

5-3-2007

Establishing Pedagogical Practicality by Reconnecting Composition Studies to the Rhetorical Tradition

Jeffrey Alan Bacha

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_theses

Recommended Citation

Bacha, Jeffrey Alan, "Establishing Pedagogical Practicality by Reconnecting Composition Studies to the Rhetorical Tradition" (2007). *English Theses*. Paper 23.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

ESTABLISHING PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICALITY BY RECONNECTING COMPOSITION
STUDIES TO THE RHETORICAL TRADITION

by

JEFFREY A. BACHA

Under the Direction of George Pullman

ABSTRACT

Composition instructors agree writing instruction should focus on helping students become better writers. Pedagogical commonality, however, ends here. Composition instructors disagree about what constitutes good writing, what student should be learning, and how best to approach a composition classroom. I argue that pedagogical diversity among composition instructors is detrimental to the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition, because it has contributed to the public perception that we have no teachable content. Focusing around the removal of and reintegration of rhetoric from American college English departments, I argue composition studies and the rhetorical tradition have historically been viewed as separate disciplines. This project will illustrate that composition studies needs to reconnect to the rhetorical tradition in order formulate a unified practical pedagogical identity. With a unified pedagogical identity, composition studies can finally claim it has a teachable and defensible content: the production of better critical thinking skills.

INDEX WORDS: Composition, Rhetoric, Pedagogy, Social construction, Expressive

ESTABLISHING PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICALITY BY RECONNECTING COMPOSITION
STUDIES TO THE RHETORICAL TRADITION

by

JEFFREY A. BACHA

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Arts
in the College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

2007

Copyright by
Jeffrey Alan Bacha
2007

ESTABLISHING PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICALITY BY RECONNECTING
COMPOSITION STUDIES TO THE RHETORICAL TRADITION

by

JEFFREY A BACHA

Major Professor: George Pullman
Committee: Marti Singer
Marty Hocks

Electronic Version Approved:
Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
May 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction: Looking at the future through the past	1
II. Historical Foundations: The Birth of disjointedness	7
Product-pedagogy and dogmatism of style.....	8
Post-product pedagogy: the shift to process and Romantic expression	18
The Social Turn: Discourse Communities and Cultural Studies	28
<i>Modern Dogma: The Return of “Current-Traditionalism”</i>	38
III. A New History: Establishing a Sense of Unification.....	46
IV: Moving on Moving Forward: A Plea for Practicality.....	62
Works Cited.....	71

I. Introduction: Looking at the future through the past

Those of us teaching composition occupy a unique position within American college curriculums. In most cases, composition instructors are among the few professionals teaching at the college level who can say they impact the lives of almost every freshmen student entering our university system. However, students who progress through our composition classrooms generally do not receive the same education regarding the production of written artifacts, because most composition instructors disagree about the best way to teach writing. “We differ about what our courses are supposed to achieve, about how effective writing is best produced, about what an effective classroom looks like, and about what it means to make knowledge” (Fulkerson “Twenty-First Century” 681). How can we, as instructors of Rhetoric and Composition, claim to be a unified body of professionals if we cannot agree on what or how we should be teaching our students? If some form of pedagogical commonality cannot be achieved within the discipline of, we run the risk of perpetuating the public perception of composition studies having no teachable content. And, as Ellen Cushman claims, “without a content, an area of specialization, we haven’t a professional identity” (123).

One problem contributing to the lack of solidarity among composition instructors is the misuse of the term “Theory” in composition studies. We, as practicing instructors, need to understand composition studies has no real “Theory” when it comes to writing; instead, we have varying “theoretical assumptions” about producing written artifacts. A second problem is the misguided hierarchical preference of using non-practical “Theories” from other disciplines inside writing classrooms, like psychology, philosophy, and linguistics. According to Fulkerson, “the importation of cultural studies from the social sciences and literary theory, has made a writing

teacher's role deeply problematic" ("Twenty-First Century" 655). Both problems are detrimental to composition studies because they do not offer us any pedagogical suggestions about what to do Monday morning when we walk into our composition classrooms. As Steven Lynn has pointed out, composition instructors "need somehow to move beyond such either/or choices, into a realm of both/and where our writing instruction can self-consciously and coherently draw on or evolve out of conflicting pedagogies" (909).

