

**COMBINING CLASSICAL RHETORIC WITH A READING
AND WRITING CURRICULUM IN A HIGH SCHOOL
ENGLISH CLASSROOM**

Thesis

Submitted to

**The College of Arts and Sciences of the
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON**

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Master of Arts in English

by

Ruth Ann Goldfine

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

Dayton, Ohio

April 1995

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON ROESCH LIBRARY

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Betty Youngkin, Advisor

Dr. Stephen Wilhoit, Second Reader

© Copyright by

Ruth Ann Goldfine

All rights reserved

1995

ABSTRACT

COMBINING CLASSICAL RHETORIC WITH A READING AND WRITING CURRICULUM IN A HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASSROOM

Goldfine, Ruth Ann
University of Dayton, 1995

Advisor: Dr. Betty Youngkin

Contemporary approaches to teaching writing at the secondary level are only successful in preparing students for college approximately fifty percent of the time (Sternglass 154). This statistic is disconcerting. If high schools are to meet students' writing needs, educators must evaluate their methods of teaching composition and develop a more effective approach — one that allows high schools to graduate writers who are prepared to meet the writing demands of higher education.

However, this is not to say that current, popular approaches to teaching writing should be abandoned. Rather, today's English teachers need to examine modern approaches, identify their deficiencies, and determine how to improve their effectiveness.

This thesis first explores the elements that make up a well-balanced "ideal" approach to teaching writing, thus creating a benchmark for composition studies. Next, an analysis of the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition is presented to highlight the weaknesses and limitations of this method. Following the analysis is a

discussion of how classical rhetoric can be used in the classroom to “fill the gaps” of the Reading and Writing approach, thus creating a hybrid method of teaching writing that is comprehensive and well-balanced. Additionally, two appendices are included.

Appendix A is a traditional Reading and Writing syllabus. Appendix B presents the same syllabus, enhanced with elements of classical rhetoric to provide a comprehensive method of teaching writing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere thanks to Dr. Betty Youngkin, my advisor, and to Dr. Stephen Wilhoit, my second reader, for their guidance and encouragement in the preparation of this thesis. Their well-timed suggestions always seemed to lighten my work load.

However, I am above all indebted to my family. My most heartfelt thanks to Patricia Rodak, my mother, for believing in me all my life. Without her I would never have set my sights so high. I am grateful also to Joe, John, Mary, Mike, Amanda, and Angela for their understanding that for nearly two and a half years my visits home were necessarily tempered by the tremendous burden of homework that is part of graduate studies. My thanks to Jeep and Milt Goldfine, my mother- and father-in-law, for patiently tolerating my visits with them during which I typically spent more time with my books than with them. Also, I owe a debt of gratitude to my friend, colleague, and fellow graduate student Gina King for all her assistance during the past two years.

But I am most grateful to Bernie Goldfine, my husband, for good-naturedly enduring with me the life of a graduate student. Thank you, Bernie, for planning our wedding, doing the housework, and keeping our lives running smoothly while I did homework and wrote my thesis. You're the reason I made it through.

This work is dedicated to the memory of my father, Anthony Francis Rodak.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
	ABSTRACT	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	An Ideal Approach to Teaching Composition.....	2
	The New Paradigm.....	2
	Focus on Process	4
	Writing as a Means to Learn and Discover	5
	Strategies for Invention and Discovery	7
	The Rhetorical Situation	8
	Evaluate Product Based on Writer’s Intent and Readers’ Needs.....	9
	Variety of Writing Modes	12
	Principles of an Ideal Approach to Teaching Composition	12
2	READING AND WRITING APPROACH TO TEACHING COMPOSITION.....	14
	Arguments for Combining Reading and Writing	14
	Writing Process in a Reading and Writing Course	16
	Strengths and Weaknesses	22
	Focus on Process.....	22
	Writing as a Means to Learn and Discover.....	23
	Strategies for Invention and Discovery	24
	The Rhetorical Situation.....	25
	Evaluate Product Based on Writer’s Intent and Readers’ Needs....	26
	Variety of Writing Modes.....	26
	Conclusion	27

3	COMBINING CLASSICAL RHETORIC AND THE READING AND WRITING APPROACH TO TEACHING COMPOSITION.....	29
	Arguments for Using Classical Rhetoric in the Composition Classroom	29
	Supplementing the Reading and Writing Curriculum with Elements of Classical Rhetoric	32
	Focus on Process.....	35
	Writing as a Means to Learn and Discover.....	39
	Strategies for Invention and Discovery	40
	The Rhetorical Situation.....	43
	Evaluate Product Based on Writer’s Intent and Readers’ Needs....	45
	Variety of Writing Modes.....	46
	Conclusion	47
	NOTES	49
	WORKS CITED.....	50
	VITA.....	52
	APPENDIX A: Reading and Writing Syllabus	A-1
	APPENDIX B: Reading and Writing Syllabus Modified to Include Classical Rhetoric.....	B-1

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In her article, “Integrating Instruction in Reading, Writing, and Reasoning,” Marilyn S. Sternglass cites evidence that “about 50 percent of students entering college cannot cope with abstract propositions” and, consequently, are ill-prepared to handle the “abstract college-level [writing] tasks required of them” (154). Why are half of all first-year college students unable to meet the challenges of collegiate writing assignments?

One answer can be derived from the writings of Janice Lauer. In “The Rhetorical Approach: Stages of Writing and Strategies for Writers,” Lauer observes that “rhetorical theory and research on writing . . . show that writing is not the mysterious process it has sometimes been taken to be but rather an art that can be taught and learned” (53). If indeed writing can be taught and learned, college students’ inability to write well suggests they were never *taught* to write well. In effect, they cannot handle college-level writing tasks because they were never adequately prepared for such assignments.

To meet the demands of abstract college-level writing tasks, students must develop the necessary skills through their secondary education because, in college, professors typically assume these mental abilities have already been developed. Some colleges offer remedial writing instruction but most often do it reluctantly. Thus, the assumption that

college students possess the requisite mental abilities for college-level work often leads professors to create educational situations with which students are unable to cope (Sternglass 155).

How can high schools better prepare students for college writing assignments?

First, theorists and educators must determine why current methods are not providing students with the necessary skills. One way to assess current methods is to identify the contemporary concept of a comprehensive, well-balanced “ideal” approach to teaching composition, then to compare a current method with this “ideal.” Such a comparison will highlight the weaknesses of the contemporary approach. Based on the findings of the comparison, theorists and educators could then explore options for enhancing the approach by “borrowing” elements from other methods of teaching composition that address the areas in which the particular approach is weak. This thesis presents such a comparison and offers a recommendation for enhancing the Reading and Writing approach so that it will adequately prepare students for the challenges of college writing tasks.

An Ideal Approach to Teaching Composition

The New Paradigm

The current-traditional paradigm for teaching composition stresses expository writing to the extent that most other forms are excluded. This paradigm assumes an unchanging reality that exists independent of the writer and which all writers are expected to describe in the same way. Furthermore, the current-traditional paradigm neglects

invention almost entirely and makes style the most important element in writing (Hairston 5).

Notably, the current-traditional paradigm for teaching writing was not tested against the composing processes of actual writers. That is, it did not evolve from an understanding of the writing process and the writer's role in that process. Rather, it seems to be based mostly on some orderly vision of what literature scholars, whose professional focus is on the written product, perceived as an efficient method of writing. It is a prescriptive and orderly view that defines the successful writer as one who can systematically produce a 500-word theme of five paragraphs, each with a topic sentence (Hairston 5).

Over the last few decades, research in the area of composition has been challenging the tenets of the current-traditional paradigm. This research has led to the emergence of a new paradigm for the study of writing. Hairston summarizes the principal features of the new paradigm in which teachers should:

- (1) Focus on the *process* not the *product* of writing.
- (2) Stress that writing is a means to learn and discover.
- (3) Teach strategies for invention and discovery.
- (4) Stress the rhetorical situation.
- (5) Evaluate the written product by how well it fulfills the writer's intention and the readers' needs.
- (6) Include a variety of writing modes. (13)

Focus on process. Traditional approaches to teaching composition stress the composed product rather than the composing process. However, emphasizing the product over the process may be a great disservice to students. Hairston states:

we cannot teach students to write by looking only at what they have written. We must also understand *how* that product came into being, and *why* it assumed the form that it did. We have to try to understand what goes on during the internal act of writing and we have to intervene during the act of writing if we want to affect its outcome. We have to do the hard thing, examine the intangible process, rather than the easy thing, evaluate the tangible product. (11)

Thus, writing courses that focus primarily on the product likely afford students little guidance in the steps necessary to create those products. And how can students produce better writing if they continually use the same defective processes that previously produced poor results? Hairston notes, “If we want to teach students to write, we have to initiate them into the process that writers go through, not give them a set of rules” (11).

Giving students “a set of rules” in essence provides them with the “how to” of writing without explaining to them the “why.” That is, students know what they should do — the rules — without understanding the reasons for doing it — the why.

Consequently, students will be able to write successfully, providing the writing task can be managed by (or falls within the domain of) the rules they have been given. When students

face writing situations to which their rules do not apply, they will find themselves lacking the ability to address the writing task because their rules are deficient.

Conversely, instructing students in the theory of writing — the writing process — provides them with an understanding of the “whys” of composition. This understanding of the process equips students with the ability to address any writing situation; that is, they will be able to modify existing rules or create new ones to handle the writing tasks they face. Thus, providing an understanding of the “whys” is a more comprehensive and well-balanced approach to teaching writing than just providing students with a set of rules — and such an approach certainly leaves students better prepared to handle a greater variety of writing challenges. Approaches to teaching composition should emphasize the process of writing and focus on assisting students in improving their individual processes.

Writing as a means to learn and discover. Learning and discovering during the writing process involve two distinct types of knowledge: knowledge gained during the prewriting stage (i.e., gained while planning and researching the essay) and knowledge acquired in the writing stage (i.e., gained while actually writing the essay). Both types are essential to produce a well-written paper; thus, both must be addressed in an approach to teaching writing.

Knowledge gained during the prewriting stage is the foundation of the research paper. Thus, this form of learning and discovery is a timeless and accepted element of academic writing. However, the acquisition of knowledge during the actual process of writing is a fairly recent perspective of composition. Writing courses derived from the

current-traditional paradigm are based on the assumption that “writers know what they are going to say before they begin to write; thus their most important task when they are preparing to write is finding a form into which to organize their content” (Hairston 5).

