Summary and Critique

Richard Fulkerson

Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century

I argue that examining two collections of essays designed for the preparation of new writing teachers and published twenty years apart provides some important clues to what has occurred to composition studies in the interval. Building on the framework I established in two previous *CCC* articles, I argue that composition studies has become a less unified and more contentious discipline early in the twenty-first century than it had appeared to be around 1990. The present article specifically addresses the rise of what I call critical/cultural studies, the quiet expansion of expressive approaches to teaching writing, and the split of rhetorical approaches into three: argumentation, genre analysis, and preparation for "the" academic discourse community.

$\mathbf{A}$bout every ten years, frustration drives me to try to make personal sense of composition studies, a discipline for which I was not trained but into which I have been inexorably drawn.[1] As I revise this manuscript, I direct a doctoral program that prepares about half of the students to become writing professors, and for the first time in over a decade, I am (Acting) Director of First-Year Composition. Selecting texts and devising a syllabus for our teaching assistants to use in multiple sections raised again those large questions of who we are, what we wish to achieve with students, and how we ought to go about it.

654

In 1990, when I attempted to survey the composition landscape ("Composition in the Eighties"), I wrote with some optimism and sense of progress that as a field we had achieved a consensus about our goals: we agreed that we were to help students improve their writing and that "good writing" meant writing that was rhetorically effective for audience and situation. But we still disagreed over what sort of pedagogy would best reach the goal—over whether to assign topics, how to assign topics, and what type of topics to assign; over the role of readings and textbooks; over peer-response groups; over how teachers should grade and/or respond to writing. I called this situation "axiological" consensus and "pedagogical diversity." Invoking the Cheshire Cat's advice to Alice, I said we agreed, in other words, on where we were trying to go but not on the best route to it: on ends but not means.

Forecast

In what follows, I intend to revisit the metatheory I suggested in "Composition in the Eighties," using it to interpret and critique what I see as the terrain of composition around the turn of the twenty-first century. My central claim is that we have diverged again. Within the scholarship, we currently have three alternative axiologies (theories of value): the newest one, "the social" or "social-construction" view, which values critical cultural analysis; an expressive one; and a multifaceted rhetorical one. I maintain that the three axiologies drive the three major approaches to the teaching of composition. I will treat them with the following designations and in this order: (1) critical/cultural studies [CCS], (2) expressivism, and (3) procedural rhetoric.[2]

We currently have three alternative axiologies (theories of value): the newest one, "the social" or "social-construction" view . . . an expressive one; and a multifaceted rhetorical one.

Specifically I shall argue that the "social turn" in composition, the importation of cultural studies from the social sciences and literary theory, has made a writing teacher's role deeply problematic. I will argue that expressivism, despite numerous poundings by the cannons of postmodernism and resulting eulogies, is, in fact, quietly expanding its region of command. Finally, I'll argue that the rhetorical approach has now divided itself in three.[3]

Mapping Comp-landia: Now and Then

We can get a suggestive picture of large-scale changes in the discipline by looking at two volumes published twenty years apart, each designed to introduce novices to alternate ways to teach college writing. In 1980 the National Coun-

cil of Teachers of English published *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition,* edited by Tim Donovan and Ben McClelland. To it we can compare the recent (2001) collection of bibliographical essays *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*, edited by Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick. As composition has become more diverse, the eight "approaches" from 1980 have increased to twelve "pedagogies" in the 2001 collection. The following table gives a chapter outline, with authors, for each collection.

In their introduction, Donovan and McClelland stress the shift from product to process, still a relatively new idea in 1980. Citing both Richard Young and Janet Emig, they endorse the metaphor that a Kuhnian "paradigm shift" has occurred in composition. Significantly, they point out that approaches 2 to 5 (that is, the models approach, the experiential, the rhetorical, and the

Two Views of the Composition Landscape

Timothy Donovan and Ben McClelland, eds. *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1980.	Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick, eds. *A Guide to Composition Pegagogies.* New York: Oxford, 2001.
1. "Writing as Process," Don Murray	1. "Process Pedagogy," Lad Tobin
2. "The Prose Models Approach," Paul Eschholz	2. "Expressive Pedagogy," Christopher Burnham
3. "The Experiential Approach," Stephen Judy	3. "Rhetorical Pedagogy," William Covino
4. "The Rhetorical Approach," Janice Lauer	4. "Collaborative Pedagogy," Rebecca Moore Howard
5. "The Epistemic Approach" Kenneth Dowst	5. "Cultural Studies and Composition," Diana George and John Trimbur
6. "Basic Writing," Harvey Wiener	6. "Critical Pedagogy," Ann George
7. "The Writing Conference," Thomas Carnicelli	7. "Feminist Pedagogy," Susan Jarratt
8. "Writing in the Total Curriculum," Robert Weiss	8. "Community-Service Pedagogy," Laura Julier
	9. "The Pedagogy of Writing Across the Curriculum," Susan McLeod
	10. "Writing Center Pedagogy," Eric Hobson
	11. "On the Academic Margins: Basic Writing Pedagogy," Deborah Mutnick
	12. "Technology and the Teaching of Writing," Charles Moran

epistemic) all "accommodate the process approach" (xiii), one version of which Don Murray presents as the volume's first and context-setting chapter.

Although both collections open with a chapter on writing as process (about which more later), the "prose models" approach, taken seriously in 1980, is missing from the new volume. Stephen Judy's experiential approach more or less matches up with expressive pedagogy as Chris Burnham defines it. Both volumes have a chapter on the rhetorical approach.

The major difference shows up in chapters 5 to 8 of the new volume. They have no parallels in the older one. These four chapters represent variations of the major new area of scholarly interest in composition as we begin the twenty-first century, critical/cultural studies (CCS), showing the impact of postmodernism, feminism, and British cultural studies.[4]

In addition, the rhetorical aims and techniques of the contributors have changed, representing a growing "scholarizing" of the field. In *Eight Approaches,* practitioner-experts explain how to use the approach each favors. The editors describe the chapters as "case studies which record the authors' attempts to put it all together—at least for themselves and their students" (xiii). Murray includes charts to help the aspiring process teacher; Paul Eschholz lists thirty authors who have interested his students as models. Janice Lauer traces a single student paper through its growth and reprints the final copy. Citations to related works are minimal (ranging from seven for Murray and for Wiener up to twenty-six for Lauer, with an average of sixteen). In contrast, the chapters in the newer collection are heavy, scholarly bibliographical surveys. Susan Jarratt's article on feminism cites well over a hundred sources, as does William Covino's on rhetoric, with an average of seventy citations per essay for the whole. Despite the editors' claims to have produced the volume for students just coming into the field (vi), it frequently makes daunting reading even for old hands.

Analytical Scheme

In "Composition in the Eighties" I postulated that in order to have a philosophy of composition upon which you can explicitly erect a course, you must answer four questions:

1. The axiological question: in general, what makes writing "good"?

2. The process question: in general, how do written texts come into existence?

3. The pedagogical question: in general, how does one teach college students effectively, especially where procedural rather than propositional knowledge is the goal? And

4. The epistemological question: "How do you know that?" which underlies answers to all the others.

I will employ these four questions (and others) in order to examine critically the variant contemporary approaches to teaching college writing. By the time I finish, then, I hope to have filled in the boxes in the following grid:

Perspective on Composition	Evaluative Theory	View of Process	View of Pedagogy	Epistemology Assumed
Current/Traditional [C/T]	Rhetoric			
Expressivism				
Critical/Cultural Studies [CCS]				
Procedural Rhetoric				

Note that, in contrast to the two collections above, I include no "process perspective." Instead, one heading for each perspective is "view of process." All composition perspectives assume some view of the writing process; that is, any concept of composing and/or teaching composition must presuppose an answer to "How are texts produced?" It is widely acknowledged that C/T composition truncates "process" as much as possible (outline, write, edit, receive grade, do exercises). Each of the other approaches is capable of and likely to encourage students to learn and employ more extensive "processing."[5]

Here is an important demurrer about that chart, however. As a tidy four-by-four grid, it seems to imply that there are separate and systematic sets of characteristics for each "perspective"—four perspectives, four pedagogies, four views of process, and four epistemologies. But it isn't that simple. Since I name the "perspective" for evaluation theory (axiology), those two will necessarily match. But although the perspective influences the pedagogical and process views and reflects epistemological assumptions, there is no neat one-to-one pattern. Different scholars who primarily value "expressiveness" in writing may

not share either epistemology or pedagogy or view of process. And a dyed-in-the-wool CCS advocate might share pedagogical and epistemological assumptions with someone professing essentially rhetorical values.