I believe Richard Fulkerson was correct in his assumption that if "a university or a department is serious about seeing writing courses as constituting a 'program' or some portion of a larger scheme of 'general education,' some degree of commonality is likely to be required" (Fulkerson "Twenty-First Century" 680). Although I do not believe, as Ellen Cushman does, that we need to establish a new discipline of writing instruction outside of English departments. Instead, I believe we need to establish a unified pedagogical curriculum in the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition. The first step is creating a unified progressive pedagogical identity and educational curriculum within the field of composition studies. Developing a unified progressive curriculum means bringing student needs and instructional practicality back to our pedagogical assumptions. As Ted Larder has pointed out, contemporary "composition theory calls for pedagogies that put the student at the center of their learning, and we ought to follow by putting students at the center of our theories" (12). A unified progressive writing curriculum is only possible, as Cushman has pointed out, "if our colleagues in literature understand and appreciate that writing, a practice, is also a knowledge base" (123). Bringing students back to the center of our pedagogical discussion will allow us to claim composition studies has a teachable content: the production of better critical thinking skills necessary to succeed in college and beyond.

From the outset, a project of this nature may be resented because many contemporary instructors view pedagogical diversity as the strongest feature of composition studies. As the introduction to the 2001 collection *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies* illustrates, composition instructors claim “[m]ultimodality is not a sign of confusion or uncertainty, but a clear signal that the teaching of writing is grounded in something beyond what colleagues, administrators, and the public often say they want: ‘good’ grammar and correct spelling” (Tate et al. vi). Other members of composition studies have countered this claim and see diversity in the writing classroom as an inhibitor to labeling Rhetoric and Composition as a unified educational paradigm. “When a discipline lacks a coherent philosophy, it can be shaped by the most anti-intellectual forces, and this is precisely what has happened to composition pedagogy over the years” (Gere 14). I agree with the second claim and believe the unification of our philosophical or ideological assumptions regarding the production of written artifacts is our top priority.

To achieve pedagogical commonality, we need to parse through our history to discover the functional aspects of our previous pedagogical assumptions. Specifically, we need to look at the shift from product-pedagogy to process-pedagogy to social-pedagogies and examine what worked and why. We can then formulate a new pedagogical identity by combining and building on the functional/practical portions of our previous pedagogical assumptions. The pedagogical identity I am proposing unites process and product with persuasion and social concerns. It is my pedagogical assumption that composition students should use writing to develop deeper understandings of cultural knowledge and use their products to present new “truth” claims to augment culturally accepted versions of social “truth.”

The pedagogical identity I am proposing goes even deeper than establishing commonality in our instructional ideologies; it also involves reconnecting composition studies with the

rhetorical tradition. As Donald Stewart has pointed out, “[w]e should continually reminded ourselves that ours is a discipline with a history and that history is inextricably linked, on the one hand to the history of the modern profession of English, and on the other hand to one of the oldest intellectual traditions in the Western World, the tradition of rhetoric” (143). Not only do composition instructors need to come to some sort of instructional commonality, the entire discipline of Rhetoric and Composition needs to begin establishing a unified pedagogical stance toward the production and purpose of written artifacts. Because, as Knoblauch has claimed, the “quality of our students’ lives depends on the cogency and the humanity of decisions we make (“Rhetorical Constructions” 139), we need to understand college is an apparatus for learning, not a “Theoretical” battlefield where what feels good to us at the moment is the best way to help our students succeed once they leave our classrooms.

A unified pedagogical identity is attainable, but it requires interlacing new historical accounts, focused around changing assumptions of how the production about written artifices help students acquire knowledge, into traditional histories of our discipline. To begin, I would like to return to the words of Robert Connors: “Historians may not be the shamans of the field, but we are the storytellers, spinning the fabric what will, we hope, knit together the separate, private stories of the researchers, the theorists, the teachers in the classroom” (*Composition-Rhetoric* 18). If Connors is accurate and historians are not shamans, but rather storytellers, then histories require a story to tell. This project’s story revolves around the historical developments leading up to the creation of composition specific classrooms in American colleges in the 1800s. It also revolves around the establishment of a divisionary classification system breaking composition studies and the rhetorical tradition into two historically distinct areas of study. Once a division between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies has been established, I will

then construct a new history intended to reconnect composition studies to the rhetorical tradition. The new history I am proposing will track the historical assumptions regarding epistemology or how composition students use their understanding of knowledge to produce “truth”.