Contemporary theorists, however, are disputing this notion.

Janet Emig contends that writing is a unique way of learning; it is more than just the self-contained process of a writer revealing text (“Writing” 86). This contention echoes the writings of Kenneth Dowst who states that the process of writing is the “activity of making some sense out of an extremely complex set of personal perceptions and experiences of an infinitely complex world” (65). Thus, as students write, they rethink and evaluate their original conceptions as new information or revelations cause them to question their initial perceptions. The mere act of organizing their ideas as they write forces them to explore issues and aspects of their topics in depth — often leading to new discoveries. In essence, they use the composition process as “a means of imposing a useful order upon the ‘blooming, buzzing’ confusion of [their] various and perhaps conflicting sense-impressions — and at a higher level of cognition, upon [their] experiences, thoughts, and bits of factual knowledge” (65).

Clearly, the written product evolves as writers work their way through the composing process. Consequently, a well-balanced, comprehensive approach to writing encourages learning and discovery in both the writing and prewriting stages and should assist students in modifying their topics or theses in accordance with the discoveries they make.

Strategies for invention and discovery. Researchers have criticized the current-traditional paradigm for neglecting invention almost entirely (Hairston 5). This neglect may be, in part, the result of the notion of many theorists in the latter part of the nineteenth century that “the actual discovery of material is outside the composing process” (Berlin 64-65). Thus, these theorists offer only a managerial view of invention; that is, the devices for invention presented in textbooks “consist of advice on shaping the message so that it will act on the appropriate faculty” (65).

In fact, one textbook cites invention as “a natural gift that can be cultivated by habits of observation, thought, and reading” (65). Thus, students were encouraged to write not by creating new thought but rather by using invention techniques to report on what was external to them — by using the data or work of better observers than themselves (68). Consequently, students were instructed in invention techniques that helped them to manipulate existing information rather than to “generate content and discover purpose” (Hairston 13).

By contrast, the new paradigm emphasizes teaching students about various invention techniques and heuristics as well as educating students in their use; this instruction provides these budding writers with the tools or means to improve their writing process throughout their lives. Lee Odell remarks, “It is not enough to send students to the library to locate information. We need to show them some strategies that will help them examine the materials they locate” (109). These prewriting techniques and heuristics provide students with the means to correctly examine and use outside material

(i.e., perform research) and enables them to synthesize the concepts and information they gather to develop their own new ideas, theories, and concepts.

Thus, the new paradigm advocates equipping students with the strategies to invent and discover as well as providing them with the knowledge to implement those strategies independent of the classroom and the guidance of their teachers. Once students understand and have mastered invention and discovery strategies, they possess the capability to explore unfamiliar topics, create convincing arguments based on the discoveries they make, and draw reasonable, logical conclusions. Consequently, these strategies enable students to become part of the discourse/inquiry community in their discipline (Dowst 74).

The rhetorical situation. The rhetorical situation — the audience, purpose, and occasion for which a written product is composed — is too often ignored under the current-traditional paradigm. The current-traditional paradigm views the written product in its neatly laid out, well-structured form with no (or at least minimal) grammatical errors as divorced from the concepts of audience, purpose, and occasion. The product is an end in itself regardless of how well it achieves a purpose or affects an audience.

However, Hairston states that, during the 1970s:

a resurgence of interest in classical rhetoric . . . also sparked interest in a new approach to the teaching of writing. The books by rhetoricians Richard Weaver and Edward P. J. Corbett provided the theoretical foundations for the view that writing cannot be separated from its context,

that audience and intention should affect every stage of the creative process. (11)

Wayne Booth, in his article “The Rhetorical Stance,” cites evidence from the classroom that exemplifies this theory. He recounts an incident involving a student who “could not write a decent sentence, paragraph, or paper until his rhetorical problem was solved — until, that is, he had found a definition of his audience, his argument, and his own proper tone of voice” (151).

Consequently, the new paradigm embraces the rhetorical situation; thus, audience, purpose, and occasion figure prominently in writing assignments. Students are taught to recognize the rhetorical situation in the works of others and to address the rhetorical situation in their own writing.

Evaluate product based on writer’s intent and readers’ needs. The current-traditional paradigm takes a formalist view of the writing process. That is, it adheres to the formalist axiology that “good writing is correct writing” (Fulkerson 412); thus, it emphasizes adherence to proper form and correctness of punctuation, grammar, and so forth. Consequently, educators who teach composition under the current-traditional paradigm evaluate writing using objective standards. In the past, these standards have been very rigid and exacting. For example, essays might have been required to contain five paragraphs with each paragraph containing exactly five sentences, and any paper that contained a single comma splice or five misspelled words likely would have received an “F” (Fulkerson 413).

However, some theorists question whether such an approach truly teaches students to write. For example, in the introduction to James Moffett's *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, Roger Brown states:

I agree again with the author that skills are not likely to be taught by dicta concerning the value of particular construction, lexical items, or marks of punctuation, nor by drills in the use of them. A student is likely to learn something more absolute than the teacher intends; perhaps that complex sentences are better than simple sentences or that *do not* is preferable to *don't* or that the semicolon is an elegant mark of punctuation. An alert student who discovers that his teacher has a fondness for the semicolon will cheerfully strew semicolons in that teacher's path. What the students need, of course, is a rich set of options and a sense of how to employ them rather than a notion that any particular option is uncontingently admirable. (vii)

Wayne Booth discussed the same issues more than a decade later. In "The Rhetorical Stance," he writes:

I had a student who started his first two essays with a swear word. When I suggested that perhaps the third paper ought to start with something else, he protested that his high school teacher had taught him always to catch the reader's attention. Now the teacher was right, but the application of even such a firm principle requires reserves of tact that were somewhat beyond my freshman. (152)

Clearly, good writing is much more than recalling rules and formulas of composition and applying them in likely circumstances. Memorization of rules must be tempered with an understanding of how such rules may need to be modified to adapt to various situations. Thus, the new paradigm assumes a rather nonformalist stance toward composition; it is much less focused on the traditional “basics” of writing. Janet Emig best sums up the attitude of the new paradigm when she writes, “capitalization, spelling, punctuation — these are touted as the basics in writing when they represent, of course, merely the conventions, the amenities for recording the outcome of the process” (“Hand, Eye, Brain” 110). Thus, the new paradigm instead advocates evaluating student writing based on how well it fulfills the intentions of the writer and the needs of the reader. In other words, how well it meets the demands of the rhetorical situation.

Such a style of evaluation reinforces many of the new paradigm’s tenets. For example, emphasizing the needs of the readers and the intent of the writer encourages students to focus on the rhetorical situation. Furthermore, keeping in mind the intent of their writing may prompt students to achieve a greater degree of learning and discovery as they seek ways to best convey their intent. Ultimately, however, the de-emphasis of form and correctness offers students greater flexibility in their writing and encourages experimentation with the written language. This de-emphasis frees students from the concern of creating the perfect *product* and lets them devote their efforts to the *process* of writing.

Variety of writing modes. Contemporary theorists typically recognize four modes of writing: exposition, argumentation, narration, and description (Kinneavy 36).¹ These modes are the writing tools used to accomplish various aims or purposes in composition. Expository writing, informative or scientific discourse (79), tends to be present in most approaches to teaching composition because one form of expository writing is the research paper. The other three modes are featured to greater or lesser degrees in contemporary approaches, depending of course on the particular focus of the approach.

An analysis of conventional textbooks revealed that the current-traditional paradigm for teaching composition stresses expository writing and research papers at the exclusion of other modes of writing. However, excluding modes of writing from the teaching of composition limits students' writing abilities.

Consequently, the new paradigm calls for stress on a variety of modes. Experience in these various modes will afford students a well-rounded repertoire of the types of writing they will need in order to address the myriad of college and post-graduate composition challenges they will face.

Principles of an Ideal Approach to Teaching Composition

The preceding discussion delineates several elements of the current-traditional paradigm of composition studies and presents some basic tenets of the new paradigm. From the tenets of the new paradigm, the principles of an "ideal" writing course can be derived: (1) focus on process, (2) write to learn, (3) stress heuristics, (4) emphasize the rhetorical situation, (5) evaluate writing based on writer's intent and reader's needs, and

(6) stress a variety of modes. However, these principles must be applied to the study of composition in equal proportions to ensure students have a solid grounding in the various facets of writing. That is, an ideal approach is a well-balanced approach — a method of teaching composition that has achieved that precarious balance among the principles identified by the new paradigm.

Based on the principles presented above and the concept of being well-balanced, are any current methods for teaching writing “ideal?” To answer this question, a popular contemporary approach to teaching writing will be identified and evaluated against these principles.

CHAPTER 2

READING AND WRITING APPROACH TO TEACHING COMPOSITION

Recent literature cites many approaches to teaching composition, such as Reading and Writing, Writing Across the Curriculum, Epistemic, Cognitive, Aims and Modes, and Expressive. How well do these contemporary approaches address the principles of an “ideal” approach to teaching writing? And are they well-balanced? To answer these questions, this chapter examines the Reading and Writing approach in detail, comparing it to the principles outlined in Chapter 1. This comparison reveals the deficiencies of the Reading and Writing approach and highlights areas of instruction that need to be enhanced in order for educators to better train students in composition.

Arguments for Combining Reading and Writing

Both reading and writing skills are used in the English classroom — usually for the study of literature and composition, respectively. However, the Reading and Writing approach to composition formally combines instruction in both skills.

The rationale for combining reading and writing can be found in recent studies which show that these skills involve similar cognitive processes and draw upon a common reservoir of text knowledge; thus, there is a definite link between reading experience and

writing fluency. Further research, cited by Sally Barr Reagan in “Teaching Reading in the Writing Classroom,” shows that “experienced readers are usually proficient writers, while inexperienced readers are almost always basic writers” (177). This interrelationship between reading and writing suggests that improving one skill (and thus its underlying cognitive processes) should lead to improvements in the other.

The underlying “cognitive processes” of reading and writing are very specific. For example, as compared with their unskilled counterparts, both skilled readers and skilled writers are better able to take control of written language, continually formulating better questions and solutions about the unfolding text and monitoring their success or failure in constructing meaning in or from print. Furthermore, skilled readers and skilled writers are reflective; that is, they pause and deliberate over written language and are able to see a wide range of alternative solutions to a rhetorical problem. Also, skilled writers can distance themselves from their text and evaluate it as a reader. In short, skilled writers have learned to write with a reader’s eye, while skilled readers have learned to read with a writer’s eye (Birnbaum 30-34).