Social Theories, Critical/Cultural Studies Approaches

Judging from the published scholarship of the last thirteen years, cultural studies has been the major movement in composition studies, no surprise to readers of our leading journals. A sort of foundational publication was *Cultural Studies in the English Classroom,* edited by Jim Berlin and Michael Vivion in 1992. It included articles about entire English programs that had shifted to cultural studies (such as Carnegie Mellon, Pitt, and the SUNY–Albany doctoral program) as well as accounts of individual courses at other schools. In 1995 came *Left Margins: Cultural Studies and Composition Pedagogy,* by Karen Fitts and Alan France. In addition to hundreds of theoretical articles, there are a good many ethnographic accounts of courses using cultural studies, including Russel Durst's *Collision Course* and Douglas Hunt's *Misunderstanding the Assignment,* as well as Mark Hurlbert and Michael Blitz's collection *Composition and Resistance.*

More to the point are the extensive bibliographical essays in the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick volume. The one explicitly on topic is "Cultural Studies and Composition," by John Trimbur and Diana George, which cites 111 sources, and says, "cultural studies has insinuated itself into the mainstream of composition" (71). Whether cultural studies is as widespread in composition classrooms as in our journals is actually an open question. Answering it would require survey data we simply do not have. Closely related is "Critical Pedagogy," by Ann George. For my purposes, feminist composition (treated by Jarratt) is similar to these two. All three focus on having students read about systemic cultural injustices inflicted by dominant societal groups and dominant discourses on those with less power, and upon the empowering possibilities of rhetoric if students are educated to "read" carefully and "resist" the social texts that help keep some groups subordinated. Andrea Greenbaum has recently argued that cultural studies approaches, critical approaches, many feminist approaches, and even postcolonial approaches can all be seen as similar "emancipatory movements in composition."

I acknowledge that treating the three pedagogies as bibliographically separate makes sense. Trimbur and George note that the originating trinity of cul-

Whether cultural studies is as widespread in composition classrooms as in our journals is actually an open question.

tural studies are Richard Hoggart (*The Uses of Literacy,* 1957), Raymond Williams (*Culture and Society,* 1958, and *The Long Revolution,* 1961), and E. P. Thompson (*The Making of the English Working Class,* 1963) (73), but the "big three" of critical pedagogy, according to Ann George, are Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, and Ira Shor (93). Feminist theory cannot be so cleanly anchored, but no one would nominate any of the six just-named authors.

It's important to emphasize that in CCS the course aim is not "improved writing" but "liberation" from dominant discourse. Here is how Ann George puts it: "[C]ritical pedagogy engages students in analyses of the unequal power relations that produce and are produced by cultural practices and institutions [. . .], and it aims to help students develop the tools that will enable them to challenge this inequality" (92). And here are some satiric but revealing thoughts of a new graduate teaching assistant, prior to entering her first-year CCS classroom: "[Students] will be astonished as I, layer by layer, unveil their ideology. They will gawk when I expose the simulacra. They will not be able to stop their pens when questioning their role in the university, the cultural formation of gender roles and expectations, racial stereotypes, and the ethical practices of the titans of industry" (Heimer 17). James Berlin, surely the most famous CCS advocate, defined the goal of the social composition course saying, "Our larger purpose is to encourage our students to resist and to negotiate [. . .] hegemonic discourses—in order to bring about more personally humane and socially equitable economic and political arrangements" ("Composition" 50).

Certainly it's misleading to talk of a single "cultural studies" or "critical" or "feminist" pedagogy. A tremendous variety of courses fit the CCS rubric. But here, as I understand it, are the essential features that would justify categorizing a writing course, including feminist courses, under the CCS heading.

1. The central activity of the course is interpretation. The interpretation may be of readings, either about cultural theory or the experiences of a cultural group or individual (Richard Rodriguez, Victor Villanueva, Paulo Freire, Gloria Anzaldúa, and other authors are popular). Alternatively, students may interpret cultural artifacts—ads, TV shows, minority language use, popular songs, etc. Most often, both sorts of "texts" are used.

2. Frequently, multiple texts reflect one theme: the course or a major chunk of it might be about family, the Vietnam War, education, the sixties. (For real examples, see George and Trimbur's anthology *Reading Culture.*)

3. The interpretive moves assume the artifact/text reveals certain deep structural truths about power in American society, specifically ways in which the dominant culture dominates, in terms of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

4. Students write papers interpreting social artifacts, usually selected in connection with the course theme(s). Some courses involve a fairly elaborate enactment of writing as an extended, recursive, complex process.

5. The course goal, as framed by Berlin and others, is to empower or liberate students by giving them new insights into the injustices of American and transnational capitalism, politics, and complicit mass media.

In fact, some writers remark that their courses would not necessarily need to be in English departments. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg's CCS textbook, *Negotiating Difference,* features documents focusing on six moments of cultural conflict in U.S. history. It would be a superb foundation for a course in history. Other courses could equally well exist in a sociology department or an anthropology department, or even in an environmental science department.

What can be learned by interrogating critical/cultural studies courses using my four features of a philosophy of composition? First, although the pedagogy as outlined above is pretty flexible, one principle is clear. It would be inappropriate in a course about cultural hegemony for the teacher to be an oppressor, so most discussions of such courses invoke a democratic, often Freirean, classroom, based on reading assigned texts and then having problem-posing discussions. Second, there is no agreed-on view of writing as a process. There may be heuristic questions about the artifacts; teachers may respond to multiple drafts, and often drafts are shared in peer-response groups to encourage revision. A portfolio with a reflective entry may well be used. But neither extended processing nor the portfolio is inherently related to the approach. And descriptions of other courses suggest that the complex process is often cut short, perhaps by restricting prewriting/invention to "reading" and to class or small-group discussion. Just what one might expect in a course in a different department.

The epistemological assumptions always include a claim that knowledge

> **It would be inappropriate in a course about cultural hegemony for the teacher to be an oppressor, so most discussions of such courses invoke a democratic, often Freirean, classroom.**

is socially constructed through dialectic exchanges. After all, such courses are part of the "social turn" in composition. And since cultural artifacts, including texts and codes of behavior, are taken as proof about the nature of a culture, ethnographic research receives high credibility as a knowledge source. Epistemological assumptions are crucial to such courses on two levels: (1) they determine what sort of scholarly research is acceptable as grounding for the approach itself (as is true for any approach), and (2) they also control what students are taught regarding "proof" in their own reading and writing. The idea that one can accurately infer features of cultural hegemony from readings and other artifacts within one's own culture is itself a crucial epistemological assumption. The pedagogical claims, although sometimes based on ethnographic case studies, are never said to be generalizable but always local. Their epistemic status is that of sophisticated lore. "I saw this happen," or "I did this and it helped my students."

In point of fact, virtually no one in contemporary composition theory assumes any epistemology other than a vaguely interactionist constructivism. We have rejected quantification and any attempts to reach Truth about our business by scientific means, just as we long ago rejected "truth" as derivable by deduction from unquestioned first principles. For us, all "truth" is rhetorical, dialectically constructed, and provisional. Even our most empirical journal, *Research in the Teaching of English,* now publishes primarily ethnographic studies.

What we come down to is that the writing in such a course will be judged by how sophisticated or insightful the teacher finds the interpretation of the relevant artifacts to be.

Finally, what of axiology? What counts as good writing in a cultural studies course? (CCS scholars are not much help on this since even in describing their classes and assignments they rarely include samples of student writing.) What we come down to is that the writing in such a course will be judged by how sophisticated or insightful the teacher finds the interpretation of the relevant artifacts to be. In other words, papers are judged in the same way they would be in any department with a "content" to teach. This is just the way a history professor would judge a paper, or a chemistry prof, or a business prof. Thus the standard of evaluation used is, I assert, actually a mimetic one—how close has the student come to giving a "defensible" (read "correct") analysis of the materials.

Axiologically, CCS courses resemble the popular and durable literature-based composition courses. In both types, students read texts judged important by the teacher. They write about those texts, and their work is evaluated

based on how well it shows that they understand and can perform the interpretive approach. The difference is that the lit/comp courses use belletristic texts, which students must interpret to the teacher's satisfaction, while the CCS course uses any text or other artifact thought to reveal cultural principles. In both courses, the writing is essentially a display of valued intellectual interactions with the relevant texts and is judged accordingly. Ungenerously, one could argue that this does not produce a writing course at all—any more than a sociology course in race relations that uses extensive writing is a writing course. Certainly it provides students with extensive practice in writing and with getting feedback—although it isn't clear whether the feedback is mainly about writing or mainly about culture and how to "read" it.