Narrowing down the pedagogical beginnings of composition studies is, however, an arduous task, because, as James Berlin has stated, “histories are a partial accounts, are both biased and incomplete. The good historians admit this and then tell their stories. The bad attempt to dominate the past, pretending at the same time to be mere recorders of the facts” (“Octolog” 12). My story begins with the Enlightenment and the establishment of a new rhetorical tradition based on creating written artifacts rather than oral speeches. The new rhetorical tradition represented, “a coherent tradition of conceptualizing the elements of correct and successful writing, trying to teach students how to find them in extant prose, and encouraging students to create them in their own prose” (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 7). Using the Enlightenment as a historical entry point, I will track the pedagogical movements within composition studies leading up to the establishment of a contemporary “current-traditional” model and the current contention among contemporary composition instructors. Focusing on the removal and reintegration of rhetoric from the Americanized academic discipline of English, this project will also illustrate how members of composition studies and the rhetorical tradition tried to establish professional merit within English studies that historically viewed Rhetoric and Composition as a subsidiary necessity that may have outlived its usefulness.

Change, then, is this project’s underlining story. It is a story of struggle and a story for professional identity within an academic setting that has continuously seen the rise and fall of rhetorical dominance. How the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition changes next depends on the facets leading to the next “big thing” in composition studies, which should be grounded in

developing a unified pedagogical identity. Composition instructors need to realize the ephemeral nature of pedagogical assumptions, which should only be viewed as guides rather than mandates of practice. Pedagogical assumptions should be viewed as “particular discourses that arise in specific intellectual and material circumstances, conditions that importantly constrain their content and its implications, or range of significance, at specific times” (Susan Miller 64). Once we have established a unified pedagogical identity designed to meet contemporary needs, we can return to Ellen Cushman’s concept of a “Vertical Writing Program,” where Rhetoric and Composition students continuously push privatized written artifacts toward performance based public rhetorical acts.

II. Historical Foundations: The Birth of disjointedness

To understand the current debate among contemporary composition instructors, one first has to understand the historical events contributing to the debate. Throughout the brief history of composition studies, numerous individuals have attempted to classify historical pedagogical movements through the use of labels based on commonly held ideologies regarding the production of written artifacts (see Berlin, Faigley, and Woods). By grouping pedagogical assumptions together under labels, historians have attempted to establish “diverging definitions of the composition process itself” (Berlin “Contemporary Composition” 165). Recently, Richard Fulkerson grouped contemporary pedagogical assumptions into three categories: “the social,” “expressive,” and “rhetorical.”

The historical trend of categorizing pedagogical assumptions in composition studies has led to Fulkerson’s assessment of “axiological” consensus with “pedagogical diversity” among contemporary instructors. According to Fulkerson, “we agreed that we were to help students improve their writing and that ‘good writing’ meant writing that was rhetorically effective for audience and situation. But we still disagreed over what sort of pedagogy would best reach this goal” (“Twenty-First Century” 655). Although all three pedagogical assumptions have, to some degree, accepted the ideological tenets of the social constructionists, most contemporary composition instructors still disagree over how to best facilitate growth in a composition classroom. According to Tim Keppel, “expressionists charge the social constructionists with politicizing the classroom and attempting to impose an ideology on students. Social constructionists counter that no classroom is value-free and that students need to move beyond their own egos” (121). It is my claim that this internal squabbling is detrimental to the discipline

of composition studies and is directly contributing to the public persona of composition studies having no teachable content. What has developed is a situation where composition instructors are now being required to defend their instructional practices by claiming alliance with one pedagogical approach.

The lack of solidarity among composition instructors can be directly tied to their differing opinions regarding the value of the rhetorical tradition inside a composition classroom when formulating pedagogical assumptions. The rhetorical tradition has not formulated any practical speculations regarding writing instruction since the Enlightenment; instead, it focused on issues impacting public rhetorical performance. Most contemporary composition instructors, on the other hand, still view writing as a private act. The development of differing opinions regarding the public versus private nature of written artifacts has produced a contemporary misconception of rhetoric and composition studies existing as separate and unique disciplines inside English departments. The removal of rhetoric from the American College curriculum and the creation of composition specific courses in the 1800s is one main contributor to the misconception that rhetoric is separate from composition studies. To illustrate the initial split between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies, my story will begin with the Enlightenment and the developments in the rhetorical tradition contributing to the creation of product-pedagogy.