Additionally, skilled writers demonstrate certain characteristics that are indicative of their proficiency and experience as readers. For example, proficient writers try to imitate elements they like in the texts they read, thus demonstrating that they pay attention to the elements of the text when they are reading. Furthermore, as compared with less proficient writers, they exhibit in their writing a wider range of stored plans for different rhetorical purposes and audiences. That is, they possess a repertoire of writing strategies

which they vary to suit different purposes and audiences — a repertoire acquired through their reading experiences (36-38).

Conversely, inexperienced writers' lack of reading experience limits their knowledge of writing conventions. And, because these students have not encountered the conventions of language in print, they are not able to retain the rules that govern their use nor will they be able to apply these conventions to their writing. This same basic principle applies to revision: when inexperienced writers revise, they usually make mechanical changes (edits) which may do more harm than good as they attempt to recall the rules they have learned and to apply these rules without exception. Experienced writers do not need to recall many specific mechanical rules because they have assimilated this knowledge as a result of their reading experience (Reagan 179-180). Thus, as they revise, they have a sense or "feel" of whether their writing is correct.

Clearly, the research on the reading and writing processes and the studies of proficient readers and writers provide strong arguments in favor of combining reading and writing. This combination has been formalized and applied in the English classroom through the current Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition.

Writing Process in a Reading and Writing Course

The objective of the Reading and Writing approach is to capitalize on the symbiotic relationship between reading and writing; that is, to develop the basic cognitive processes inherent in both reading and writing. The basic premise of this approach is that reading will improve students' cognitive skills which, in turn, will be reflected in improved

writing abilities; conversely, the cognitive processes enhanced through writing can be applied to reading. Therefore, the Reading and Writing approach to composition attempts to improve reading skills and writing skills simultaneously.

A basic tenet of the Reading and Writing approach is that writing is a *process* that must be taught (Lauer 53). That is, while some students may demonstrate more of an aptitude for writing than others, all students can learn to write — the ability to write is not something people are born with. Therefore, one objective in the Reading and Writing classroom is to focus on the writing *process* and de-emphasize the written *product*. This objective necessarily leads to a classroom atmosphere that does not stress punctuation, capitalization, and other such formalist notions of correctness. Rather, students are guided through the process of writing, moving through carefully sequenced activities and assignments that help them hone the skills they need to write well. This de-emphasis on process is not meant to suggest that formal correctness is totally disregarded. Students should be instructed in the fundamentals of good grammar, but grammar alone should not be the basis for evaluating student writing.

The Reading and Writing approach also strives to dispel the myth, believed by some inexperienced writers, that the writing process is “magical” — that good writing means first-time perfection (Reagan 181). This myth presents the inexperienced writer with a daunting and seemingly unattainable challenge: to produce a masterpiece in a single sitting. Such a perspective does not recognize the true recursive nature of writing. That is, the writing process includes a significant portion of time devoted to revision.

Writers may indeed complete a first draft of a paper in one sitting, but the writing process does not end there. To produce *good* writing, writers must read what they have written and determine how effective the piece is (i.e., Does it meet the writer's objectives and the readers' needs? Are the arguments presented in a logical order? Are the words used the most appropriate for the situation?). They can then begin the long and tedious process of identifying areas for improvement and revision. This process of rereading and revising — the continuous, recursive process of polishing a work — is the secret to good writing.

Thus, to understand the writing process and dispel any myths surrounding it, students need to recognize its recursive nature. Educators can assist in demonstrating this recursiveness by showing students a product in the making. That is, they can present students with several versions of a draft document, particularly versions that show substantial changes to content and arrangement as the author made discoveries or rethought the original premise or thesis.

Furthermore, proponents of this approach contend that educators need to make students aware of the similarities between reading and writing; thus, every reading assignment should be linked with a related writing assignment. However, for this linking of reading and writing to be effective, students' comprehension must be improved (Reagan 181). Recent research has linked reflective behavior to skilled reading and writing, thus suggesting that reflective thinking is central to proficiency in written language (Birnbau 31). Therefore, a second objective of the Reading and Writing

approach is to develop the cognitive processes — particularly reflective thinking and comprehension — students will need to handle challenging writing tasks.

Consequently, a well-structured Reading and Writing course will gradually build cognitive skills and increase the writers' knowledge of language by engaging the students in carefully coordinated reading and writing assignments. In particular, exercises and assignments should be designed to help students become more reflective and assist them in increasing their comprehension.

Birbaum suggests a four-stage approach to aid students in becoming more reflective (43). These stages correlate to specific steps in the writing process; thus, the exercises she recommends in each stage are designed to facilitate particular portions of the writing process. Her stages are (1) prereading, (2) prewriting, (3) composing, and (4) postcomposing.

- (1) **Prereading Stage.** In the prereading stage, the teacher should ask students to predict the form and content of a text based on its title and a sample from the text. Next, the teacher should read aloud with the students, pausing between major segments to ask not only what the author has said, but why he or she arranged ideas and selected certain stylistic features rather than others. Finally, the teacher should lead a discussion on predictions about the next section of the text based on the passage just read and the first few words of the next section.
- (2) **Prewriting Stage.** The teacher should lead students in deliberating over alternative topics for research papers rather than seizing on the first idea that occurs to them. The teacher should then show the students how to explore the subject for related ideas and possible patterns of organization.
- (3) **Composing Stage.** During the composing stage, the teacher should intervene in the writing process when students seem uncertain of how to proceed. Rather than providing solutions, the teacher should ask questions that encourage students to think about what they have written and either recognize the need to modify it or plan the next segment of the text.

- (4) Postcomposing Stage. The teacher should ask students to read the text they have written aloud to their peers; the listeners must respond with questions and comments. This exercise serves several purposes: (1) knowledge of their audience causes most writers to deliberate longer when they write; (2) peers learn to listen carefully and ask pointed questions; (3) writers learn to respond to questioning and to justify their choices and arrangements of ideas; and (4) revision in light of peer and teacher comments fosters attention to the written language from the viewpoints of readers and writers, thus students learn to set more inclusive goals that address the multiple considerations of the exploration of ideas, their arrangement, and their presentation in view of the needs of audiences. (42-43)

Once students have learned to become more reflective, teachers can focus on assisting them in increasing their comprehension. Several exercises to increase comprehension can be derived from the writings of Reagan.

- (1) Give students a purpose for reading. Ask them to write a paragraph predicting what will happen in a reading. Afterwards, ask them to write a comparison of their predicted outcome and what actually happened.
- (2) Have students write a reaction to a short story. Then, ask them to compare and defend, justify, or explain their reaction to their peers.
- (3) Use mapping (i.e., illustrating/tracking the plot of a story using flowchart-like lines, boxes, circles, etc.) to analyze readings, clarify students' writing, and teach organization.
- (4) Ask students to write summaries; encourage them to look for main ideas and paraphrase them. By reading and summarizing a variety of texts, students become familiar with a number of text structures; by employing these strategies in their own writing, students will eventually internalize these structures. (181-183)

The reflection and comprehension exercises are designed to enhance the cognitive processes of the writing student. As these processes improve, the students' ability to handle increasingly difficult writing tasks should also improve. Therefore, the writing

assignments in the Reading and Writing classroom should become more difficult in consonance with the students' developing cognitive skills.

For example, a Reading and Writing course typically begins with a basic assignment such as asking students to write summaries of their readings. The ability to summarize, apart from being a necessary skill and prerequisite for subsequent tasks, is useful as a tool in teaching organization and familiarizing students with the conventions of text structure (182-83). Furthermore, students who have mastered the ability to summarize will be much less likely to plagiarize in later writing assignments since they will have developed the art of expressing others' ideas in their own words.

From summaries, students advance to the next level of difficulty: synthesizing. This assignment requires students to combine the material summarized from two readings (183). Synthesizing assignments build cognitive skills and lay the groundwork for a more sophisticated Reading and Writing assignment: critique writing.

To write critiques of their readings, students must draw upon their analytical skills. Writing critiques forces students to move beyond identification of the thesis and supporting ideas to examine and comment on their validity and effect. In the process of critique writing, students learn to weigh the arguments presented by the authors in the readings against their own points of view. This activity forces them to clarify, validate, or perhaps even modify their own opinions and compels them to engage in higher-level synthesis in order to note points of agreement and disagreement (183).

The final assignment of a Reading and Writing course is usually a research paper. This assignment tests students' mastery of the preceding skills because good research writing requires the ability to read, summarize, synthesize, and critique information from many texts. It is usually at this point that students begin independently to rely on and apply the different Reading and Writing strategies they have learned throughout the semester (183-184).

Strengths and Weaknesses

The basic premise of the Reading and Writing approach derives from research findings that seem to be generally accepted by the composition studies community; additionally, theorists offer many rational strategies for implementing the approach. Thus, the Reading and Writing approach seems intrinsically sound. However, how well does it measure up to the well-balanced "ideal" described in Chapter 1? This determination can be made by comparing the Reading and Writing approach to the basic elements of a well-balanced approach, as identified by the new paradigm for composition.

Focus on Process

An ideal approach to teaching composition should emphasize the process of writing and assist students in understanding and learning to implement that process. The Reading and Writing approach, with its focus on developing the underlying cognitive processes of writers and its rigidly structured assignments that move writers through the composition process via increasingly difficult writing tasks, obviously emphasizes process

over product (see Appendix A). Furthermore, teachers using this approach are encouraged to de-emphasize correctness and absolute right and wrong answers (Sternglass 156), which is essentially a de-emphasis of the product. Consequently, the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition creates an environment in which students can discuss and experiment with written language without being inhibited by the feeling that their writing must be “perfect.” They are provided the opportunity to investigate the writing process — to experiment with language and “learn by doing.”

Writing as a Means to Learn and Discover

An ideal approach to writing should encourage learning and discovery in both the prewriting and writing stages and should assist students in modifying their topics or theses in accordance with the discoveries they make. The emphasis on reading in the Reading and Writing approach makes learning and discovering an intrinsic element of this particular teaching method.