Both the lit-based course and the cultural studies course reflect, I suspect, content envy on the part of writing teachers.

Both the lit-based course and the cultural studies course reflect, I suspect, content envy on the part of writing teachers. Most of us (still) have been trained in textual analysis: we like classes built around texts to analyze. (And I am certainly not immune to that envy. I *enjoy* leading discussions of complex nonfiction that challenges students to think hard about basic beliefs.)

Let me attempt to further concretize this portrait of CCS as contemporary mimeticism by examining Russel Durst's *Collision Course: Conflict, Negotiation, and Learning in College Composition,* one of the most thoughtful and realistic CCS ethnographies. At Durst's university, students take a two-quarter sequence of writing courses, which follow a standardized syllabus and use the same texts. Durst spent the first two quarters of successive years observing two teachers in the program, occasionally participating in the classroom, reading student papers, and interviewing selected students. In other words, pretty much the full panoply of classroom ethnography by an outside observer. In the first and relatively traditional course, students write in various genres, based on personal experience. The second-quarter course uses a cultural studies approach, which Durst asserts to be typical of current approaches to teaching writing. He invokes Freire, Bizzell, Giroux, Shor, and Trimbur for its underlying philosophy (3). In this second course, using Gary Colombo, Robert Cullen, and Bonnie Lisle's *Rereading America* (1992 edition), the students write four major assignments on separate cultural themes: "[T]he standard syllabus asked students to read and write about the nature of family structures, the issue of money and success as reflected in the American dream, and aspects of prejudice, discrimination, and group membership" (17). Each student picked a fourth topic from the book as the basis of a research project, which counted double.

Durst is careful to say, "Though I believe in and teach a critical literacy approach that locates students in a larger cultural and historical context, my goal as a teacher and program director is not to turn first-year students into critical intellectuals and political activists" (6). Durst began his ethnographic study with the hypothesis that what students wanted and expected from a composition course in college conflicted with what teachers using a critical pedagogy were mostly interested in: "first-year students typically enter composition with an idea of writing and an understanding of what they need to learn about writing that are dramatically at odds with the views and approaches of the teacher" (2). The students are "career-oriented pragmatists who view writing as a difficult but potentially useful technology" (2). Durst wanted to investigate the connection between the "social turn" in composition and the "more traditional concern in the field with the teaching of writing, as in strategies, approaches, and techniques. [...] I see unresolved, even unacknowledged tensions between these areas of concern" (4). Since the program had a first course in this more traditional format and a second course emphasizing cultural studies, Durst was in an ideal position to compare student reactions to the two approaches.

Most of the book deals with the second course as taught by Sherry Stanforth, a "doctoral student interested in critical theory, feminism, composition studies, and creative writing" (19). She is already a published author and has been identified as an outstanding teacher who gets "consistently strong evaluations" (19). She has some of the same students for both courses, and Durst met regularly with several of them throughout both quarters. He also observed and took field notes on half of Stanforth's class meetings (30). In the later chapters, he narrates a plethora of classroom events that frustrated him and many of the teachers. "As course subject matter began to focus more on political issues, the conflict between many students' views and those of the textbook became more pronounced" (142). Teachers "lamented the horrific ignorance of individual [student] writers who misapplied citations or misinterpreted the central idea of an argument" (161). The students didn't listen to NPR or read the *Atlantic Monthly* or the *New Yorker*, and thus were unaware that what they were studying was actually a hot public topic (161); "helping them evolve as socially just citizens seemed overwhelming, especially for first-year teaching assistants. In between conferences and classes, they sat around the office together, pondering the ongoing confusion of their work. Was the goal to teach them better values or better writing or both?" (161). And the students, as Durst sees them, engage in "twin resistance" (128). They resist

politically, claiming "they are being force-fed 'a liberal ideology'" (128). And they resist intellectually "the work they are being asked to do in reading what seem to them unnecessarily abstruse essays and taking on the difficult task of forming and supporting interpretations of what they are finding out are surprisingly complex issues" (128).

In addition to paralleling literature-based "composition" courses and displaying our content envy, most CCS course seem inappropriate to me for two reasons. First, reading, analyzing, and discussing the texts upon which the course rests are unlikely to leave room for any actual teaching of writing. So we get a "writing" course in which writing is required and evaluated, but not taught. I agree with Gary Tate, who remarked, "if we are serious about teaching *writing* rather than literature or politics or religion, we can—should—make the writing of our students the focus (content) of the course" ("Empty" 270).

Reading, analyzing, and discussing the texts upon which the course rests are unlikely to leave room for any actual teaching of writing.

The second problem is the likelihood of indoctrination. Teachers dedicated to exposing the social injustice of racism, classism, homophobia, misogyny, or capitalism cannot perforce accept student viewpoints that deny such views or fail to register their contemporary relevance. Maxine Hairston's notorious "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing," accusing CCS teachers of indoctrinating their students with leftist views, was widely denounced, provoking more written responses than any other article during Richard Gebhardt's six-year tenure as editor of *College Composition and Communication*. Hairston claimed that cultural studies composition teachers "show open contempt for their students' values" (119), and engage in "facile non-logical leap[s]" (121), all the while perverting the purpose of writing classes and turning them into leftist political indoctrination.

The standard response accused Hairston of ideological naivete, arguing that she assumed her own pedagogy to be ideology-free but that since all pedagogies are always already political, she must be incorrect (and thus also unenlightened). Therefore, her critique of CCS courses could be denounced as well as ignored.

Logically that argument means no pedagogy can be accused of indoctrination, because the accuser's hands would necessarily also be unclean. In other words, there could be no grounds for distinguishing between a teacher who overtly forces students to echo his or her politics in their writing and one who

tolerates alternative positions. All education becomes equally indoctrinating; I take such a position to be an obvious absurdity.

It was unfortunate that Hairston expressed her views so intemperately, liberally engaging in ad hominem argument and provoking the same from many respondents, and even more unfortunate that she later had to acknowledge seriously misquoting Cy Knoblauch, after identifying him as one CCS ideologue. Both features substantially reduce her ethos. She also described her own classroom approach in a vague way that made her seem an extreme expressivist, who would accept whatever her students said on primarily personal topics. That was not an accurate view of her teaching (see Jolliffe et al.).

Most scholars who examine a CCS course ethnographically or narrate such a course of their own go out of their way to say the teachers are careful not to indoctrinate students. Students are "free" to write their papers from any perspective they choose. They have only to make a thoughtful case for their position. The problem is that a socially committed teacher will rarely find contrary views presented by an undergraduate to be sufficiently "thoughtful," any more than a literature scholar will find an undergraduate reinterpretation of "Hills Like White Elephants" convincing. In addition, a student who knows his or her instructor's own political views will probably not choose to oppose them with a grade at stake.

Contemporary Expressivist Composition

At least one approach to feminist pedagogy does not fall under critical/cultural studies, even though it is still designed to help free students from patriarchy and even though it does include readings. It is essentially a consciousness-raising and coming-to-voice class, in which female students are provided a safe place to share and explore experiences and viewpoints. Many traditional features of academic writing, such as having a clear argumentative thesis and backing it up to convince a reader, are put on a back burner (see especially Annas). Contemporary feminists might regard such a course as retrograde (see Greenbaum's discussion of "bitch pedagogy" and her critique of the self-effacement and self-sacrifice implied by the commonly held view that, for women, an "ethic of care" is most appropriate).

> The enduring category of the expressivist composition class . . . seems to be going strong, despite the groundswell of cultural/critical pedagogies.

Such courses are one variety of the enduring category of the expressivist composition class, a category which seems to be going strong, despite the groundswell of cultural/critical pedagogies. In the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick

volume, Chris Burnham writes the bibliographical chapter on expressive pedagogy, and it's worth quoting his definition at length (starting with the presumption of the rhetorical triangle):

> Expressivism places the writer in the center, articulates its theory, and develops its pedagogical system by assigning highest value to the writer and her imaginative, psychological, social, and spiritual development and how that development influences individual consciousness and social behavior. Expressivist pedagogy employs freewriting, journal keeping, reflective writing, and small group dialogic collaborative response to foster a writer's aesthetic, cognitive, and moral development. Expressivist pedagogy encourages, even insists upon, a sense of writer presence even in research-based writing. This presence—"voice" or ethos—whether explicit, implicit, or absent, functions as a key evaluation criterion when expressivists examine writing. (19)

Notice that the overriding goal is to "foster [...] aesthetic, cognitive, and moral development," not to improve written communication or encourage critical thinking. Writing is a means of fostering personal development, in the great Socratean tradition of "knowing thyself." Burnham invokes both Thomas Merton and bell hooks as sponsoring voices for the viewpoint (20). One crucial axiological goal is to have students write with "voice"—although Burnham doesn't commit the 1960s mistake of referring to the student's "authentic" voice.