Product-pedagogy and dogmatism of style

Prior to the Enlightenment, the rhetorical tradition was dominated by pulpit oratory and focused around flashy speeches intending to invigorate an audience through their emotions. According to Bizzell and Herzberg, “[o]rinate style continued to be regarded as beautiful and impressive, and *impressive* was synonymous with *effective*, for the striking phrase would capture the attention of the reader or auditor” (794). As I will show in the following section, during the

Enlightenment, rhetoricians began to view Renaissance rhetoric as “an art of obfuscation” (Bizzell and Herberg 195), which resulted in a shift in the rhetorical tradition where rhetorical value became dominated by stylistic purity. According to Bizzell and Herzberg: “Before the end of the seventeenth century [...] traditional rhetoric came under attack by adherents of the new science, who claimed that rhetoric obscured the truth by encouraging the use of ornamented rather than plain, direct language” (792).

During the Enlightenment a new form of rhetoric was also constructed to teach writing to the members of middle-class America who lacked classical training. Contemporary historians have labeled the Enlightenment the “current-traditional” period of the rhetorical tradition and the pedagogical stance adopted by composition instructors as the “current-traditional” model of writing instruction. Using the term, however, fails to recognize the fact composition studies as a discipline did not exist during this time period. It also fails to take into account that rhetoric, during the Enlightenment, was never a “traditional” aspect of the rhetorical tradition. “Current-traditional” is actually a construct used by modern historians to explain two-hundred years of work within the rhetorical tradition that most contemporary practitioners wish to forget. According to Donald Stewart, “a writing teacher’s development can be measured by the degree to which that person has become liberated from current-traditional rhetoric” (134). I will instead use the term “product-pedagogy”, because pedagogical assessment during this time period was based solely on the rhetorician’s product and rhetorical eloquence became associated with utility, plainness of style, and structural form.

The foundational elements of product-pedagogy were first postulated in the rhetorical tradition through the style guides of Enlightenment Elocutionists like John Locke, who began searching for a discourse capable of reaching a population with a diverse educational

background. Technological advances, like the advent of the printing press, near the end of the Renaissance made it possible to mass produce rhetorical documents. Elocutionists were finding it possible to spread their sermons to people who could not witness them in person, which meant rhetorical documents needed to be constructed as clearly as possible so all members of the faith could understand them regardless of their educational background. The Industrial Revolution also made it possible for rhetoricians to communicate with each other about the usefulness of oral rhetoric and how rhetorical acts should be constructed through printed materials. It is in these printed materials we find the roots of contemporary composition studies. One of the first examples in the rhetorical tradition for the establishment of a utilitarian discourse can be found in John Locke's 1690 publication *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* where rhetoric's main goal became the ability to inform an audience without clouding the meaning of the rhetorical act (385).

In order to achieve the rhetorician's goal, Locke believed the product should be written as plainly as possible to keep ornamentation from clouding meaning. Rhetoric, according to Locke, failed "when any word does not excite in the hearer the same idea which it stands for in the mind of the speaker" (386). Near the end of the 1700s, rhetoric's utilitarian purpose became solidified and product-pedagogy rather ornamented beauty became the standard when judging rhetorical value. In *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* George Campbell furthered Locke's perspective on rhetoric by claiming rhetorical talent results entirely from the rhetorician's ability to display "propriety" and "accuracy of method." Under Campbell's version of rhetoric, a rhetorical act failed if it did not meticulously lead the audience to the rhetorician's goal through simple diction or if it left the audience to discover clarification for any point made. Structure, then, became the second

fundamental element of product-pedagogy and placed assessment criteria directly on how the rhetorical act functioned logically from start to finish.

In *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, Hugh Blair furthered Campbell's project by arguing for the elimination of unnecessary ornamentation and artificiality from rhetoric. According to Blair, rhetoric should "direct attention more towards substance than show, to recommend good sense as the foundation of all good composition, and simplicity as essential to all true ornament" (950). Blair believed the purpose of rhetoric was to persuade people to act through logical reasoning and ornamentation was a form of trickery or deceit because it could lead an audience to irrational actions based on emotions rather than logic. Blair's call for rhetoricians to use plain language to eliminate obscurity would become the third fundamental element of product-pedagogy.

The establishment of a product-pedagogy belief system in the rhetorical movement of the Enlightenment is a pivotal moment in history and is generally overlooked in the histories of composition. Most historical accounts of rhetoric and composition studies view the 1700s as a time period where composition's only function was to reproduce the rhetorician's final product. "The older discipline of rhetoric did contribute some of the ideas and definitions that were in general suspension but no one was certain how to grid older orally attuned rhetorical concepts to the problems of writing" (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 8). This time period is important to the history of composition studies because it is where the foundational elements of product-pedagogy first developed and it helps point the way to the conditions surrounding the removal of rhetoric from American English departments.