As students are exposed to readings that explore areas with which they are unfamiliar or which challenge their existing beliefs and values, they are forced to contemplate new ideas or re-evaluate their existing beliefs. The result is the acquisition of new knowledge or, perhaps, the rethinking of old. Furthermore, through in-class discussions students are encouraged to share ideas about the readings with their peers, thus exposing one another to different perspectives and interpretations of the text (156). These in-class discussions thus offer additional opportunities for learning and discovery (Appendix A, 13 Sep). The Reading and Writing approach also promotes learning about

the art of writing itself. That is, as students are exposed to various types and styles of writing through their readings, they begin to internalize specific formats and conventions of language that they can then invoke in their own writing (Appendix A, 26 Sep).

Strategies for Invention and Discovery

In an ideal approach to teaching writing, strategies for invention and discovery are emphasized. However, such strategies do not receive significant attention in the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition. The Reading and Writing approach includes some strategies for invention and discovery. For example, in her stages to help students become more reflective, Birnbaum suggests exercises in which the teacher leads students in deliberating ideas; thus, students are encouraged to consider alternative topics — not just the first idea that occurs to them. In a later stage, the teacher may ask students questions which help them think about what they have written. In the final stage, students' writing is critiqued by their peers, thus providing writers the opportunity to view their work from a different perspective.

Such strategies encourage invention and discovery, however, their range is limited. The strategies encourage invention based on information or knowledge gained from external sources. That is, the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition guides students in reading, summarizing, and critiquing the works of others (Appendix A, 12-16 Sep). Therefore, students acquire knowledge and learn about topics by examining and manipulating existing information; they do not generate new ideas. Consequently, the

Reading and Writing approach does not provide sufficient strategies for invention and discovery.

The Rhetorical Situation

The “ideal” approach to teaching writing calls for an emphasis on the rhetorical situation, that is, audience, purpose, and occasion. However, the Reading and Writing approach gives little attention to the rhetorical situation; rather, the focus is largely on the writer.

Admittedly, in the Reading and Writing approach, students address an audience of sorts when they read their works to and receive feedback from their peers in class. Yet, these interactions are intended to primarily benefit the writers — to help them learn to (1) deliberate longer over the shape and content of their texts, (2) justify their choices of arrangements and ideas, and (3) see written language from the viewpoints of reader and writer (Birnbaum 43).

Additionally, the attention given to the audience in the Reading and Writing approach usually occurs in the *postcomposing stage*, that is, at some point after the students have completed their writing assignments. Thus, students are not taught to consider the elements of the rhetorical situation when they begin to write — which is, of course, when the rhetorical situation can best be addressed if it is to have a significant bearing on the content, style, and form of a written work.

Evaluate Product Based on Writer's Intent and Readers' Needs

A well-balanced approach, as derived from the new paradigm for teaching writing, purports that writing should be evaluated on how well it fulfills the intent of the writer and the needs of the reader. The Reading and Writing approach does not meet this criteria. In fact, it is largely a writer-based approach. For example, the Reading and Writing exercises are designed to improve the writer's cognitive skills, the readings are seen as a means for writers to gain knowledge of the conventions of written language, and the audience is given little regard other than for its value in providing feedback that will aid writers in improving their composing skills.

Thus, most of the focus is on the writer; little emphasis is placed on the reader, as is evident from the Reading and Writing approach's disregard for the rhetorical situation. Although in Birnbaum's postcomposing stage peer comments and questions about a written work are solicited, such feedback is viewed as a tool to aid the writer. Consequently, the Reading and Writing approach is not well-balanced because of its lack of attention to the needs of the readers.

Variety of Writing Modes

Based on the tenets of the new paradigm for composition studies, a well-balanced approach to teaching writing should stress a variety of modes. Experience with a variety of modes will afford students a solid grounding in many types of writing, thus better preparing them to meet the writing challenges of college course work and post-graduate employment. The Reading and Writing approach is deficient in this respect. Its rigidly

structured series of exercises and writing assignments build on one another, culminating in the final assignment: the research paper. Thus, students spend the bulk of the semester honing skills that will assist them in writing a research paper — a piece of expository or argumentative writing. Consequently, the other modes receive little or no attention.

Conclusion

Obviously, the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition does not adhere to all the principles of a well-balanced method for teaching writing as derived from the new paradigm. Of the six tenets of a well-balanced method, the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition is deficient in four: teach strategies for invention and discovery, stress the rhetorical situation, evaluate the written product based on the writer's intent and the readers' needs, and include a variety of writing modes.

Therefore, should educators and theorists abandon the Reading and Writing approach to composition and attempt to create a method that includes all the tenets of an ideal, well-balanced approach as outlined in Chapter 1? Certainly not. Ideals tend to be elusive — if not impossible to achieve. Rather, the Reading and Writing approach to composition can be enhanced to ensure it addresses all the principles of an ideal method. The question, then, is how to enhance Reading and Writing. The answer can be found by looking back to the ancient study of classical rhetoric.

Sharon Crowley, in *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, states:

“Ancient composing processes did not aim toward the production of a finished product; rather, they equipped rhetors with arguments and materials that would be readily available

whenever they needed to compose for a given occasion” (xv). Thus, classical rhetoric is not focused on the product but rather on equipping writers with the tools and abilities to meet the challenges of the writing process. Classical rhetoric provides an approach to composition that is much broader and more well-balanced than its narrowly focused modern counterparts. Classical rhetoric is comprehensive — and it is this comprehensiveness that is lacking and must be regained in modern-day writing instruction.

CHAPTER 3

COMBINING CLASSICAL RHETORIC AND THE READING AND WRITING APPROACH TO TEACHING COMPOSITION

Classical rhetoric, as formalized by Aristotle, offers a comprehensive approach to effective communication. Aristotle addresses the many and various aspects of rhetoric, such as the objective of the speaker² and the needs of the audience, the words and format used to achieve these objectives and meet these needs, the process of preparing a speech, and the best arguments to persuade an audience. These elements of effective communication are also important aspects of composition.

Arguments for Using Classical Rhetoric in the Composition Classroom

Winifred Horner, in *Rhetoric in the Classical Tradition*, makes a strong statement for the value of using classical rhetoric in the composition classroom.

What distinguishes rhetoric from other studies of literature and linguistics is that it looks at all aspects of communication in terms of the message, the speaker, the audience, and the occasion. It also involves the emotions as well as the rational side of the human being as it takes in ethical, pathetic, and logical considerations. Rhetoric recognizes that carefully reasoned arguments may fail because they do not take into account the hopes and

fears of the audience — those basic emotions that finally make us human. It allows for options and choices depending on the complex interactions between writer, audience, and occasion. (3)

A study of classical rhetoric would afford high school students a comprehensive understanding of the writing process and the theories behind it — essentially the “whats” *and* the “whys” of writing. Thus, rather than trying to guess what a teacher wants for a particular assignment and providing that, students ingest theories, techniques, and applications they can apply to any writing challenge.

Edward P. J. Corbett, in *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, asserts the value of classical rhetoric in developing proficiency in writing.

Rhetoric can also assist us in becoming more effective writers. One of the chief values of rhetoric, conceived of as a system for gathering, selecting, arranging, and expressing our material, is that it represents a *positive* approach to the problems of writing. Students have too often been inhibited in their writing by the negative approach to composition — don’t do this, beware of that. Classical rhetoric too had its negative prescriptions, but, in the main, it offered positive advice to help writers in the composition of a specific kind of discourse directed to a definite audience for a particular purpose. Rhetoric cannot, of course, tell us what we must do in any and every situation. No art can provide that kind of advice. But rhetoric can lay down the general principles that writers can

adapt to fit a particular situation. At least, it can provide writers with a set of procedures and criteria that can guide them in making strategic decisions in the composition process. (30-31)

Classical rhetoric may seem an unlikely tool for teaching composition because it originated in spoken language.³ In fact, in *The Contributions of Walter J. Ong to the Study of Rhetoric: History and Metaphor*, Betty Youngkin points out how rhetoric dates back to a period in history before the invention of writing — a period Walter Ong calls “primary orality” (88). Youngkin explains:

Culturally, “primary orality” is a descriptor for a group of people who have not been exposed to or touched by writing. The telling of past significant events is done by oral performers who carry past events in their heads and tell them to the rest of the group in narratives, using proverbs, epithets, riddles, song. (91)

Consequently, rhetoric initially was limited to the spoken word because, simply, no other options existed. “Communities [in the primary orality stage] had an exclusively oral culture . . . all communication was instantaneous. That is, information could be conveyed only through the act of speaking; all communication took place only at the instant that the speaker was speaking and the listener was listening” (Goldfine and King, 1994).

Clearly, then, memory and oratorical skills were important components of rhetoric during the primary orality stage. Memory was the only means of preserving

knowledge to be shared with future generations, and oratory was the sole means of sharing that knowledge. Additionally, oratory played a more prominent role in the social interactions of private citizens during the early years of rhetoric. For example, Bizzell and Herzberg note that “the upper-class men who received training [in classical rhetoric] . . . would use it to participate in political life and to perform at private entertainments and family occasions such as funerals” (32).

The inventions of writing and printing diminished the need for memory as a means of retaining knowledge and oratory as a means of disseminating that knowledge. However, the written/printed word allowed the great works of the master rhetoricians to be preserved in print and shared with countless people. The timeless quality of these works is evidenced by the fact that they not only are still considered masterpieces centuries after their creation but also have “translated” well from the spoken to the written/printed word. Such timeless quality and easy “translation” seems to indicate that the techniques used to develop classical oral rhetoric are applicable in creating good written works as well. Consequently, classical rhetoric, though steeped in an oral tradition, has much to offer in the modern composition classroom.

Supplementing the Reading and Writing Curriculum with Elements of Classical Rhetoric

The Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition does not address all the principles of a well-balanced method for teach writing; however, classical rhetoric

does. So, then, should high school educators simply replace the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition with classical rhetoric? No.

First, implementing classical rhetoric in the contemporary high school classroom would be a tremendous undertaking. The study of rhetoric is not required in most colleges and universities (Youngkin 1995); therefore, the majority of graduates — which of course includes secondary-level educators — have little or no knowledge of Aristotle’s classical rhetoric. Thus, in practical terms, before classical rhetoric could be used as a means to teach composition, English teachers would have to be educated in classical rhetoric and the means for implementing it in the classroom.