The current hotbed of expressivism seems to be the NCTE affiliate the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning (AEPL), which publishes yearly the *Journal of the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning* (founded by Alice Brand in 1995). The assembly began as a special-interest group, "Beyond the Cognitive Domain," started by Robert Graves and Brand, which met at the 1991, 1992, and 1993 CCCC Conventions. When the interest group became the AEPL, James Moffett was the first member. The group continues to hold well-attended day-long preconvention workshops at CCCC, and several edited collections of articles by members have appeared. (See Brand and Graves; Foehr and Schiller.) Other recent presentations of complex expressive views include books by Marshall Alcorn, Jeffrey Berman; and Charles Anderson and Marian MacCurdy.

Of course, there is no single "expressive" way to teach composition, any more than there is a single CCS way.

Of course, there is no single "expressive" way to teach composition, any more than there is a single CCS way. Some expressive teachers are interested in helping students mature and become more self-aware, more reflective. Others are interested in writing as healing or therapy. Some are most interested in

creative self-expression. Some have students choose their own topics; others have concerns they want students to address. And another sort of expressivism involves asking students to write the classic personal *essai*. (See Paul Heilker and Kurt Spellmeyer for arguments about the value to our students of essayist literacy.)

Recently Karen Surman Paley criticized the easy and common denigration of expressivist teaching, in *I-Writing: The Politics and Practice of Teaching First-Person Writing*. For her dissertation, she did ethnographic case studies of two female teachers at Boston College, including audiotaped student interviews. She says the results "deconstruct the social construction of 'expressivism' as a naïve pedagogy" (x) and "demonstrate that 'expressivist' programs are much more complicated than they have been made out to be" (xiii). To the extent that she argues for allowing first-person narrative to be a part of composition (both first-year and advanced), Paley does an excellent job, both in critiquing the work of Berlin and Lester Faigley that rejects autobiographical narrative out of hand, and in demonstrating that in the classrooms she observed, even autobiographical narrative often raises issues related to the holy political trinity of class, race, and gender.

But Paley seems to defend the wrong victim in the wrong way because the courses she observed do not look expressivist in the first place. The first-year course required four papers: an autobiographical narrative, an "analysis," a persuasive argument, and a research paper. In the advanced course, no topics or genres were assigned; students were to choose their own topics and write once a week. Paley, however, identifies the Boston College program as "expressivist" (56). The only reason I can determine is that it is directed by Lad Tobin, who received his doctorate from the University of New Hampshire under Don Murray et al. and who has often written about expressivism and its relationship to "process pedagogy." The inclusion of a single autobiographical narrative in the first course is a perfectly standard practice and doesn't warrant labeling the course "expressive."

In addition, one would not "defend" a truly "expressive" course by saying that it actually does address issues of social consciousness—class, race, gender, ethnicity, etc. It would be defended by showing that it led to greater self-awareness, greater insight, increased creativity, or therapeutic clarification of some sort. To say that such a course "actually" does involve cultural studies issues is to give the game away by accepting the values of a quite different composition philosophy.

Just as no one actually knows how widespread CCS composition courses are, the same is true for expressive courses grounded in the views and experiences of the student authors. We have lots of indirect evidence for both.

A Digression on Process and Post-Process

It's simply inaccurate to equate "process" teaching with an expressive axiology, although the two were entwined in the influential early work of Don Murray. Tobin, writing in the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick volume, remarks that "it was not unusual to hear 'process' and 'expressivism' used almost interchangeably" (9). I think his chapter on "Process Pedagogy" encourages the confusion, even though he points out that "a teacher could emphasize the organic nature of the composing process but not assign or even allow personal writing" (9). Those who are committed to an expressive axiology nowadays do generally teach an extended writing process, a process of invention and discovery. So do many of those committed to what I have called the mimetic axiology of cultural studies. And so do those who are primarily committed to teaching students from the perspective of a rhetorical axiology ("good" writing is writing that works effectively for the readers in the rhetorical context). Jim Berlin said it well: "Everyone teaches the process of writing, but everyone does not teach the *same* process. The test of one's competence as a composition instructor [. . .] resides in being able to recognize and justify the version of the process being taught" ("Contemporary" 777). There are complicated historical reasons that the "process revolution" of the 1970s also became identified with the advocacy of unique expressive voice. But probably most process teaching today derives more from the cognitive and problem-solving research of Linda Flower and John Hayes plus pioneering work by Janet Emig, Nancy Sommers, and Sondra Perl, not to mention the rhetoric revival—led by figures like Edward P. J. Corbett—than it does from the individualistic advocacy of Don Murray and Ken Macrorie. At any rate, to equate one's view of process with the overall aim of an approach is a category error. All approaches necessarily include views of process. (For a related discussion that attempts to identify separate theories of process that correspond to three major "views" of composition, see Faigley's "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal.")

To equate one's view of process with the overall aim of an approach is a category error. All approaches necessarily include views of process.

As for our being "post-process," I tend to share Lynn Bloom's view (expressed at the Miami Conference on Composition in the Twenty-First Century in 2001) that the term is an oxymoron. But there is no agreed-upon meaning

for it; it may just be the latest way of showing yourself to be *au courant*. One meaning is that as a field we no longer do research into writing processes. That is certainly accurate (although not necessarily progress), but it isn't what the term seems to refer to most of the time. Thomas Kent argues that "process" implies a set of regular, sequential procedures that writers do or should go through, in short, a production formula. And since writing isn't formulaic but "hermeneutic guesswork" (3), process research and theory were essentially mistaken from the start. It's true that "process" in some classrooms and text-books did (and no doubt still does) become reduced to formulaic steps. Tobin even tells of overhearing a colleague tell a student, "You have not done any freewriting here. You can't just jump from brainstorming straight to composing. You can't skip steps" (11). But such linear rigidity was never faithful to what the process researchers learned. So Kent attacks a straw character. A third definition takes "process" to mean the romanticized view of the isolated writer seeking inspiration and striving to make personal meaning alone in a garret, together with the resulting personal texts. Since we have rejected that view of process and emphasize all writing as social, we are, therefore, "post-process." This viewpoint too makes a category error by equating expressivism as an axiology with a process based on genius and inspiration. It further presumes a reductive notion of what a genuinely expressive writing course involves. Thus it commits the straw-character fallacy twice. (See my "Of Pre- and Post-Process: Reviews and Ruminations.")

Rhetorical Approaches to Composition

When the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) approved in 1999 a statement of minimal standards for what a first-year writing course should accomplish, neither critical cultural studies approaches nor expressive ones were much reflected in the document, officially approved by the organization of people who actually direct programs ("WPA Outcomes"). That statement lists broad desired outcomes under four headings: Rhetorical Knowledge, Critical Thinking, Processes, and Knowledge of Conventions. Under each heading is a bulleted list of six to ten outcomes—the bulk of which are pretty traditional. They emphasize writing effectively for different audiences, seeing writing as an extended process of multiple tasks and drafts, and learning to control surface features and formatting. The only gestures I see toward a cultural studies agenda are the fourth and seventh entries under "Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing." The fourth says students should "understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power," and the seventh suggests that fac-

ulty in all disciplines should help students learn "the relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields."

As I see this document, it is fully in the dominant tradition of composition in the 1970s and 1980s. Let's call that tradition procedural rhetoric. Using my four dimensions of a philosophy of composition, we can say that this constellation of approaches shares an axiological commitment to judging writing by suitability to the context ("situation and audience"), including concern for classical issues of *pathos, ethos,* and *logos.* Its theory of the writing process says that writing is a complex extended set of (teachable) activities in which a wide variety of invention procedures may be valuable, and an equal variety of drafting and revision activities. Its pedagogical assumptions are flexible, although lecture is eschewed. One standard metaphor for the teacher in a rhetorically grounded classroom is that of a coach helping students master a variety of activities (procedural knowledge). Another is that of an experienced guild member, a master craftsperson, to the student as apprentice. Teacher modeling, followed by student performance, followed by critique, followed by further practice would be an appropriate learning sequence. This may be a collaborative or democratic classroom; very likely part of the extended writing process will include peer-revision groups. And teacher commentary, either written or oral, will be given on drafts of papers. Readings may be used but are not the center of the class activity.

> **Rhetorical teachers would generally not be comfortable with the claim that "all truth [reality] is a social construct."**

Epistemologically, adherents of this view believe that values and decisions are reached through dialectic, but they do not take a radical antifoundational view. Rhetorical teachers would generally not be comfortable with the claim that "all truth [reality] is a social construct"; they grant that evidentiary statements can be true or false (i.e., that "facts" do exist), and that some claims are better founded than others.