During the early 1800s, English studies in American universities followed the product-pedagogy movement established by Locke, Campbell, and Blair. Most programs followed a

mixture of Blair's "Belletristic" style of rhetoric and students were being taught how to develop both oral and written rhetorical skills (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric*). During the 1800s, literature and rhetoric were taught as if they were the same discipline. Students were asked to study literature and then respond to the literature rhetorically in daily theme writings. By the mid 1800s literature and rhetoric would split into two separate departments within English studies. In the newly formed composition classes, students, usually already trained in the classical rhetorical tradition, were being asked to continue the tradition of delivery by preparing essays and presenting them orally. Rhetorical instruction focused around the aspects of sophisticated taste and style as presented in 19th century literature. As James Berlin has pointed out, rhetoric was the dominant course of study in American English departments throughout the second half of the 1800s and "only the well-endowed and the well-prepared were in attendance" (Berlin *Rhetoric and Reality*, 2).

Most traditional accounts of composition history point to the creation of a split between rhetoric and composition with the establishment of the first prescribed freshman and sophomore composition courses at Harvard in 1874, labeled English A (Gere 14), which were created to meet the demands of a widening student population. Prior to the Civil War, college education in America was reserved for upper class students determined to begin a career in politics or business. Following the Civil war and the advent of the American Industrial Revolution, the United States witnessed a boom in industry opportunities. Factories were opening and stores were being constructed to help handle the influx of new products which created a growing need for an educated middle-class capable of filling the new managerial positions. In response, the United States government created the Morrill acts: "The Morrill Act of 1862, which established the Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges, brought a large new population of students to

American colleges and helped found the major state universities” (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 9).

As new “Mechanical and Agricultural Colleges” began to open, a new class of students began flooding to them (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 9). A shifting student population, however, meant composition studies in the United States needed a pedagogical shift in order to accommodate non-classically trained students who required technically efficient communication skills. Rhetoric’s classical focus on oral persuasion could not accomplish this, because the new students “needed to be taught correctness in writing” and “needed to know forms” (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 9). English instructors responded by teaching composition to the less well prepared student population.

Responding to the growing diversity among students, English courses began adopting the aspects of product-pedagogy as presented in the rhetorical style guides of the Enlightenment. In *The Philosophy of Style*, Herbert Spencer took Campbell’s theory of perspicuity one step further by urging for a principle of economizing the audience’s attention within every piece of composition. In discussing an approach to composition, Spencer called for the use of “direct style” where writing “conveys each thought into the mind step by step with little liability to error” (1162). Spencer believed all language communicated in any form should be transmitted clearly, plainly, and as efficiently as possible in order to maintain the audience’s attention and limit distractions which could hinder the clearness of the communicated thought. According to Spencer, written artifacts should be viewed as “an apparatus of symbols for the conveyance of thought, we may say that as in a mechanical apparatus, the more simple and the better arranged its parts, the greater will be the effect produced” (1155). The concept of perspicuity proposed by Spencer would become one of the strongest facets of product-pedagogy in composition studies.

In *English Composition and Rhetoric*, Alexander Bain pushed Spencer's assessment of rhetoric even further by stressing the need for mechanical purity which should allow the audience access to a text's meaning if it is presented plainly enough (1148). Bain stressed the need for purity of style within every piece of composition, by claiming "[e]ach paragraph has a plan dictated by the nature of the composition. According to such plan, every pertinent statement has a suitable place; in that place, it contributes to the general effect; and, out of that place, it makes confusion" (1148). According to Bain, the arrangement of paragraphs will disclose the meaning "for although a discourse as a whole has a method or plan suited to its nature, yet the confining of each paragraph to a distinct topic avoids some of the worst faults of composition" (1148). Joined with Spencer's concept of perspicuity, Bain's call for mechanical purity within written artifacts created a writing pedagogy where style and form became crucial components of assessment.

