

California State University, San Bernardino

**CSUSB ScholarWorks**

---

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

---

2007

## The plenary address: A rhetorical analysis

William James Amrine

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Amrine, William James, "The plenary address: A rhetorical analysis" (2007). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3127.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3127>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

THE PLENARY ADDRESS: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in  
English Composition

---

by  
William James Amrine

March 2007

THE PLENARY ADDRESS: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

by  
William James Amrine  
March 2007

Approved by:

  
Jacqueline Rhodes, Chair, English

  
Sunny Hyon

  
Renee Pigeon

March 5, 2007  
Date

## ABSTRACT

While reviewing background about Mina Shaughnessy's book Errors and Expectations, I discovered a plenary address delivered in her honor. Since the address exhibited certain rhetorical patterns and features, a question arose: does the plenary address constitute a genre? Since further investigation yielded only limited research of the plenary address, and since the plenary possesses those components John Swales identifies as genre, "patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience" (Genre Analysis 58), this thesis presents a rhetorical analysis of the plenary address as a genre.

Four examples of the opening plenary were analyzed because they represent the opening plenary lecture-keynote speech type, the most common presented at conferences; they are analyzed for their rhetorical features, their moves and steps, which are then explicated in the thesis results and discussion. Swales' Create a Research Space (CARS) model for analyzing introductions to research articles was adapted as a framework for analyzing the moves and steps of the plenary address.

In addition, this thesis analyzes the plenary addresses' use of metatext, those linguistic variables

which convey to the hearers the speaker's intentions for meaning, signify the organizational relationships between prepositions, and alert the hearers to the speaker's attitude toward the address.

The analysis results indicate that the plenary address is a genre, exhibiting definite moves, steps and particular linguistic exponents and signals, which enable a speaker to advance the rhetorical purposes of a plenary's presentation to an audience of hearers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . . iii

CHAPTER ONE: THE PLENARY AS GENRE . . . . . 1

CHAPTER TWO: THE METHOD

    The Texts . . . . . 12

    Method of Analysis . . . . . 18

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS . . . . . 27

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION . . . . . 69

APPENDIX A: ROBERT LYONS: MINA SHAUGHNESSY AND  
            THE TEACHING OF WRITING . . . . . 88

APPENDIX B: VIRGINIA SMITH: KEYNOTE ADDRESS . . . . . 99

APPENDIX C: LESTER FAIGLEY: LITERACY AFTER  
            THE REVOLUTION . . . . . 108

APPENDIX D: ROBERT FUNK: THE UNEASY PARTNERSHIP  
            BETWEEN GRAMMAR AND  
            WRITING INSTRUCTION . . . . . 123

WORKS CITED . . . . . 132

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE PLENARY AS GENRE

The idea for this thesis began subtly; I had been reading Mina Shaughnessy's Errors and Expectations for a graduate course in composition theory, and during a search for additional commentary about her life and work discovered a plenary address delivered by Virginia Smith at a conference in Shaughnessy's honor. The address exhibited rhetorical patterns that made it possible to "hear" the address, a tonality that created an anticipation of certain rhetorical features. I began to wonder if other plenaries exhibit similar rhetorical patterns, and if so, does the plenary address constitute a genre of spoken and written text?

Further investigation yielded only limited research on the plenary address as a genre, a result conformed by Celia Shalom. She states, "Applied linguists have concentrated on the written forms of academic communication" and conceded that "far less research has been done on spoken research process genres" (37). Susan Hood and Gail Forey concur:

One of the key means by which knowledge is disseminated in the academic discourse community is the spoken presentation of papers at an academic conference. In contrast to the written research article, the spoken presentation remains relatively under-researched from a linguistic perspective,

limiting the knowledge available for explicating this kind of discourse in academic language programs [...]. (1)

Perhaps writing, and the written research article in particular, has been researched so thoroughly because it is the primary medium of academic communication and so precisely a "communicative event [...] in which language (and/or paralanguage) plays both a significant and an indispensable role" (Swales, Genre Analysis 45); however, writing may record the verbal utterances of a speaker, words spoken in a communicative event in which the event is "constituted entirely by talk" (Levinson, qtd. in Swales, Genre Analysis 45).

Within the sphere of academic discourse, such communicative proceedings "constituted entirely by talk" include a paper delivered at a conference, or a plenary address. Each communicative event, or proceeding, constitutes a genre in its own right; according to Celia Shalom, the conference paper is a "de facto genre" in that "the name itself" (the conference paper) "conjures up discursal expectations for members of the discourse community" (37).

Dell Hymes defines it thus: "The ethnography of speaking is concerned with the situations and uses, the patterns and functions of speaking as an activity in its own right" (16). In that regard, Hood and Forey base a study of the plenary



upon "a social semiotic theory of language (Systemic Functional Linguistics) and of gesture" (1) to explore interpersonal meaning in the plenary. Using for their data several plenary presentations at an academic conference, they combine attention to staging, expressions of attitude, and the co-expression of attitudinal language and gesture to explore how speakers "construe a relationship of solidarity with their audiences in the introductory or 'set-up' stage of their talk" (1). It appears that this study of the plenary has been the only one published to date.

This thesis will attempt a linguistic analysis of the plenary address as a genre, for it appears to meet the criteria posited by Amy Devitt. She states that genre has not been defined so much as it has been classified by its textual features and argues for a genre definition closer to Miller's, who defines genres as "'typified rhetorical actions based in recurrent situations'" (576).

Lloyd Bitzer also speaks to this definition when he says that rhetorical forms are created when "comparable situations occur, prompting comparable responses; hence rhetorical forms are born and a special vocabulary, grammar, and style are established." Because they recur and we experience them recurring, "a form of discourse is not only established but comes to have a power of its own—the tradition itself tends to function as a constraint upon any new response in the form" (13).

Thus, in a study of a set of plenaries, we expect to find rhetoric that recurs in the comparable situations of various academic conferences; and, we expect to find that the plenaries demonstrate typified textual features in their introductions, organization, conclusions, and textual features, including Bitzer's "special vocabulary, grammar, and style." If these expectations may be realized in this thesis, then we may conclude that plenaries do constitute an established form of discourse, and thus a genre.

Shalom states, "the whole research process, from initial conception of hypotheses through the experimental stage to final publication, can only wholly be understood as an interweaving of talking, working and writing" (37). Since a plenary is a verbal presentation of a written genre, she makes a "modest attempt at a taxonomy of academic conference research process genres" and thus to identify several plenary types: (1) the opening plenary lecture-keynote speech; (2) the sum-up or final plenary; and (3) the plenary lecture as pivot: a conference paper in "Book of Papers" or "Proceedings" (38). She asserts that "The plenary lecture is an established conference genre" and that any conference may have only an opening plenary, or it may have a number of plenaries, including one that closes the proceedings of the conference. She notes that the opening plenary, also called the keynote speech, "is often an overview or state-of-the-art presentation given by a leading scientist in the field" (38).

She further explains that "Plenary lectures may focus on a theme or important research directly related to the day's topic" and that such "may last for between 40 minutes to an hour" (38).

While delivered as speech events "constituted entirely by talk," plenaries are also written discourse, delivered from either notes or written manuscript, and they may later be published in an academic journal. As Hood and Forey point out, "In most instances [...] the oral performance is strongly associated with the development of a parallel written text" (2). The authors maintain that the parallel of spoken and written text means that a plenary will reflect many of the features found in research writings, a circumstance that suggests the use of a model for analyzing those features.

This thesis, a rhetorical analysis, purports to analyze four examples of a genre of academic discourse that records a specific communicative event, the plenary address, which Shalom describes as "the opening plenary," also called the keynote speech. Four addresses will be analyzed for their rhetorical features, particularly their moves, steps and metatext, which are explicated in the section that follows.

In Genre Analysis, Swales states that "a genre-centered approach gives particular attention to the rhetorical organization of texts [...]" (85). He explains that our prior knowledge of texts "not only interprets facts and concepts

but also calls up interactive procedures or routines" (83-4). In discussing the work of Swales, Vijay Bhatia identifies these interactive procedures or routines as "moves," a term Swales used as early as 1981 (Genre Analysis 140) and defined in Research Genres (2001) as "a discursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse" which "can be realized by a clause (or by) several sentences" (228-9).

Building upon the definition of moves, Bhatia discusses the "move structure," a type of cognitive structure that promotes "an effective and successful accomplishment of the communicative purpose of the genre at various levels." He explains that "the notion of cognitive move-structure [...] can be widely used for a variety of genres, (but) it may not always be applicable to all of them. The idea is to interpret the regularities of organization in order to understand the rationale for the genre" (32).

For the purposes of analyzing the plenary address as a speech event, the "move structure" will be referred to as moves and steps; they may be viewed as behavior-regulating and, by means of linguistic exponents and signals, as a means of preparing the participant for understanding the structure of the speech event. That is, the speaker of the plenary addresses "an audience in time and in place," and thus the speaker experiences a "pressure in the other direction, towards a more interactive text, as the writer shapes the

message in ways intended to connect with the immediate context" (Hood and Forey 2). Thus, moves and steps may be viewed as rhetorical routines a speaker uses to "inter)act interpersonally with their audience, to set-up a relationship of solidarity," so that the address becomes a speech event wherein speakers employ discourse strategies "to resolve inherent tensions and to construe a relationship of solidarity or rapport with their audience" (2). How these discourse strategies function will be examined in more detail in Chapter Four of this thesis.

U. K. Ahmad states that another way of understanding behavior-regulating routines is to examine "the relationships between forms and functions by giving the common or typical linguistics exponents and signals" of a text (276-7). The research of Swales helps us understand Ahmad's linguistics exponents and signals. Swales shows that the discourses of research articles' introductions contain various rhetorical moves, and he postulates a series of move and step patterns he calls, "Create a Research Space," or the "CARS" model, which will be useful in analyzing the plenary for its "linguistics exponents and signals" (Genre Analysis 140-142) and will be examined in Chapter Two.

Rhetorical moves and steps are organized and signaled by the use of metadiscourse. As E. Moreale and M. Vargas-Vera write:

Textual metadiscourse refers to devices allowing

the recovery of the writer's intention by explicitly establishing preferred interpretations; they also help form a convincing and coherent text by relating individual propositions to each other and to other texts. Interpersonal metadiscourse alerts readers to the author's perspective towards both the information and the readers themselves: it therefore expresses a writer's persona. (5)

However, a simpler definition of metadiscourse is "Writing about writing, whatever does not refer to the subject matter being addressed" (Joseph M. Williams, qtd. in Vande Kopple, 1985:82). William J. Vande Kopple constructs seven classifications of metadiscourse, explaining that a writer uses it to "help our readers organize, classify, interpret, evaluate, and react to [propositional content]" (82-3). The list below indicates that he grouped metadiscourse into textual and interpersonal types. Textual metadiscourse provides textual cohesion and define unfamiliar words; interpersonal metadiscourse describes interpersonal functions, which show an author's attitudes as he or she attempts to establish a relationship with readers. In the case of the plenary address, the speaker uses metadiscourse to help in the resolution of inherent rhetorical tensions and establish a relationship with the audience.

## Vande Kopple's Seven Kinds of Metadiscourses

### Textual

1. Connectives—reveal organization and intertextuality. Examples: "first," "next," "however," "as I noted in Chapter One."
2. Code Glosses—parenthetical definitions within sentences.

### Interpersonal

3. Illocution Markers—identify discourse acts. Examples: "I hypothesize that," "to sum up," "we claim," "for example," "we conclude," "we recommend."
4. Validity markers—assess the probability of truth of the propositional content.
  - a. hedges—"perhaps," "may," "might," "often," "usually," "apparently."
  - b. emphatics—"clearly," "undoubtedly," "it is obvious that," "of course," "very," "crucial."
  - c. attributors—"according to Einstein."
5. Narrators—let readers know who said what. Example: "Mrs. Jones said . . ."
6. Attitude Markers—reveal attitudes of writer toward propositional content. Examples: "surprisingly," "unfortunately."
7. Commentary—direct comments to the reader.

Examples: " The reasons for these choices are simple...", " Most of you will oppose the idea that ...."

Luming R. Mao calls Vande Kopple's classifications "metadiscourse markers," pointing out that metadiscourse, like primary [propositional] discourse, "is capable of conveying both the illocutionary [the author's intended meaning] and the perlocutionary [the effect of her intended meaning] force depending on, for example, its audience, communicative purpose and its given situations," and thus "it is therefore implausible to designate one type of discourse as being primary and the other type as being secondary when both types fulfill the same kind of communicative functions" (266-7).

Anna Mauranen reduces Vande Kopple's seven classifications of metadiscourse to four and calls metadiscourse "metatext," which functions to "organize and comment on the discourse, particularly the propositional content that is being conveyed [guiding] the readers with respect to how the text is organized, to what functions the parts of it have," and how the author views those propositions, his or her attitudes toward them (9). Mauranen's four classifications of metatext appear as recurring word or phrase patterns within the text (connectors, action markers) and as clauses that indicate



reviews of earlier stages of text or previews of anticipated text (9-10).

Applied to the genre of the plenary address, metatext indicates something of the conventions of the speech event: "A vast portion of verbal behavior in fact consists of recurrent patterns, of linguistic routines, [and the] analysis of routines includes identification of idiomatic units [...] the full range of utterances which acquire conventional significance, for an individual, group or whole culture" (Hymes 41-2). As a text-level linguistic variable, metatext "plays an important role in rhetorical strategies" (Mauranen 7); thus, as patterns within the plenary address, metatext helps to further the purposes of the address as a speech event.

The literature presents some research into the plenary's rhetorical forms, Shalom has suggested a classification of its different types, and Swales' CARS model is adaptable for analysis of the plenary's rhetorical moves. In concert with metatextual analysis, the adapted CARS model provides the method for a rhetorical analysis of the plenary as a genre by examining plenary addresses given at conferences and published in scholarly journals. Chapter Two will present four texts of plenaries and explicate the method used for their rhetorical analyses.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE METHOD

#### The Texts

For this project I selected four texts representative of the genre of the plenary address: Robert Lyons's "Mina Shaughnessy and the Teaching of Writing," and Virginia B. Smith's "Keynote Address," both from the Third Annual Conference of the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors, a conference dedicated to Mina Shaughnessy and her work; Lester Faigley's "Literacy after the Revolution," a plenary given as the Chair's Address at the 1996 College Composition and Communication Convention, March 1996; and Robert Funk's "The Uneasy Partnership between Grammar and Writing Instruction," a keynote address given at the 1994 Annual Conference of the NCTE Assembly for the Teaching of English Grammar. (All are found in their full text versions in the Appendices of this thesis.)

I selected these specific plenaries for several reasons. First, they are of the type Shalom presents in her taxonomy as the opening plenary lecture-keynote speech. Second, they were delivered in conferences dedicated to the professional community of teachers of rhetoric and writing, and yet they represent three different organizations: one regional (Third Annual Conference of the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors) and two national, the CCCC and the NCTE.

Finally, they present a variety of topics within the field of rhetoric and composition. Lyon's address centers upon Shaughnessy's work with basic writers, Smith presents a pedagogy, Faigley calls attention to forces that act upon writing teachers' success, and Funk discusses the conflicts between two camps of professional teachers. While this selection restricts the analysis to plenaries that address a select body of professional academics, it does present an opportunity for close examination of the linguistic nuances of plenaries presented to those professionals, and of the variety of rhetorical strategies in the speakers' moves and steps. On the other hand, it does ignore those plenaries in other fields (such as science and technology) most likely to meet Shalom's description of the plenary as a "state-of-the-art presentation given by a leading scientist in the field" (38), but these are not the focus of this study.

Here I briefly summarize the themes of each plenary. At the conclusion of the summaries, I analyze each for its rhetorical moves and steps and use of metatext. This is presented in the Method of Analysis section. There I examine the work of Swales and others to establish a working definition of moves and steps, and there I also outline the definition and function of metatext as presented by Mauranen and others.

In "Mina Shaughnessy and the Teaching of Writing," Lyons makes immediate reference to Shaughnessy's Errors and

Expectations; he suggests that the book is the work of an "academic revolutionary" (90) and explores that idea in its relationship to basic writers. As he reviews the book's emphasis upon the basic writer as an intelligent person, one who makes errors in writing due to errors in logic, he notes how Shaughnessy's attempts to create new instructional methods to teach basic writers "transforms the way a teacher would perceive and therefore respond to the work of basic writing students" (92). He asserts that her work would not accept the "false" distinction between those who advocated the rights of the non-traditional student (granted status through Open Admissions at CUNY) and those who would uphold and maintain academic standards; her work upheld the academic tradition, accepting "without condescension a new kind of student within that tradition" (93). Lyons concludes by describing Shaughnessy's commitment to academic discourse and the transformation of the way teachers see and judge what they do in working with basic writers; in that, he notes, Errors and Expectations is truly the work of an academic revolutionary.

Smith's "Keynote Address" opens by honoring Shaughnessy, noting Smith's professional relationship to her, and presenting three beliefs, or values, that motivated Shaughnessy's work: "teaching makes a difference [...] the individual is important, and [...] literacy is power" (100). Developing the first value, "teaching makes a difference,"

she outlines Shaughnessy's approach to the basic writer, one that called for a development of a "pedagogy for illiteracy" which would recognize "the relationship of expectation to learning" (101). She urges her listeners to question the sincerity of legislative efforts for programs, to question levels of expectations for student performance, and to question "cynicism about our powerlessness as individuals" (102). In developing the second value, "the individual is important," Smith stresses the value of small grants support to many participants as a way of addressing individual students' needs. She describes how Shaughnessy urges action for the individual student within the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). Developing the third value, "literacy is power," Smith cites Shaughnessy's concern for "appropriate vocabularies to articulate concepts," urging her audience to equip students with the writing skills and vocabularies so needed by a society increasingly technological and computer literate (105-6). Smith concludes with a call for respecting the needs of students to address writing, vocabulary and bilingualism, and she relates those needs to maintaining standards of literacy that will empower individuals for democracy and shared values, concern and solutions for problems (106-7).

Lyons and Smith's discussion of matters important to the teaching of the basic writer reflect themes found in the

plenaries by Faigley and Funk. Faigley's 1997 address to the CCCC reflects upon the development of rhetoric and composition as a specialization within the teaching of English in universities. He believes that within the practice of the discipline "institutional power could be challenged and [...] students who had been labeled as deficient could succeed" (110). He recognizes the diversity of writing students and believes that "composition teachers were better situated than anyone to adapt to their needs" (110).

Building on that claim, he presents his perception of the state of rhetoric and discipline in the mid-1990s as having limitations imposed upon it by institutions that would "replicate the traditional forms of academic and professional discourses" (111). He laments the high percentage of writing courses taught by part-time faculty enduring "uncertain employment, heavy workloads, poor pay, nonexistent benefits" and so on (111). He uses this perception to move into "how larger forces of change," the revolution of the rich and the digital revolution, affect writing teachers' perceptions of themselves and the teaching of writing (112).

Faigley says the revolution of the rich results in politicians, often unfamiliar with higher education, ordering colleges and universities to make sweeping changes. He contends that these same politicians are responsible for eroding "tax dollar support for higher education" at a pace outstripping "huge tuition and fee increases" (114).

Then he asserts that the digital revolution, which has created a proliferation of computers and the internet, generates challenges to the teaching of writing and creates questions about the equality of student access to digital technologies. Faigley responds to the challenges by calling upon writing teachers to unite in the formation of alliances, of organization, of "[situating] their activities within the contexts of the larger profession as well as the contexts of economic and political concerns" (121).

Faigley's call for unity echoes a theme in the plenary by Funk, "Keynote Address: The Uneasy Partnership between Grammar and Writing Instruction." Funk contends that "an important professional partnership does exist between teachers of grammar and teachers of writing" (124) yet it is strained, even "hostile," due to the controversy over the teaching of grammar, especially the "best methods" by which practitioners are to achieve the goal of basic language instruction (125). Funk outlines the nature of the controversy, discusses the reasons for it, and elaborates upon a related and fundamental issue: whether meaningful work occurs in the colleges and universities' literature departments or composition departments (126-7). He asks if the teaching of grammar is a "throwback" to the kind of education many composition teachers have been trying to reform (128). Funk's proposal, his call to action, is the imperative that practitioners must develop a functional

grammar: "inductive, actively analytical stimulating, and discovery-based." (130).

#### Method of Analysis

As a feature of genre analysis, organization helps us understand the purpose of the speech event and enables us to examine the correlation of the form of the speech event to its function. As previously noted, Swales helped clarify the form-function correlation with his moves analyses, which identify in genre analysis those discursal or rhetorical units that perform "a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse" (Research Genres 228).

#### Moves and Steps

Swales' CARS model may be useful for an interpretation of the regularities of organization. Although it was designed for use with a written discourse and may not be appropriate for analysis of all genres or completely adaptable for an analysis of the moves in a speech event, the CARS model is a useful starting point for examining the organization of the rhetorical elements within the plenary address. Swales' moves (supported by various sub-moves, or steps, which are strategies for completing the purpose of the moves) enable the writer of the research article to establish a territory within the research field of the discipline being researched, establish a niche within that territory, and then occupy the niche:



the need to re-establish in the eyes of the discourse community the significance of the research field itself; the need to 'situate' the actual research in terms of that significance; and the need to show how this niche in the wider ecosystem will be occupied and defended. (Swales, Genre Analysis 140-142).