In contemporary composition practice, I see rhetorical philosophies taking three different emphases: composition as argumentation, genre-based composition, and composition as introduction to an academic discourse community.

Ironically, these topics are not now discussed much in our leading journals. Maybe this material is just too "traditional" to warrant much space. To find major articles on argument theory and argument teaching, one does better by looking to related fields. *Informal Logic* carries many directly relevant articles, as does *Argumentation and Advocacy* from the field of speech and rhetoric. The bulk of genre theory is found in collections rather than journals,

although a good deal of it was also published in speech communication in the eighties (see Campbell and Jamieson; Miller).

Although the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick bibliographical collection is strong on various dimensions of cultural studies and on expressivism, it is unfortunately weak on rhetorical approaches. The extensive essay entitled "Rhetorical Pedagogy," by William Covino, is misnamed and ill-fitted to the volume. Although Covino cites over one hundred sources about rhetoric, ranging from Plato and Aristotle through Thomas Sprat to Walter Ong and Chaim Perelman, he focuses on history and theory. A graduate student who read all the cited material would be well prepared to write a comprehensive exam over both classical and modern rhetoric, but the student would know little about contemporary rhetorical pedagogy. Ironically, in the predecessor volume to Tate, Rupiper, and Schick, *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition,* Janice Lauer did a far better job of explaining how to enact a rhetorical approach in the classroom. What the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick collection needs are three further bibliographical essays: one on "Argumentation and Composition," a second on "Genre Theory and Composition," and a third on "Discursive Communities and the Teaching of Composition."

Despite the shortage of composition scholarship on argumentation, evidence indicates that treating writing as argument for a reader is widespread.

Despite the shortage of composition scholarship on argumentation, evidence indicates that treating writing as argument for a reader is widespread.

There are two relevant edited volumes on argumentation (see Emmel, Resch, and Tenney; and Barnett). And the growth and success of argument-based textbooks in the last twenty years has been phenomenal (see Rottenberg; Ramage, Bean, and Johnson; Clark; Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz; Williams and Colomb; Faigley and Selzer; Fahnestock and Secor; Crusius and Channell). The WPA statement, with its call for making students aware of the need to have a thesis and to write for an audience, supports this outlook. (See also Gerald Graff's *Clueless in Academe,* in which he argues that all academic discourse is argument characterized by certain preferred intellectual "moves" that should be shared explicitly with students.) In fact, even CCS teachers actually want argument from their students: claims about oppression, race, or the American Dream are to be grounded in close readings of various social "texts"; assertions of cultural patterns are to be backed up with artifactual data.

Durst's case study of Sherry Stanforth demonstrates how composition teachers may expect students to produce arguments but fail to share that ex-

pectation with students. One assignment in Stanforth's first-quarter course is to "explain a concept"—"not only by presenting factual information but by doing so in an interesting, critical, and creative manner that would appeal to an audience" (96). After some class discussion, student groups of four are given concepts on which to generate ideas for writing. After an oral report from one of the groups, Stanforth praises their work: "These people didn't just define. They discussed their topic as a problem and also proposed some solutions. They went way beyond just a boring, pointless listing of information" (97–98). Now, in this course, the assignments are supposed to progress by mode or genre. This assignment to "explain a concept" will be followed by a "problem/solution" paper and then by an "argument." But, of course, when Stanforth praises this group's work on their concept explanation by saying that they perceived the concept as a problem and also offered solutions, she indicates both that the sequence is problematic and that what she would in fact find "interesting" and thus reward would be a concept paper that also takes a stand, makes an argument.

And indeed, this turns out to be the case on the actual assignment. The whole class seems confused by how to go about the task, and Stanforth asks Cris, one of the case-study students, what the main point of her paper is to be. Cris says she wants "to show people that tattooing is an art, it's not what other people think" (Durst 101). The teacher's question and the student's answer both reveal that this task is actually to make an argument for a reader. The entire situation would be much clearer if everyone involved recognized this was the case and could discuss the task in the language of argumentation: claim, evidence, assumption, counterviews, refutation. Later in the lesson, Stanforth stresses the need to narrow the topic and decides to model the process. She asks for a sample topic from the students. Someone proposes Halloween, and she spends several minutes demonstrating ways to limit that topic. Durst remarks, "she emphasized that the essay should be focused around a thesis and main point that the writer wanted to make about Halloween" (101). The students remain "puzzled" (101), which doesn't seem too surprising. What Stanforth wants is for them to take a topic they are familiar with, locate an arguable issue within it that would be interesting to an (unspecified) audience, and then develop an argument with a thesis, necessarily including sufficient explanation of the concepts involved. Matters would go more smoothly if that expectation were shared with the students, perhaps even built into the class.

I would not want to argue that there is an "argumentation approach" to teaching composition. For many, probably most, of the "approaches" discussed in these two central collections twenty years apart could fit under such a broad rubric. And "argumentation" certainly can't be called a full "philosophy" of composition because the relevant features of argumentation imply only an axiology (rhetorical), not a particular pedagogy or view of writing as a process, nor even a coherent epistemology. In fact, the specialists in teaching students to argue and critique arguments, members of the informal logic and speech debate communities, disagree dramatically about how argumentation should be taught (not to mention how it should be analyzed and assessed). Many of us know that we want arguments from students, but we differ on what topics they should argue about, on how explicitly to "teach" argument, over how to assess it, and over the role of "logic," either formal or informal, in such a course. (See my "Technical Logic, Comp-Logic, and the Teaching of Writing.")

The second dominantly rhetorical approach at the turn of the twenty-first century, and a major concern in composition scholarship, involves the direct study of "genre."

The second dominantly rhetorical approach at the turn of the twenty-first century, and a major concern in composition scholarship, involves the direct study of "genre." "Genre" is the contemporary heir to what Paul Eschholz called "The Prose Models Approach: Using Products in the Process" in the Donovan and McClelland volume. "Genre" is also the contemporary incarnation of what we (properly) disparage as a "modes of discourse" approach (see Robert Connors, "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse").

The scholarship on teaching "composition as genre" would require a full-length chapter of the sort in the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick collection. (For a start, see the collections by Berkenkotter and Huckin; Bishop and Ostrom; and Freedman and Medway.) Most discussions of genre in the last decade have paid homage to the contextual/situational definition offered by Carolyn Miller, in contrast to the older idea of a genre as a form/formula (such as the genre "Elizabethan sonnet"). Miller developed her definition specifically to describe oral genres; as has often been the case, rhetorical scholars in speech communication have beaten those of us in composition studies to the punch (see Foss as well as Campbell and Jamieson). As I have written elsewhere in connection with *Newsweek* "My Turn" columns, the consensus in speech-rhetoric is that a rhetorical genre exists when common subject matter plus a common provocative exigence (see Miller) leads to discourses manifesting "a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members. These forms, *in isolation,* appear in

other discourses. What is distinctive about the acts in a genre is the recurrence of the forms *together* in constellation" (Campbell and Jamieson 20).

In "Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social Response to Process," Ken Hyland provides an excellent overview of the current situation, even though his study focuses on English as a Second Language. The grounding for a genre-based approach is the identification of a number of those "relatively stable [. . .] types of utterances" (Bakhtin 64) that scholars have thought valuable enough for students to justify explicit teaching of the generic features and the genre's social contexts. As Hyland puts it, "from a genre perspective [. . .] people don't just write, they write to accomplish different purposes in different contexts and this involves variation in the ways they use language" (19). Because "the features of a similar group of texts depend on the social context of their creation and use" and because "those features can be described in a way that relates a text to others like it and to the choices and constraints acting on text producers [. . .] every successful text will display the writer's awareness of its context and the readers who form part of that context" (21). Thus the genre approach has a relatively clear (rhetorical) axiology, and Hyland also describes the implied pedagogy: "Genre pedagogies assume that writing instruction will be more successful if students are aware of what target discourses look like" (26). Thus teachers explain both required and optional features of the genre in question, as well as any constraints on order of elements. Students and teachers are likely to examine several samples of the target genre plus their rhetorical contexts prior to students' launching their own projects.

Genre-based courses and CCS courses . . . share an extensive focus on close reading of texts and on culturally determined patterns, but the goals of the reading differ.