In *The Principles of Rhetoric*, Adams Sherman Hill merged the principles of Enlightenment rhetoric with Spenser's idea of economical composition and Bain's concept of mechanical purity, declaring "rhetoric may be defined as the art of efficient communication by language" (v). According to Hill, a writer should obtain an extensive command of language, meaning a writer should be able to structure a written artifact logically through correct grammar and style. Hill presumed that "[w]hatever a writer's materials, whatever his gifts, he must, if he hopes to be read, awaken interest at the beginning and hold it to the end. Unless he succeeds in doing this, his work, whatever its merits in other respects, fails" (246). The result of Spencer, Hill, and Bain's composition textbooks was the solidification of a writing pedagogy that resembled the product-pedagogy of the Enlightenment, which viewed all rhetorical acts as finalized products that should be structured logically through correct grammar and style. This

pedagogical view of writing would become the formulaic and dogmatic tenant of product-pedagogy in composition studies and placed assessment criteria solely on the product being presented. By the end of the 1800s, composition instructors reduced product-pedagogy from the traditional five cannons of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery to the production of explanatory prose surrounding examinations of literary works.

The final break between rhetoric and composition occurred twenty years after the formation of English A. In 1892 Harvard removed rhetoric from the institution's curriculum after the publication of the first of three "Harvard Reports" marking one of the most influential historical shifts in composition studies and the rhetorical tradition (Gere 13). The reason for the break between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition can be directly attributed to the practical need that dominated 19th century America. Faced with a new, non-classically trained student population, who could not compete in a rhetorically centered classroom, could barely pass the universities newly established entrance exam, and did not need to know how to participate in the oral tradition of civic rhetoric, Harvard decided to investigate the matter.

The results of the investigation, called the "Harvard Reports," showed students entering into the university were not prepared for the educational requirements of the university's curriculum. The reports declared composition studies should be taught in high schools and students should be mechanically and grammatically prepared for the task of writing before entering college. As a result, most secondary institutions and high schools across the United States followed Harvard's lead. But, all of the universities in the United States soon began to face the same problem: how to educate students lacking the skills to produce rhetorically acceptable products. Most universities found answers in the work of Spencer, Hill, Bain, and

others by combining the stylistic principles of Enlightenment Rhetoric with the principles of economy and the idea of mechanical purity as presented in early composition textbooks.

English departments in colleges and universities eventually created style manuals and writing handbooks for their composition classes stressing mimetic, theme based, structurally sound, and grammatically error free writing. It was the assumption of early composition studies that any student could write or learn how to write correctly if shown the proper method. Students were required to emulate “good” writing with intentions of producing an accurate product, which should possess correct form, style, and correctness of grammar. What occurred was the classification of writing into five provinces, labeled “description, narration, exposition, argumentation, persuasion” (Winterowd and Blum 34). From the early 1900s up until the 1940s, writing instruction shifted from idealized elitism, where the student was groomed to participate in politics, to a democratized formulism, where any student, regardless of their upbringing, could become proficient in mimetic based composition.

It was during this period of progressive change and open reforms in the educational systems of the United States that writing became “positivistic and practical in spirit [...] designed to provide the new middle-class professionals with the tools to avoid embarrassing themselves in print” (Berlin *Rhetoric and Reality* 35). What occurred in writing curriculums across the United States was a shift to “Belletristic” approaches toward writing, which focused on discussions about literature. During the early 1900s, literature replaced rhetoric as the dominant subject of study within English departments and writing instruction became dominated by literature students waiting to join the great *Belles Lettres* discussion. Composition courses, which were taught by literature students who did not have training in the rhetorical tradition, “remained a scholarly backwater and a professional avocation, a drudgery, and a painful

initiation ritual” (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 14-15). The byproduct of the “Belletristic” based composition was the creation of a generation of writers who could discuss literature, but lacked the rhetorical skills necessary for invention.

Once removed from the English curriculum, rhetoric was relegated to Speech departments and manipulated by philosophers as a way to continue theorizing about how knowledge is formed and the search for “truth.” Composition studies, on the other hand, would eventually become dominated by the product-focused, style guide approach to composition pedagogy that developed out of the Enlightenment and became locked inside a tradition of explanatory prose through exposition that continued well into the 1950s. It would not be until the late 1950s and early 1960s that rhetoric would officially return to English departments through the efforts of composition instructors searching for ways to push composition instruction past the dogmatism of product-pedagogy. It is during this period of change within English departments when composition instructors shifted back to a rhetorically based pedagogy and, by traditional accounts of composition history, is when composition studies became an established academic discipline.

Helping to promote the reintegration of rhetoric into composition studies, scholars like James Kinneavy, C.H. Knoblauch, Patricia Bizzel, Edward Corbett, and James Berlin began retracing the rhetorical situation found in classical rhetoric to reintroduce composition students to the idea of audience. In 1967, Corbett claimed, “rhetoric has fairly consistently been regarded as an art governing the choice of strategies that a speaker or writer must make in order to communicate most effectively with an audience” (166). At the same time, rhetoricians began expanding rhetoric from mechanically and stylistically appropriate discourses to a public act. As the next section will illustrate, the joint movement away from product-pedagogy established a

very tumultuous relationship between traditional rhetoricians and composition instructors, who were both looking for inspiration from the past to separately establish academic credibility.