### Swales' CARS Model

Move 1 Establishing a territory

Step 1 Claiming centrality and/or

Step 2 Making topic generalization(s) and/or

Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research

Move 2 Establishing a niche

Step 1A Counter-claiming or

Step 1B Indicating a gap or

Step 1C Question-raising or

Step 1D Continuing a tradition

Move 3 Occupying the niche

Step 1A Outlining purposes or

Step 1B Announcing present research

Step 2 Announcing principal findings

Step 3 Indicating Research Article structure

Several of the moves appeared similar to what a speaker does when presenting a plenary to a conference, and I began to use the CARS model as a reference while I examined several plenaries for other possible moves. In the process I

discovered that two moves and several steps of the CARS model did contribute directly to examining the relationship between form and function of various rhetorical elements of the plenary address. These I incorporated with the moves and steps I discovered and constructed the following:

A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine)

Move 1: establishing the speaker's role

Step 1 acknowledging the role

Step 2 stating the purpose of the conference

Step 3 listing credentials

Move 2: statement of theme/topics of the address

Move 3: developing the topic

Step 1 raising a question(s)

Step 2 indicating a need

Step 3 announcing findings

Move 4: call to action

Swales explains that the researcher writing the introduction to the research article attempts to demonstrate that his or her research is needed to fill a gap in the body of research extant at the time of writing, "to re-establish in the eyes of the discourse community the significance of the research field itself" (Genre Analysis 142). Those familiar with Swales' work may recognize that his CARS model Move 2, Step 1B, "indicating a gap," suggests the second step of Move 3, indicating a need, in A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine). In the plenary, this move

indicates issues to be addressed, situations to be remedied, or research to be done; all of these may be offered as the goal for taking action.

The CARS model also contains Step 1C of Move 2, question-raising. Swales describes it as "the need to 'situate' the actual research" in terms of its significance to the research field" (Genre Analysis 142). This step is similar to the plenary's Move 3 Step 1, raising a question, wherein the speaker questions the effectiveness of existing academic practices or the quality of research in a particular academic field of study.

Finally, in A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine), the third step of Move 3, announcing findings, resembles the CARS model Move 3, Step 2 "Announcing principal findings," which Swales describes as "the need to show how this niche in the wider ecosystem will be occupied and defended" (Genre Analysis 142). In terms of the plenary address, announcing findings again appears often as a statement of existing circumstances within the field of focus, and the findings suggest what needs doing to address those circumstances, remedy them, or take action for or against them.

The preceding comparisons of the CARS model moves and steps with those of the plenary address indicate that the moves and steps of the CARS model are not a precise match to the individual moves and steps of A CARS Model Adaptation for

Plenary Addresses (Amrine). Specifically, announcing findings, step 3 of Move 3 of Amrine's model, is not presenting the same kinds of rhetorical routines found in the CARS model with the Step of the same name. Because CARS attempts to account for the rhetorical movement in article introductions, the "findings" will be the result of research development. In the model adaptation for plenary addresses, "findings" will often take the form of conclusions about the state of affairs in the field under discussion, usually with an accompanying call to action designed to address a need indicated earlier in the plenary.

Thus, by applying the adaptation of various moves and steps of Swales' CARS model to a new model (Amrine) for analysis of the rhetorical organization and development of the plenary address, I discerned from careful re-readings that the plenary texts I selected for this study shared a number of similar moves and steps. These appeared in the plenaries generally in the order indicated in A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine).

#### Metatext

Following the analysis of the texts' organization, each text will be analyzed for its use of metatext. When metatext is spoken, as in a plenary address, it can be identified as recurring patterns which are behavior regulating and which prepare the audience, as participants in the convention address, to understand the structure of the speech event.

Metatext will be analyzed using the subtypes list (connectors, previews, reviews and action markers) provided by Mauranen (9-10) and presented in that order.

Mauranen's first type, the connectors, helps organize the text of written discourse, indicating relationships between propositions (9). An analysis of this metatext in the texts selected for this study, and presented in Chapter Three, demonstrates that in the plenary address, connectors function in much the same way, organizing the relationships between rhetorical propositions and functioning to hold the narrative together by marking important transitions. These uses may include the rhetorical functions of (1) contrasting or linking propositional material, (2) outlining the purposes of the address, (3) placing an emphasis upon the previous propositional material, and (4) indicating contrasting ideas. For the purposes of this study, the connectors will include not only the conjunctions and adverbial and prepositional phrases which Mauranen identifies but also a type of "text connective" (connector) that Vande Kopple identifies: those that enumerate or indicate a sequence, such as the adjectives first, next, and so on (83).

According to Mauranen, reviews function in the text as a clause indicating to the reader that "an earlier stage of the text is repeated or summarized" (10). In the plenary address, the review functions similarly. An analysis of the use of this move in the texts selected for this study, and

presented in Chapter Three, demonstrates that the review may include a number of rhetorical functions: (1) indicating to the hearer that an earlier element of the address is repeated or summarized, (2) referring to an earlier point of the address, (3) recalling the key ideas of the address, (4) concluding a discussion, (5) or calling upon the hearer to review his or her experiences outside of the immediate experience of hearing the plenary address.

In written discourse, the preview functions as a clause indicating "an explicit indicator that a later stage of the text is being anticipated" (Mauranen 10). In the plenary address, the preview builds anticipation for the next rhetorical move. An analysis of the use of this move in the texts selected for this study, and presented in the Results section, demonstrates that the preview may include a number of rhetorical functions, which include (1) introducing a quote, (2) previewing topics, (3) anticipating an explication of a key point or points of the topic, (4) anticipating or introducing the theme and topics of the address, (5) moving the hearer from one topic to topic another, (6) anticipating or introducing propositional content, (7) or restating a theme and/or re-listing the topics.

The fourth use of metatext I will consider is Mauranen's designation of the action marker. For written discourse, action markers function as "indicators of discourse acts performed in the text," with examples such as "the

explanation is," "to illustrate," and so on (Mauranen 10). Given that Mauranen's definition of the action marker refers to text, yet the plenary address is initially delivered as spoken discourse (and secondarily as written discourse), I suggest a shift in the definition of action marker:

"Indicators of discourse acts performed in the address." An analysis of the use of this move in the texts selected for this study, which I present in the Results section, demonstrates that the action marker may include a number of rhetorical functions, which include an indication that quotes will be explicated in the lines that follow, that discourse acts in the address are imminent, and to indicate discourse that discusses propositions new to the address.

Where they occur, I also include evidentials in the analysis. As metatext, evidentials are attitudinal, revealing something of how the speaker feels about the topics of the address. While Mauranen does not elaborate upon this function of metatext, Ellen Barton has written extensively upon it. She uses Vande Kopple's validity markers, "which 'express our view of the validity of the propositional material we convey,'" and attitude markers, "which 'reveal our attitude toward the propositional content'" (745). She notes that validity markers include hedges like "perhaps," emphatics like "clearly," and attributors like "according to," whereas attitude markers includes phrases like "surprisingly" and "I find it interesting that." She asserts

that "linguists unite these validity and attitude markers under the term evidentials" (745-6).

Barton has held that "English does not have a specific grammatical category of evidentials" but that several "optional, nonpropositional constructions can function as evidentials": She lists (1) modals like "must" or "should"; (2) sentential adverbs like "possibly", "normally" and "undoubtedly"; (3) sentence-initial conjunctions like "but"; (4) prepositional phrases like "of course" and "in fact"; (5) and predications like "I believe that" and "X claims that" (745-6). Barton goes on to define the evidential as "a nonpropositional word or phrase used to express an attitude toward knowledge" (746). In this study, I indicate those occurrences in the plenary address where an evidential indicates strongly the speaker's attitude toward the topics of the address. They will be noted only as they occur within the four types of metatext listed by Mauranen.

Having examined the texts of the plenaries and the method used for analysis of the plenary as genre, we now turn our attention to the results of the analysis.



## CHAPTER THREE

### RESULTS

As I discuss the results of my analysis of the plenaries, I hope to demonstrate that the moves and steps of A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine) contribute to the progression of each plenary's rhetoric: establishing the speaker's role, stating the purpose of the conference, presenting the theme and topics of the address, developing each topic, and concluding with the call to action. I will argue that all four plenaries share the moves given above; that certain steps are emphasized more strongly in some plenaries than in others; and that some steps may not be explicitly stated, but simply implied.

#### Move 1

In each plenary the opening paragraphs contain a move similar to Swales' CARS model, wherein the writer of the research article establishes his or her territory by claiming centrality (Move 1, Step 1), "whereby members [of the discourse community] are asked to accept that the research about to be reported is part of a lively, significant or well-established research area" (Genre Analysis 144). Thus, I call Move 1 "establishing the speaker's role," for the speaker seems to be "claiming centrality" in the plenary address as a speech event. Within this move, at least three steps make it possible to describe the move's "coherent

communicative function" (Swales, Research Genres 229) in more detail: acknowledging the speaker's role, stating the purpose of the conference, and listing credentials all appear to be the speaker's attempt to establish territory. All three steps occur in close proximity within each of the addresses, even in the same paragraph in three of the four, as in Lyon's address. It begins with acknowledging the role, "I am particularly honored to be asked to speak on this occasion-, " which is followed by stating the purpose of the conference, "dedicated to Mina Shaughnessy and her work," and listing the speaker's credentials, offered as anecdotes about Shaughnessy that only a professional colleague would know: "Mina herself liked conferences," ending with details of that liking (3).

As in Lyon's plenary, Smith's address quickly establishes the speaker's role with acknowledging the role, "I appreciate the opportunity to be here today," followed by stating the purpose of the conference, "it honors Mina Shaughnessy" and listing credentials, "Mina and I crossed paths a number of times. " Then Smith makes references to the speaker's (Smith's) solicitation of Shaughnessy as a counselor and member of a board (FIPSE) to which the speaker belonged (100).

In "Literacy After the Revolution," Faigley establishes his speaker's role with the acknowledgement, "One of the traditions of the CCCC Chair's address is to narrate an anxiety dream" (109). The statement has the effect of

reminding the audience that he honors a tradition: the CCCC Chair opens the conference by presenting the plenary. Then he establishes the purpose of the conference by reminding the hearers of previous addresses, "like reading a personal history of the field [of rhetoric and composition]" (109). Finally he lists his credentials by naming those aspects of his career he never planned to attain: "an English major [...] PhD [...] college teacher [...] chair of CCCC" (109).

Funk establishes his role as the speaker immediately. He begins the address, "I want to use as my title [...]" and establishes his credentials with "So I chose instead, a more pedestrian title" (124). These clauses seem to demonstrate his control of the material and his right to speak before his hearers. In that same introductory paragraph, he affirms the purpose of the conference, which is also a theme: to explore "the link between grammatical knowledge and writing competence that I'm going to be discussing today" (124).

Clearly, the plenaries share Move 1, which establishes the speaker's role; three steps extend the move by acknowledging the speaker's role, stating the purpose of the conference, and listing the speaker's credentials.

## Move 2

Once the speaker's role is established, each plenary appears to move on to presenting the body of the address. To analyze the body, I reviewed again Swales CARS model Move 1,

Step 2, Making topic generalizations and/or Step 3, Reviewing previous research (Genre Analysis 140-142).

Move 1 Establishing a territory

Step 2 Making topic generalization(s) and/or

Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research

In the research introductions that Swales studies, Making topic generalizations and/or Reviewing previous research are steps that "generally fall into two categories: statements about knowledge or practice, or statements about phenomena" (Genre Analysis 146). The former "express in general terms the current state of the art—of knowledge, of technique [...] or further requirements for further progress. The second group of topic generalizations refers to phenomena [...] (in which) there is a strong tendency [...] to establish territory by emphasizing the frequency and complexity of the data" (146). These categories (statements about knowledge or practice, and statements about phenomena) seem to find development in the plenary addresses that are the focus of this study. I found in each plenary a move similar to Swales' Move 1, Steps 2 and 3. In A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine) these become Move 2, a statement of theme/topics of the address. More specifically, the statement of theme itself may be a type of the CARS model Move 2, Step 1C, Question-raising. In Lyons, for example, by raising the suggestion of Errors and Expectations being "the work of an academic revolutionary" (90), Lyons not only raises a key

question but also presents his theme within his plenary, that Shaughnessy's work is that of an academic revolutionary.

The theme is found in Lyons' Move 2, a statement of theme/topics of the address, paragraph 1, page 90: "The passage suggests that Errors and Expectations is the work of an academic revolutionary [...]." This move is followed by three topics of the address, which Lyons develops in the succeeding paragraphs: the book itself and its method, the word "academic" and how it would apply to the book, and a consideration of the word "revolutionary" and how it might apply to Shaughnessy's work and book. Thus, in presenting his statement of topics and theme of the address, Lyons makes a topic generalization about knowledge and practice, and what Lyons' audience knows about Shaughnessy's work and her practice of academics; what they do not know, Lyons will make known in the plenary.

Smith also makes topic generalization about knowledge and practice as she places move 2 in the last sentence of paragraph 2, page 100 and continues it into the next paragraph: "I thought I would talk about the broad values that motivated Mina's work and life [...]." Thus, for Smith the statement of theme itself appears to be a kind of CARS model Move 2, Step 1D, "continuing a tradition" as she lists Shaughnessy's three beliefs: "teaching makes a difference [...] the individual is important, and [...] literacy is power" (100). These beliefs constitute a tradition of

teaching values that Smith and her hearers would like to continue, "but when we try to implement these values, they quickly lose ground to competing demands for resources, time and energy" (100). (Note that her use of the plural pronoun "we" is a way for her to establish a relationship with her hearers by including them in the implementation of Shaughnessy's values.) As Smith develops her plenary, she explores these beliefs in the three steps of Move 3: developing the topic, which will be discussed later.

In Faigley, Move 2, statement of theme/topics of the address begins after he shares his own journey to becoming the plenary speaker; he introduces his theme by making the claim for himself and his hearers that "more immediate were the positive experiences that we were teaching something quite valuable for our students' lives." Here he makes a topic generalization about a theme, the positive experiences of teaching, from which emerges a phenomena identified in these statements: "teachers also found spaces where institutional power could be challenged and where students who had been labeled as deficient could succeed" (110) and "We were in step with the new mission of colleges and universities to provide education for all who wanted it" (111).

To introduce his topic, Faigley emphasizes the frequency and complexity of the data. He notes that writing teachers "have run up against a multitude of institutional barriers

and attitudes that would limit writing instruction to teaching students to replicate the traditional forms of academic and professional courses" (111). Then he utilizes a step similar to Swales' CARS Model Move 2, Step 1b, Indicating a gap, by suggesting that writing teachers, such as his hearers, are no longer "riding the wave of history" (which is to "provide education for all who wanted it") and "instead are caught in a rip tide carrying us away from where we want to go" (111). The metaphor suggests a gap in practice, not a gap in research, and not one of the hearers' own makings; it leads him into the topic itself: "I'm going to talk today about how larger forces of change affect how we see ourselves and what we do" (111). He lists the subtopics as "a technological transformation called the digital revolution and [...] an economic, social and political transformation called the revolution of the rich" (112).

In Funk's introductory paragraph, wherein he states the purpose of the conference, to explore "the link between grammatical knowledge and writing competence that I'm going to be discussing today" (124), he also presents his theme. He moves immediately and directly into presenting his topic: "My thesis is quite straightforward, perhaps even obvious: I contend that an important professional partnership does exist between teachers of grammar and teachers of writing, and that we need to value and strengthen this partnership, if at all possible" (124). He follows the thesis with a further

qualification of the topic, "But that partnership is an uneasy one [...] 'downright hostile' is often closer to the truth--unfortunately" (124). Then he presents the "main points of the conflict" as described by the anti-grammarians and the pro-grammarians, and he asserts that "tak[ing] the emphasis off formal grammar and put[ting] it on functional grammar [...] has not brought the two sides together" (125).

### Move 3

Except for a concluding paragraph or paragraphs containing the call to action, the remaining text of each plenary is devoted to developing each topic; this occurs in Move 3. The speaker of the address promotes the topic development by a series of propositions, which in the written form of the address form the topic sentences of the paragraphs. However, within the text of Move 3 there exist three steps, which as rhetorical elements function to move the address forward by raising a question (or questions) the hearer is to consider (Step 1); indicating a need that the hearer is asked to recognize as existing within the province of the discourse community (Step 2); and announcing findings that support the topic being developed (Step 3).

The topic development of each plenary constitutes the bulk of the address, and in the written form constitutes many pages. In Lyons, the topic development begins at paragraph 2, page 92 through the continued paragraph that begins page 97. That span of text presents the three topics, the first



beginning with paragraph 2, page 90: "A central concern in Mina's work is represented in one phrase from the passage I just quoted: 'intelligent young men and women'." This sentence raises a question (Step 1 of Move 3) implied in the sentence below:

Many teachers and writers had been aware that young people who have not succeeded in mastering the traditional school skills are nevertheless intelligent and worthwhile human beings (Lyons 90).

The question implied is that teachers must find ways of developing the skills of the basic writer, but how does one do that?

Then, in paragraph 3, page 91, a possible use of Move 3, Step 3, announcing findings, begins a sentence on the sixth line:

It was clear from several essays on Open Admissions and from several letters to the Times that examples of unskillful writing by non-traditional students were considered a powerful weapon by those opposed to the broadening of public higher education [...].

Another finding occurs at the ninth line, page 92, "What it does do in a modest way is display her method."

In paragraph 3, page 92, Lyons develops the second topic, Shaughnessy's conception of "academic" as revolutionary as it applies to her work in Errors and Expectations: "And because it makes us see what we are doing

in a new way, Errors and Expectations can be called a revolutionary book." This topic development continues through paragraph one of page 94, "I've used Mina's comments on the features of academic writing quite extensively, because her book exemplifies and enacts all that she thought valuable in the academic mode" and culminates in the last few lines of page 95, "Errors and Expectations is an academic book in the sense that in its very language and structure and tone, it enacts the academic ideal." Shortly after, beginning paragraph 2 of page 96, Lyons develops the third topic, the sense of Errors and Expectations as "revolutionary" by cycling the topic development back to his original question, "[...] -is Errors and Expectations the testament of an academic revolutionary?" to create a rhetorical framing of the topics developed.

Within this text are several uses of Move 3, Step 3, announcing findings: beginning paragraph 3 of page 92, "At the same time, the book has virtually none of the attributes of academic books called revolutionary in the last decade"; beginning paragraph 1, page 93, "Instead, her work both as a person and as a writer extended an invitation to the non-traditional student [...] to become a member of the academic community"; beginning with "Mina did not finally have the opportunity to do this analysis in the full and systematic way she felt was necessary [...]" in the seventh line of page 94 and ending four lines later with "I would like to draw on

a few of her phrases here in order to convey her Baconian assumptions about academic writing [...]"; the beginning of paragraph 2, page 94, "As a result, the book is habitually classifying, even numbering, as a way of producing tentative order [...] in the interest of creating a more powerful and more inclusive theoretical models for teachers-[...]"; and in paragraph 1, page 95, the first sentence, "Errors and Expectations makes its claims on us, then, through the firmness and clarity of its discriminations [...] from the specific to the speculative." This development of the third topic concludes with the use of a Move 3, Step 1, raising a question, at paragraph 2, page 96. There, the theme of the address is restated as a question that begins, "I would like to return to my original question-is Errors and Expectations the testament of an academic revolutionary?"

Smith's Move 3, developing the topic, begins just after she lists, in paragraph 3 of page 100, the three beliefs that motivated Shaughnessy's work: "[...] that teaching makes a difference, that the individual is important, and that literacy is power." Thus, "teaching makes a difference" begins with another step of a move analogous to CARS model Move 2, Step 1B. She indicates a gap not in research but in practice: "[...] when we try to implement these values, they quickly lose ground to competing demands for resources, time, and energy." Then she begins to develop the topic, a move indicated by raising a question: "If we really believe

teaching makes a difference, why in higher education are we so preoccupied with gauging the potential ability of students to learn, rather than assessing our own abilities to teach?" (para. 1, pg. 101). The speaker's use of the question indicates an attitude of incredulity toward a current practice, invites the hearers to share in the speaker's incredulity, and asks the hearers to examine the paradox that the question implies. In addition, the use of the subordinated clause followed by the interrogative builds the hearer's anticipation and permits the parallel triple use of the clause, "Rarely do we hear [...]," to indicate that what the hearer will hear is rarely recognized or addressed.

In the fourth line Smith lists three sentences in a row that begin with the parallel clauses, "Rarely do we hear," which implies a need in higher education and thus marks the use of Step 2, indicating a need:

Rarely do we hear [professors] say, 'Send us students with great need, students who challenge our ability to reach and teach them.' Rarely do we hear that teaching is a craft we can learn, by a scholarly approach to pedagogy, just as we can learn by a scholarly approach to the development of cellular life or any other field of inquiry; and rarely do we hear that teaching underprepared young adults how to write may be a profound task, not a simple task.