Genre-based courses and CCS courses thus share an extensive focus on close reading of texts and on culturally determined patterns, but the goals of the reading differ. In the CCS course, the students are to read critically and cite the texts read in their own papers on related topics. In the genre course, the readings serve as discourse models from which students can generalize. Both approaches presume that texts are socially constructed and intertextual. Genre researchers often study multiple instances of a target discourse in order to discern its features; they also do classroom research that quantifies in order to determine how successfully a genre has been taught. Thus, implicitly, genre approaches to composition rest on a quasi-scientific epistemology. The only feature of a full philosophy of composition they lack is an overt perspective on process. Most discussions of actual genre-based classes, as well as current genre

textbooks, indicate that writing processes are assumed to be extensive, multiple-draft activities, frequently with peer-group feedback. Invention practices, however, seem to be restricted to imitating required features of the target genre.

In a recent and elaborate analysis Anis Bawarshi, after arguing that repeated social situations give rise to genres (including the first-year writing syllabus) and that generic features guide the "invention of the writer" in both senses of that phrase, surprisingly concludes that, therefore, we should have students actually investigate and write about genres as the essence of the class. He forms "semester-long groups, each adopting a specific academic discipline," which "study the discipline through its genres" (163). "Students still write arguments, but these arguments are about writing, about the rhetorical choices writers make and how their genred positions of articulation organize and elicit these choices" (163). Bawarshi's vision of the first-year writing class is of a group of students who become discourse analysts in search of field-specific academic genres.

As a practical matter, for composition outside of ESL contexts, genre-based composition is now likely to be found either in courses devoted to argument genres or in technical writing, where the idea of learning quite specific, even discipline-specific, writing genres has been entrenched and is largely without controversy.

For first-year courses, although a number of major textbooks use a genre approach, Rise Axelrod and Charles Cooper's *St. Martin's Guide to Writing* has become the modern classic of the type. It shows a sort of transitional link between the old modes pedagogy and a contemporary genre pedagogy, as well as the shift from the C/T product orientation to extended process. Older modes texts either classified full discourses into some variety of the EDNA modes (exposition, description, narration, argument), or they were snippet anthologies in which fragments of discourses were reproduced to illustrate a given method of elaborating a single point. (The archetype here is *Prose Models,* by Harry Levin, which originally included a paragraph from *The Grapes of Wrath* to illustrate "description" and a couple of paragraphs from Orwell about military parade marching to demonstrate comparison and contrast.)

Axelrod and Cooper classify full-length discourses rather than snippets, devoting a chapter to each genre chosen; the chapters include extensive directives for students to use suggested processes of invention, arrangement, revision, and group response. Some chapters are just EDNA modes in process dress (such as a narrative writing assignment and later an argument). Others, how-

ever, come closer to being actual writing genres, such as a profile or a policy recommendation.

The more fully evolved first-year argumentation texts that coherently use a genre approach tend to accept some modern version of classical Greek and Roman stasis theory. (See Fulkerson, *Teaching the Argument in Writing*; Fahnestock and Secor, "Teaching Argument: A Theory of Types" and *A Rhetoric of Argument*.)

Stasis theory asserts that only a limited number of claim types can be "at issue" in dialectal discourse. If one can identify the type of claim, that knowledge has immediate generic implications concerning what features must, may, or must not be included, and even some traditionally expected orders of presentation. Joining this quasilogical analysis of claim plus elaboration with a specific exigency of situation and thus a specific set of intended readers further assists in defining both the requisite and the disallowed moves. So a text arguing for a claim of a specific stasis (such as evaluation), especially within a context including exigency and audience, gives rise to what can be called an argument genre.

This is reasonably well-settled ground, so there is little contemporary scholarship discussing it. But the central textbook, John Ramage, John Bean, and June Johnson's *Writing Arguments* (now into its sixth edition) continues to lead the sales of argument textbooks, and newer argument textbooks nearly all demonstrate some variation on the stasis-based genre approach. (See Faigley and Selzer; Williams and Colomb; Crusius and Channell.)

The major modern stasis types, common in the scholarship but even more evident in textbooks, include definition, generalization or interpretation, causation, evaluation, and policy recommendation. Typically, a textbook chapter presenting a stasis-based argument genre for students will include background discussion of the types of situations the genre is likely to arise in, discussion of the features—obligatory or optional—the genre involves, some invention guidelines or prompts, some revision questions, and several model texts (perhaps including unsuccessful attempts), both student-authored and professional. The pedagogy is essentially the classical one of imitation.[6]

The third variety of "procedural rhetorical" is the "discourse community" view implied by David Bartholomae in his famous article "Inventing the University," and elaborated in *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course,* coauthored with Anthony Petrosky. Beginning students (especially those identified as "basic" writers) are presumed to

be neither cognitively deficient nor linguistically impoverished. As outsiders, they simply lack experience with the "academic discourse community" and its conventions. In order to introduce them to that community, they are asked to read a sequence of difficult texts, often on a single theme, and write regularly, also about that theme. The goal is to allow students to read, write, and reason as they will be expected to do in other college courses, and thus to absorb the sorts of rhetorical moves that will help them survive in college. The discourse community approach assumes that most college writing responds to other texts, that it relies on close reading, that the student text will present an interpretive argument, that the preferred method of reasoning is citing textual evidence for one's position, while also indicating awareness of alternative positions, and that students must learn to take on vocabulary and some syntactic and organizational features of academic discourse.

Bartholomae's approach resembles CCS in being based on "reading" and using extensive materials relating to a single theme, and in giving little direct advice about either genre or process. (The student is the one who must "invent the university.") But the approach is still essentially rhetorical in that the student text will be judged on the basis of how well it meets the demands of the expected academic audience, of how well it suits the logos, pathos, and ethos accepted in the academy.

> The concept of introducing students into a new discourse community has produced a good deal of controversy.

The concept of introducing students into a new discourse community has produced a good deal of controversy. At first it seemed like a good way to conceive of weak writers without challenging their literacy—they were just not "members" of the discourse community they needed to enter, and such membership was just a matter of learning a new set of literacy conventions. But then a whole series of complicated issues arose. Is there such a thing as "academic discourse"? Or would students need really to learn the conventions of the major field they intended to work within, or indeed of all the fields they had to take courses in? Doesn't the idea of "academic" discourse, with its concern for critical thinking, definition of terms, citation of evidence, and preferred reasoning patterns, give an unfair advantage to students from middle and upper classes (especially whites), who are likely to have a greater familiarity with such texts prior to college? Is it in fact an act of hegemonic imperialism to insist that students not use their own languages but master that of their professors? (Don't students, in the famous NCTE document's phrase, "have a right to their own language"?) Composition teachers who object to the entire idea of having students learn to conform their

writing to the demands of the academic discourse community are thus un-
likely to adopt this version of procedural rhetoric.

Conclusions and Implications

Although it's always nice to map a large and complicated region of study so
that novices, at the least, can more easily navigate it, what does any of this
matter? In other words, as we sometimes ask of students, "So what?" What
does this look, at approximately the last fourteen years of college composition
theory, show? I confess that frequently during the project I felt I was saying
nothing that would not already be obvious to any scholar who has been paying
attention. Nevertheless, here are my suggestions about where the discussion
leaves us.

1. Composition has become much more complex with the significant
   growth of cultural studies, postmodernism in comp, genre theory, and
   discourse community theory (not to mention issues of assessment,
   placement, service, teacher preparation, etc.).

2. At the turn of the twenty-first century, there is a genuine controversy—
   within the field, not in the eyes of the public, the administration, or the
   legislature—over the goal of teaching writing in college. Are we
   teaching students to write in order that they should become successful
   insiders? Or are we teaching them to write so that they are more
   articulate critical outsiders? (Or even so that they "know themselves"?)
   The major divide is no longer expressive personal writing versus
   writing for readers (or whatever oppositional phrase you prefer:
   "academic discourse," "formal writing," "persuasion"). The major divide
   is instead between a postmodern, cultural studies, reading-based
   program, and a broadly conceived rhetoric of genres and discourse
   forums (Jim Porter's term [137]).

3. While a composition philosophy can be examined by asking about
   axiology, epistemology, pedagogy, and process, the options are neither
   interdetermined nor independent. Planning a composition course isn't
   quite like ordering from a menu, in which the main course you want is
   largely unconnected to what you choose for an appetizer, soup, and
   dessert. On the other hand, you probably would not want egg rolls as an
   appetizer followed by pizza and refried beans. Axiology (what you want
   to achieve) has implications for, but doesn't determine, processes (what

moves you think students need to learn), and both are involved with pedagogy (how you will conduct class to enable the process to achieve the goal). And how you answer any of those questions will depend in part on your epistemology. It's easy to create a course that is self-contradictory and thus baffling to students. We may teach one thing, assign another, and actually expect yet a third.

