th, and concluding on Tuesday the 16th (CCTE Registration and opening sessions begin Tuesday evening). But if some Inkshedders want a pre-conference tour, the tour company will offer the same tour from August 12 - 14 at the same cost, provided twelve people or more sign up.

THE THEME: VALUES AND EVALUATION arises from suggestions made at the final session of Inkshed IV and later. Judging from the response we've had, most people are looking for ways of bringing together the two parts of the theme: examining evaluation practices in the context of questions about what we value in our students, our discipline, our culture, ourselves.

FORMAT: Of those who expressed views on the matter, everyone agreed we should preserve Talent Night, and an overwhelming majority suggested that we have few formal papers. The following suggestions also seemed to meet with general (though not unanimous) approval:
-- For the most part, participants who want to present papers should circulate them in advance (or have the organizers circulate them) so papers can be discussed by participants, rather than read aloud in formal sessions.
-- Readings (in addition to papers written for this conference) should be sent out to participants before the conference. These might include copies of short articles as well as references to and perhaps comments on favorite books and articles relating to the conference theme.
-- Inksheddings should be reinstated to the central role they had in the first three Inkshed conferences. (Loose translation: All participants should write responses to sessions and share these written responses with other participants.)

The 1988 committee has decided to adopt these suggestions, but we still welcome comments on all aspects of the conference, and remain flexible on most matters.

COSTS:
So far, we have not had much success in our search for external funding, but we intend to submit an application to the SSHRC in time for their March 30 deadline. If you are thinking of coming to Inkshed and are willing to submit a paper either for oral delivery or advance publication, please return the enclosed proposal form, an abstract of your proposed paper, and your curriculum vitae as soon as possible. There seems to be a good possibility of getting funds to cover your travel and living expenses for the conference if we act quickly. Even if you don't want funding yourself, please send abstracts and CV's to help strengthen the application for funding.

Costs will be reasonable, with or without external funding.

REGISTRATION (including meals Sunday night, all day Monday
                   and breakfast and lunch on Tuesday)------------   80.00
ACCOMMODATION --------------------------------------- single ----   35.00
                                                    double ----   40.00
PRE-CONFERENCE TOUR (optional, but highly recommended)   ----   285.00
(including meals from Friday breakfast to Sunday lunch,
but not rooms). We can book rooms for you at Littledale for
this period or send you information about alternative accommodation
in the city. Watch for the CCTE package you will be receiving
shortly for information about the tour and city hotels as well as
about program highlights and costs of this year's CCTE conference,
PART OF THE MAIN.

ONE FURTHER CONCERN we'd especially like help with: What can we do to make newcomers welcome? How can we best preserve and strengthen our sense of community while including others in our continuing dialogue?

INKSHED WORKING CONFERENCE V

VALUES AND EVALUATION
August 14 - 16, 1988
PRE-REGISTRATION FORM (AND OTHER REPLIES)

NAME_____

INSTITUTION_____

MAILING ADDRESS_____

_____

_____

PHONE NUMBERS (home) _____ (work) _____

I do_____ do not_____ plan to come to the conference.

I have not decided, but expect to know by _____.

I would like to come provided I can get funding from my
         institution _____some other source_____

I would like to come, but prefer not to prepare a paper_____

I am willing to spend approximately _____(hours) or _____(days) doing
         preparatory readings if I find them interesting.

I am interested in the pre-conference tour_____: please send
         information_____.

I enclose $10.00 Pre-Registration fee, to ensure a space at the
conference, and to help cover initial administrative costs $_____

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WITH THE ABOVE INFORMATION AND PRE-REGISTRATION FEE
BY APRIL 30.

The following information is needed by May 31:

Please book accommodation at Littledale for the following nights:

    Aug. 11___, Aug. 12___, Aug. 13___, Aug. 14___, Aug. 15___
    I will need a single room @ $35.00 per night for ____ nights = $_____
         OR a double room @ $40.00 per night for ____ nights = $_____
    I will be sharing a room with _____

FULL REGISTRATION FEES ARE DUE ON June 30 ($70.00 in addition to the $10.00
pre-registration fee); accommodation can be paid when you arrive. Advance
payments for both are welcome. Please make cheques payable to INKSHED V.

PROGRAM PROPOSAL FORM

The program will be drawn up from submissions received by JUNE 30.
Reminder: if you want to be considered for funding send proposals and
CV's right away.

1. <u>FORMAL PAPER</u>:

Title of Proposal _____

Approximate Length (number of words)_____

I prefer to deliver my paper orally _____

  to have my paper circulated before the conference _____

I expect to have my paper completed by _____ (no later

  than June 30 if it is to be circulated in advance).

Please attach an abstract of 100 to 200 words, preferably typed, on a
separate sheet of paper. Add further comments if you wish, for example
about the kinds of participation and preparation, if any, you would like
to encourage from your audience.

2. <u>SESSION OR EVENT OTHER THAN A FORMAL PAPER</u>:

Dialogue_____ Debate_____ Workshop_____ Film/Video/Slide Presentation_____

Dramatization_____ Poetry Reading _____ Other (Specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Describe the session, including information about other participants you
would like to include in your session. Include as many extra sheets of
paper as you need.

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

I recommend the following, which have been important for my own thinking, and which have a direct bearing on the theme of the conference.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please provide complete bibliographic references, and, if you list more than three items, indicate which three seem to you most valuable for our purposes. It would be useful to have your comments on each item. Deadline for these lists is MAY 31.

****

Send replies, proposals, money, suggestions and anything else that seems appropriate to:

Phyllis Artiss
Department of English Language and Literature
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland   A1B 3X9

Phone: 709-737-8056   (English Department)
         709-753-2270   (home)