Another Step 2 is used in paragraph 4, page 101 signaled by four clauses, two in parallel to frame the text "we expected") and two in the negative, nearly parallel: "not expecting [...] we did not" and "expecting little [...] we did not":

Believing in democracy, we expected that education would be a key element in our life, but not expecting much of women, we did not initially include them in any of our colleges; and expecting little of slaves, or fearing too much power from literacy, we did not teach slaves to read and write. It was overexpectation, however, which gave us the cruelest disappointment. We expected to teach everyone to read and to write [...] and to do it all overnight.

Smith indicates a need, which she implies in two clauses that follow the quote just given. She states, "[...] we are now adjusting our expectations downward," and "Our legislatures seem to be giving up on support for programs that aid the underprepared young adult." She indicates a need not to abandon high expectations or abandon support for basic writers.

The second topic, "the individual is important," is developed beginning with paragraph 1, page 102; a Step 1 functions there to introduce the topic by raising several consecutive questions, lines 4-5 ("Were we wrong in our

expectations [...]?) and lines 8-9 "What right have we to expect? What have we done to lead us to expect?"). The use of the word "expect" in the two questions echoes uses of the past tense "expected" and present participle "expecting," found in paragraph 4 on the previous page (101), which follows a paragraph that has as its topic sentence, "Mina saw clearly the relationship of expectation to learning," a reference to her principal work, Errors and Expectations. These questions move the hearer from topic one, teaching makes a difference, to topic two, the individual is important and can affect events:

Implicit in these questions is the assumption that what we do as individuals will alter the outcome, and this of course leads to the second value [...] that individuals are important, that what an individual does can have an impact [...]. (102)

At paragraph two Smith opens with a general statement offering a kind of counter-claim (refer to Move 2, Step 1A of the CARS model) that seems to negate the power of Shaughnessy's "the individual is important." She says, "The complexity of modern life makes it extremely easy for us to see that the individual no longer has any control over her own life [...]." This kind of counter-claiming Smith develops with additional generalizations, like "Cynicism about our powerlessness as individuals" and the prevalency of "acceptance of defeat" among "lower socio-economic groups and

[...] underprepared students." These generalizations are immediately reinforced by a Step 3, announcing findings: "Recent ACE statistics on freshman attitudes [...]." Then she adds a narrative about how to use effective funding of grants to counter the negation of individual importance by empowering individual students (para. 4, pg. 102). These rhetorical steps enable her to establish her niche (Move 2, CARS model), which in A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine) is part of Move 1, establishing the speaker's role; her credentials (Step 3 of Move 1) are reinforced by her reference to her connections with FIPSE, the agency funding the aforementioned grants.

On page 103 Smith uses two more steps of Move 3. A Step 3, announcing findings, begins the third line, "When last year's report on FIPSE [...] was released, we were all pleased to see that our system of choice had indeed paid off. Not only was FIPSE suggested as a model for other federal projects [...]." In the first sentence of paragraph 2, a Step 2, indicating a need, follows the Step 3, announcing findings: "Our response to the need for better secondary education [...] did not sufficiently consider the relationship between human problems and the need for solutions to those problems [...]" (103). Finally, she uses another Step 3 at the tenth line of that same paragraph, "A recent study suggests that bigger schools do not result in higher scholastic achievements [...]."

Smith's development of topic three, "literacy is power," appears at the first sentence of paragraph 1, page 104, which is a Step 2. While a need is not explicitly indicated, it is implied at the beginning of the paragraph: "Certainly, the necessity for writing is substantially reduced in modern society; it is even reduced in massive systems of higher education." The speaker implies that opportunities for writing must be provided, an implication made explicit by the middle of the paragraph: "When I was hiring (staff), [...] I discovered that many [...] had never written a paper"; it is emphasized at the end: "They had found a way to [...] earn a [...] degree, more often [a science degree] with no experience in writing."

Smith's developing the topic (Move 3) asserts the need for more student writing; she begins developing the third topic (literacy is power) by opening with a kind of review of previous assumptions about functional literacy, then indicating a gap of understanding in those assumptions: "But to think of that side of literacy as the only one needed by some is to deny to that portion of our population the real power of literacy" (para. 1, pg. 104,). Similar to the CARS model Move 2, Step 1B, "indicating a gap," her statement reflects Move 3, Step 2 of A CARS Model Adaptation for Plenary Addresses (Amrine) that constitutes a "gap in understanding." This move enables her to continue to "establish her niche" (Swales, Genre Analysis 141) as being



conversant with Shaughnessy's three beliefs, which form the basis for the three topics she develops in response to the theme.

The aforementioned topics also reflect the use of three more steps: on page 105, Smith has a Step 1 raising a question on the fourth line from the top of the page, "We must ask the question whether oral communication is by its very nature lacking in vigor, precision and depth [...]," but her next use, a Step 2, indicating a need, may also be a Step 3, announcing findings, for the second sentence of paragraph 1 appears to indicate a need and announce a finding: "Many of our college students fail to achieve satisfactory levels of writing [...] because they don't know the relevant vocabularies" (105).

Then, a clear indication of need (step 2) begins paragraph 3, line one: "For us as educators, then, the challenge is to equip our students not only with writing skills, but also with the ability to acquire future vocabularies." This step 2 is followed on page 105, paragraph 3, line 5, with a Step 3, announcing findings: "Today the United States [...] has the seventh or eighth largest Spanish-speaking population in the world."

From this finding Smith brings her topic development full circle to Shaughnessy's three beliefs, encapsulated in the idea that teaching empowers the individual through literacy: "[...] for it is empowerment that makes if possible

for us to share not only values, but concerns, and finally to move forward to shared solutions of our problems" (107).

Faigley does not reveal a Move 3, developing the topic, until page 3. There, he directly and simply states, "I'm going to talk today about how larger forces of change affect how we see ourselves and what we do." Then he moves on to a refinement of his topic: "I want to begin with the revolution of the rich" (111) and moves several pages later to this: "The revolution of the rich as been facilitated by another related revolution--the digital revolution of electronic communications technologies" (113). Both statements are introductions to announcing findings, but these in turn will raise questions about the action the hearers are to take: "Can we do anything to stop the decline in publicly supported education? Can we promote a literacy that challenges monopolies of knowledge and information? Can we use technology to lessen instead of widen social divisions?" (120).

In Faigley, the order of steps in Move 3 has been rearranged from the patterns in Lyons and Smith's plenaries. First, on page 120, he confirms a Step 1, raising a question: "The overriding question facing us as a professional organization is what do you do when the tide seems to be running against you?" I say "confirmed" here because the raising of the question does not appear early in the address or overtly, as it does in Lyons or Smith. It is offered in a

series of statements on the second page of the transcript in a way that implies the question, what are the forces that have brought the hearers to the convention? "After all, there are over 3,000 of us at this convention. Evidently some common forces brought us here. I only gradually became aware of these forces" (110).

The next two pages present these forces, and on the third page a Step 2 of Move 3, indicating a need, is presented thus: "[...] it no longer seems like we are riding the wave of history but instead are caught in a rip tide carrying us away from where we want to go" (111). The need is not overtly stated but implied: rhetoric and composition teachers need to identify the forces that are drawing them away from their role as teachers of writing so they may find ways to return to their purpose. Faigley twice confirms this implication at the end of the address: "What concerns me much more is whether we as a professional organization can sustain a shared sense of values when in many respects history is not on our side" (120), and "You have to look for opportunities to inform people about what you do. You have to practice what you preach and engage in public discourse. You have to form alliances [...] and look for common ground [...] to organize" (120).

Needs also imply findings, which in the research article are empirically verifiable and support the topic being developed. The needs implied above do not seem directly

related to any findings in the plenary, although one finding is suggested by the statement, "[...] college students often become more careful, critical and appreciative readers after a semester in a writing course" (119). Faigley does not offer the empirical evidence to support this finding, and his plenary devoted more effort to raising a question and indicating a need than to announcing findings.

Funk, having stated that teachers of grammar and teachers of writing have developed a "hostile" professional partnership, develops the topic by qualifying the factors of the conflict as he raises questions the hearers are to consider: practitioners still value grammar instruction as a part of basic literacy (125); many compositionists have abandoned the attempt to teach grammar (126), and the anti-grammar stance is political, in that the division between the literature and composition departments in universities has led to inequities in status, pay, teaching assignment choices and logistical support for teaching staff, with composition teachers being those "underpaid, underappreciated" who in turn "regard PhDs in literature as [...] ill inclined and ill suited to teach writing [...]" (127).

In the meantime, Funk announces findings that there has been a "steady growth of graduate programs in composition and rhetoric" and an accompanying growth in their status. However, the practitioners "regard the teaching of grammar as a throwback to the kind of education they have been trying to

reform" as they attempt to develop writing as a process that gives students "access" and "empowerment" in their educations (128). This step 3 leads Funk back to Step 1 of Move 3, raising a question. He asks, "So where does this leave us?" and moves into the rhetorical device of the "If [...] then" conditional clause pair: "If we want to improve the partnership [...] then [we must] support efforts to improve the status of writers teachers and increase the respect accorded scholarship in rhetoric and composition" (129). While this device implies a call to action (a Move 4, but see below), I suggest that Funk reiterates a question: "How do we 'support efforts to improve the status of writers and teachers and increase the respect accorded scholarship in rhetoric and composition?'"

The final move, the call to action, appears in the conclusion to the plenary to complete the moves and steps sequence. This statement asks the hearer of the address to respond to the "hearing" of the speaker's indication of a need with a subsequent commitment to action. For example, in Lyons' address the conclusion consists of the last two paragraphs of the text and the call to action move is found in the sentence, "Mina's writing suggests much that we ourselves can do in the future" (97). This sentence refers back to the second paragraph of the address, wherein he states, "[...] the chapter 'Expectations' which concludes the book should serve to define the obligations and mission of a

great urban university" (89). He then cycles the theme of Shaughnessy's work as "revolutionary" as he enumerates the "much that we ourselves can do" in paragraph 1, page 97, and thereby the audience's opportunity to "recognize and stimulate growth in writing skills among ill-prepared young adults, [...]; to utilize instruction that "can help recover lost time because, for these students, academic and economic pressures require rapid mastery [...]" ; and to expose the "inexperienced writer" to the "qualities of 'craftiness' and 'cunning'" experienced writers use to "gain the attention of an academic audience" (97).

In her conclusion Smith also uses the call to action move by drawing together all three topics in one paragraph. She inverts the order of their presentation from their original listing in paragraph 3, page 100. She foregrounds her call to action by making a rhetorical cycle back to the second sentence of paragraph 3, page 101: "Believing in democracy, we expected that education would be a key element in our life [...]." In her conclusion, she states, "[...] without the empowerment that literacy gives individuals there can be no democracy [...]." Finally, her inversion of the "three beliefs" from paragraph 3, page 100 brings the responsibility of teaching back to the hearer in the segment, "[...] it is empowerment that makes it possible for us to share not only values, but concerns" (107), a proposition that embodies her call to action move. The sharing of values

and concerns puts her squarely in the role of the speaker and the inclusion of the hearers in the "empowerment that makes it possible for us" grounds her there.

Faigley's call to action comes at the end of a long presentation of the changes the digital revolution has thrust upon the field of rhetoric and composition, how the field should respond to it, and what the response should be. He introduces the move with an evidential, "I don't think there is any big answer but there are some little ones" (120), and then he lists the responses, using the evidential clause "You have to" as an emphasis in parallel structure from sentence to sentence:

You have to look outward. You have to be smarter and more aware. You have to look for opportunities to inform people about what you do. You have to practice what you preach and engage in public discourse. You have to form alliances. You have to be more tolerant of your friends and look for common ground. You have to organize (120).

This same list identifies, by implication, the Move 3, Step 2 indicating a need, in that a call to action is a call to address a need; if, for example, the need is "to look outward," then by implication the corresponding call to action is to take the steps necessary "to look outward."

The call to action in Funk occurs, as it does in the other plenaries, at the end of the address. Funk uses the

rhetorical device of the "If [...] then" conditional clause pair to initiate the call to action: "If we want to improve the partnership [...] then [we must] support efforts to improve the status of writers teachers and increase the respect accorded scholarship in rhetoric and composition" (129). This device is followed by an evidential (discussed in Metatext) that signals a call to action. "I think we need to insist that all English majors [...] have training in rhetoric and language" (129) followed by another evidential continuing the call: "I think they should have more than a casual knowledge of the theories [...] and know something about the teaching of writing. It's my observation that all English majors are potential teachers [...]" (129). Funk follows this statement with a qualifier, "On a more practical level," followed immediately by another "If [...] then" conditional clause pair: "[...] I would suggest that if we want composition instructors to teach grammar as a tool for writing, then we need to supply them with efficient, effective procedures for doing so [...]" (130). He becomes very specific with the call to action: "We must work to develop a grammar for writers that is inductive, actively analytical, stimulating, and discovery-based." He follows with another "If [...] then" conditional clause pair, although the word "then" is merely implied: "If students are going to write better sentences [then] they must write a lot of sentences [...]" (130). The repetition of the rhetorical



devices of the evidential "I think" and the "If [...] then" conditional clause pair serves, I believe, to guide the hearers through the call to action. The evidential "I think" personalizes the call, perhaps achieving a continuation of what Hood and Forey refer to as the speaker employing a discourse strategy "to [inter]act interpersonally with their audience" and hopefully "to resolve inherent tensions and to construe a relationship of solidarity or rapport with their audience" (125).

### Metatext

According to Mauranen, metatext works in written discourse to "organize and comment on the discourse," give the writer a presence in the text, and "give guidance to the reader with respect to how the text is organized, to what functions different parts of it have," and (as evidentials) the author's attitude, how the author feels about it (9).

I propose that metatext works in the plenary address in much the same ways as in other genres of written discourse. The writer becomes the speaker, and the reader becomes the hearer. Employed by the speaker as an organizing and commenting tool, metatext guides the hearer in following the propositions of the address; it also grounds the speaker in the words, so that the speaker may give metatextual clues to how the speaker has organized the topics of the address, how the speaker views those topics, his or her attitudes toward them and how the various parts of the address will function.

Again, metatext occurs as recurring word or phrase patterns within the address that function to connect propositional material (connectors); to indicate to the hearer that quotes will be explicated in the lines that follow (action markers); and as clauses that indicate reviews of earlier stages of the address or previews of anticipated topics or propositional material (9-10).

Connectors. In Lyons, connectors appear as the conjunctions "and," "but," "yet," "so," "for"; as the adverbials "but also," "not only," "furthermore," "then," "finally"; as the prepositional phrases "of course," "for example," "at the same time"; and as the sequence adjectives "first," "second," "third," "final."

"But" and "and" are used at least nine times each to contrast or link propositional material. One sentence-initial use of but, linked with "clearly" (p. 91 line 11), may also be an evidential: "But clearly [...]" indicates Lyons' confident attitude of knowledge regarding Shaughnessy's intention in writing her book. He uses another sentence-initial "But" in the middle of page 95 to introduce the sentence, "But there is one more quality that characterized academic writing for Mina and that should be included here: 'the stances of fairness, objectivity, and formal courtesy'." When Lyons says "But there is one more quality," it seems that he has used the sentence-initial "But" to give the sentence special emphasis, to imply his

favorable attitude toward, and to emphasize to his hearers, "one more quality" of Shaughnessy's writing: "'the stances of fairness, objectivity, and formal courtesy'" (95). Given that his address is a tribute to Shaughnessy, her work and her book, the statement is consistent with his mention of "her personal dignity and respect for her readers, conveyed through the manner and tone of her book" (95).

Connectors that indicate sequence were used in two locations within the text of Lyons's address. He uses the first set ("first," "then," "finally") when outlining the purposes of the address in paragraph 1, page 90: "the book and its method [...], the word 'academic' as it might apply to Errors and Expectations, [and] in what sense the word 'revolutionary' should be applied to Errors and Expectations." He uses the second set ("first," "second," "third," "final") when he raises "four broad questions" in paragraph 1, page 97, to bring the listener back to the original theme, "Errors and Expectations is the work of an academic revolutionary."

A less obvious use of a connector exists in paragraph 2, page 89, in the opening sentence. There, the adjectival phrase "of course" appears to link the subordinate clause that begins, "When I began to think about speaking [...]" with the independent clause that begins, "I was, of course, reminded [...]." There, it may function for the hearer as a connector; indeed, if moved to a position where it begins the

independent clause, as in "of course I was reminded," then its function becomes clearer. Also, it may act as an evidential, indicating an attitude of strong certainty by the speaker.

Smith uses a greater variety of connectors than Lyons: "then," "however," "nor," and "for" once each, and "or" 4 times; interestingly, as does Lyons, she uses "but" and "and" equally (8 times each). She uses the adverbials "only if," "even now" and "thus" once each, and the prepositional phrase "to some extent" once. On page 105, she employs the conjunction "but" with an idiom to create "But of course." This phrase functions as a unit by itself, placing an emphasis upon the previous propositional material, the first three complete sentences on the page. It may also be an evidential, conveying a sense of the limited meaning of "that side of literacy" as opposed to a strong sense of "the real power of literacy." She also uses the conjunction "but" to connect parallel grammatical structures in the second sentence of paragraph 1, page 105: "[...] not because they can't write, but because they don't know [...]." This connector functions to join three independent clauses (and their modifiers) into one long sentence of strong rhetorical force.

"Beyond question" may also be a connector; Smith uses it in the sentence, "That teachers' efforts are conditioned by their own expectations is beyond question; learners' efforts

are also conditioned by the teachers' expectations" (101). It does not function as clearly as conjunctions like "and, but" and "or"; however, it does help the hearer make the connection between the two propositions whose clauses begin with "That teachers' efforts [...]" and "efforts are also conditioned." In addition, the phrase acts as an evidential; it conveys an attitude of absolute certainty on the part of the speaker.

Like Lyons, Smith also uses "certainly" as a connector in paragraph 2, page 103, second to last sentence; it connects the sentence that precedes it with the sentence it begins; she uses "certainly" once more to connect paragraphs 1 and 2 on page 104. Both are evidentials in their indication of the speaker's conviction of her knowledge.

Faigley uses the usual connectors, but he demonstrates frequent use of the conjunction "but," which occurs six times in the first five pages to indicate contrasting ideas, and which he uses twelve times overall. As an evidential he uses "But [...]" in the sentence-initial position to indicate a strong "but if-then this" statement of propositional content: "But if the particular paths that our lives take are very influenced by seemingly chance events, [then] the broader track shows a great deal more regularity" (110). He also uses the sentence-initial "But" as a "contrast evidential" to "(mark) the contrast between knowledge and expectation" (Barton 746):

But as talk radio so vividly demonstrates, providing venues for the discussion of public issues does not necessarily lead to a more informed public, increased civic engagement, or enhanced democracy (115).

To lead his hearers to the moment of introducing his topic he also uses as an evidential the phrase combination, "Even though--I felt." He uses a third evidential in a sentence-initial position when he begins with the qualifier, "Most disappointing [...]"

Faigley uses sparingly phrases like "after all" and "at the same time," and the more common "however," "nevertheless" and "even if." He also uses as connectors the emphatics such as "More and more" and "so too," once each. These connectives seem especially important in this plenary, as Faigley uses a number of statistics in developing his topic, and the connectors function to hold the narrative together by marking important transitions from one block of data to another.

Two sentence-initial uses of "but" mark Funk's use of connectors, and they conform to Barton's description of that use: "The use of but as an indicator of strong opposition also suggests its use as an evidential, "marking the contrast between knowledge and expectation" (746). The first use of the sentence-initial "but" creates an immediate contrast of ideas in his topic regarding the need "to value and strengthen" the "professional partnership [that] does exist

between teachers of grammar and teaches of writing." He says, "But that partnership is an uneasy one" and even "downright hostile" (124). The next use of the sentence-initial "but" ends a paragraph discussing the integration of grammar instruction with student reading and writing: "But that approach, simple and clear as it may seem, has not brought the two sides together" (125).

As has been discussed in Funk's use of Move 4, the call to action, "If [...] then" conditional clause pairs are used often in his address. He uses them in the last page of text, during his call to action, and they function as connectors to bring together a conditional clause marked by "if" with a statement clause marked by "then." This use occurs four times within three paragraphs of text (129-30), and it has the effect of connecting propositions in the call to action section of his plenary.

In summary, Lyons and Smith use the common conjunctions "and" and "but" equally and often to contrast or link propositional material for the purpose of developing strong rhetorical force. They also use adverbs, adverbials, and adjective phrases as connectors that function as evidentials to convey certainty in regard to propositional material, although Smith demonstrates a preferred use of them.

In contrast, Faigley's and Funk's uses of the conjunction "but" are often in the sentence-initial position and used as contrast evidentials, and among the four speakers

Funk alone uses conditional clause pairs, introduced respectively by the conjunction "if" and the adverb "then."