4. Even though we disagree among ourselves, those outside of English—including the public who pay tuition and taxes, the deans, presidents, and politicians who demand accountability, and the students themselves—in general hold a still different view of what we should be up to than we do.

5. There is no ultimate ground, no empirical, dialectical, or Platonic basis, for proving that one approach is proper. I do not intend this remark to ally me with postmodern antifoundationalism. I simply accept the old epistemological axiom that you cannot derive an "ought" from an "is."

6. Yet if a university or a department is serious about seeing writing courses as constituting a "program" or some portion of a larger scheme of "general education," some degree of commonality is likely to be required.

7. Preparing our graduate students in composition for the discourse community they must enter to succeed as composition professors is becoming increasingly difficult. It is natural to imitate our literary colleagues and produce PhD-holders created in our own image(s). "If you got your degree at South Florida, then you are post-everything. University of Pittsburgh grads are into cultural studies. Purdue and Arizona State products know rhetorical traditions." But limiting students to understanding one dominant perspective disadvantages them. Programs will have to make serious choices and perhaps prepare students as utility players able to fit into several positions, rather than teach them the field's "best practices." A new tenure-track PhD may have been well prepared in teaching composition for her alma mater using Approach A, yet be required to shift smoothly to Approach X in her new home.

If you accept my analysis, then no matter which of my four questions you pose, composition studies is a less unified field than it was a decade ago. We

differ about what our courses are supposed to achieve, about how effective writing is best produced, about what an effective classroom looks like, and about what it means to make knowledge. If the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick volume reflects our current standing as a field, the various "sociocultural pedagogies" have become the center. Process has been deemphasized, although each axiology accommodates some version of it. Classroom practices are in dispute, but tending toward an emphasis on reading. If, however, the WPA Statement accurately reflects the views of program directors, then perhaps procedural rhetoric is dominant in reality though not in publications. But the actual question of what is good writing is more problematic than ever. Bob Broad, in *What We Really Value,* says that every department should spend at least a semester using a complex ethnographic procedure that leads to Dynamic Criteria Mapping in order to discover the multitude of "real" textual features it values, which can then be shared with students.

In *The Making of Knowledge in Composition,* Steve North asserted that "composition faces a peculiar methodological paradox: its communities cannot get along well enough to live with one another, and yet they seem unlikely to survive [. . .] without one another" (369). I suggest the paradox is now not just methodological, but axiological, pedagogical, and processual. If you think

> I suggest the paradox is now not just methodological, but axiological, pedagogical, and processual.

that is a dangerous situation, as North and I do, then early in the twentieth-first century, composition studies is in for a bumpy ride. Maybe Gary Olson was not just engaging in hyperbole when he told *Chronicle of Higher Education* writer Scott McLemee that "the field of composition studies is on the verge of 'what undoubtedly will come to be known as "the new theory wars"'" (A17).

Notes

1. The research leading to this paper was pursued with the help of a grant from the Texas A&M–Commerce Organized Research Committee during the spring of 2003. I thank the committee for its support.

2. There are also still plenty of current-traditionalist teachers. Their views don't appear in publications, but signs of their existence show up in anecdotes about papers being failed for comma errors, and in the continued sales of handbooks and workbooks. My best proof rests on studies of commenting practices carried out by several doctoral students in our program, using Richard Straub and Ron Lunsford's analytical model. They have collected marked papers from teachers in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, and used the teacher responses to infer teachers'

current-traditional values. In his most recent book, Straub in fact found the same thing. But this is probably no surprise. Current-traditional formalists you shall have always with you.

3. My argument will necessarily be based on indirect evidence: published scholarship, textbooks, a few organizational documents, and personal discussions. There is no available and current synthetic account of what goes on in college writing classrooms in the United States: the syllabi, writing assignments, readings, classroom procedures. Most observers presume that a disjunct exists between published theory and daily practice, with the practice being much less philosophically consistent than the scholarship. Although we have many ethnographic accounts of separate classrooms, we desperately need a comprehensive empirical study of what actually goes on nationwide.

4. As in the earlier volume, the final chapters are not so much "pedagogies" as considerations of important related issues: WAC and basic writing are in both; writing center pedagogy now replaces "tutorials"; and technology has become important enough to get a chapter of its own now, as does service-learning, whose philosophical basis is quite unclear.

5. I have deliberately chosen to omit from the list of perspectives several topics treated in both the Tate, Rupiper, and Schick and the Donovan and McClellan volumes: writing across the curriculum and basic writing, as well as service-learning and computers and composition. By leaving these topics out of my heuristic grid, I do not mean to imply they are unimportant. But I do not see them as constituting "approaches" to composition.

6. A vivid contrast between a CCS approach and a rhetorical (genre) approach results from looking at the work of John Trimbur. Diana George and he edited what is probably the first anthology for cultural studies, *Reading Culture,* now in its fifth edition (2004). The book has an introductory procedural chapter, "Reading the News," followed by thematic chapters pulling together materials on topics such as "Generations," "Schooling," and "Work." So it is no surprise that Tate, Rupiper, and Schick tapped the same two authors to write on cultural studies. In addition, Trimbur gets credit for the earliest use of the term "post-process" in print for his multiple review "Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process." Trimbur also coedited *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary* (1991) with Richard Bullock, and wrote "Cultural Studies and the Teaching of Writing" (1988). He also wrote one of the critical responses to Hairston, in fact. Based on such publications, one would presume Trimbur belongs to the "camp" of scholars who consistently support postmodern and post-process CCS approaches to composition. His scholarly credentials for such a role are impeccable.

Yet Trimbur has also questioned some CCS tenets: "I worry that postmodernism has based its authority on a kind of intellectual blackmail that makes it difficult to argue against the current climate of radical disbelief without sounding hopelessly naïve, unfashionable, and incipiently totalitarian" ("Composition Studies: Postmodern or Popular" 131). He further pushed to separate cultural studies from postmodernism, saying, "the notion of the popular revises the severe textualism of postmodernism." And he criticized postmodernists for commonly assuming that "the effective meanings of social texts can be deciphered from the constitutive surfaces of popular entertainment and mass-mediated culture by acts of critical reading" (127). He favorably cited Dave Morley saying, "[T]he meaning produced by the encounter of text and subject cannot be read off straight from its 'textual characteristics' or discursive strategies" (128).

In ironic contrast, Trimbur also wrote a more recent successful textbook, *The Call to Write* (1999 and 2002), which joins extensive treatments of writing as process with a series of chapters presenting argument genres, including chapters on the evaluative review, the recommendation proposal, and the report, plus the traditional library research project. He says the book treats "eight of the most familiar genres" (1st ed. 115), and sums up his rationale as follows: "Studying and experimenting with the eight genres can help you expand your repertoire of writing strategies so that you can respond flexibly and creatively to a range of situations that call on you to write" (115). The book was advertised as the first rhetoric written to conform to the composition outcomes from the WPA guidelines. The second edition actually reprints the guidelines in a chapter on "public documents" (203–05).

The chapters contain elaborate discussions of the "call" (exigency) that might produce a given genre, plus suggestions for audience analysis, process materials, and both student and professional example texts. There are, in addition, chapters on critical reading, on collaboration, and on writing essay tests. This book could scarcely be a greater contrast to *Reading Culture,* which gives students writing tasks such as the following:

> Read Barbara Kantrowitz and Keith Naughton's entire article in the November 12, 2001 *Newsweek.* Jot down your own account of what happened in your school or community immediately following 9/11. But don't stop there. Step back and ask, from your own perspective several years later, what the meaning of those events is. Write an essay that both describes what happened around 9/11 and what you now see as its meaning. (5th edition 81)

Note that neither genre nor audience is indicated, and no process advice given (here or anywhere in the book), other than "read" and "write."

Works Cited

Alcorn, Marshall W., Jr. *Changing the Subject: Discourse and the Constructions of Desire*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002.

Anderson, Charles M., and Marian M. MacCurdy, eds. *Writing and Healing: Toward an Informed Practice*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2000.

Annas, Pam. "Style as Politics: A Feminist Approach to the Teaching of Writing." *College English* 47 (1985): 360–71.

Axelrod, Rise B., and Charles R. Cooper. *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*. 4th ed. New York: St. Martin's, 1994.

Bakhtin, M. M. "The Problem of Speech Genres." *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. 60–102.

Barnett, Timothy. *Teaching Argument in the Composition Course: Background Readings*. Boston: Bedford, 2002.

Bartholomae, Donald. "Inventing the University." *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing Process Problems*. Ed. Mike Rose. New York: Guilford, 1985.

Bartholomae, Donald, and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton, 1986.

Bawarshi, Anis. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2003.