Post-Product Pedagogy: The Shift to Process and Romantic Expression

Prior to the Woods Hole Conference of 1959 and the Dartmouth Conference of 1966, composition studies in the United States was governed by the belief system inherited from the product-pedagogy movement of the Enlightenment. It was not until composition instructors first attempted to reconnect composition studies to the rhetorical tradition by exploring the usefulness of classical rhetoric that composition studies would break the manacles of product-pedagogy. According to William Covino, the movement toward reestablishing a traditional rhetorical pedagogy among composition instructors began “in the 1930s when proponents of new Criticism [...] began to connect the importance of ambiguity as a characteristic of language to a reconsideration of rhetoric as the explanation of ambiguity” (37). How to break from product-pedagogy would lead to one of the largest historical divisions in composition studies, which revolved around establishing universal explanations for how students produce written artifacts and how classical rhetoric should be used to accomplish that goal.

At the same time, the reintegration of rhetoric into English departments is also one of the foundational elements contributing to the contemporary classification standard of referring to the rhetorical tradition and composition studies as two unique branches of study. The apparent lack of joint conversations led to a situation where composition instructors viewed writing as the privatized act of the writer and established the view that rhetoric was merely a tool for change when change was necessary. According to Robert Connors, “[u]nlike a speaker, an author cannot fall back on the excuse that a point was taken or heard incorrectly. The writer is thus forced by the nature of the scribal act to be more responsible than is the speaker” (“Differences” 286).

Rhetoric, on the other hand, had been studied in Philosophy and Speech departments since its initial departure from English departments in the late 1800s, and had continued the concept of discourse being a public act.

Following the Woods Hole and Dartmouth Conferences, a shift in ideology concerning the production of written artifacts developed in composition studies, leading composition instructors to consider the process writers used to communicate an idea to a given audience. Early post-product composition instructors began to see the act of writing as the writer's attempt toward the formation of a discussion between the artifact's creator and intended recipient. As Corbett explained, "[i]t is this awareness of an audience that we must bring back to the composing process, and ancient rhetoric has much to offer us on this score" ("Usefulness" 162). At this stage, composition studies had a new history stretching beyond the Enlightenment and composition studies became associated with an author's struggle to connect with an external audience. Composition's new history, by traditional accounts, was rooted in and remained in classical rhetoric well into the mid 1980s. According to Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford, composition instructors prior to 1984 viewed the audience as either Addressed or Invoked: Addressed, meaning a writer must have complete knowledge an already established audience (78); and Invoked, meaning an audience is a fictional representation of what the writer thinks the audience might be (82).

In 1969, James Kinneavy brought classical rhetoric to the forefront of composition studies by reattaching modern definitions to Aristotle's three *pisteis* of persuasion, *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*, and by describing the production of written artifacts as a triangular relationship. Under Kinneavy's model of composition, all written artifacts are made up of an "encoder (writer or speaker), a decoder (reader or listener), a signal (the linguistic product), and a reality (that part

of the universe to which the linguistic product refers)” (134). Like Aristotle, Kinneavy assumed all written artifacts could be classified by the author’s rhetorical goal or desired aim of discourse. Focusing on one portion of the triangular relationship produced a desired response from an intended audience. As Kinneavy’s communication triangle illustrates, early pedagogical speculations revolved around attempts to use classical rhetoric to break from the mechanical ideology of product-pedagogy and shifted the focus of composition studies toward finding a rationale behind how writers write. Although the work of early post-product composition instructors helped connect students in composition studies to the concept of audience, the concept of audience would remain a static entity well into the late 1980s.

Under the influence of historians like Edward Corbett who looked at classical rhetoric, the creation of written artifacts in composition studies began to be viewed as an exploration of how writers accomplish goals or communicate through the production of a written artifact. As Patrick Hartwell has pointed out, early discourse speculation was rooted in the notion of writers developing and nurturing two skills with writing, “[o]ne, broadly rhetorical, involves communication in meaningful context [...] The other, broadly metalinguistic rather than linguistic, involves active manipulation of language with conscious attention to surface form” (225). Eventually, composition instructors began to envision writing as a form of communication directly influenced by the writer, the writer’s intended audience, and the context of the writing. Although most traditional historical accounts view the use of rhetoric in composition studies throughout the 1960s as a factor of unification between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies, it is actually a point in history solidifying the concept of the rhetorical tradition and composition studies as two distinct disciplines. Once composition instructors found a way to break from product-pedagogy, the rhetorical tradition would once again become devalued in

composition studies as composition instructors turned their attention to psychology, science, and Romantic individualism.