Reviews. Again, as a type of metatext, a review is a clause that indicates an earlier state of the address and carries the rhetorical force of renewing for the hearer propositions the speaker wishes to develop. The first use of a review in Lyons occurs initially in the first sentence of paragraph 2, page 93 (last three lines): "My point here about Mina's work is therefore related to the one I made earlier [...]." A review occurs again in paragraph 1, page 94: "I've used Mina's comments [...] quite extensively [...]."

To conclude his discussion of Shaughnessy's emphasis upon academics and his portrayal of Errors and Expectations as an academic work, he begins paragraph 2, page 95 with this review: "I have paid particular attention to the qualities of Mina's writing [...] because ultimately that is one of the book's important legacies [...]."

The last review occurs when Lyons returns to a theme of his address, "-is Errors and Expectations the testament of an academic revolutionary?" The review is found at paragraph 2, page 96, the first clause of the second sentence: "I have already suggested a typically academic answer [...]," which leads into a use of parallel rhetorical structures, idioms parallel in form but contrasting in idea ("On the one hand" and "on the other hand") and used in the clause-initial position:



On the one hand, yes, since Mina transformed our way of seeing and judging what we do as teachers; on the other hand, no, since she was deeply committed to a tradition of academic discourse [...]."

The contract in idioms alert the hearer to the paradoxical nature of Shaughnessy's behavior as an accomplished traditional academic publishing her revolutionary methodology for teaching the non-traditional student described in Errors and Expectations.

In contrast to Lyons' address, where he uses reviews over a span of four pages, Smith's use of reviews is found within one page of the text, in the space of just three paragraphs. The reviews occur as two sets of parallel clause use. Neither may be a strict use of the review as metatext; rather, in the first set she asks the hearer to recall the key ideas of Shaughnessy's speeches, writing and actions, occurring in paragraph 2, page 101, with "She called [...]" used twice, each followed by prepositional phrases as modifiers: "She called for the development of a pedagogy for illiteracy [...]," and "She called for teachers of writing who would 'grope their ways into the turbulent disciplines of semantics and linguistics [...]'." In the last paragraph on the same page, she uses the parallel clauses "She expected [...]" to bracket two participles, "not expecting" and "expecting little":

Believing in democracy, we expected that education would be a key element in our life, but not expecting much of women, we did not initially include them in any of our colleges; and expecting little of slaves, or fearing too much power from literacy, we did not teach slaves to read and write. (101)

Here she calls upon the hearer to review his or her experiences as a participant in American educational experience and history. Again, in both uses of the parallel clause sets the review does not function, as it would in written discourse, as a metatextual device that is an "explicit indicator that an earlier stage of the text is being repeated or summarized" (Mauranen 10). Instead, the review asks the hearers of the address to review experiences outside of the event of the plenary address, to review in their memories Shaughnessy's urgings for action and what, historically, Americans have expected from education.

In Faigley's address, the speaker refers to many past events in the development of rhetoric and composition as a specialization within the teaching of English in universities, but at only two places does he seem to refer to an earlier point of the address. In particular, one use of a review occurs on page 120 of the address when he refers to "the tide" in "What do you do when the tide seems to be running against you?" He uses this metaphor on page 111 in

reference to forces that degrade the teaching of writing as a way of providing education "for all who wanted it," a metaphor of "rip tides carrying us away from where we want to go." Another use of the metaphor occurs in paragraph 3, page 113:

Given the magnitude of these forces, continuing to argue for a vision of literacy for participate in democratic community life, civic engagement, and social justice feels like swimming against the current.

Funk appears to use the review only once to indicate to the hearer that an earlier element of the address is repeated or summarized. Halfway through the address, he uses the phrase, "Given this situation [...]" in reference to quotes by other academics (Horner, Young) outlining the conditions of teaching literature versus the teaching of writing in the text immediately preceding the use of the review (127).

To summarize: In contrast to Lyons' address, where he uses reviews over a span of four pages, Smith's use of reviews are found within one page of the text, in the space of just three paragraphs. Nevertheless, Lyons and Smith often use the review, three to four times each, but Funk uses it only to refer to an earlier quote and Faigley uses it (save for two references to a metaphor) mostly to ask his hearers to refer to events prior to and outside the address itself, not true metatextual uses of reviews.

Previews. The speaker uses the preview as a clause that functions to build anticipation in the hearer toward an imminent portion of the address; the preview may introduce the address, or anticipate a theme, topic, proposition or quote. In Lyons and Smith, previews occur immediately to introduce the address as the speakers indicate to their hearers that discourse has begun, as in Lyons' opening sentence: "I am particularly honored to be asked to speak on this occasion [...]" and in Smith's opening sentence, "I appreciate the opportunity to be here [to speak] today [...]."

Lyons' first sentence of paragraph 2, page 89 anticipates his theme and topic presentation and signals a reflection upon the background to his theme, Shaughnessy's legacy and her principal work, Errors and Expectations:

When I began to think about speaking today to CUNY teachers on Mina's (Shaughnessy) work, I was, of course, reminded of the obvious point that her thought and writing were deeply rooted in the experience of this University.

It anticipates his theme and topic presentation and signals a reflection upon the background to his theme, Shaughnessy's legacy and her principal work, Errors and Expectations. Then, the theme is indicated by the clause, "I would like to quote a passage [...]" and use it to characterize some of Mina's special concerns [...]" (line 3 of page 90). This

action marker is followed by a string of clauses that preview his topics: "First, I want to speak about [...]," "[...] then I want to talk about [...]," and "I would like to consider [...]" (90).

This preview is followed by other previews on page 96, paragraph 2: "I would like to return to my original question [...]" and "If we look again at the passage I quoted at the start of my talk and continue beyond its last sentence with the sentence that follows, we can see [...]." Both clauses may appear to function as reviews, since they refer back to "my original question" and "the passage I quoted at the beginning of my talk," but they primarily function as previews since Lyons delivers a new perspective on the "original question," and in the second clause he will "continue beyond its last sentence with the sentence that follows," a reference to an imminent quote.

The last use of a preview occurs in paragraph 1, page 97, where Lyons approaches the conclusion to the address. He anticipates his explication of "four broad questions" that Shaughnessy proposes for her readers (and the hearers of the address) by stating, "In the essay she proposes four broad questions [...]."

Smith uses far fewer previews than Lyons, but whereas Lyons uses them in the first half of his address, Smith uses them both at the beginning and end of her address. "I thought I would talk about the broad values [...]" (para. 2,

pg. 100) immediately introduces the theme and topics of the address. Another use of the preview follows in paragraph 1, page 106, "Think for a moment [...]," which introduces propositional content.

In contrast to Smith, Faigley uses the preview sparingly, first using it to help his hearers transition from the history of the rhetoric and composition field to the forces that work against the success of that field: "Now that we are more than halfway [...]" (111). Then, in the next paragraph, he employs a very obvious preview to introduce his theme: "I'm going to talk today about [...]." His only other apparent use of a preview occurs at the beginning of his explanation of the two forces that are the development of his topic, as he prepares the hearers with "I want to begin with the revolution of the rich" (111).

Funk introduces his thesis with this preview: "My thesis is quite straightforward, perhaps even obvious [...]," and the thesis follows immediately (124). While this immediate use may question the idea that a preview is "an explicit indicator that a later stage of the text is being anticipated" (Mauranen 10) because the "later stage" comes immediately, the use of the colon after "obvious" may provide a suitable pause before the "later stage" is reached.

As a clause that functions to build anticipation in the hearer toward an imminent portion of the address, the speaker may use the preview to introduce the address or to anticipate

a theme, a topic, key points of a topic, proposition or quote. They may move the hearer from one topic to another, draw together for the hearer linking prepositions, or prepare the hearer for a restatement of theme and re-listing of the topics.

Action markers. Action markers have perhaps the most specific role of the metatextual elements employed in the analyses of the plenaries. They directly indicate to the hearer that quotes or some other discourse act will be explicated in the lines that follow. Those that indicate that quotes will be explicated occur three times in Lyons: "The method that Mina used in analyzing error can be shown by quoting [...] " (para. 1, pg. 91); the clause, "I deliberately chose this passage [...]" in line 8, page 92; and at the end of line 9, page 94, "I would like to draw on a few of her phrases [...]."

The remaining occurrences of action markers in both Lyons and Smith appear to indicate imminent discourse acts in the address. However, they function not as an action marker for the speaker, indicating an imminent illocutionary act; rather, they function to indicate a discourse act by the author being discussed, which in Lyons is Shaughnessy, the subject of his address. For example, the clause in line one, page 97, "Instead, her favorite metaphor is that of the frontier [...]" indicates an imminent explication of the metaphor. Two markers in paragraph 1, page 97, "Mina's

writing suggests much [...]" coupled with "[...] she proposes four broad questions [...]" indicate a listing of questions Shaughnessy herself presented in a previous essay to which Lyons makes direct reference.

Smith uses an action marker to indicate a discourse act in her address at line 4, page 105: "We must ask the question [...]" This use of the action marker indicates discourse that discusses a proposition new to the address, "[...] whether oral communication is by its very nature lacking in vigor, precision and depth, and thereby doomed temporal and shallow. But of course." In addition, the use of the modal "must" in "We must ask the question [...]" may indicate the use of an evidential, uttered in the imperative to demonstrate the speaker's strong conviction revealed at the end of the sentence by a sentence-initial use of "But" in the idiom, "But of course."

Faigley uses an action marker immediately in his plenary, and at the very end. His first line begins, "One of the traditions of the CCCC Chair's address is to narrate an anxiety dream," which indicates to the hearers that a dream will be narrated, as indeed it is. Faigley's final use of the action marker occurs in the last paragraph as a call to action. It introduces a quote, "Our charge is in the last two sentences from [a book by James Berlin]."

Funk uses the action marker sparingly. His opening clause in the plenary is, "I wanted to use, as my title, the



line [...]” and provides a contrast to it three sentences later: “So I chose, instead, a more pedestrian. His next use does not appear until page 127 where he uses “-and it is this situation that I want to comment on” to indicate an imminent discourse act in the address. A use of both an evidential (embedded within the action marker) and the action marker itself occurs in a sentence that begins, “I think you all know” and which ends with a quote from Richard E. Miller (127).

Action markers directly indicate to the hearer that quotes or some other discourse act will be explicated in the lines that follow. Such uses may include discourse that discusses propositions new to the address, explication of a metaphor, or a statement that prepares the hearers for the speaker’s call to action.

We have seen that the plenary is the subject of research into its rhetorical forms, it may be classified for its different types, and Swales’ CARS model may be adapted for an analysis of its rhetorical moves, resulting in a new model (Amrine) of moves and steps. The rhetorical analysis was expanded by the application of metatextual analysis, and together those applications provided the method for an overall analysis of the plenary as a genre. We have examined four plenary addresses given at conferences and published in scholarly journals, the method used for analysis of the plenary as genre, and the results of that analysis.

The chapter that follows presents a discussion of how the four moves of the plenary address function to provide the speaker of the address with an opportunity to create an interactive communicative event, wherein the speaker draws the hearer into an interpersonal and shared experience in which linguistic signals prepare the participant for understanding the structure of the speech event.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DISCUSSION

An analysis of the plenary addresses for their rhetorical organization indicates four types of moves, the rhetorical conventions and linguistic routines explicated in Chapter Two. In this chapter, I will discuss how the various speakers use those moves and steps to advance the communicative purposes of the speech event and to interact with their hearers. Following that, I will discuss also how metatext organizes and signals the moves and steps, thus guiding the hearer through the discourse.

#### Move 1

First, all the speakers used almost immediately in their addresses a move I call "establishing the speaker's role." In the plenary address, this is Move 1, and it "centers" the speaker in the address; that is, the speaker attempts to interact with the hearers in a way that builds the hearers' acceptance of the speaker as qualified and authoritative. The speaker becomes one with whom the hearers may establish a trust and secure for themselves a sense of concurrence, so that the hearers become agents with the speaker in validating the theme and topics of the address. The move is described in more detail with at least three steps: acknowledging the role, stating the purpose of the conference and listing credentials. That is, the speaker acknowledges his role in

the address as the speaker, confirms why the conference brings speaker and hearers together, and validates the right to speak by giving evidence of the speaker's authority.

Each speaker uses the move and steps differently. Lyons assures his hearers that being asked to address them is an honor, thus confirming his role as speaker and the authority behind it, and he defers to the purpose of the conference, given in honor of a well-respected author and teacher (89).

Lyons' effort is paralleled by Smith, who "appreciates the opportunity" to speak, "not just because of the importance of the subject of this conference, but because it honors Mina Shaughnessy" (100), a reference to the purpose of the conference.

Faigley attempts to establish his role as speaker and create a relationship with his hearers by referring to a CCCC Chair's address tradition, honoring that tradition with his offering "to narrate an anxiety dream," and then appealing to their memories of previous conferences attended. By listing his credentials as aspects of the career he never planned to have, he is asking his hearers to identify with the serendipitous moments in their own lives; this appears to be a way of asking his hearers to validate his role as speaker. Later, he will ask his hearers to reflect upon those moments as they consider the forces that work against their efforts to "provide education for all who [want] it" (111). Thus, while he does not literally list his credentials, he seeks a

common identification of experience, a way to gain support for his right to speak as he "construe[s] a relationship of solidarity with [his audience]" (Hood and Forey 1).

With an opening line presented perhaps less strongly than the other speakers, Funk seeks to establish a rapport with his hearers by introducing a bit of humor and irony: he shares that he wanted to use, as the title of his address, a comment found on a student evaluation form: "'She taught me how to use the comma splice.'" The statement acts to remind the hearers that they are all sharers in the "risks in teaching grammatical elements to composition students" and gives Funk an opportunity to establish his role as an author, and thus as speaker, since he references the aforementioned comment to his "friend and co-author Susie Day" (124).

The solidarity building that comes from Move 1 is the result of the moves' three steps: each speaker acknowledges in some form his or her role as speaker, affirms the purpose of the conference, and lists or makes allusion to his or her credentials, thus validating the authority and privilege to speak. These steps are important for advancing the communicative purposes of the plenary, for without them, the speaker may be unable to gain his hearers' acceptance of his or her role as speaker; accordingly, it is unlikely that the hearers would be willing to consider the theme and follow the topic development of the address.

## Move 2

In the analysis of each plenary, identifying and applying Move 2, a statement of theme/topics of the address, was perhaps most important for understanding the purpose of each speech event and for identifying thematic statements about knowledge or practice, or statements about phenomena. Thus, when Lyons introduces his theme that Shaughnessy's Errors and Expectations is the work of an "academic revolutionary" (90), he makes an implication about a revolution in the practice of teaching basic writers; then he indicates that the topical development of the address will speak to Shaughnessy's efforts to teach basic writers in a way that creates a new methodology, a rhetorical move that will be realized by Lyons' contrasting how basic writers have been taught and treated by their institutions with how Shaughnessy would have them taught and treated.

Smith presents as her theme a statement about knowledge and practice, presenting Shaughnessy's approach to basic writers as students worthy of respect who can become participants in the democratic process. Thus, the topical form of the address assumes the discussion of the three beliefs that motivated Shaughnessy's work with basic writers. This rhetorical strategy supports her communicative function of calling for her hearers to urge appropriate legislative funding for education, raise levels of expectations for student performance, and equip students with the writing

skills necessary for them to compete in a society increasingly technological.

Faigley's address reflects upon his knowledge of the development of rhetoric and composition as a specialized teaching discipline, and that in practice the discipline can challenge institutional power and empower students labeled as deficient. To communicate this theme, he forms the topical development around a listing of forces that threaten composition teachers' status as those practitioners best situated to teach basic writers. He calls upon writing teachers to form alliances and create organizations "within the contexts of the larger profession as well as the contexts of economic and political concerns" (121), thus linking his topical development back to the opening theme, challenging institutional power and empowering students.

Funk's theme contends that the controversy over the teaching of grammar within institutions of higher learning strains the professional partnership between teachers of grammar and teachers of writing. To develop this theme, Funk forms his address by outlining and discussing key topics: the nature of the controversy, the reasons for it, and the argument over whether meaningful work occurs in the literature department or the composition department (126-27). He returns to his theme in the call to action, which makes imperative practitioners' development of a functional grammar to address the grammar controversy.

### Move 3

As a rhetorical strategy, Move 3, developing the topic, initiates the greatest volume of discourse found in the plenary, for in the discourse following this move the speaker develops the topics by a series of steps of the move; these steps raise questions, indicate needs and announce findings.

In the first step, raising a question, the speaker asks the hearers to question the effectiveness or validity of a practice or the quality of research in a particular academic field of study. The raising of a question often suggests Step 2, indicating a need, where the speaker asks the hearer to recognize within the province of the discourse community something that needs to be addressed and remedied, to be recognized as a goal for taking action. The two steps are complementary; a question may bring to the hearers' attention a current practice or gap in research that needs to be the focus of further consideration, and the need indicated for further consideration may raise an additional question.

The last step, announcing findings, I adapted directly from Swales' CARS model Move 3, Step 2, Announcing principal findings. As one might expect, in announcing findings the speaker often identifies circumstances within the field from which the plenary topic is drawn and thereby states or implies what needs doing to address, remedy, or take action for or against those circumstances. The use of announcing findings varies from plenary to plenary, yet the step most



often appears toward the end of the address, often as a way for the speaker to introduce Move 4, the call to action. For example, Lyons announces his principal findings when he concludes by describing Shaughnessy's commitment to academic discourse and that her transformation of the way teachers see and judge what they do in working with the basic writer makes Errors and Expectations truly the work of an academic revolutionary (96). This step leads to Move 4, a call to action, as he asks his hearers to respond to Shaughnessy's commitment to academic discourse and the basic writer.

Smith announces her principal findings when she relates students' needs to address writing, vocabulary and bilingualism with a call for practitioners to maintain the standards of literacy that will empower individuals for democracy and shared values and concerns (107). These are a reflection of themes within Shaughnessy's work, and Smith connects them back to Shaughnessy's three beliefs, referenced in the statement, "[...] it is empowerment that makes it possible for us to share not only values, but concerns" (107).

Faigley announces his findings when he states that the proliferation of computers and the internet have created challenges to the methodology of teaching writing and created questions about the equality of student access to these technologies. These circumstances are complicated by the high percentage of part-time faculty teaching writing courses,

which reflects politicians' devaluing of higher education (111). These findings will support Faigley's Move 4, where he calls upon teachers to unite, organize and take action on behalf of their profession and the students they serve (120-1).

Funk announces his findings when he outlines the nature of the controversy over the teaching of grammar and discusses the reasons for it. These findings provide a base of information from which he can elaborate upon a related and fundamental issue: the argument over whether meaningful work occurs in the literature department or the composition department (126-7). These lead to his call to action as he asks his hearers to "support the efforts to improve the status of writing teachers and increase the respect accorded scholarship in rhetoric and composition" (129).

Each speaker's uses of the three steps of move 3 are analyzed and explicated in detail in Chapter 3, Results. Thus, for the purposes of this discussion, what follows is a general outline of each speaker's use of Move 3 and its steps, indicating a variety in the pattern of steps each speaker chose for the topic development.

Lyons, for example, develops his topic as follows:

Step 1, raising a question

Step 3, announcing findings, used several times

Step 1, raising a question

The second use of Step 1 in the development of his third topic restates the theme of the address. Lyons does not directly use Step 2, indicating a need, although questions raised may imply a need, and one may infer from a finding announced that something is lacking and needs addressing.

In its topic development Smith's address uses all three steps of Move 3, the first use beginning just after she lists the three beliefs that motivated Shaughnessy's work (and which form the theme of her address) and continued used as described below:

Step 1, raising a question

Step 2, marked by three sentences that begin with parallel clauses indicating a need.

Step 2, signaled by four clauses, two in parallel to frame the text and two in the negative, nearly parallel; then another need implied but not directly stated.

Step 1, raising a question, introducing the second topic

Step 3, announcing findings to reinforce a general statement that Smith develops with additional generalizations; these steps enable her to establish her speaker's role (move 1), and thereby reinforce her credentials (Step 3 of Move 1).

Step 3, announcing findings

Step 2, indicating a need

Step 3, announcing findings

Step 2, indicating a need (implied)

While a need is not explicitly indicated in her development of the third topic, it is implied at the beginning of the paragraph: she begins with a kind of review of previous assumptions about functional literacy; then she indicates a gap of understanding in those assumptions, thus implying a need to address that gap. This move also continues to establish her credentials as a speaker conversant with Shaughnessy's three beliefs, which form the basis for the three topics she develops in response to the theme.

The continued topic development reflects Smith's use of all three steps of Move 3. She does this in a pattern that is almost cyclical: a Step 1, raising a question; a Step 2, indicating a need or a Step 3, announcing findings; these followed by another clear indication of need (Step 2) followed with another Step 3, announcing findings. From these steps Smith brings her topic development full circle to her theme, Shaughnessy's belief that teaching empowers the individual through literacy.

Faigley directly and simply states his Move 3, developing the topic, on the third page of his address; he refines the statement with two introductions to announcing findings, but these in turn will raise questions about the action the hearers are to take. Unlike Lyons or Smith,

however, Faigley does not overtly raise a question early in the address; that is, he does not confirm a clear Step 1, raising a question, until late in his address. Then he does not overtly state, but merely implies, a Step 2, indicating a need, although the implication seems to be confirmed at the end of the address. Faigley primarily uses the steps of raising a question and announcing findings; Step 2, indicating a need, is a step implied.