Second, some concepts of classical rhetoric may be too advanced for the cognitive abilities of high school students, particularly ninth graders. Therefore, the study of classical rhetoric would have to be modified to match the skill level of the students. Depending on the extent of the modifications needed, such alterations to the basic “pure” form of classical rhetoric could severely impact its comprehensiveness, thus diminishing its effectiveness.

Third, classical rhetoric is derived from the ancient world of Aristotle — a world steeped in the spoken word. Today’s student faces a much different environment in which the spoken word has been supplanted by the printed word and the recorded word. Consequently, instituting rhetoric as the standard for teaching composition in the contemporary high school English classroom would require that theorists and educators explicitly make the connection between classical rhetoric and modern technology.

Finally, high schools cannot afford the luxury of dividing the English curriculum into literature and composition; both must be tackled in the high school English classroom. Classical rhetoric, however, involves a study of composition; it does not include the study of literature. Therefore, on its own, classical rhetoric is deficient in that it does not provide instruction in literary analysis.

Clearly, classical rhetoric has limitations. Using classical rhetoric in its purest form as a means to teach composition is not the answer to improving the writing skills of high school students. Rather, the solution lies in combining classical rhetoric with a contemporary approach to create a hybrid method that obtains a modern outlook from a current approach (and thus is relevant to today's students) yet provides the comprehensiveness that classical rhetoric offers.

The contemporary Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition would be well-balanced if supplemented by elements of the ancient art of classical rhetoric. That is, select components of classical rhetoric could be inserted in the framework of the contemporary approach. Combining the two methods in this manner would overcome the limitations of introducing classical rhetoric to the modern classroom independently.

First, educators would not have to become proficient in all aspects of classical rhetoric. They would only be required to be particularly knowledgeable in the components of classical rhetoric that are needed to augment the Reading and Writing approach. Second, students would not be forced to tackle elements of classical rhetoric that are too difficult. Since these elements would be presented within the framework of

the Reading and Writing approach, they can be modified to suit the cognitive capabilities of the students without diminishing the effectiveness of the overall method. Third, the components of classical rhetoric would be inserted into the Reading and Writing approach at points in the syllabus where they relate to the contemporary issue or discussion. Thus, the applicability of classical rhetoric still today would be implicitly evident. And, finally, because the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition focuses so strongly on reading, literature naturally becomes a large part of the curriculum. The remainder of this paper examines how classical rhetoric can be used to supplement Reading and Writing in the high school English classroom.

Focus on Process

One tenet of a well-balanced approach to teaching composition, as derived from the new paradigm, is a focus on *process*. Classical rhetoric, with its neatly defined stages of speech writing (which can easily be applied to preparing a written work) and clearly delineated types of arguments, obviously emphasizes process. A brief overview of these elements of classical rhetoric demonstrates its process-oriented focus.

In preparing a speech, rhetors should use heuristics, such as the common topic of comparison, to generate possible arguments. They should select the best arguments, place them in an effective order, then polish the style to ensure the best words are chosen to convey the well-arranged arguments (Bizzell & Herzberg 29). The means to accomplish these steps are delineated in the five distinct stages of speech preparation defined by classical rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery (3-4).

Invention is the search for persuasive ways to present information and formulate arguments. In this stage, rational arguments are formed to address a particular audience, purpose, and occasion. The speaker identifies the appropriate arguments to use based on an analysis of the audience and an understanding of the purpose and occasion.

In the arrangement stage, the arguments devised in the invention stage are put into their most effective order; that is, they are organized to be most persuasive. In this stage, nonlogical appeals — appeals to ethos and pathos — are formulated. “In the arrangement stage, the speaker considers the kind of discourse to be presented, the nature of the subject, and the characteristics of the audience, all of which guide decisions about the relative weight and placement of logical and emotional appeals” (6).

The purpose of the style stage is to dress up “previously formulated ideas in attractive verbal garb” (6). While style does not generate ideas (that is the responsibility of the invention stage), the process of formulating ideas in verbal figures (e.g., metaphors) and ornamenting arguments makes them structurally more understandable, memorable, and convincing. Thus, “the process of stylistic formulation can be seen as a heuristic method, in which ideas are discovered by the search for figurative expression” (6).

Memory is the use of mnemonics and practice to learn a speech “by heart.” For example, one method of memorization taught by classical rhetoric was to have speakers memorize, in sequence, the rooms of a building, then associate portions of their speeches with each room. To recall the speech, speakers mentally toured the building, each room invoking vivid images of the portion of the speech associated with it.

Delivery is the means of presenting a speech with effective gestures and vocal modulation. It is “a system of nonverbal signs with enormous power” (7). The tone of voice coupled with the body language of gestures and facial expressions can have a tremendous impact on the content of the speech.

These five stages of speech preparation specifically delineate the process a rhetor must work through to create a speech — and this same process can be applied to written discourse. Certainly, memory and delivery are of little use in the preparation of a written work that will never be presented orally; however, invention, arrangement, and style figure prominently in the process of composing on paper. Introducing the five stages of speech preparation in a Reading and Writing classroom will further emphasize the focus on process. All five stages should be introduced early in the course to provide a complete overview of the stages and how they relate to one another. Specific stages should be reviewed or discussed in greater detail as appropriate throughout the term. For example, the invention stage could be addressed when students are attempting to develop topics for a paper (Appendix B, 24 Aug) and a discussion of arrangement could be included as part of the study of the structure of a written work (Appendix B, 6 Sep).

The focus on process demonstrated by the five stages of speech writing is further emphasized by the arguments developed in the invention stage. Classical rhetoric maintains that all arguments start with a *premise* — a statement supposed or assumed before the argument begins. Based on this premise, arguers use specific methods of reasoning to reach conclusions — conclusions that are only valid if their premises are true.

Classical rhetoric offers four methods of reasoning: scientific demonstration, dialectic, rhetoric, and false or contentious reasoning (Crowley 151).

Scientific demonstration begins from premises that are true or accepted by experts as true. “It reveals unalterable truths about the physical world” (Bizzell & Herzberg 4). Such arguments must be believable in and of themselves; they must not require supporting arguments. A simple scientific premise would be, “The sun sets in the west.”

Dialectic reasoning starts with premises whose truth is less certain. These premises are accepted by the majority of the people or by those who are supposed to be most knowledgeable. Dialectic uses syllogistic (deductive) logic to approach probable truths in questions about human affairs and philosophy that do not lend themselves to absolute certainty (4). Socrates’ dictum that “the unexamined life is not worth living” is an example of a dialectical premise (Crowley 152).

The premises of rhetorical arguments are drawn from beliefs accepted by all, or most, members of a community. Like dialectic, rhetoric also seeks probable truth in the realm of human affairs, relying on knowledge produced by demonstration and dialectic, along with traditional or received wisdom and the various means of finding persuasive connections, such as those suggested by the common topics (Bizzell & Herzberg 4).

False or contentious reasoning relies on premises that only appear to be widely accepted, or are lies or mistakes.

The development of arguments as described in classical rhetoric demonstrates that there is a highly structured process for asserting and supporting statements in a speech (or composition). Additionally, it is important to underscore the importance of arguments because, according to Aristotle, they are central to invention. An understanding of how to develop and implement arguments will assist students in formulating more logical and convincing papers, thus better preparing them for the types of writing they will be asked to produce in college.

The use of arguments, as presented by classical rhetoric, can be incorporated in the Reading and Writing classroom to augment discussions on and further demonstrate the writing process. In particular, arguments should be introduced along with the stages of speech preparation, in connection with the invention stage (Appendix B, 24 Aug). In fact, a brief review of arguments might be appropriate each time a paper is assigned.

Writing as a Means to Learn and Discover

In a well-balanced approach to teaching writing, students should be encouraged to learn and make discoveries through the process of writing, in both the prewriting and writing stages. Classical rhetoric is replete with such opportunities, however, these opportunities focus mostly on discovering during prewriting. For example, during the invention stage of speech writing, speakers must make numerous discoveries in order to focus their writing. They must learn about their audience, discover the appropriate arguments to persuade the audience and meet its needs, and identify the best style, form, and words to use. Furthermore, “the rhetorician constructing an argument must draw on

sources of knowledge that lie outside the domain of rhetoric. To ensure access to these sources, the rhetorician must be learned in philosophy, history, law literature, and other fields of study” (Bizzell & Herzberg 5). Thus, if speakers are not knowledgeable in a subject, they are to expected conduct research and investigate that area, discipline, or topic so that they are sufficiently informed to write a well-thought-out speech.

Classical rhetoric’s focus on learning and discovery in the prewriting stage of the writing process does not address completely the second principle of an ideal approach to teaching writing (i.e., write to learn). However, the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition offers many opportunities for learning during the actual writing process. Consequently, by supplementing a Reading and Writing curriculum with discussions of classical rhetoric — in particular the invention stage of speech preparation — high school educators can provide a method of composition that addresses knowledge acquisition through all stages of the writing process (Appendix B, 3 Oct).

Strategies for Invention and Discovery

In an ideal approach to teaching writing, strategies for invention and discovery are emphasized. These strategies provide students with the ability to write independently — without the structure of a classroom environment facilitated by an English teacher. The study of classical rhetoric abounds with such strategies. In particular, Aristotle’s invention stage includes heuristics which are used to generate rational arguments.

Rational arguments, which are appeals to logos (i.e., logic), are developed in the first stage of the composing process: invention. These arguments were considered by

Aristotle to be superior to others because they appeal to human rationality which, Aristotle believed, is the most uniform and universal of all human mental faculties. Thus, Aristotle presumed logical arguments would have the greatest currency.

Classical rhetoric affords orators and writers with several methods for generating rational appeals. These include topoi, syllogism, and enthymeme.

Topoi (i.e., common topics) are stock formulas in which arguments can be cast. These formulas include cause and effect, comparison and contrast, arguments a fortiori — even puns on proper names. Special topoi exist for particular kinds of speech or subject matter, such as the rules of law in criminal evidence. “When employing any of these heuristic devices, the rhetorician ‘invents’ arguments in the sense of finding ways to combine and present evidence persuasively” (Bizzell & Herzberg 4).

Syllogisms, rational appeals used in dialectic reasoning, consist of three propositions: a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion. The major premise is supposed to be true; therefore, the conclusion is deduced to be true (3-4). While the major premise is a statement that is generally accepted to be true, writers must devise as the minor premise a statement that (1) derives from the general premise, (2) will be accepted by the audience, and (3) will lead to the desired conclusion. Thus, syllogisms provide students with a strategy for inventing logical arguments.