Berkenkotter, Carol, and Thomas N. Huckin, eds. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/ Culture/Power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1995.

Berlin, James. "Composition and Cultural Studies." *Composition and Resistance*. Ed. C. Mark Hurlbert and Michael Blitz. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1991. 47–55.

———. "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories." *College English* 44 (Dec. 1982): 765–77.

Berlin, James, and Michael Vivion, eds. *Cultural Studies in the English Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1992.

Berman, Jeffrey. *Risky Writing: Self-Disclosure and Self-Transformation in the Classroom*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2002.

Bishop, Wendy, and Hans Ostrom, eds. *Genre and Writing: Issues, Arguments, Alternatives*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1997.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. *Negotiating Difference: Cultural Case Studies for Composition*. Boston: Bedford, 1996.

Brand, Alice Glarden, and Richard L. Graves, eds. *Presence of Mind: Writing and the Domain beyond the Cognitive*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1994.

Broad, Bob. *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2003.

Bullock, Richard, and John Trimbur, eds. *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1991.

Burnham, Christopher. "Expressive Pedagogy: Practice/Theory. Theory/ Practice." Tate, Rupiper, and Schick 19–35.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction." *Form*

and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action. Ed. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Assn., 1977. 9–32.

Clark, Irene. *The Genre of Argument.* Fort Worth: Harcourt, 1998.

Colombo, Gary, Robert Cullen, and Bonnie Lisle, eds. *Rereading America: Cultural Contexts for Critical Thinking and Writing.* 2nd ed. New York: Bedford, 1992.

Connors, Robert. "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse." *CCC* 32 (Dec. 1981): 444–63.

Crusius, Timothy W., and Carolyn Channell. *The Aims of Argument.* 4th ed. Boston: McGraw, 2003.

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

Durst, Russel K. *Collision Course: Conflict, Negotiation, and Learning in College Composition.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1999.

Emig, Janet. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1971.

Emmel, Barbara, Paula C. Resch, and Deborah S. Tenney, eds. *Argument Revisited, Argument Redefined: Negotiating Meaning in the Composition Classroom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

Fahnestock, Jeanne, and Marie Secor. *A Rhetoric of Argument.* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw, 1990.

———. "Teaching Argument: A Theory of Types." *CCC* 34 (Feb. 1983): 20–30.

Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal." *College English* 48 (Oct. 1986): 527–42.

Faigley, Lester, and Jack Selzer. *Good Reasons.* 2nd ed. New York: Addison, 2003.

Fitts, Karen, and Alan W. France, eds. *Left Margins: Cultural Studies and Composition Pedagogy.* Albany: SUNY P, 1995.

Flower, Linda, and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *CCC* 32 (Dec. 1981): 365–87.

Foehr, Regina Paxton, and Susan A. Schiller, eds. *The Spiritual Side of Writing: Releasing the Learner's Whole Potential.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1997.

Foss, Sonya. *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1989.

Freedman, Aviva, and Peter Medway, eds. *Learning and Teaching Genre.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1994.

Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition in the Eighties." *CCC* 41.4 (Dec. 1990): 409–29.

———. "*Newsweek* 'My Turn' Columns and the Concept of Rhetorical Genre: A Preliminary Study." *Defining the New Rhetorics.* Ed. Theresa Enos and Stuart Brown. Sage Series in Written Communication 7. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993. 227–43.

———. "Of Pre- and Post-Process: Reviews and Ruminations." *Composition Studies* 29.2 (Fall 2001): 93–119.

———. *Teaching the Argument in Writing.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1996.

———. "Technical Logic, Comp-Logic, and the Teaching of Writing." *CCC* 39 (Dec. 1988): 436–52.

George, Ann. "Critical Pedagogy: Dreaming of Democracy." Tate, Rupiper, and Schick 92–112.

George, Diana, and John Trimbur. *Reading Culture*. 5th ed. New York: Pearson, 2004.

Graff, Gerald. *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003.

Greenbaum, Andrea. *Emancipatory Movements in Composition: The Rhetoric of Possibility*. Albany: SUNY P, 2002.

Hairston, Maxine. "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." *CCC* 43 (May 1992): 179–93.

Heilker, Paul. *The Essay: Theory and Pedagogy for an Active Form*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1996.

Heimer, Carrie. "Forty-Eight Eyeballs." *What to Expect When You're Expected to Teach*. Ed. Anne Bramblett and Alison Knoblauch. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 2002. 11–14.

Hunt, Douglas. *Misunderstanding the Assignment: Teenage Students, College Writing, and the Pains of Growth*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 2002.

Hurlbert, C. Mark, and Michael Blitz. *Composition and Resistance*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1991.

Hyland, Ken. "Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social Response to Process." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12 (2003): 17–29.

Jolliffe, David, Michael Keene, Mary Trachsel, and Ralph Voss, eds. *Against the Grain: A Volume in Honor of Maxine Hairston*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2002.

Kent, Thomas. "Introduction." *Post-Process Theory: Beyond the Writing Process Paradigm*. Ed. Thomas Kent. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999.

Levin, Harry. *Prose Models: An Inductive Approach to Writing*. New York: Harcourt, 1964.

Lunsford, Andrea A., and John Ruszkiewicz. *Everything's an Argument*. Boston: Bedford, 1999.

McLemee, Scott. "Deconstructing Composition: The 'New Theory Wars' Break Out in an Unlikely Discipline." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 21 Mar. 2003. A16–A17.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (May 1984): 151–67.

Murray, Don. "Writing as Process: How Writing Finds Its Own Meaning." Donovan and McClelland 3–20.

North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton, 1987.

Paley, Karen Surman. *I-Writing: The Politics and Practice of Teaching First-Person Writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2001.

Perl, Sondra. "Writing Process: A Shining Moment." *Landmark Essays on Writing Process*. Ed. Sondra Perl. Davis, CA: Hermagoras, 1994. xi–xx.

Porter, Jim. *Audience and Rhetoric*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1992.

Ramage, John, John Bean, and June Johnson. *Writing Arguments*. 6th ed. New York: Pearson, 2004.

Rottenberg, Annette T. *Elements of Argument*. 6th ed. Boston: Bedford, 2000.

Shor, Ira. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.

Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *CCC* 31 (Dec. 1980): 378–88.

Spellmeyer, Kurt. *Common Ground: Dialogue, Understanding, and the*

Teaching of Composition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1993.

Straub, Richard. *The Practice of Response: Strategies for Commenting on Student Writing.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2000.

Straub, Richard, and Ronald Lunsford. *Twelve Readers Reading: Responding to College Student Writing.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 1995.

"Students' Right to Their Own Language." Spec. issue of *CCC* 25 (Fall 1974).

Tate, Gary. "Empty Pedagogical Spaces and Silent Students." Fitts and France 269–73.

Tate, Gary, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick, eds. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies.* New York: Oxford, 2001.

Tobin, Lad. "Process Pedagogy." Tate, Rupiper, and Schick 1–18.

Trimbur, John. *The Call to Write.* 1st and 2nd eds. New York: Longman, 1999, 2002.

———. "Composition Studies: Postmodern or Popular." *Into the Field: Sites of Composition Studies.* Ed. Anne Ruggles Gere. New York: MLA, 1993. 117–32.

———. "Cultural Studies and the Teaching of Writing." *Focuses* 1.2 (1988): 5–18.

———. "Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process." *CCC* 45.1 (1994): 108–18.

Trimbur, John, and Diana George. "Cultural Studies and Composition." Tate, Rupiper and Schick 71–92.

Trimbur, John, et al. "Reply to Maxine Hairston: Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." *CCC* 44.2 (1993): 248–55.

Weisser, Christian R. *Moving beyond Academic Discourse: Composition Studies and the Public Sphere.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002.

Williams, Joseph M., and Gregory G. Colomb. *The Craft of Argument* 2nd ed. New York: Addison, 2003.

"WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 23.1/2 (Fall/Winter 1999): 59–66.

Young, Richard. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." *Research on Composing: Points of Departure.* Ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1978. 29–47.

Richard Fulkerson

Richard Fulkerson received his PhD from The Ohio State University in 1970 with a concentration in Victorian fiction. He took a full-time position at East Texas State University in Commerce (now Texas A&M–Commerce). He has spent his entire career there, and is currently director of English graduate studies and assistant to the department head. He has published articles in the *Dickensian,* the *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* the *Journal of Advanced Composition, Rhetoric Review,* and *College Composition and Communication.* He served one term on the executive committee of CCCC, and serves as a peer reviewer for five journals. In 1996 he published *Teaching the Argument in Writing,* which became an NCTE bestseller. He is current at work on a critical history of ethnographic research in composition.