Funk develops his topics by qualifying the factors of the conflict his theme presents as he raises questions the hearers are to consider. In doing so, he announces findings. Then he returns to a Step 1 of Move 3, raising a question and employs the rhetorical device of the "If [...] then" conditional clause pair as a framing device to signal a call to action (Move 4). Like Lyons, he relies on the first and last steps of Move 3, raising a question and announcing findings. The second step, indicating a need, is implied in the raising of questions but not, as in Faigley's address, overtly stated.

The preceding overview of the speakers' uses of the steps of Move 3 provides an interesting contrast in their use of Step 2. The three male plenary speakers (Lyons, Faigley and Funk) use Step 2 sparingly to indicate a need, and then only by implication. However, Smith uses step 2 often and overtly, and she uses all the steps of Move 3 in a variety of combinations to further the communicative purposes of her

address. Perhaps one can draw conclusions about the role of gender in the uses of the various steps; Smith, the only female speaker of the four plenary speakers in this study, is the only speaker who overtly uses Step 2. A conclusion that female plenary speakers are more likely than males to overtly use Step 2 of Move 3 cannot be verified without further rhetorical analysis of other plenaries delivered by female speakers. Such an analysis goes beyond the scope of this thesis; however, it does suggest an opportunity for further research.

#### Move 4

Move 4, the call to action, completes the moves and steps of the plenary address and appears in all four plenaries at their conclusions. There, the speaker asks the hearers for a decision to act in response to the speaker's overt indication of a need that should be addressed or to a need implied in the raising of a question or the announcement of a finding. For example, in Lyons' call to action he asks the hearers to respond to the issues Shaughnessy's writings identify.

Smith uses Move 4 as she draws together all three of her topics in one paragraph. She inverts the order of their presentation from their original listing at the beginning of her address and foregrounds her call to action by making a rhetorical cycle back to the theme, Shaughnessy's values and concerns, thus offering a proposition: "I would say that

without [the] empowerment that literacy gives individuals there can be no democracy [...].” Her statement embodies her call to action move, “to move forward to shared solutions of our problems” (106).

Faigley calls his hearers to action as a response to the changes wrought upon the field of rhetoric and composition by the digital revolution and changes in the funding and structure of higher education as it relates to basic writers. He uses a quote from a colleague (Berlin) to appeal to his hearers to organize and work together (120-1).

As it does in the other plenaries, Funk’s call to action move occurs at the conclusion of the address. Funk uses the rhetorical device of the “If” [this is what we want] “then” [this is what we must do]” conditional clause pair with a use of the evidential “I think” to initiate a very specific call to action (129-30). The repetition of these rhetorical devices guides the hearers through the move and invites them to participate in action to “improve the partnership between grammar instruction and the teaching of writing” (130).

### Metatext

The moves and steps of the plenary take the rhetorical forms as described above partly because metatext functions in the plenary address by organizing the content of the address and providing instructions to the hearer.

Connectors occurred most frequently; they keep the address organized and link together the various propositions,

indicating to the hearer their relationship to one. They support the rhetorical moves by indicating combinations of propositions, contrasts between propositions, and enumerations of propositional content or propositions themselves. They can also indicate the speaker's attitude toward propositions, and as such, they function as evidentials.

Following Move 1, previews in the address build anticipation for Move 2, the statement of theme/topics of the address. Using initial connectors, the previews can enumerate the topics to be presented or appear before a quotation, as in Lyons' address. They may simply introduce Move 2 or form questions for the hearer to consider, as in Smith. They may, as in Faigley, preview propositional material at the same time that they help the speaker establish a relationship with his hearers; after sharing commentary about Sven Birkert's The Gutenberg Elegies, wherein Birkert discusses the place of reading in our technological culture (119), Faigley previews a proposition and draws his hearers into a confidence (to build "a relationship of solidarity") with this comment: "I would like to let him in on a little secret that writing teachers know [...]" (119).

Previews may also occur during the presentation of propositions, helping the hearer progress from one step of Move 3, developing the topic, to the next step, as Funk does when he introduces anew his theme, the controversy over



grammar: "And this is where the controversy about grammar comes in" (128). From there a preview leads his hearers to a discussion that culminates in raising a question, "So where does that leave us?" and indicating a need: "On a more practical level, I would suggest that if we want [...] then we need [...]" (130).

In the address, a preview might enumerate the topics to be presented, as in Lyons' listing of four questions the hearer should consider. Or, a preview might simply introduce Move 2, as in Smith. Previews may prepare the hearers for propositional material to come, as in Faigley. They may help the hearer progress from one step of Move 3, developing the topic, to the next step, as Funk does when he introduces anew his theme. In the conclusion of the plenary a preview can anticipate Move 4, as in Lyons' call to action, or it can prepare the hearer for as a restatement of theme and re-listing of the topics, as in Smith.

Reviews contribute to the organization of the address by asking the audience to review in their memories previous rhetorical actions employed by the speaker. Used this way, reviews help the hearers recover important propositions as a base upon which the speaker may introduce a new proposition or advance the development of an existing one. If the new or existing proposition identifies a topic following a theme, then reviews contribute to the organization of Move 3, developing the topic, by recalling a question the speaker

asked earlier in the address or restating a finding already presented.

The action marker typically functions in written discourse "to indicate discourse acts performed in the text" (Mauranen 10). It functions similarly in the plenary address to indicate discourse acts, specifically in the introduction to the address, and initiate Move 1, establishing the speaker's role. Action markers move the address forward by indicating Move 2, statement of theme/topics of the address. As such they contain action verbs indicating discourse acts performed in the address, or they may indicate immediate discussion of a proposition within Move 3, developing the topic. In Lyons' address, for example, action markers present material belonging to another source, quotes from Errors and Expectations. They also work to effectively conclude the address in the final remarks, indicating Move 4, call to action.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

For a newcomer approaching the plenary address as a genre, the difficulty of identifying moves may be facilitated by the application of my adaptation of Swales' CARS model. As I have shown in the discussion of the rhetorical analysis of each address, there are similar functions between the moves of the CARS model and those of the plenary address. Just as the researcher of the CARS model establishes territory by claiming centrality, making topic

generalizations and reviewing items of previous research, the speaker of the plenary establishes territory by establishing his or her role, stating the purpose of the conference and listing credentials; delivering the theme and topics of the address; and (in developing the topic) reviewing items of previous research by quoting published material. Just as the researcher establishes a niche by indicating a gap or question-raising in text, so the speaker of the address indicates gaps in the hearer's knowledge or actions and raises questions the hearer must consider.

The plenary address moves identified in this study are specific to the plenary address as a genre, and while the CARS model has been helpful in identifying the functions of certain rhetorical moves, a specific, accurate form-function correlation may be achieved by letting the plenary address moves stand on their own. This is not to say, however, that the plenary address moves identified in this study cannot be applied to another genre. Just as Swales' CARS model has been applied by several studies to analyze rhetorical moves in research articles across disciplines (Ahmad 277), so it may be possible that various moves of the plenary address can be applied to the analysis of rhetorical moves in the texts of other disciplines. My 2005 model may apply especially to the analysis of rhetorical moves in other recorded speech events, such as sermons, inaugural speeches, state of the union addresses and eulogies, to name a few.

Finally, to the extent that metatext organizes and comments on the discourse, the process of identifying rhetorical moves is made easier if the newcomer pays close attention to the metatext. Mauranen's four types of metatext serve well the purposes of identifying moves, but in the plenary metatext takes on different nuances of function: the text-organizing of written discourse becomes the speech-act organizing of the address, and metatextual signaling of the author's presence in text become indications of the speaker's presence in the address. In applying the functions of metatext to the plenary address as a spoken genre, the speaker substitutes for the writer and the hearer for the reader.

Thus, while metatext functions to organize the content and provide instructions to the reader of written discourse, in the plenary address it identifies rhetorical moves, organizes the speaker's propositions, and provides instructions to the hearer. Such instructions, as in the use of reviews, ask the hearer to review material previously read or events previously experienced; or, the instructions may indicate to the hearer that an earlier element of the address is repeated or summarized. Metatext is not fixed; as Mauranen states, "no simple linguistic criteria are available for unambiguous recognition of metatext" and thus metatext "can be realized through all kinds of linguistic units, ranging from affixes to whole clauses" (8). In addition, metatext is

"an open category to which new items can be added indefinitely according to the needs of the situation" (9), and, I suggest, according to the needs of the genre of the plenary address.

The plenary is a verbal communicative event that has its own situation, linguistic patterns, and rhetorical functions. Thus, it is a genre, and it exhibits definite interactive routines, the linguistic exponents and signals, moves and steps, which enable a speaker to advance the rhetorical purposes of a plenary's presentation to an audience of hearers. This presentation is given both illocutionary and perlocutionary force by use of metadiscourse, or metatext, guiding the hearer from one stage of the plenary to the next and providing clues to the speaker's attitude toward his or her topics. Perhaps most important, it works to build for the hearers a relationship of solidarity with the speaker. As a result, a successful plenary not only disseminates valuable research, information and insights to the hearers; a successful plenary invites, perhaps even compels, the hearer to invest in the speaker's topics.

APPENDIX A  
ROBERT LYONS: MINA SHAUGHNESSY  
AND THE TEACHING OF WRITING

Robert Lyons

## MINA SHAUGHNESSY AND THE TEACHING OF WRITING

I am particularly honored to be asked to speak on this occasion—a conference dedicated to Mina Shaughnessy and her work. Mina herself liked conferences and she had special expectations of them. In Scott Fitzgerald's stories, there are characters who gaze up at the lighted windows of Manhattan buildings in twilight and are filled with a sense of wonder at the variety of life they sense behind those windows. Mina had some of that anticipation, transferred to conference rooms and conference panels. She was always arranging to have friends and colleagues sit in on sessions running at the same time as one she was attending, always insisting that something interesting was likely to happen at every meeting. No matter how exotic the conference setting, no matter how tempting the sightseeing or the restaurants, Mina would always set her schedule by the conference schedule, listening to as many papers and discussions and workshops as she could. How often her hopes at these gatherings were realized I can't say, but it was often enough to sustain her, for she never stopped poring over conference programs with an expression that belonged to a gambler reading the racing form at Aqueduct.

When I began to think about speaking today to CUNY teachers on Mina's work, I was, of course, reminded of the obvious point that her thought and writing were deeply rooted in the experience of this University. Her book, *Errors and Expectations*, begins by portraying the effects of Open Admissions on City College and its faculty, and the chapter "Expectations" which concludes the book should serve to define the obligations and mission of a great urban university. Most CUNY writing teachers, I think, feel a special relation to this wonderful book. It speaks not only *to* us, in the way of practical instruction, but also *for* us, expressing with such eloquence our own half-formulated purposes and goals. There

---

*Robert Lyons is Associate Professor of English, Queens College, CUNY. This talk, in slightly altered form, was given as the keynote address at the Third Annual Conference of the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors, May 1979.*

are many passages in Mina's book that are revelations about teaching, and there are many others that strike a more familiar note and recapitulate some of our own experiences as teachers. I would like to quote a passage of the second kind and use it to characterize some of Mina's special concerns:

...Wherever the new students have arrived in substantial numbers, English teachers have begun to realize that little in their background has prepared them to teach writing to someone who has not already learned how to do it. Confident in the past that students who could not master certain "simple" features of English usage were probably not "bright" enough (a much-used term) to stay in college, they now begin to wonder, when large numbers of intelligent young men and women fail to learn a simple lesson, whether the lesson is indeed so simple. And once having asked this fruitful question, their own revolution as teachers of English usually begins.

This passage suggests that *Errors and Expectations* is the work of an academic revolutionary and I would like to explore that suggestion. First, I want to speak about the book itself and its method, and then I want to talk about the word "academic" as it might apply to this unusual book. Finally, I would like to consider in what sense the word "revolutionary" should be applied to this civilized, scholarly, immensely courteous author and her book.

A central concern in Mina's work is represented in one phrase from the passage I just quoted: "intelligent young men and women." The recognition of the intelligence and the adulthood of basic writing students is the key to virtually all that Mina has to say about the teaching of writing. Many teachers and writers had been aware that young people who have not succeeded in mastering the traditional school skills are nevertheless intelligent and worthwhile human beings. As all of us know, there is a substantial literature describing and championing the non-traditional student. Essentially, that literature concentrated on pointing to the special strengths that such students bring to the college environment and on challenging the inadequacies of our school systems or the larger failure of our social system.

Mina obviously knew this literature, shared its concerns, and voiced some of the same criticisms in her book. What was special to her was the decision to turn directly to the actual writing of such students where it most diverged from standard written forms and to raise the question of how these particular documents were themselves manifestations of the powers of "intelligent young men and women." When such student writing had previously appeared in print, it usually served as the "before" in a before and after illustration of some effective teaching technique or it demon-



strated particular features of dialect use or of second language interference. Other than that, such writing was rarely reproduced. It represented the dirty little secret of basic skills courses, classified information because if it leaked out it was sure to appear as part of some professor's demonstration that such students were on the face of it uneducable. This was not a matter of paranoia. It was clear from several essays on Open Admissions and from several letters to the *Times* that examples of unskillful writing by non-traditional students were considered a powerful weapon by those opposed to the broadening of public higher education. From this point of view, Mina had great courage in choosing to examine publicly such quantities of error-laden student writing. But clearly she did not intend her book to be an act of daring. Her controlling argument was that there is little that is random or illogical in such problematic student writing. Error, far more often than we suspect, is a matter of pattern, an effort of intelligence, even if that effort is faulty or misapplied. She needed to provide many examples in order to demonstrate the range of individual difficulties that create error.

The method that Mina used in analyzing error can be shown by quoting a representative passage from her book. In the chapter "Syntax" she discusses some ways in which the pronoun "it" may prove troublesome to inexperienced writers:

Part of the trouble with the word stems from its vagueness. Like other pronouns, *it* refers to something that has already been mentioned, but unlike *he* or *she*, it can refer to any *thing* in the world as well as to some beings (an animal, for example, or even a child when the sex is unknown or of no importance to the context). Beyond this, it can refer to ideas or situations or even to something in the mind of the writer that never quite gets stated on the page. (Certain idiomatic expressions illustrate this vagueness—"It may rain today." "How far is it to Wall Street?" "It's late." "Let him have it.") In analytical writing, where inanimate nouns and abstract terms tend to be more frequent than in talk or written narrative, the word *it*, with its broad range of designata and slight semantic weight, easily becomes a free-floating substitute for thoughts that the writer neglects to articulate and that the reader must usually strain to reach if he can...

Mina here presents some characteristic features of "it" as potential sources of confusion; typically, her perspective is not on the grammatical rule but on the various ways a word or form behaves in actual use. Then she narrows down to consider the school situation: does analytic writing place particular stress on the form, or create special occasions for error? At this point, particular misuses of the form by basic writers are cited and categorized. In each instance, Mina's explanation centers on how the error

closely approximates an acceptable usage or how the writer thinks that the error serves his purposes. After introducing and commenting on these examples, Mina then says in a summary paragraph: "The two problems with *it* that have been touched on so far are different kinds of problems requiring different strategies" and proceeds to make a more general distinction between a semantic problem and a word-order problem. Then she moves on to consider yet another function of the pronoun "it." I deliberately chose this passage for discussion because it does *not* display Mina at her most eloquent. What it does do in a modest way is display her method, applied patiently and painstakingly to hundreds of student sentences and evolved in the same way by reading literally thousands of student essays. The persistent effort is to discriminate and classify errors, to order the apparently chaotic, to create a grammar out of ungrammaticality. The importance of such a method is that it introduces system without being reductive. It oversimplifies neither the complexities of English grammar nor the range of variation that articulate but inexperienced writers can create.

Reading this book, a teacher gains confidence through repeated encounters with the general principle that there is a logic of error ("The Logic of Error" was, in fact, Mina's original title for the book). This logic differs from student to student and it is to this logic that teachers must adapt their knowledge of systematic grammar. For example, the students whose errors were cited in the passage I read to you would not need to be guided through a handbook review of all pronoun forms, even though their errors involve a pronoun. They would need to be shown the connection between their idiosyncratic pattern and the pattern of standard written English.

Mina's sense, then, of the potentialities of the intelligent young men and women who are basic writing students led her to recognize the logic of error. Her method transforms the way a teacher would perceive and therefore respond to the omissions, confusions, and derailments that characterize the work of basic writing students. And because it makes us see what we are doing in a new way, *Errors and Expectations* can be called a revolutionary book.

At the same time, the book has virtually none of the attributes of academic books called revolutionary in the last decade. In fact it is remarkable that someone so deeply involved in the most contentious issue in higher education in New York, involved at a college where feelings about this issue were particularly intense, could write without any trace of revolutionary rhetoric. The reason, I think, is that much of the struggle of Open Admissions centered on what Mina saw as a false conflict between

those supporting the rights of a new group of non-traditional students and those insisting on the need to maintain academic standards. The two groups tended to see each other as enemies in this struggle. Advocates of Open Admissions appeared to their opponents as willfully destroying all that made colleges meaningful. Academic life and academic writing came more and more to seem (from the other side of the barricades) to represent outmoded or irrelevant concerns. In the teaching of writing, "academic," for many defenders of the rights of non-traditional students, described a pedantic, rule-bound teacher who insisted on the stylistic etiquette of a by-gone day. Mina's work is distinctive because it does not accept this kind of division. It both upholds the academic tradition and welcomes without condescension a new kind of student within that tradition. Mina recognized the differences between the students she taught and wrote about and the academic world, but she did not think the differences condemned either the student or traditional academic values.

Instead, her work both as a person and as a writer extended an invitation to the non-traditional student, not just to learn something, but to become a member of the academic community. If there was a generous idealism in Mina's sense of her students and their potential, there was a similar idealism in her conception of the nourishing value of the academic tradition for any learner. That sense of idealism about higher education explains some of the paradoxical aspects of her own behavior—the fact that, living in the midst of an Open Admissions debate that found many scholarly humanists at their least humane, Mina should have a more uncritical admiration than most of us do for the great universities, for graduate training, for academic degrees and honors. She was always suggesting that the Ph.D. conferred special wisdom, despite all the evidence we sometimes see to the contrary. There was the further paradox that Mina—an authority on the teaching of basic writing—had as her favorite author Milton, that most academic of the great English poets. (Mina once said her ideal teaching schedule would be a section of Basic Writing and a course on Milton.) Another classic English writer that Mina greatly appreciated because of his relevance to academic writing was Francis Bacon. I remember her demonstrating in detail to a class of graduate students one day how Bacon could show them the way to organize a term paper. Just as Mina found something adult and intellectual in her young students, so she found something youthful and energizing in the tradition of academic discourse that influenced Milton and Bacon.

My point here about Mina's work is therefore related to the one I made earlier about her sense of basic writing students: again, she went further than most of her colleagues in the kind of commitment she made to the

scholarly enterprise. While most of us believe in the value of a college education for our students, Mina had an extraordinary trust in the qualities of academic discourse and in the habits of mind that such discourse fostered. One of her great interests was to identify more precisely the distinctive qualities of academic prose, to analyze the set of rules that guided, consciously or unconsciously, the performance of a successful academic writer. Mina did not finally have the opportunity to do this analysis in the full and systematic way that she felt was necessary, but there are observations about this subject scattered through her work. I would like to draw on a few of her phrases here in order to convey her Baconian assumptions about academic writing. Such writing, she says, "aspires to high standards of verification and sound reason"; it requires "shrewd assessments of what constitutes adequate proof"; it demands "the stances of fairness, objectivity, and formal courtesy that smooth the surface of academic disputation." Furthermore, academic writers need to be skilled in "habits of generalization." "These habits require that writers not only make abstract statements in a language that has been especially developed to extend the ladder of abstraction beyond conventional needs, but that they be able to move back and forth between levels of generalization in the interest of supporting their abstract statements." "Committed to extending the boundaries of the known, the scholar... is constantly proposing generalizations that cover the greatest possible number of instances. This requires both that he make statements that have broad applicability and that he defend them by the support of cases, arguments, and explanations." And finally as a teacher of basic writing students, Mina wanted to know more about the nature of the academic vocabulary, the common stock of words that teachers use as well as the specialized terms of a particular discipline. (When she was at City College, she arranged to have several writing teachers each enroll in an introductory course in an unfamiliar subject area in order to identify its special vocabulary and the special conventions assumed by its writing assignments.)

I've used Mina's comments on the features of academic writing quite extensively, because her book itself exemplifies and enacts all that she thought valuable in the academic mode. It is a book committed to sound reason, and to ordering and clarifying disparate examples of writing through rational discrimination. It is also a book that repeatedly demonstrates the power and value of the mind's inclination to order, whether in establishing causes, identifying problems, or suggesting the procedures for solving those problems.