An enthymeme is a rational appeal that deduces a conclusion from a general premise that is merely probable — thus the conclusion is tentative. Enthymemes are based in community beliefs; therefore, whether the reasoning in an enthymeme is sound often

makes little difference to the community's acceptance of the argument. Because listeners' or readers' prior knowledge is part of the argument, they are inclined to accept the entire argument — if they are willing to accept the rhetorician's use of their common prior knowledge (Crowley 159). However, because the premise of an enthymeme is a probability not a certainty, the enthymeme can lead to a faulty conclusion. For example:

Premise: Good men do not commit murder.

Argument: Brutus and Cassius are good men.

Conclusion: Brutus and Cassius did not participate
in the murder of Caesar.

The enthymeme, like the syllogism, requires convincing arguments directed toward a particular audience. Thus, enthymemes provide students another strategy by which they can invent and discover through their writing.

Additionally, deductive and inductive reasoning come into play in developing arguments to persuade an audience. Deductive reasoning moves from general concepts to specific examples; inductive reasoning moves from particulars (specific examples) to general concepts. An understanding of inductive and deductive reasoning and how to employ them in developing arguments is key in creating convincing arguments.

These invention and discovery strategies that classical rhetoric offers can assist students in inventing and discovering through the process of writing. Such strategies are lacking in the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition. Although the Reading and Writing classroom provides some strategies for learning and discovery, these strategies focus on the students' basic cognitive skills and on the prewriting stage.

Consequently, combining Reading and Writing with classical rhetoric will provide invention and discovery strategies that are applicable throughout the entire writing process. A brief discussion of the strategies could accompany the discussion of the invention stage (Appendix B, 24 Aug and 31 Aug) and precede each writing assignment. Teachers could also provide students with examples relevant to their assignment and assist them in using the strategies for the first few assignments.

The Rhetorical Situation

The “ideal” approach to teaching writing calls for an emphasis on the rhetorical situation, that is, audience, purpose, and occasion. These elements are the fundamentals of classical rhetoric. Classical rhetoric considers the rhetorical situation in the very first stage of the speech-writing process because it determines every aspect of the speech, from the rational and persuasive appeals selected, to the style and ultimate delivery. In fact, classical rhetoric addresses each element of the rhetorical situation very specifically.

The rhetorical situation always includes an audience. Therefore, to prepare the most effective speech, speakers should consider the arguments that are most likely to achieve their goal — which is to influence a particular audience. “The successful rhetor should also investigate the situation by investigating the audience in terms of both their particular cultural predilections and their emotions” (Bizzell & Herzberg 29). Thus, an audience analysis should be performed to determine the arguments speakers should use in preparing their speeches.

Classical rhetoric views oratory (and writing) as a means of persuading an audience. Thus, the purpose of a written work is persuasion. Therefore, classical rhetoric devotes significant attention to types of persuasion. In particular, three forms of persuasive appeal are addressed: logos, pathos, and ethos. These appeals are generated in the invention stage of speech writing.

Logos is appeal to reason. It focuses on the audience's acceptance of proven knowledge as fact. Pathos is appeal to emotion about the subject under discussion. "The pathetic appeal seeks to align the audience's emotions with the speaker's position (for example, arousing the audience's anger against an enemy nation one wishes to attack)" (Bizzell & Herzberg 29). Finally, ethos is appeal to the speaker's authority (i.e., trust in the speaker's character). "The ethical appeal evokes the speaker's own moral authority ('I am old and wise and of a noble family') or the shared concerns of speaker and audience" (29).

Classical rhetoric addresses the occasion of any oratory or written work much more thoroughly than does the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition. Classical rhetoric, in fact, identifies three types of occasion that call for public speech: forensic, deliberative, and epideictic (Bizzell & Herzberg 3).

A forensic speech is a legal speech, for example, an opening statement in a trial. It takes place in a courtroom and is concerned with judgment about a past action. A deliberative speech is a political speech, for example, an appeal for a bill in Congress. It occurs in a legislative assembly and is particularly concerned with moving people to future

action. An epideictic speech is a ceremonial speech, for example, the President's State of the Union Address. Its intent is to strengthen shared beliefs about the present state of affairs.

The rhetorical situation is fundamental to classical rhetoric. Its three components (i.e., audience, purpose, and occasion) are addressed from the very beginning of the writing process (i.e., in the invention stage) and figure prominently throughout the remainder of the composing process. Conversely, the Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition gives little attention to the rhetorical situation. Therefore, supplementing the Reading and Writing classroom with discussions of the rhetorical situation derived from classical rhetoric will adequately address the fourth principle of the ideal approach: emphasize the rhetorical situation. The rhetorical situation should be introduced early in the term (Appendix B, 25 Aug). As much as possible, teachers should lead students in an analysis of the rhetorical situation in assigned readings (Appendix B, 19 Sep) and assist them in contemplating the rhetorical situation of their writing assignments (Appendix B, 22 Sep).

Evaluate Product Based on Writer's Intent and Readers' Needs

An ideal approach, as derived from the new paradigm for teaching writing, purports that writing should be evaluated based on how well it fulfills the intent of the writer and the needs of the reader. Classical rhetoric judges oratory from both perspectives. Writers achieve their intent if "they manage to persuade people to agree with them or to act on whatever proposal they have put forth" (Crowley 9). Conversely,

it can be surmised that the audience's needs are met if it has been successfully persuaded because such persuasion indicates that the speaker has anticipated and implemented the necessary arguments and appeals to convince others of a particular position or view.

The Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition focuses primarily on the writer; therefore, combining this method with classical rhetoric will provide the comprehensiveness required by the ideal: a balance between the intent of the writer and the needs of the reader. A discussion of this balance could accompany discussions on the rhetorical situation (Appendix B, 24 Aug / 19 Sep / 22 Sep / 13 Oct), discussions of persuasive appeals (Appendix B, 25 Aug / 19 Sep / 27 Sep), and discussions about critiques (Appendix B, 12 Oct).

Variety of Writing Modes

Based on the tenets of the new paradigm for composition studies, an ideal approach to teaching writing should stress a variety of modes. Implied in this principle is not that the modes in and of themselves are particularly important, but that students develop the skills and abilities to address a variety of writing situations by experiencing many different types of writing in the classroom. Thus, while classical rhetoric does not explicitly define or instruct students in particular modes, it equips them with the basic tools to write in any situation. Sharon Crowley demonstrates this quality of classical rhetoric when she states:

Ancient teachers gave their students more advice about invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery than they could ever use. They

did so because they knew that practice in these rhetorical arts alerted rhetors to the multitude of communicative and persuasive possibilities inherent in language. (16)

The Reading and Writing approach, because it focuses primarily on expository writing, offers students little exposure to the other modes (i.e., argumentation, narration, and description). Supplementing this method with classical rhetoric affords students the skills and capabilities (e.g., invention techniques, persuasive appeals, and so forth) to address any writing situation. However, to ensure students gain experience in applying these capabilities to specific modes of discourse, the curriculum should include assignments in all the modes (Appendix B, 23 Aug / 24 Aug / 22 Sep / 3 Oct).

Conclusion

The Reading and Writing approach on its own does not demonstrate all the principles of an ideal method of teaching composition. However, its limitations can be overcome by supplementing a Reading and Writing curriculum with elements of classical rhetoric.

In theory, combining this ancient art with the contemporary method seems fairly straightforward: identify the principles of the ideal that are missing in Reading and Writing, “borrow” these elements from classical rhetoric, and insert them into the existing Reading and Writing framework. However, educators must be creative and skillful when introducing elements of classical rhetoric. They must ensure that these components are introduced at a point in the syllabus where they enhance the lesson

under discussion — rather than disrupt it. A disjointed course that does not flow well certainly would not be an improvement over an unmodified Reading and Writing syllabus.

However, if theorists and educators use care in incorporating the ancient art of classical rhetoric in the framework of the contemporary Reading and Writing approach to teaching composition, the result will be very close approximation of the “ideal” method for teaching writing that is derived from the new paradigm.

NOTES

¹The four modes of discourse — exposition, argumentation, narration, and description — were established by Alexander Bain in the nineteenth century and still prevail today. The expository mode concerns mostly “what is said, not why it is said: the nature of the reference, not the purpose of the reference” (Kinneavy 79). Argumentation pursues an end: to inquire, to win assent from an audience, to vent hostility, or to demonstrate the probable truth of a hypothesis (32). Narration is a story or process recounted for a particular reason — to entertain, persuade, or inform — and description seeks to isolate the distinctive features of something (Crusius 16). On their own, the modes of discourse merely provide a classification of the “kinds of reality referred to by full texts” (Kinneavy 35); thus, they are typically taught in conjunction with the aims of discourse. The aims of discourse “are the reason for the existence of the . . . [other] aspects of language. . . . [T]he modes of discourse exist so that humans may achieve certain purposes in their use of language with one another” (38). The aims of discourse are expressive (e.g., conversation, journals, diaries, prayer), referential (e.g., seminars diagnosis, news articles), literary (e.g., short story, lyric, ballad, joke), and persuasive (e.g., advertising, political speech, editorials) (61). Thus, the aims of discourse define the purpose of writing, and the modes flow from these means. That is, the modes of discourse used in composition will be determined by the aims. Therefore, a study of the modes is not complete without an understanding of the aims which drive those modes. Students cannot be expected to write well if they have no purpose for writing. The aims provide that purpose.

²Classical rhetoric, because it derives from an oral tradition (see Note 3), contains terminology consist with that tradition. That is, the focus of the classical tradition is on *speech* preparation and *speakers*. Therefore, the terms “writer,” “speaker,” and “rhetor” are used interchangeably throughout this thesis (as are the terms “speech,” “composition,” “written work,” and so forth) so that the discussions of classical rhetoric retain the essence of this ancient art.

³At the time that Aristotle lived and formalized classical rhetoric, written language was not commonplace. Aristotle was considered an orator — a speaker. Therefore, his classical rhetoric typically makes reference to the spoken word (i.e., the speech) and the speaker. This focus on orality is particularly evident in the stages of speech preparation. However, these stages, as well as most of the other facets of classical rhetoric, can be easily applied to the written word; thus, a study of classical rhetoric will translate well into the modern composition classroom.