As a result, the book is habitually classifying, even numbering, as a way

of producing tentative order, from an early section describing "four grammatical concepts that underlie most student misunderstandings about forms" to a concluding review of "seven basic thought patterns that transcend the intellectual classifications of various disciplines." And one can see in those two examples how she uses this power to order and generalize in the interest of creating a more powerful and more inclusive theoretical model for teachers—"the concepts that *underlie*," "the *basic* thought patterns." Yet this inclination to classify never hardens into the dogmatism of a rule book. Mina always acknowledges the complexity of her subject and its constantly shifting nature. She says at one point that grammar itself "is a web, not a list, of explanations, and often a seemingly simple feature of instruction will be located at the interstices of several grammatical concepts." The remark is characteristic of her sense that, in writing instruction, the seemingly simple is often complex, but that, on the other hand, the seemingly chaotic conceals something coherent and systematic.

*Errors and Expectations* makes its claims on us, then, through the firmness and clarity of its discriminations—in part through the aptness of its illustrations, and in part through the skill with which it moves back and forth from the specific to the speculative. But there is one more quality that characterized academic writing for Mina and that should be included here: "the stances of fairness, objectivity, and formal courtesy." Objectivity and formal courtesy are important when a writer is dealing, as Mina was, with material so susceptible to ridicule or to being dismissed as merely inconsequential. Mina's own tact is evident throughout the book: she looks for no scapegoats, she neither creates nor acknowledges adversaries, and she does not establish her own approach by aggressively repudiating the views of others. It is surprising, when one thinks about it, how many books addressed to skills teachers are anecdotal, colloquial, chummy, or slightly comical in their relation with the reader, and full of examples dramatizing the author in the classroom. Mina uses none of these stratagems, and her personal dignity and respect for her readers, conveyed through the manner and tone of her book, give her a special kind of authority.

I have paid particular attention to the qualities of Mina's writing that are bound up with the qualities of academic discourse because ultimately that is one of the book's important legacies to teachers of basic writing, who have sometimes come to doubt their importance in the academic community. *Errors and Expectations* is an academic book in the sense that in its very language and structure and tone, it enacts the academic ideal. Mina's craft is to demonstrate the habits of mind, the qualities of style, the

procedures of analysis and argument that academic training at its best can provide, and to bring those qualities to bear on matters of great human and moral concern.

For Mina, the technical mastery that enabled students to express themselves also made them freer intellectually. Skills teaching makes students aware of the linguistic rules that facilitate thought and communication. Those rules are mastered until they are no longer a matter of conscious effort. They become instead the habitual resources that allow students to create their own kind of writing performances based on choices *they* want to make. Mina often referred to training in ballet or piano (two kinds of training she herself had experienced) and found them analogous to training in the structure of sentences. “The practice of consciously transforming sentences from simple to complex structures (and vice versa), of compounding the parts of sentences, of transforming independent clauses into dependent clauses, of collapsing clauses into phrases or words, helps the student cope with the complexity in much the same way as finger exercises in piano or bar exercises in ballet enable performers to work out specific kinds of coordination that must be virtually habitual before the performer is free to interpret or even execute a total composition.” In Mina’s sense of the writer or the person, the goal is invariably choice, option, freedom—key words for her.

I would like to return to my original question—is *Errors and Expectations* the testament of an academic revolutionary? I have already suggested a typically academic answer: on the one hand, yes, since Mina transformed our way of seeing and judging what we do as teachers; on the other hand, no, since she was deeply committed to a tradition of academic discourse reaching back through the centuries. If we look again at the passage I quoted at the start of my talk and continue beyond its last sentence with the sentence that follows, we can see something of the same balancing tendency in Mina’s own language:

And having once asked this fruitful question their own revolution as teachers of English usually begins. It is a revolution that leads not inevitably or finally to a rejection of all rules and standards, which would be to deny the very point that is finally being made about language, namely that it is variously shaped by situations and bound by conventions, none of which is inferior to the others but none of which, also, can substitute for the others.

Rule and convention still must be taken into account, even in revolutionary situations. One way to resolve this question is to note that revolution is a word that Mina herself uses only rarely when she is describing what she and

other teachers are doing. Instead, her favorite metaphor is that of the frontier, apt enough, of course, for someone from South Dakota. The frontier of a profession was her term for basic skills teaching. She uses this image, characteristically, with great precision. The frontier is the place where everyone is a stranger, and where nobody is fully at home or settled in. In this new territory, everyone has to get his bearings, students and teachers alike, and everyone has to make adjustments in his habitual modes of thinking and acting. The frontier calls on everybody's resourcefulness and ingenuity in adapting his particular kind of knowledge to new situations. It also calls for a special openness and trust—in a difficult and sparsely populated land, people must cooperate for survival. And the frontier is finally a place where the future is necessarily more important than the past.

Mina's writing suggests much that we ourselves can do in the future. The last piece she published during her lifetime was titled "Some Needed Research on Writing." It is a poignant essay to read today, because it obviously sketches out work she was especially interested in and would have done herself, if she had lived. In the essay she proposes four broad questions that most urgently need to be answered, or to be given better provisional answers than we have produced up to now. Her questions play at the edges of *Errors and Expectations*, because they concern the successful instruction of the students who come to us for help. Each of Mina's questions serves to express one of her major concerns. The first asks how to recognize and stimulate growth in writing skills among ill-prepared young adults, the group usually taught as if they were either conventional college students or much younger learners at an earlier stage of development. The second question concerns the ways instruction can help recover lost time because, for these students, academic and economic pressures require rapid mastery rather than slow assimilation of skills. Her third question addresses the ways in which writers gain the attention of an academic audience by mastering qualities of "craftiness" and "cunning" hidden from the inexperienced writer.

Mina calls her final question ("What goes on and what ought to go on in the composition classroom?") "embarrassingly rudimentary," but it is not a question that brings her back to basics in any nostalgic way. Rather its purposes have been defined—with some academic craftiness—by the questions that have preceded it. Each of those questions suggested that the new students have created new issues, making the writing teacher's profession more crucial, but also more exacting. It seems fitting that Mina's final question (and virtually her final message to her colleagues)

asks us to look at ourselves as we are, to think of the new challenges we face, and to seek to bridge the gap between what is and what ought to be. Mina's own work, as much as that of any single individual, furnished preliminary answers to the questions she raised and made many of us reformulate our sense of the academic responsibilities of college writing teachers.



APPENDIX B

VIRGINIA SMITH: KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Virginia B. Smith

## KEYNOTE ADDRESS

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today, not just because of the importance of the subject of this conference, but because it honors Mina Shaughnessy. Mina and I crossed paths a number of times over the last several years. We were first introduced at a Carnegie Corporation dinner by Alden Dunham, of Carnegie. Both the corporation, through its financial aid, and Alden, through his personal interest and encouragement, had supported each of us: Mina, for her book about teaching writing, and me in my work at the Carnegie Commission.

When I transferred from the Commission to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), it didn't take me long to remember Mina and realize the help that she could provide for FIPSE. She became first an informal counselor, then more formally an adviser to the Networks project at Bronx Community College, and finally a member of FIPSE's board. Her counsel, seldom lengthy, was unusually wise and always resolutely, though realistically, optimistic. But I cherish her memory most because she was one of those rare people who put into practice three critical values, values which might almost be viewed in today's society as endangered species. And, because I am not an expert on literacy in any sense of the word, I thought I would talk about the broad values that motivated Mina's work and life and which, I think, are so important to society today.

Characterized briefly, her three beliefs were that teaching makes a difference, that the individual is important, and that literacy is power. Who wouldn't agree to the importance of those beliefs, but when we try to implement these values, they quickly lose ground to competing demands for resources, time, and energy. We are often forced to assume that implementation is complete when only the most minimal threshold of accomplishment has been reached.

---

*Virginia B. Smith is President of Vassar College.*

If we really believe teaching makes a difference, why in higher education are we so preoccupied with gauging the potential ability of students to learn, rather than assessing our own abilities to teach. We often hear professors say, "Send us better students." Rarely do we hear them say, "Send us students with great need, students who challenge our ability to reach and teach them." Rarely do we hear that teaching is a craft we can learn, by a scholarly approach to pedagogy, just as we can learn by a scholarly approach to the development of cellular life or any other field of inquiry; and rarely do we hear that teaching underprepared young adults how to write may be a profound task, not a simple task.

Not until we reverse these attitudes will we buttress and make meaningful the tenet that teaching does, indeed, make a difference. And this Mina stood for—in her speeches, in her writing, but most importantly in her actions. She called for the development of a pedagogy for illiteracy, for analysis of errors in writing that would inform the hierarchy of tasks in teaching writing. She called for teachers of writing who would "grope [their] ways into the turbulent disciplines of semantics and linguistics for fuller, more accurate data about words and sentences; . . . pursue more rigorously the design of developmental models; . . . examine more closely the nature of speaking and writing and define the subtle ways in which these forms of language both support and undo each other."<sup>1</sup>

Mina saw clearly the relationship of expectation to learning. Teachers, frustrated by a multiplicity of errors, may lower their expectations and thereby contribute to the failure of their own teaching. That teachers' efforts are conditioned by their own expectations is beyond question; learners' efforts are also conditioned by the teachers' expectations. Central, then, to a belief in the effectiveness of teaching is awareness about expectations and how those expectations have been formed.

Historically, American expectations have had a profound impact on education. Believing in democracy, we expected that education would be a key element in our life, but not expecting much of women, we did not initially include them in any of our colleges; and expecting little of slaves, or fearing too much power from literacy, we did not teach slaves to read and write. It was overexpectation, however, which gave us the cruelest disappointment. We expected to teach everyone to read and to write, to use education as a road to social justice, to teach the skills needed in our economy, to wipe out unemployment, and to do it all overnight. Failing to

---

<sup>1</sup> Mina Shaughnessy, "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing," *College Composition and Communication* 27 (October, 1976), p. 237.

reach these goals easily, we are now adjusting our expectations downward, perhaps to another extreme.

Our legislatures seem to be giving up on support for programs that aid the underprepared young adult. Our high school competency tests may be set at levels that are too basic. Having hoped too much, now, to save ourselves, we may be hoping too little. Were we wrong in our expectations, or did we allow too little time, or apply insufficient or inappropriate effort? There is a subtle difference between hope and expectation. We wait almost passively for a hope to be fulfilled, but an expectation arises because of some action on the part of those with the expectation. What right have we to expect? What have we done to lead us to expect? Implicit in these questions is the assumption that what we do as individuals will alter the outcome, and this of course leads to the second value that I mentioned: that individuals are important, that what an individual does can have an impact on the course of events.

The complexity of modern life makes it extremely easy for us to feel that the individual no longer has any control over her own life, or any power to make a change that could affect others. The acceptance of the system as a given and the necessity for adapting to it as best we can inevitably lead to a sense of depression and the curtailment of creative thought and energy that could improve the system.

Cynicism about our powerlessness as individuals is, perhaps, the greatest deterrent to improvement for both the society and individuals. The acceptance of defeat before trial is particularly prevalent in lower socio-economic groups and also among underprepared students. Recent ACE statistics on freshmen attitudes reveal that over 50 percent of the entering freshmen felt that they had no power as individuals to change society. Education is committed to the belief that the individual can both be changed and have the power to help others change. It is sobering to think of teaching classes in which 50 percent of the students do not accept the central purpose of education.

When I first went to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, I was told that with our very small level of funding—it was only \$10 million at that time—I should not give very many grants because the money wouldn't have an impact if given out in small amounts. This position is quite consistent with the philosophy in Washington and with the general push given by Congress to federal programs. One suggestion made to me as the new director was to fund ten projects at a million dollars each. It was argued that this would cut down overhead and staff time; it would make certain that each of the projects was reviewed at length; and it would be easy to explain to Congress. To be effective, it was assumed, a project

would have to be expensive and flashy. We chose the other road—to make small grants to a large number of projects. In many cases we were backing grass roots efforts by individuals. When last year's report on FIPSE by an outside evaluation agency was released, we were all pleased to see that our system of choice had indeed paid off. Not only was FIPSE suggested as a model for other federal programs, but it was clear that many of the projects were continuing to benefit students after the FIPSE funding had ended.

When faith is put in the individual at the operating level, investments and experiments have results. The idea that a panacea may rest in a system or a mass application of funds fails to take into account that human problems usually must be solved through human action and therefore are rarely responsive to grand, impersonal schemes. In Washington, FIPSE was not popular among some of the more committed and better credentialed analysts who were selling, at that time, megasystems. Megasystems are often the response when no one has yet solved the problem at the individual or operational level. That problems of literacy have not been solved before in this nation may well result from our tendency to propose generalized solutions without first analyzing the problems at the level of the individual.

Our response to the need for better secondary education, and for more higher education in the late 50's and early 60's, did not sufficiently consider the relationship between human problems and the need for solutions to those problems to be on a human scale. James D. Conant, in 1959, suggested that our high schools could be better if they were bigger. At the time he made this recommendation, less than one-fifth of our high schools met his size criterion. Now that we have greatly reduced the number of high schools and increased their sizes, we are not so certain that the anticipated benefits are being realized. A recent study suggests that bigger schools do not result in higher scholastic achievements, nor do they produce students who do better in college. Certainly, our own experience in college classrooms would reinforce the results of the study. It is ironic that not many years after Conant's report a new report, *Youth Welfare Policy and Transition*, prepared for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated that American high schools are too large.

Mina was concerned with whether the individual student, particularly the student with educational problems, could receive proper attention in massive systems. It was because of that concern that she encouraged Alison Bernstein [then program officer at FIPSE] and me to put our thoughts on this problem into a book, which was subsequently published as *The Impersonal Campus*. It was Mina's encouragement which led us to dedicate that book to her. Of course, her encouragement to write about issues and experiments was deeply tied to her belief in the power of literacy.

Too often we think in terms of functional literacy as the ability to read enough to take directions on a job, or to get around town, or to fill out census forms. Mina said, "Some people—English teachers among them—have even insisted that writing is a skill not everyone can acquire or needs to acquire especially in an age when television and tapes have liberated speech from transiency and telephones have reduced the burden of ritual and routine correspondence."<sup>2</sup> But to think of that side of literacy as the only one needed by some is to deny to that portion of our population the real power of literacy.

Certainly, the necessity for writing is substantially reduced in modern society; it is even reduced in massive systems of higher education. Certain types of pedagogy, of necessity, reduce practice with writing. For instance, large lecture classes almost necessitate short answer tests; as the class grows, assignments for written papers decline. When I was hiring people at FIPSE and the Carnegie Commission, I discovered that many were college graduates who had never written a paper and who had taken all of their examinations through multiple-choice questions or other short-answer forms. They had found a way to move through four years of college and earn a bachelor of arts degree or bachelor of science degree, more often the latter, with no experience in writing.

It is possible to teach youngsters about reading through "Sesame Street" and perhaps it is even possible to teach them to write words through "Sesame Street." But reading as a tool, unless it moves quickly to writing, can be simply a passive experience. The expressive experience—that active process of struggling with one's own responses and ideas, and putting them together in a way that someone else can read and ponder—is the side of literacy in which real power lies. As Mina pointed out, "It is in the nature of writing to encourage individuals to discover and explore their own hunches, to ponder over their own words, to respect their own thoughts enough to entrust them to a written page."<sup>3</sup> Thus the ability to write is intimately tied to the power to refine one's own thoughts, to develop them sufficiently to permit them to be examined for more than a fleeting moment.

I often wonder whether the Gettysburg Address would have any force for us today if it had only been spoken and not circulated and studied by generations of students. Would Tom Paine's utterances have sparked a

---

<sup>2</sup>"The English Professor's Malady." Address at the Association of Departments of English Conference, Albany, New York, June 1977.

<sup>3</sup>"The English Professor's Malady."

nation if they had only been television speeches? To some extent, the quality of ideas in the nation today has declined as the ability to reach people through modern technology has increased. The current illusion is that satisfactory communication can take place orally. We must ask the question whether oral communication is by its very nature lacking in vigor, precision, and depth, and thereby doomed to be temporal and shallow. But of course.

The real power of writing can be experienced only if we employ appropriate vocabularies to articulate concepts. Many of our college students fail to achieve satisfactory levels of writing for their particular colleges, not because they can't write, but because they don't know the relevant vocabularies. Vocabularies are specific to fields, sometimes strangely so. I remember when I was heading the United States Observer Delegation at the UNESCO Conference on Innovation in Bucharest, everybody was asking if the United States was going to make an "intervention." I thought this a very weighty question and figured we would have to discuss it at length before deciding whether an "intervention" would be made. Then I discovered it meant a "speech," so I said yes, and then learned that a "speech" in official international conferences was a written statement which is reviewed by a great number of people and put into the record.

In one of Mina's speeches, which were, fortunately for us, written, she also showed concern for vocabulary. She said, "...we need above all else to take a closer look at vocabulary, which is of course critical to the development of complex concepts, the maturation of syntax, and the acquisition of an appropriate tone or register. . . . We have done little to describe the common stock of words teachers assume students know—proper names, words that have transcended their disciplines, words that initiate academic activities (document, define, etc.), words that articulate logical relationships, etc. In short, the territory of academic rhetoric—its vocabulary, its convention, its purposes—is waiting for an Aristotle."<sup>4</sup>

For us as educators, then, the challenge is to equip our students not only with writing skills, but also with the ability to acquire future vocabularies. Society changes swiftly, and with those swift changes comes the need for new vocabularies. Even now, and certainly in the future, full powers of literacy require a revised scientific vocabulary and compendium of concepts. A new awareness of technology and its importance in our lives,

---

<sup>4</sup> "Some Needed Research in Writing," *College Composition and Communication*, 28 (December 1977), p. 320.

including computer literacy, and a new international literacy are also required. Scientific knowledge not only grows; its orientation sometimes shifts dramatically. Thirty years ago, who talked about pollution? Perhaps if the vocabulary of pollution had been more broadly shared at that time, we would not find ourselves talking so much about it today.

The operative vocabularies in any society depend upon the state of knowledge in that society. To the extent that any portion of the society is cut off from that expanding and changing knowledge, it cannot participate in the society and in the decisions of the society in any meaningful way. In science the shifts have been broad and often revolutionary. Think for a moment of how vocabulary in discourse must have changed when we discovered that not sin but germs caused disease, when we came to know that illnesses resulted from physical rather than metaphysical causes. And today we must incorporate new vocabulary and new concepts as science establishes that pollution causes disease and illness, that chemicals and invisible rays affect our well-being. We moved from a vocabulary of mysterious unseen forces causing illness to tangible physical causes, and now must alter our vocabulary again to take in the new, unseen forces.

Modern communication also increasingly requires computer literacy, not necessarily a mastery of a computer language but knowledge of computer capabilities and limitations. Reliance on computers in daily life will become the norm. With that reliance we may alter our thinking modes, that is, shift to binary analyses. Will that shift necessitate remedial education for solving problems that require more complex patterns of thought? Our most stubborn social problems cannot be solved with simple yes-no, in-or-out responses. Or, in another aspect of modern technology, will we lose the cyclical concept of time, as we switch from reading clock faces to digital screens? It is possible that technology will require new ways to fill in the subtleties of reasoning and thinking that are lost by precise and limiting forms.

The United States is moving into a new era, and that new era will require shifts in our vocabulary. Words like "independent" and "dependent" will need to be replaced by better understanding of words such as "interdependent." The fundamentals of Middle East politics and economy must be mastered. Today the United States, as a result of increases in its Chicano, Cuban, and Puerto Rican populations, has the seventh or eighth largest Spanish-speaking population in the world. In 1976 there were thirty million people in the United States whose native tongue was not English or who lived in households where languages other than English were spoken. In short, ethnic and cultural diversity is far from decreasing and may well increase in the future. We will probably have to include in our literacy criteria for the future the command of two languages, not one.



As society changes, the standards for literacy will change with it, but whatever its current form, its importance to this society remains central. Alice Chandler [Acting President, The City College of New York] told us as she opened the conference that the relationship between democracy and literacy runs deep. I would say that without the empowerment that literacy gives individuals there can be no democracy, for it is that empowerment that makes it possible for us to share not only values, but concerns, and finally to move forward to shared solutions of our problems.

APPENDIX C  
LESTER FAIGLEY: LITERACY AFTER  
THE REVOLUTION

*Lester Faigley*

## Literacy After the Revolution

One of the traditions of the CCCC Chair's address is to narrate an anxiety dream. Andrea Lunsford still has the best one, when she dreamed about beginning her address, turning the first page, and finding only the word *linguine* on the next page, and on the page after that, and on the page after that, and on all the rest of the pages. My dream was somewhat less fantastic. I dreamed that I met many of my friends walking out of the auditorium as I was walking in to speak. I wanted desperately to ask them why they were leaving, but then I thought that I probably didn't want to know.

When faced last August with a deadline for supplying a title for this talk, I began reading the addresses of past chairs printed in CCC. They comprise a distinguished collection of essays on the values placed on literacy and on what it means to be a college teacher of writing. The tradition of the chair delivering an address at the opening general session began with Richard Lloyd-Jones in 1977, the first year I attended the convention. Reading the addresses I had heard over my years at the annual convention was like reading a personal history of the field, a history I had witnessed.