WORKS CITED

- Berlin, James A. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1984.
- Birnbaum, June Cannell. "Reflective Thought: The Connection between Reading and Writing." *Convergences: Transactions in Reading and Writing*. Ed. Bruce T. Petersen. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1986. 30-45.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990.
- Booth, Wayne C. "The Rhetorical Stance." *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Eds. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 151-157.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Crowley, Sharon. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. New York: Macmillan College Publishing Company, 1994.
- Crusius, Timothy W. *Discourse: A Critique and Synthesis of Major Theories*. New York: MLA, 1989.
- Dowst, Kenneth. "The Epistemic Approach: Writing, Knowing, and Learning." *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*. Eds. Timothy R. Donovan and Ben W. McClelland. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1980. 65-86.
- Emig, Janet. "Hand, Eye, Brain: Some 'Basics' in the Writing Process." *The Web of Meaning: Essays on Writing, Teaching, Learning and Thinking*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1983.
- . "Writing as a Mode of Learning." *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Eds. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 85-91.

- Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity." *College Composition and Communication* 41 (1990): 409-429.
- Goldfine, Ruth, and Gina King. "Never at a Loss for Words." *ETC* 51 (Fall 1994): 338-350.
- Hairston, Maxine. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." *Rhetoric and Composition*. 3rd ed. Ed. Richard L. Graves. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1990. 3-15.
- Horner, Winifred Bryan. *Rhetoric in the Classical Tradition*. New York: St. Martin's, 1988.
- Kinneavy, James E. *A Theory of Discourse: The Aims of Discourse*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Lauer, Janice M. "The Rhetorical Approach: Stages of Writing and Strategies for Writers." *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*. Eds. Timothy R. Donovan and Ben W. McClelland. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1980. 53-64.
- Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Odell, Lee. "The Process of Writing and the Process of Learning." *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Eds. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 103-110.
- Reagan, Sally Barr. "Teaching Reading in the Writing Classroom." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 5 (1986): 177-185.
- Sternglass, Marilyn S. "Integrating Instruction in Reading, Writing, and Reasoning." *The Writer's Mind*. Eds. Hays et al. Urbana: NCTE, 1983. 153-158.
- Youngkin, Betty. Personal interview. 16 March 1995.
- . *The Contributions of Walter J. Ong to the Study of Rhetoric: History and Metaphor*. Diss. Texas A&M University, 1989.

VITA

September 5, 1964	Born — Cleveland, Ohio
1986	B.A., University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio
1995	M.A., University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

- Goldfine, Ruth. "Polymer Research at the University of Dayton." *Polymer News* [in press].
- . *University of Dayton Research Institute Style Guide*. Dayton, Ohio: University of Dayton, 1994.
- Goldfine, Ruth, and Gina King. "Never At a Loss for Words: Why Do Clichés Live On?" *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 51.3 (1994): 338-350.

APPENDIX A

Reading and Writing Syllabus for a High School Senior English Class 1994 Fall Quarter

The attached syllabus is an example of a typical syllabus using the Reading and Writing approach at the secondary level. The text used for the readings is *The Shape of this Century: Readings from the Disciplines*, by Diana Wyllie and Susan S. Waugh. This particular syllabus includes lessons in grammar using the text, *A Writer's Reference* by Diana Hacker.

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 1</i>		
22 Aug	Introduce course Discuss expressive writing and journals Grammar test (to establish baseline abilities)	
23 Aug	Assign Paper #1: Description (2 pages) Discuss reading Present writing process Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 17-23	
24 Aug	Brainstorming (class) Freewriting (individual) Discuss Research Methods (interviews, library research, etc.) Homework: Research childhood memory (use interview method to acquire information from family members); write one-page paper recounting the incident	
25 Aug	Discuss rhetorical problem Analyze reading to determine its problem/purpose Homework: Write one paragraph describing rhetorical problem/purpose of Paper #1 Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 169-170	
26 Aug	Discuss Paper #1: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Terminology and the Basics Reading: Hacker 195-206	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 2</i>		
29 Aug	Paper #1 due Assign Paper #2: Instruction (2-3 pages) Logic exercise (class) Homework: Rewrite illogical statements from in-class exercises	
30 Aug	Review handouts Group Work: rewrite instructions Reading: Handouts (samples of instructions)	
31 Aug	Analyze logic of reading Group Work: Map logic (flow chart, etc.) Homework: one-page essay; present a logical argument for why the reading is convincing (or is not convincing) Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 579-589	
1 Sep	Analyze logical progression of story In-Class Assignment: Rewrite end of story Reading: Handout: Cask of Amontillado	
2 Sep	Discuss Paper #2: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Punctuation Reading: Hacker 124-134	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 3</i>		
5 Sep	LABOR DAY — NO CLASSES	
6 Sep	Paper #2 due Group Work: Analyze structure of reading Homework: Develop outline for a hypothetical thesis; provide rationale for logic flow Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 275-283	
7 Sep	Analyze structure of reading briefly as a class In-Class Assignment: Write two one-page essays in response to questions on p. 358 of text Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 352-358	
8 Sep	Grammar review In-class writing day	
9 Sep	Journals Due Grammar Quiz #1 Grammar Lesson: Subject-Verb Agreement Reading: Hacker 29-34	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 4</i>		
12 Sep	Assign Paper #3: Combining Materials Discuss reading Summarize reading through class discussion Homework: Summarize readings due 13 Sep Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 365-369	
13 Sep	Group Work: Discuss and compare summaries; reconvene class and discuss findings Homework: Summarize newspaper or magazine article Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 296-302	
14 Sep	Peer Review: Exchange articles and summaries; provide written reaction and rationale In-Class Assignment: Write brief description of a physicist	
15 Sep	Discuss Reading Compare pre- and post-reading ideas of physicists In-Class Assignment: Summarize revised description of a physicist; discuss how preconceived ideas affected prediction Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 334-341	
16 Sep	Discuss Paper #3: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Shifts (voice, tense, etc.) Reading: Hacker 70-71	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 5</i>		
19 Sep	Paper #3 due Assign Paper #4: Reaction Paper (6 pages) Discuss reading/reactions to reading Homework: Write two-page reaction to the reading Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 529-532	
20 Sep	Prediction exercise Read and discuss first 75% of story (handout); predict ending In-Class Assignment: Write ending for story Homework: Write responses to the questions for tomorrow's readings (pp. 480-481)	
21 Sep	Discuss readings and questions Homework: Clip article from newspaper or magazine; write a one-page reaction to the article Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 463-479	
22 Sep	Group Work: Discuss articles and reactions In-Class Assignment: Write a rebuttal to a classmate's reaction	
23 Sep	Discuss Paper #4: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Misplaced modifiers Reading: Hacker 67-69	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 6</i>		
26 Sep	Paper #4 due Lead class in critical analysis of reading Homework: Write two-page paper emulating author Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 214-219	
27 Sep	Peer Review (in groups): Read papers aloud; discuss effectiveness of papers	
28 Sep	Lead class in identifying main points of reading In-Class Assignment: Identify supporting arguments for main points; discuss whether they are effective Homework: Read and analyze two newspaper articles Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 390-395	
29 Sep	Grammar Review In-class writing day	
30 Sep	Journals Due Grammar Quiz #2 Grammar Lesson: Parallelism Reading: Hacker 63-64	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 7</i>		
3 Oct	Assign Paper #5: Research paper (7-10 pages) Discuss methods of research Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 702-715	
4 Oct	Analyze use of sources in reading Group Work: Brainstorm topics for research papers Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 547-557	
5 Oct	Discuss citing sources in papers Reading: Hacker 169-192	
6 Oct	Library visit	
7 Oct	Discuss Paper #5: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Pronouns Reading: Hacker 42-50	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 8</i>		
10 Oct	COLUMBUS DAY — NO CLASSES	
11 Oct	<p>Show example of work in process of being revised</p> <p>Discuss reading; explore possible revisions of it</p> <p>Homework: two-page revision of reading</p> <p>Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 75-81</p>	
12 Oct	<p>Peer Review: Exchange and critique papers</p> <p>In-Class Assignment: Write critique of paper</p> <p>Homework: revise paper based on critique</p>	
13 Oct	<p>Discuss reading</p> <p>Group Work: Have students suggest revisions they would make if submitting reading to different journals/magazines</p> <p>Homework: Revise a previous writing assignment</p> <p>Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 161-167</p>	
14 Oct	<p>Grammar Lesson: Adjectives and Adverbs</p> <p>Reading: Hacker 52-55</p>	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 9</i>		
17 Oct	<p>Discuss common errors in writing (especially those of the students in this course)</p> <p>Group Work: Do worksheets in class</p> <p>Homework: Edit one-page of text handout; provide rationale for any changes</p> <p>Homework: Identify three paragraphs you might change in the reading due tomorrow</p>	
18 Oct	<p>Discuss paragraphs for possible edits; provide rationale</p> <p>Homework: Find three newspaper or magazines articles that contain errors or could be rewritten for clarity; correct and/or rewrite</p> <p>Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 647-650</p>	
19 Oct	In-class writing day	
20 Oct	Paper #5 due Grammar Review	
21 Oct	Journals due Grammar Final	

APPENDIX B

Reading and Writing Syllabus Modified to Include Classical Rhetoric

High School Senior English Class
1994 Fall Quarter

The attached syllabus is a Reading and Writing syllabus that has been modified to include elements of classical rhetoric. The text for the readings is *The Shape of this Century: Readings from the Disciplines*, by Diana Wyllie and Susan S. Waugh. This textbook offers readings in a variety of disciplines and on a many different subjects, thus affording students a chance to gain knowledge in a variety of areas. A grammar reference book, *A Writer's Reference* by Diana Hacker, is also required for the course.

NOTE: The italics typeface indicates text additions or modifications to the text as compared to the syllabus in Appendix A.