Together the chairs' addresses also caused me to reflect on how I came to be before you today. The condition of living in a highly urbanized, mobile, and transient society allows remarkable sets of circumstances to direct the paths of particular lives, and my life is no exception. When I graduated from high school, I never planned to be an English major, never planned to get a Ph.D, never planned to be a college teacher, and certainly never planned to be chair of CCCC. In each case I could narrate a series of minor events that were pivotal in shaping years of my life. I'm sure each of you can think of at least one small event where if a particular person were ab-

*Lester Faigley* directs the Division of Rhetoric and Composition at the University of Texas at Austin. This essay is a revised version of his 1996 CCCC Chair's address delivered in Milwaukee in March 1996.

*Faigley/After the Revolution*

sent or if your presence at a particular location had been just few minutes earlier or later, the subsequent course of your life would have been very different.

But if the particular paths that our lives take are very influenced by seemingly chance events, the broader tracks show a great deal more regularity. After all, there are over 3,000 of us at this convention. Evidently some common forces brought us here. I only gradually became aware of these forces. Like most other college writing teachers of my generation, I was not trained specifically in rhetoric and composition. I taught writing in graduate school as a teaching assistant, but at the universities where I did my graduate work, there was no specialization in rhetoric and composition at that time. Teaching writing was something you did for a living but not something you thought about very much. For those of us who found our way into rhetoric and composition, somewhere along the way we began thinking about teaching writing other than as a drudgery from which we wished deliverance. We realized that likely we would be teaching writing in some form if we were to have a professional career, but more immediate were the positive experiences that we were teaching something quite valuable for our students' lives.

It is not coincidental that early experiences of teaching basic writers figure so prominently among the past chairs of my generation—Jacqueline Jones Royster, Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Anne Ruggles Gere, Bill Cook, Don McQuade, Jane Peterson, Andrea Lunsford, David Bartholomae, Miriam Chaplin, Lee Odell, Rosentene Purnell, Jim Hill, and Lynn Quitman Troyka—and among many other of my contemporaries. We came of age when the great social issues of the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam War were being debated publicly and when education was widely believed to be the chief means of ending social inequality. Early experiences of teaching basic writers exposed for these teachers the role and power of institutions in maintaining social divisions. But these teachers also found spaces where institutional power could be challenged and where students who had been labeled as deficient could succeed.

That the good classroom could help produce the good society seemed self-evident when I began teaching college writing courses. The students I taught were becoming more diverse, and I believed composition teachers were better situated than anyone to adapt to their needs. We were the faculty who were exploring anti-authoritarian ways of teaching and who were encouraging our students to use literacy to participate in democratic community life, to engage civic issues, and to promote social justice. Even though, like nearly everyone else teaching composition, I experienced the second-class status of a writing teacher in an English department, I felt that composition was going to do fine in the long run. We were in step

with the new mission of colleges and universities to provide education for all who wanted it. History seemed to be on our side.

Now that we are more than halfway through the 1990s and closing quickly on both the end of the millennium and the fiftieth anniversary of CCCC, it no longer seems like we are riding the wave of history but instead are caught in a rip tide carrying us away from where we want to go. Part of this frustration is linked to the growth of rhetoric and composition as a discipline. Had not the members of CCCC been so successful in creating an expansive discipline, in fostering important research and scholarship, and in broadening the ways in which writing is taught, perhaps visions of restoring rhetoric to the central place in the American college curriculum might have remained nostalgic images of the past. At the same time, however, writing teachers who have been at the forefront of initiating change have run up against a multitude of institutional barriers and attitudes that would limit writing instruction to teaching students to replicate the traditional forms of academic and professional discourses. Most disappointing, the discipline's success has not influenced institutions to improve the working conditions for many teachers of writing. A huge percentage of college writing courses are taught by part-time faculty who endure uncertain employment, heavy workloads, poor pay, nonexistent benefits, and often the lack of the most meager support services such as a desk and a mailbox.

A decade ago, Maxine Hairston in her Chair's address blamed the literature faculty for the problems writing teachers face. Now the situation for writing teachers might seem rosy if the problems could be resolved within English departments, no matter how petty and vicious the politics. I'm going to talk today about how larger forces of change affect how we see ourselves and what we do. These changes are of such magnitude that they have been labeled revolutions—one a technological transformation called the *digital revolution* and the other an economic, social and political transformation called the *revolution of the rich*. These revolutions have been described as having very different impacts—the digital revolution as expanding access and the revolution of the rich as contracting it—but we may eventually come to see them as different aspects of an even larger scale change.

I want to begin with the revolution of the rich. What no one, including writing teachers, foresaw 20 years ago was the extent to which the creation of wealth would be divorced from labor and redistributed, leaving the United States the most economically polarized among industrialized nations, with the divide between rich and poor continuing to widen. The most recent Federal Reserve figures available, from 1989, indicate that the wealthiest 1% of the population, living in households with a net worth of at least \$2.3 million each, own almost 40% of America's wealth. The top

*Faigley/After the Revolution*

20% of U.S. households, worth \$180,000 or more, own nearly all of its wealth—more than 80% (Bradsher).

Those in the middle have increasingly struggled to maintain their position. The workweek in America has increased and leisure time has decreased since 1970. Juliet Schor found that the average working American in 1989 put in 163 more hours a year than he or she did 20 years earlier—the equivalent of an extra month of work. Those who work harder for lower real wages and reduced benefits have found life precarious. Business executives take great credit for increasing corporate profits through downsizing, but these profits have come out of the pockets of the workers. During the 1970s and 1980s, corporations succeeded in busting unions and in rolling back government social programs.

But the most important strategy to increase profits has been to seek greater flexibility in hiring workers. Between 1979 and 1995, the *New York Times* estimates from Department of Labor statistics that 43 million jobs were eliminated in the United States (Uchitelle and Kleinfield). The layoffs in the 1990s read like casualty totals from World War I battles: 123,000 gone from AT&T, 50,000 fired by Sears, 18,800 pink slips at Delta Airlines, 16,800 cut from Eastman Kodak. Four companies out of five in America laid off workers in 1995. These reductions came not at a time of economic depression but when the economy was booming and the stock market was setting record highs. While unemployment is currently low in the United States and millions of new jobs have been created, there has not been such job instability since the Great Depression and never before have highly paid, highly educated workers been so vulnerable. Only 35% of currently laid-off full-time workers find jobs comparable to the ones they held.

Workers have not shared in the prosperity of the last 15 years. The median wage in 1994 adjusted for inflation is nearly 3% below what it was in 1979. Household income climbed 10% during the same period, but the richest 20% received 97% of that gain (Uchitelle and Kleinfield). The accumulation of wealth at the top is staggering even when compared to the robber barons of the nineteenth century. On November 29, 1995, Steven Jobs, the co-founder of Apple Computers, made \$1.2 billion on paper on the first day of the public issue of his company Pixar Animation Studios, when the stock price jumped from 22 to 39. In August, 1995, Jim Clark, the co-founder of Netscape, made \$1.3 billion when it went public. To give some perspective, these sums are over double the annual gross domestic product of a small nation like Belize (CIA). That's what I call empowerment.

What is different today from the era of monopoly capitalism in the 19th and early 20th centuries is that people in the last century looked to government to regulate the monopolies of industries, railroads, and banks.

For example, San Francisco newspaper editor Henry George attacked speculators who reaped huge profits from the rising price of land that they did not improve. He proposed a tax on this "unearned increment" that the government would use to address the misery caused by industrialization. Today no one is calling for taxes to ameliorate poverty on money earned by speculation. Instead government is identified with bureaucracy, inefficiency, and waste. Current defenders of the free market go even further than Andrew Carnegie, who justified laissez-faire economics by appealing to Social Darwinism, but nonetheless saw the need for public schools and libraries.

Today the invisible hand of the unregulated market is trusted to do nearly everything, and publicly supported higher education is becoming an institution of the past. Tax dollar support for higher education is being reduced so rapidly that huge tuition and fee increases cannot keep pace. From 1991 to 1995, the California State Legislature slashed the budget of the University of California at Berkeley by \$70 million, or about 19%, and over the same period the City University of New York has been cut \$200 million, or 20% (Honan).

More and more, colleges and universities are being ordered to make sweeping changes by politicians who are unfamiliar with higher education. They see colleges and universities as bloated and want to "re-engineer" higher education on the market-driven principles of "downsizing" by imposing heavier workloads, getting rid of tenure, and converting full-time jobs into "permanent temp" positions. In the corporate world, these changes are called "planned staffing." Arizona Regent John Munger, an opponent of tenure, puts it bluntly: "There's plenty of faculty out there who want to teach and are willing to teach without tenure, and frankly who we might be able to obtain at a cheaper price and with more hiring flexibility" (Mayes). Munger and his allies are already far along in these "reforms." According to the Education Department's National Center for Education Statistics, the percentage of part-time faculty in institutions of higher education rose between 1970 to 1991 from 22% to 35%. These jobs are also disproportionately held by women.<sup>1</sup> In this respect writing programs have been pioneers in the new employment structure of higher education.

Given the magnitude of these forces, continuing to argue for a vision of literacy for participation in democratic community life, civic engagement, and social justice feels like swimming against the current. But as in the case of rip tides where there are often complex cross currents, so too are the social and economic forces influencing higher education. The revolution of the rich has been facilitated by another related revolution—the digital revolution of electronic communications technologies. These tech-

*Faigley/After the Revolution*

nologies have grown up along with CCCC. It is very difficult to imagine from the perspective of 1949, the year of the first meeting of CCCC, the development of computer and information technologies and the impacts they would have on the industrialized world. Computers in 1949 were comparable to automobiles in 1899. Computers, like early cars, were bulky, slow, expensive, and difficult to use. Their utility was confined largely to replicating certain functions of mechanical calculators. Even though the transistor had been invented in 1947, the big advances that allowed the rapid increase in computing power and decrease in cost were yet to come, especially the development of the integrated circuit in 1957 and the microprocessor in 1971 (Braun and MacDonald). We can now describe the history of computers in terms of household objects. A throw-away greeting card that sings "Happy Birthday" has more computing processing power than existed in 1951; a home video camera has more than a 1976 IBM 360, the standard mainframe machine that I used as an assistant professor (Huey 37).

Personal computers invaded the academy in large numbers beginning in the early 1980s, and where they were available in composition classrooms, they enhanced process pedagogy by making it easier for students to revise their papers. But as personal computers became enormously more powerful in memory and speed, they began to challenge the unproblematic relationship between familiar pedagogy and new technology. When personal computers became linked to other computers in local-area networks, writing teachers were forced to devise new pedagogies because the traditional lines of authority had to be renegotiated. With the coming of the Internet and the World Wide Web, another major renegotiation of pedagogy and authority is now in progress.

I direct a large college writing program that aims to give every student opportunities to practice the new electronic literacies unless they prefer to be in a traditional classroom. We are committed to teaching the great majority of our writing courses in networked classrooms by 1998. The Division of Rhetoric and Composition and the University of Texas administration believe that college students should be able to use the media of literacy that they will likely use in their later lives. The Division of Rhetoric and Composition also has as one of its central goals to encourage students to read and write about significant public issues.

Discourse on significant public issues abounds on the Internet, and giving students access to participate in these discussions at first seemed like a wish come true. Our instructors quickly explored the potential of connecting students with ongoing world-wide discussions of political and social issues. For example, at the time of the elections in South Africa that brought Nelson Mandela to power, a graduate instructor, Noel Stahle, directed his



students to the on-line newsgroup, `soc.culture.southafrica`, where they were able to obtain first-hand accounts of the elections and to contact people in South Africa. Other instructors have involved students in on-line discussion groups concerning domestic and international issues.

But as talk radio so vividly demonstrates, providing venues for the discussion of public issues does not necessarily lead to a more informed public, increased civic engagement, or enhanced democracy. The problems our instructors have encountered in introducing students to newsgroups reflect larger debates over the impacts of the Internet. In the wake of the exponential growth of the Internet—from 213 host computers in 1981 to over 9,000,000 in early 1996—and sweeping pronouncements on the scale of John Perry Barlow's that (forget Gutenberg!) the coming of the Internet is the most transformative event in human history since the capture of fire, others have begun asking into what changed state are people being transformed.<sup>2</sup> One of the most strident critics of the Internet, Mark Slouka, sees the appeal of life in virtual worlds motivated by the degradation of our physical environment. Slouka blames technology for our present lack of civic engagement, arguing that when our own communities have become unsafe, uncertain, unpleasant, and ugly, we seek artificial ones.

The stampede to get on-line has prompted much hype and horror about the Internet, but before we pronounce it good or bad for our discipline, we should pause to examine how the Internet developed over several decades and what actually is new about its widespread use. The Internet has its origins in a Cold War project in the 1960s that addressed how the military would maintain communications in the aftermath of a nuclear war, when presumably many if not most lines of communication and most major communications centers would be destroyed. The ingenious solution was to flatten the communications hierarchy, making every node equivalent so that the loss of any one node would not collapse the system. Each node would have the capability to originate, pass, and receive individually addressed messages bundled in packets. The routing of messages became relatively unimportant. Messages would bounce from host to host like a beach ball batted around in the crowd at a free concert until it finally reached its destination.

In 1969 the Pentagon began connecting researchers at military and university sites on the ARPANET, enabling them to transmit data at high speeds and access each other's computers. The ARPANET grew rapidly in the 1970s because its utility was obvious and its structure accommodated different kinds of machines, overcoming the problem of incompatibility. Because the demand for high-speed communications was so great at the time the National Science Foundation took on the expansion of the Internet in 1986, the NSF decided to build a network capable of connecting

most of the nation's researchers. By 1990 the Internet had outgrown the community of scientists as corporations and individuals began to take advantage of the Internet's speed and low cost, and by 1993 the growth of the Internet became explosive.

It is not surprising that the Internet would become so widely used so quickly. The Internet became available at a time when other new low-cost, high-speed communications technologies—FAX machines, cellular telephones, and cable television—were also growing in popularity. But what is surprising is how the Internet came to be used. Soon after the introduction of the original ARPANET in 1969, researchers began to do more than access and transfer data at remote sites. Those researchers who had personal accounts soon exploited the net for person-to-person communication that ranged from project collaboration to schmoozing to the first hobby bulletin boards. Just as was the case for older technologies, researchers on the ARPANET quickly discovered new uses that hadn't been imagined by the designers.

A decade later, between 1979 and 1983, programmers wrote the software that led eventually to thousands of newsgroups created on USENET and on other networks.<sup>3</sup> The number of words posted each day on these newsgroups may now exceed the number of words printed each day—a fact that enthusiasts like Barlow celebrate as the overcoming of barriers to communication and that skeptics like Slouka decry as a morass of babel in which reflective thought disappears. Overlooked in these pronouncements is that a significant new medium of literacy has come into existence with the Internet.

In 1982, Thomas Miller and I conducted a survey of 200 college-educated people writing on the job, stratified according to type of employer and type of occupation. We found that everyone in an occupation that requires a college education wrote on the job and wrote frequently. Nearly three-fourths of the people sampled claimed to devote 10% or more of their work time to writing, but very few reported writing much off the job. For many people who have access to the Internet, that situation has changed. They may be using work time for personal writing, but they are nonetheless writing for purposes other than work. For many people on-line newsgroups and chat rooms have become something close to an addiction.

The Internet will soon be as ubiquitous as cable television as the costs of computers and connections continue to drop. At least ten million people today in the United States are connected either directly to the Internet or to commercial on-line services. Even more phenomenal has been the growth of the World Wide Web, which in months became a major medium of publishing. By August 1994, just two years after its introduction by the European Nuclear Research Center, Internet traffic on the World Wide

Web was greater than the volume of electronic mail. If this growth pattern continues, traffic on the Web will surpass the total world voice communication traffic by 1998 (Rutkowski).

When the NSF backbone was turned off on April 30, 1995, the Internet became privatized, and with the signing into law of the Telecommunications Reform Act in February 1996, the land rush is on for the control of Cyberspace. Initially, the part of the telecommunications bill that has been most controversial is the Communications Decency Act, which is a truly benighted piece of legislation but which also is likely to be struck down in numerous court challenges.<sup>4</sup> The major long-term impacts, however, will come from removing regulations from corporations involved in computing, communications, publishing, and entertainment. The new media megaliths created by the mergers of Time Warner/CNN, Westinghouse/CBS, and Disney/ABC are only the beginnings of consolidation of power as the giants buy up the technology to control how we work, how we get information, how we shop, how we relax, and how we communicate with other people.

AT&T, which we used to think of as a telephone company, has been fast out of the starting blocks following the Telecommunications Act to reach out and crush someone—notably Prodigy, CompuServe, and America Online along with MCI—by offering five hours of free Internet service monthly to all of its 80 million long-distance customers beginning on March 14, 1996. This move points the way of the future because it not only gives AT&T an advantage in its telephone business but greatly expands its share of telecommunication and financial services. Soon AT&T is going to launch its WorldNet Internet service that will insure credit card transactions for users of its Universal Card, creating a world-wide Home Shopping Network with massive possibilities for cross-marketing with other partners.

As much as I resist AT&T's "you will" advertisements that offer scenes of technological determinism, I do not foresee colleges and universities remaining unaffected by these developments for long. AT&T and the other telecommunication giants are committed to put every household with a computer and disposable income on-line in the very near future, and soon the majority of students we teach are going to come from these households. Many colleges are already responding by giving students easy high-speed access to the Internet. By December 1996, my university will have installed ethernet connections in every dormitory room, boasting "a port for every pillow." Student traffic on the Internet at the University of Texas doubled from spring to fall semester in 1995.

When students enter one of our networked classrooms, they quickly dispel any assumptions of their teachers that they do little writing on their own. Most use email, and many already have personal home pages on the

World Wide Web. While many of these personal home pages are little more than self-advertisements, the students who made them have experience producing and publishing multimedia forms of literacy.

Some have made quite remarkable use of this new literacy. Even though Generation X often gets bashed for its political apathy, many students have used their digital literacy to engage social and political issues. For example, the Web site of an undergraduate student at Swarthmore, Justin Paulson, became an important distribution point for the publications of the Zapatista rebels in the Mexican state of Chiapas. Many thousands of people have connected to Paulson's Web site and have read essays, communiqués, and articles about the Zapatistas. The Web site itself has become much publicized through articles in many magazines and newspapers including *The Guardian* (UK) and *Reforma* (Mexico). In April 1995, the Mexican Foreign Minister, José Angel Gurría, declared that the uprising in Chiapas is a "Guerra de Tinta y de Internet" ("a war of ink and of the Internet"). The role of the Internet in the Zapatista uprising becomes evident when Chiapas is contrasted to the Shining Path rebellion in Peru. The Zapatistas have been able to historicize the context of their rebellion and convey the complexity of a peasant society without resorting to ongoing violence.

While I am much encouraged by the creativity and commitment students like Justin Paulson, their Web sites need to be placed in a larger perspective. Pointing to their work as proof that digital literacy necessarily leads to democratic participation and civic engagement is another version of the good classroom leading to the good society. We as teachers have little control over who gains access to higher education and even less control of access to the Internet. Very simply, the Internet is not the world. Use of the Internet is even more skewed than consumption of the world's energy resources, where less than 5% of the world's population who live in the United States annually consumes nearly 25% of its energy resources (*Economist Book*). In January 1995, nearly 98% of Internet hosts were located in the United States, Western Europe, Canada, Australia, and Japan. The presence on the Internet of much of Africa, Asia, and Latin America is nonexistent (In Africa, there were only 90 hosts outside of South Africa).

Even within the United States, Internet users are far from being equally distributed across the population. A major Internet publisher, O'Reilly and Associates, conducted a survey of United States residents over 18 years of age, which used random telephone dialing to obtain interviews with a statistically representative sample of nearly 30,000 people. This survey, released in October 1995, confirmed findings of other surveys that younger people are the most frequent users of the Internet.<sup>5</sup> Over half the users are between the ages of 18 and 34 (57%) and only 4% are 55 or older. They are

also well-off financially. Median annual income in 1994 is reported as between \$50,000 and \$75,000. And they are mostly white. There is no doubt that African-Americans are severely underrepresented because their percentage of ownership of computers is far lower than that of white Americans. A 1989 U.S. Census Bureau report estimated that nearly 27 million whites but only 1.5 million African-Americans used computers at home (Stuart).

The O'Reilly survey found that a third of Internet users are women, a higher percentage than earlier surveys that gave estimates that 80–90% of Internet users are men. Nonetheless, even the O'Reilly figures have the gender skew at 2 to 1. The disparity of men and women on the Internet indicates that factors beyond merely owning a computer with a connection to the Internet and being literate in English determine access. People must have time to keep up with the abundant discourse if they are to be active participants, and the people who have this time are most likely to be young, affluent-white men.

Up to now the debate over the Internet within the humanities has been conducted in terms of the printed book. In *The Gutenberg Elegies*, Sven Birkerts asks "What is the place of reading . . . in our culture?" (15) and he answers that it is increasingly shrinking, with the attendant effects of the loss of deep thinking, the erosion of language, and the flattening of historical perspective. Birkerts calls on us to resist the tide of electronic media; his last words in the book are "refuse it." It's disappointing for someone as thoughtful as Birkerts to allow his book to derail by collapsing all electronic media into a single form and then offering an either/or vision of the future. Anyone who has used email knows that it bears little similarity to television beyond light appearing on a screen, and we haven't thrown away pencils, legal pads, or the good books that Birkerts loves to curl up with.