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 1</i>		
22 Aug	<p>Introduce course Discuss expressive writing and journals <i>Present modes of writing</i> Grammar test (to establish baseline abilities)</p>	<p>Stress that the journals can be used especially for expressive writing. Discuss expressive writing in some detail. Present and describe the four modes of discourse.</p>
23 Aug	<p>Assign Paper #1: Description (2 pages) Discuss assigned reading Present writing process Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 17-23</p>	<p>Discuss the writing process, emphasizing process over product. Include a discussion about the recursiveness of writing. Discuss the descriptive mode in detail; present its distinguishing elements.</p>
24 Aug	<p><i>Present the five stages of speech writing and the arguments of classical rhetoric</i> <i>Emphasize the invention stage and the heuristics used in this stage</i> Brainstorming (class) Discuss research methods (interviews, library research, etc.) Homework: Research childhood memory (use interview method to acquire information from family members); write a one-page <i>narration</i> paper recounting the incident</p>	<p>Present the five stages of speech writing defined in classical rhetoric. Discuss how they are applicable to modern composition. Emphasize the invention stage and present the heuristics (e.g., <i>topoi</i>, <i>sylogism</i>, <i>enthymeme</i>) of the invention stage that can be used to develop arguments. Explain the arguments of classical rhetoric and how they are used. Discuss the narration mode in detail; provide examples.</p>
25 Aug	<p><i>Present rhetorical situation</i> <i>Discuss persuasive appeals (i.e., ethos, logos, pathos)</i> <i>Analyze reading in terms of rhetorical situation/Identify persuasive appeals/Evaluate author's intent and readers' needs (class)</i> Homework: Write one paragraph describing how audience will be addressed in Paper #1 Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 169-170</p>	<p>Introduce students to the elements of the rhetorical situation and explain their impact on the writing process. Present the types of persuasive appeals that can be used; assist students in recognizing these appeals in the assigned reading. Discuss how different appeals are used in different situations for different audiences. Discuss ways the audience will be addressed in the students' first assignment and which/how persuasive appeals can be used in these papers.</p>
26 Aug	<p>Discuss Paper #1: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Terminology and the Basics Reading: Hacker 195-206</p>	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 2</i>		
29 Aug	Paper #1 due Assign Paper #2: Instruction (2-3 pages) Logic exercise (class) Homework: Rewrite illogical statements from in-class exercises	
30 Aug	Review handouts Group Work: rewrite instructions Reading: Handouts (samples of instructions)	
31 Aug	<i>Present inductive and deductive reasoning</i> Analyze logic of reading Group Work: Map logic (flow chart, etc.) Homework: one-page essay; present a logical argument for why the reading is convincing (or is not convincing)/ <i>Explain</i> <i>why the deductive or inductive reasoning</i> <i>of the reading was effective</i> Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 579-589	Explain inductive and deductive reasoning. Lead class discussion on the reading; ask students to find examples of inductive or deductive reasoning. Help students identify situations in which one or the other type of reasoning would be preferred.
1 Sep	Analyze logical progression of story In-Class Assignment: Rewrite end of story Reading: Handout: Cask of Amontillado	
2 Sep	Discuss Paper #2: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Punctuation Reading: Hacker 124-134	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 3</i>		
5 Sep	LABOR DAY — NO CLASSES	
6 Sep	<p>Paper #2 due <i>Discuss arrangement stage of speech preparation</i> Group Work: Analyze structure of reading Homework: Develop outline for a hypothetical thesis; provide rationale for logic flow Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 275-283</p>	<p>Discuss the arrangement stage of speech writing in detail. Lead students in a discussion of the structure of their homework reading assignment. Help them recognize how the arrangement/structure of the reading contributed to its effectiveness. Encourage students to suggest alternate arrangements that could be equally or more effective.</p>
7 Sep	<p>Analyze structure of reading briefly as a class In-Class Assignment: Write 2 one-page essays in response to questions on p. 358 of text Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 352-358</p>	
8 Sep	<p>Grammar review In-class writing day</p>	
9 Sep	<p>Journals due Grammar Quiz #1 Grammar Lesson: Subject-Verb Agreement Reading: Hacker 29-34</p>	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 4</i>		
12 Sep	<p>Assign Paper #3: Combining Materials Discuss reading Summarize reading through class discussion Homework: Summarize readings due 13 Sep Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 365-369</p>	
13 Sep	<p>Group Work: Discuss and compare summaries; reconvene class and discuss findings Homework: Summarize newspaper or magazine article Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 296-302</p>	
14 Sep	<p>Peer Review: Exchange articles and summaries; provide written reaction and rationale In-Class Assignment: Write brief description of a physicist</p>	
15 Sep	<p>Discuss Reading Compare pre- and post-reading ideas of physicists In-Class Assignment: Summarize revised description of a physicist; discuss how preconceived ideas affected prediction Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 334-341</p>	
16 Sep	<p>Discuss Paper #3: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Shifts (voice, tense, etc.) Reading: Hacker 70-71</p>	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 5</i>		
19 Sep	Paper #3 due Assign Paper #4: Reaction Paper (6 pages) Discuss reading/reactions to reading <i>Examine reactions in terms of rhetorical situation and persuasive appeals</i> Homework: Write two-page reaction to the reading Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 529-532	Lead students in a discussion of the reading, examining the author's intent and the readers' needs/reactions. Help the students in recognizing the persuasive appeals used; have students evaluate whether these appeals are the most effective in the given context.
20 Sep	Prediction exercise Read and discuss first 75% of story (handout); predict ending In-class assignment: Write ending for story Homework: Write responses to the questions for tomorrow's readings (pp. 480-481)	
21 Sep	Discuss readings and questions Homework: Clip article from newspaper or magazine; write a one-page reaction to the article Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 463-479	
22 Sep	Group Work: Discuss articles and reactions <i>Address rhetorical situation of articles</i> In-Class Assignment: Write a rebuttal to a classmate's reaction (<i>argumentation paper</i>)	Ask students to consider what the author's intent may have been in writing the article and to determine if their classmate reacted in the intended manner. Their rebuttals should counter their classmate's opinion, even if they agree with his or her opinion. Thus, they will be forced to consider the audience, their intent as writers, the particular situation, and the arguments and persuasive appeals best suited to the particular purpose. Discuss the argumentation mode in detail; present its distinguishing features.
23 Sep	Discuss Paper #4: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Misplaced modifiers Reading: Hacker 67-69	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 6</i>		
26 Sep	Paper #4 due Lead class in critical analysis of reading Homework: Write two-page paper emulating author's style Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 214-219	Focus discussion primarily on the effectiveness of the piece and those elements that contribute to its effectiveness.
27 Sep	Peer Review (in groups): Read papers aloud; discuss effectiveness of papers <i>Review the arguments and persuasive appeals of classical rhetoric</i>	Provide a list of questions/issues students should address in their reviews to help them focus their discussions. In particular, they should evaluate the arguments and persuasive appeals used, indicating why these elements make for effective (or ineffective) writing.
28 Sep	Lead class in identifying main points of reading In-Class Assignment: Identify supporting arguments for main points; discuss whether they are effective Homework: Read and analyze two newspaper articles Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 390-395	
29 Sep	Grammar Review In-class writing day	
30 Sep	Journals Due Grammar Quiz #2 Grammar Lesson: Parallelism Reading: Hacker 63-64	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 7</i>		
3 Oct	Assign Paper #5: Research Paper (7-10 pages) (<i>expository writing</i>) Discuss methods of research and invention Review heuristics of the invention stage (e.g., syllogisms, enthymemes) Lead a class brainstorming session followed by small group discussions Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 702-715	Discuss the exposition mode in detail; describe its particular features. Discuss how students can put into practice the heuristics of the invention stage. Provide practical examples of developing arguments. Lead a class brainstorming session to generate ideas for papers. Follow up with small group discussions that allow students to fine-tune these ideas and begin to develop arguments to support their topics.
4 Oct	Analyze use of sources in reading Discuss results of yesterday's small group discussions In-class assignment: Begin outlining research paper Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 547-557	Allow students to present the results of their small group discussions to the class. Assist students in focusing on a manageable topic. Allow them in-class time to reflect on their topic and begin writing ideas for their papers.
5 Oct	Library visit	Accompany students to the school library. Show them how to find information on their topics.
6 Oct	Discuss citing sources in papers Reading: Hacker 169-192	
7 Oct	Discuss Paper #5: Progress, questions, etc. Grammar Lesson: Pronouns Reading: Hacker 42-50	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 8</i>		
10 Oct	COLUMBUS DAY — NO CLASSES	
11 Oct	<p><i>Review arrangement and style stages</i> Show example of work in process of being revised Discuss reading; explore possible revisions of it Homework: two-page revision of reading Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 75-81</p>	<p>Discuss the arrangement and style stages of speech writing in detail. Demonstrate the impact of arrangement and style by showing students an example of a work in progress (i.e., early marked-up drafts of a document and a final version). Lead students in examining the specific revisions. Ask them to evaluate whether the revisions were improvements and to explain why the author might have made particular revisions. Encourage students to make suggestions for possible revisions; discuss the reading to generate ideas for revision. Encourage students to consider their audience and intent before beginning their homework assignment.</p>
12 Oct	<p>Peer Review: Exchange and critique papers In-Class Assignment: Write critique of paper <i>focusing on writer's intent and readers' needs</i> Homework: revise paper based on critique</p>	<p>In writing the critiques, students should focus on the writer's intent and the readers' needs: How effective was the writer in accomplishing these objectives?</p>
13 Oct	<p>Discuss reading Group Work: Have students suggest revisions they would make if submitting reading to different journals/magazines; <i>focus on how the rhetorical situation comes into play</i> Homework: Revise a previous writing assignment Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 161-167</p>	<p>Explain to students that this is the "real life" application of much of what they have been learning. That is, to get something published in a particular journal/magazine (writer's intent, the "purpose" he or she is writing), a writer must write about a topic that is relevant (i.e., appropriate for the occasion) and interesting to the readership of that particular journal (readers' needs; the audience). Thus, an audience analysis (i.e., knowing the readership of a journal) as well as an understanding of the conversation in the discourse community are an essential part of the research that must be performed.</p>
14 Oct	<p>Grammar Lesson: Adjectives and Adverbs Reading: Hacker 52-55</p>	

DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY/ASSIGNMENT	COMMENTS
<i>Week 9</i>		
17 Oct	<p>Discuss common errors in writing (especially those of the students in this course)</p> <p>Group Work: Do worksheets in class</p> <p>Homework: Edit one-page of text handout; provide rationale for any changes</p> <p>Homework: Identify three paragraphs you might change in the reading due tomorrow</p>	
18 Oct	<p>Discuss paragraphs for possible edits; provide rationale</p> <p>Homework: Find three newspaper or magazines articles that contain errors or could be rewritten for clarity; correct and/or rewrite</p> <p>Reading: Wyllie & Waugh 647-650</p>	
19 Oct	In-class writing day	
20 Oct	<p>Paper #5 due</p> <p>Grammar Review</p>	
21 Oct	<p>Journals due</p> <p>Grammar Final</p>	