The more misleading either/or that Birkerts posits, however, is that reflective thinking can occur only in acts of reading. I would like to let him in on a little secret that writing teachers know: college students often become more careful, critical, and appreciative readers after a semester in a writing course. I'm learning that little secret again. This semester for the first time I am devoting a significant part of a writing course to graphic design, and I am discovering that after years of attempting to teach students to analyze images, they learn much more quickly when they create images on their own. Active learners can think reflectively about any human symbolic activity whatever the medium.

If we come back to our annual convention a decade from now and find that the essay is no longer on center stage, it will not mean the end of our discipline. I expect that we will be teaching an increasingly fluid, multi-

*Faigley/After the Revolution*

media literacy, and that we will be quite happy that attempts in the past failed to drop our fourth "C," "Communication,"—a term David Bartholomae noted in his 1988 Chair's address that "keeps us from ever completely knowing our subject" (45).

What concerns me much more is whether we as a professional organization can sustain a shared sense of values when in many respects history is not on our side. Benjamin Barber summarizes our condition when he writes that the more hollow values of the Enlightenment: "materialism, solipsism, and radical individualism [have triumphed] over certain of its nobler aspirations: civic virtue, just community, social equality, and the lifting of the economic yoke from what were once known as the laboring classes" (222). These nobler aspirations were developed and spread primarily through the practices of literacy. We know that literacy education has often not lived up to these ideals and has functioned instead to label individuals and groups as deficient, inferior, and unworthy. Nevertheless, these ideals have provided the means of critique for educational practices that uphold illegitimate hierarchies of power.

When I first came to the annual convention in 1977, I needed CCCC for the intellectual community it provided. Over the years I have come to appreciate more the values we share in common. In a culture that is increasingly cynical about the belief that schools should offer equal opportunity to education, we have remained steadfast to the goal of literacy for equality. Even if many of us occupy less powerful positions in less powerful departments, we still have many strengths. We are not tied to narrow disciplinary turf. We can cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries. We can be confident that the need for what we teach will only increase. And as part of a much larger professional organization, we have many possibilities for working with teachers in the schools and with colleagues in the other college organizations of NCTE.

But we also have some hard questions before us. Can we do anything to stop the decline in publicly supported education? Can we promote a literacy that challenges monopolies of knowledge and information? Can we use technology to lessen rather than widen social divisions? The overriding question facing us as a professional organization is: What do you do when the tide seems to be running against you? I don't think there is any big answer but there are some little ones. You have to look outward. You have to be smarter and more aware. You have to look for opportunities to inform people about what you do. You have to practice what you preach and engage in public discourse. You have to form alliances. You have to be more tolerant of your friends and look for common ground. You have to organize.

Our charge is in the last two sentences from *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures*, the recently published final book from Jim Berlin, who sustained me through his work and his friendship. He writes: "It is time all reading and writing teachers situate their activities within the contexts of the larger profession as well as the contexts of economic and political concerns. We have much to gain working together and much to lose working alone" (180). May Jim Berlin remain present among us.

### Notes

1. These numbers come from the National Center for Education Statistics (230, 234). The statistics on full-time higher education faculty count full-time adjuncts; thus the percentage of non-tenure-track faculty is actually much higher than 35%. In 1991, the percentages of full-time women and men faculty were nearly equal, but the percentage of women in part-time positions was over two-thirds (66.8%).

2. This debate is enacted in "What Are We Doing On-Line?"

3. See *Salus*, chapters 15 and 18.

4. A panel of federal judges ruled the Communications Decency Act unconstitutional in June 1996.

5. A January 1994 survey found that 62% of respondents were under age 35; 73% under age 45 (Quarterman).

### Works Cited

- Barber, Benjamin R. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Times Books, 1995.
- Bartholomae, David. "Freshman English, Composition, and CCCC." *CCC* 40 (1989): 38-50.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures*. Urbana: NCTE, 1996.
- Birkerts, Sven. *The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.
- Bradsher, Keith. "Gap in Wealth in U.S. Called Widest in West." *New York Times* 17 Apr. 1995: A1+.
- Braun, Ernest, and Stuart MacDonald. *Revolution in Miniature: The History and Impact of Semiconductor Electronics Re-explored*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Central Intelligence Agency. *The World Factbook, 1995*. Washington, DC: CIA, 1995.
- The Economist Book of Vital World Statistics, 1990*. New York: Times Books, 1990.
- Faigley, Lester, and Thomas P. Miller. "What We Learn from Writing on the Job." *College English* 44 (1982): 557-69.
- George, Henry. *Progress and Poverty. An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth*. San Francisco: Hilton, 1879.
- Hairston, Maxine C. "Breaking Our Bonds and Reaffirming Our Connections." *CCC* 36 (1985): 272-82.
- Honan, William H. "New Pressures on the University" *New York Times* 9 Jan. 1994, sec.4A: 16.
- Huey, John. "Waking Up to the New Economy." *Fortune* 17 June 1994: 36-46.
- Mayes, Kris. "Tenure Debate Worries Faculty" *Phoenix Gazette* 28 Sept. 1995, B1.
- National Center for Education Statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics 1995*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1995.
- O'Reilly and Associates. "Defining the Internet Opportunity." <http://www.ora.com/survey> (31 Oct. 1995).
- Paulson, Justin. "Ya Basta!" <http://www.peak.org/~justin/ezln/ezln.html> (31 Oct. 1995).
- Quarterman, John S. "The Internet Demographic Survey." *Matrix News* 4 (January 1994): 2-6.
- Rutkowski, Anthony-Michael. "Bottom-Up Information Infrastructure and the Internet." <http://info.isoc.org:80/speeches/upitt-foundersday.html> (31 Oct. 1995).
- Salus, Peter H. *Casting the Net: From ARPANET to Internet and Beyond*. Reading, MA: Addison, 1995.

*Faigley/After the Revolution*

- Schor, Juliet B. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic, 1992.
- Slouka, Mark. *War of the Worlds: Cyberspace and the High-Tech Assault on Reality*. New York: Basic, 1995.
- Stuart, Reginald. "High-Tech Redlining." *Utne Reader* 68 (March-April 1995): 73.
- Uchitelle, Louis, and N. R. Kleinfield. "On the Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties" *New York Times* 3 March 1996, sec. 1: 1.
- "What Are We Doing On-Line?" *Harper's* August 1995: 35-46.



APPENDIX D

ROBERT FUNK: THE UNEASY PARTNERSHIP  
BETWEEN GRAMMAR AND WRITING INSTRUCTION

KeyNote Address:  
The Uneasy Partnership between  
Grammar and Writing Instruction  
Robert Funk  
Eastern Illinois University

---

A paper presented at the Fifth Annual Conference of the NCTE Assembly  
for the Teaching of English Grammar, August 12 & 13, 1994. Illinois State  
University, Normal, IL.

---

I wanted to use, as my title, the line "She taught me how to use the comma splice," which was a comment that my friend and co-author Susie Day once got on a student evaluation form. Although this comment illustrates the risks involved in teaching grammatical concepts to composition students, I couldn't quite bend it to fit the main focus of my speech today. So I chose, instead, a more pedestrian title. I took this title from an advertising blurb for Professor Rei Noguchi's recent book *Grammar and the Teaching of Writing* (1991). I think the phrase "an uneasy partnership" accurately describes my perception of the situation that exists in many college and high school English departments throughout the country. Indeed, I've noticed that a number of the presentations at this conference are addressing the same issues about the link between grammatical knowledge and writing competence that I'm going to be discussing today.

My thesis is quite straightforward, perhaps even obvious: I contend that an important professional partnership does exist between teachers of grammar and teachers of writing, and that we need to value and strengthen this partnership, if at all possible. But that partnership is an uneasy one, to say the least. In fact, "uneasy" is probably too polite a term: "downright hostile" is often closer to the truth -- unfortunately. Professor Noguchi, who consciously adopts a moderate position on the question of how grammar instruction affects the teaching of writing, speaks of "the staunch cadre of pro-grammar instructors" and the "hard-line anti-grammar teachers." The terms he uses, staunch and hard-line, suggest the often polemical nature of the grammar controversy.

I think most of us here are familiar with the main points of the conflict. Those in the hard-line anti-grammar camp claim that research reveals little evidence that direct instruction in grammar has any positive effect on a person's ability to speak and write. They insist that skills learned from grammar textbooks and worksheets do not transfer to the messy business of composing a full essay. And they point out that the more time spent studying grammar as grammar, the less time spent writing; and the less time spent writing, the less improvement in the written product.

On the other side, the staunch pro-grammar instructors are convinced that studying grammar improves language use, especially in writing. They maintain that a knowledge of grammar makes the writer aware of the resources available for creating effective sentences and that it also provides the student and teacher with a common basis for recognizing and analyzing sentence problems and for learning to remedy them.

I'm sure that those of us who are here today recognize that this conflict is not about the basic goal of language instruction. Both sides agree that students can and should become more effective and flexible users of their language. The debate is over the best methods by which to achieve this goal. The most sensible and productive way to reconcile the pedagogical differences between the staunch grammarians and the hard-line compositionists -- and one that several presenters at this conference appear to be pursuing -- is to integrate grammar instruction with student reading and writing, to take the emphasis off formal grammar and put it on functional grammar. But that approach, simple and clear as it may seem, has not brought the two sides together.

A lot of English teachers continue to disregard -- or deny -- the distinction between "teaching grammar as an academic subject and teaching grammar as a tool for writing" (Noguchi 17). The fact is that grammar -- both as a description of language structures and as a standard of verbal etiquette -- still plays a big part in what many teachers, administrators, and parents consider to be basic literacy. Thus, in many schools and colleges across the country the teaching of formal grammar is still taken for granted. New teachers and graduate assistants are given a text like Warriner's (on the high school level) or Evergreen (on the college level) and told to teach it.

On the other side of the battlefield, many composition specialists, primarily at the university level, I think, have abandoned the attempt to teach any grammar at all. They focus, instead, on helping student writers to develop a unique voice and acquire a number of strategies for finding and organizing better content, and in doing so, they hope to foster an improved self image, a confidence and pride in the act of writing, a desire to make it perfect on every level. These teachers seek to avoid a crippling and useless preoccupation with grammar and error, in the belief that students can get it right readily enough when they genuinely have the motivation to do so and in the belief that repeated exposure to the written standard will enable students to acquire standard forms by some kind of linguistic osmosis (D'Eloia 373).

In other words, some teachers of English still teach formal grammar religiously, while other teachers of English avoid grammar like some form of flesh-eating bacteria. Any sense of forging a viable partnership between grammar and rhetoric, at least in the minds of these people, still seems a dim and distant goal, despite continuing efforts to integrate the two fields of study.

Now, obviously there are a number of reasons for this stand-off. The staunch pro-grammar advocates tend to believe that studying grammar contributed to their own ability to use language effectively, and they conclude, rightly or wrongly, that the same will be true for their students. Besides, many of these people like to teach grammar, and publishing companies are more than willing to provide them with textbooks and workbooks in which explanations, exercises, and drills come conveniently packaged. I think we also have to acknowledge the role that standardized testing plays in affirming the inclination to teach formal grammar: it's a lot easier to score the multiple-choice items in the Test of Standard Written English than it is to evaluate an essay.

As for the hard-line anti-grammarians, they tend to fall into two groups: those who learned to write successfully without rigorous training in grammar and those who became frustrated when their attempts to teach formal grammar failed to produce significant writing improvement. Of this frustrated group, Professor Noguchi writes:

This failure has resulted not so much because of a lack of effort on the part of teachers -- many have spent their professional careers trying to bring fruitful results -- but, ultimately, because expectations of grammar were unrealistic. Like the near-mythical omnipotence of cod-liver oil, the study of grammar became imbued with medicinal powers it simply did not possess, particularly with respect to writing ills. (15)

I also think that there's a larger political struggle that contributes to the hard-line anti-grammar stance taken by many composition teachers -- and it is this situation that I want to comment on more specifically. (I'm speaking now primarily about the university level, which is the arena that I know best.) I think you all know about the longstanding division of labor in university English departments, where, according to Richard E. Miller, "it is taken for granted that meaningful work occurs in literary studies and menial labor takes place in the composition classroom" (165). This division between literature professors and composition specialists should not be underestimated. It has a long history, and the harsh economic realities in higher education for the past twenty years or so have only increased the tensions. It is still true, as Winifred Horner pointed out several years ago, that "at most universities the study and teaching of literature are the serious business of departments of English and are supported by research funds and salaries and rewarded by promotion and tenure" (4), while the economic truth, according to Art Young, is that "the teaching of writing makes up more than sixty percent of the instructional load of English departments, it finances graduate students, it provides jobs; and it supports the study and teaching of literature" (48).

Given this situation, it is not surprising to hear angry voices from both sides of the divide. The underpaid, underappreciated composition specialists regard PhDs in literature as reluctant colleagues, ill inclined and ill suited to teach writing, whose materials, assignments, and methods seem designed to allow themselves to indulge in their own specialized literary pre-occupations. The threatened literature people look askance at research in composition and claim that writing is not an academic subject at all: "I'm sorry to have to say, " writes one full professor of literature, but "departments cannot

justify hiring composition specialists as such. These persons cannot teach anything because they do not know anything" (Harmon 32).

In the past decade, composition specialists have begun to combat their relegation to the economic and intellectual lower classes, and we have seen a steady growth of graduate programs in composition and rhetoric, a proliferation of articles and book-length studies on the theory and practice of composition, and the development of workers' rights initiatives like the Wyoming Resolution. And while some of these developments have arisen as defensive maneuvers, as strategies to protect turf and rationalize self-interest, they also represent the politics of teaching writing. As James Slevin has pointed out, the field of rhetoric and composition has emerged in our own time as a form of educational and political reform (154). Composition specialists -- from Mina Shaughnessy, Ken Macrorie, and Richard Ohmann to James Berlin, Andrea Lunsford, and Mike Rose -- have consistently addressed questions of who gets to attend college, what happens to them, and how their writing can make a difference for them, as well as what it means to acquire knowledge and change what is claimed to be known. The catch phrases about composition instruction with which we are all familiar -- writing as process, writing to learn, writing as a way of thinking, writing as a way of knowing -- reflect a concern with such matters as "access" and "empowerment" and the way that higher education is conducted in this country (Slevin 154).

And this is where the controversy about grammar comes in. Many composition specialists, I think, regard the teaching of grammar as a throwback to the kind of education they have been trying to reform. They also take suggestions about the use and value of grammar instruction as ideological positions that serve to undercut composition studies in the curricular politics of university English departments. Or, to put it another way, composition specialists are often on the defensive: like Rodney Dangerfield, they feel they don't get no respect. And who can argue with them? Almost always, it is composition that gets taught by teachers in the least privileged positions. Even at universities where rhetoric and composition is an accepted academic discipline, composition specialists often have to perform administrative tasks that deter them from

pursuing the research and scholarship that will earn them tenure and promotion and the esteem of their colleagues. So when a comp specialist hears a comment like "These students can't write because they don't know grammar" or "All these students need is a good course in grammar," she's likely to take such a remark as both an insult and a threat. She feels, quite rightly I think, that such simplistic attitudes about language and writing denigrate her professional standing. If writing is merely a craft that anyone with a Harbrace Handbook can teach, then there isn't any need for graduate courses in rhetorical theory or travel funds and release time to support research about the writing process. This feeling of professional insecurity, I believe, has contributed a great deal to the unyielding position that many composition experts take on the subject of grammar.

So where does this leave us? Well, for one thing, it leaves us in the cross-fire between composition and literature. If we want to improve the partnership between grammar instruction and the teaching of writing, then one of the most important things we can do is support efforts to improve the status of writing teachers and increase the respect accorded scholarship in rhetoric and composition. (By the way, I would make this recommendation to all of my colleagues, regardless of their academic specialties. I think it's disgraceful the way our profession continues to operate with attitudes and practices that debase the teaching of writing.) In addition, I think we need to insist that all English majors, both graduate and undergraduate, have training in rhetoric and language. I have no problem with requiring English majors to study grammar as an academic subject. I think they should have more than a casual knowledge of the theories of language and writing and should also know something about the teaching of writing. It's my observation that all English majors are potential teachers, even those who say they don't want to be. Too many graduate students, who have taken nothing but literature courses, wind up teaching three sections of freshman composition without any idea of where to start and how to proceed.

On a more practical level, I would suggest that if we want composition instructors to teach grammar as a tool for writing, then we need to supply them with efficient,

effective procedures for doing so, as several of the presenters at this conference are clearly doing. We must work to develop a grammar for writers that is inductive, actively analytical, stimulating, and discovery-based. If students are going to write better sentences (which is what the controversy about grammar usually boils down to), they must write a lot of sentences -- not someone else's sentences but sentences of their own. We must remember that the chief limit of grammatical analysis is that it has no necessary connection to the synthetic process of writing. Observing grammatical patterns is not the same as constructing them. And constructing them is not the same as proofreading them. We diminish the partnership between grammar and writing instruction when we lose sight of this essential distinction (D'Eloia 389).

And finally, let me make one more suggestion. Let's all relax a little, lower our voices, and draw on the confidence that comes from doing valuable, important work. Teaching writing is important. The study of language, including grammar, is valuable. And with intelligence and persistence and an understanding of the conflicts involved, we can improve the partnership between grammar instruction and the teaching of writing. It's a goal worth pursuing.

#### List of Works Cited

- D'Eloia, Sarah. "The Uses -- and Limits -- of Grammar." *A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Random, 1987. 373-416.
- Harmon, William. "Loneliness: Second Epistle to the Laodiceans." *ADE Bulletin* 66 (Winter 1980): 31-33.
- Horner, Winifred. "Historical Introduction." *Composition & Literature: -- Bridging the Gap*. Ed. Winifred B. Horner. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1983. 1-8.



Miller, Richard E. "Composing English Studies: Towards a Social History of the Discipline." *College Composition and Communication* 45.2 (May 1994): 164-79.

Noguchi, Rei R. *Grammar and the Teaching of Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1991.

Slevin, James F. "The Politics of the Profession." *An Introduction to Composition Studies*. Ed. Erika Lindemann and Gary Tate. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. 135-59.

Young, Art. "The 1981-82 Writing and Literature Survey: Courses and Programs." *ADE Bulletin* 73 (Winter 1982): 47-52.

## WORKS CITED

- Ahmad, U. K. "Research Article Introductions in Malay: Rhetoric in an Emerging Research Community." In A. Duszak (Ed.), Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997: 273-303.
- Barton, Ellen L. "Evidentials, Argumentation and Epistemological Stance" College English 55.7 (November 1993): 745-769.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. London: Longman, 1993.
- Birkerts, Sven. The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1995.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation" Philosophy and Rhetoric 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Devitt, Amy J. "Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept" College Composition and Communication 44.4 (Dec. 1993): 573-586.
- Faigley, Lester. "Literacy After the Revolution" College Composition and Communication 48 (1997): 30-43.
- Funk, Robert. "The Uneasy Partnership between Grammar and Writing Instruction" A paper presented at the Fifth Annual Conference of the NCTE Assembly for the

- Teaching of English Grammar, 1994.
- Hood, Susan and Gail Forey. "Introducing a Conference Paper: Getting Interpersonal With Your Audience" Journal of English for Academic Purposes 20 (2005): 1-16.
- Hymes, Dell. "The Ethnology of Speaking" Anthropology and Human Behavior. T. Gladwin and W. Sturtevant. Washington DC: Anthropological Society of Washington. (1962): 13-53.
- Lyons, Robert. "Mina Shaughnessy and the Teaching of Writing" Journal of Basic Writing 3.1 (Fall-Winter 1980): 3-12.
- Mao, Luming R. "I Conclude Not: Toward a Pragmatic Account of Metadiscourse" Rhetoric Review 11.2 (Spring, 1993): 265-289.
- Mauranen, Anna. "Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English Economics Texts" English for Specific Purposes 12.1 (1993): 3-22.
- Moreale, E., & Vargas-Vera, M. "Semantic Services in e-Learning: an Argumentation Case Study" Educational Technology & Society 7.4 (2004): 112-128.  
<[http://www.ifets.info/journals/7\\_4/12.pdf](http://www.ifets.info/journals/7_4/12.pdf).>
- Shalom, Celia. "Established and Evolving Spoken Research Process Genres; Plenary Lecture and Poster Session

- Discussions at Academic Conferences" English for Specific Purposes 12.1 (November, 2002): 37-50.
- Smith, Virginia B. "Keynote Address" Journal of Basic Writing 3.1 (Fall-Winter 1980): 19-26
- Swales, John. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Swales, John. Research Genres, Explorations and Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Vande Kopple , William. J. "Metadiscourse and the Recall of Modality Markers" Visible Language 22.2 (1988): 233-72.
- Vande Kopple, William. J. "Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse" College Composition and Communication 36 (1985): 63-94.
- Williams, Joseph M. Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity & Grace. Glenview: Scott Foresman, 1981.