How an audience affects the rhetorical situation is one of the biggest examples of separation between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies prior to the 1990s. Unlike composition instructors, rhetoricians throughout the 1970s and 1980s speculated that the production of written artifacts was a social process and not an individual process. While composition instructors were exploring the production of written artifacts from the writer's perspective, rhetoricians began expanding the rhetorical tradition from mechanically and stylistically appropriate discourses by re-exploring how audience impacts the rhetorical situation. Rhetoricians following in the Sophistic tradition or the Aristotelian tradition of rhetoric reestablished rhetoric as a public act of persuasion intending to reach a large audience. In the 1968 article "The Rhetorical Situation," Lloyd Bitzer claimed "[v]irtually no utterance is fully intelligible unless meaning-context and utterance are understood; this is true in rhetorical and non-rhetorical discourse" (Bitzer 218). In the article, Bitzer established a situation where rhetoric could only exist if there was a social condition warranting its existence; rhetoric's function was to respond to socially determined needs for change. It was Bitzer's belief that "rhetoric is a mode of altering reality, not by the direct application of energy to objects, but by the creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action" (Bitzer 219). Bitzer established a need for context in all rhetorical documents and an already established audience who would agree with the rhetorician's claim.

In 1970, Edwin Black expanded on Bitzer's concept of audience in the article "The Second Persona," claiming that a rhetorician's audience dictates the production of a written artifact and controls the rhetorician's use of diction. Black claimed "[w]hat equally well solicits

our attention is that there is a second persona also implied by a discourse, and that persona is its implied auditor” (333). The “implied auditor” or “second persona” Black is referring to is the rhetorician’s knowledge of her audience; for a written artifact to be effective, her audience must be able to understand the position being presented. According to Black, “rhetorical discourses, either singly or cumulatively in a persuasive movement, will imply an auditor, and that in most cases the implication will be sufficiently suggestive as to enable the critic to link this implied author to an ideology” (334). The work of Bitzer and Black made the purpose of producing written artifacts an attempt by the rhetorician to connect to a specific audience through commonly held beliefs and concepts.

Instead of continuing to look for inspiration in the rhetorical tradition for answers of how to move composition studies further away from product-pedagogy, composition instructors turned their attention to psychology and the hard sciences. As Connors pointed out in 1979, “[t]eachers of composition, heartened by the new attention being given to our field and anxious to learn any techniques helpful in teaching writing, are flocking in great numbers to other departments for assistance” (285). One of the first major pushes away from product-pedagogy in composition studies was the development of process-pedagogy, where the textual focus shifted away from the finalized product toward the production of the product. Composition instructors like Donald Murray envisioned the writing process as a chain of stages culminating in the development of a finished product. The stage model always began with the writer’s initial response followed by a period of pre-writing steps. It was Murray’s belief that the main criteria for assessing the production of discourse should be the strength of the written artifact’s representation of the student’s process, rather than product-pedagogy’s view of assessment stemming from the final product’s structure.

Under Murray's view of process-pedagogy, the students proceeded through a linear chain of events, beginning with a response to a rhetorical situation or problem and ending with concluding remarks toward the rhetorical situation or solution. According to Murray, after sufficiently mapping out a plan for the eventual paper, the writer would produce a first draft and then proceed to lengthy re-writing sessions, which became the stage model approach to the production of written artifacts. The culmination of stages in the artifact's development would be a successfully crafted product (Faigley 532). If a writer progressed through the three stages in the right order, the process would lead to a well written artifact. The problem-solution approach to composition pedagogy that developed out of Murray's stage model created an ideological assumption, unlike the rhetorical tradition, where writing was a private interaction between a writer and her text during the production of written artifacts.

Murray's process model quickly became outmoded in composition studies because, like product pedagogy, it reduced the process behind the production of written artifacts to a pre-constructed formula. One of the first composition instructors to question the model's usefulness was Sondra Perl, who published data from a case study she had conducted that directly contradicted Murray's process model. Like Murray, Perl found writing students display the same "behavioral sequences [where] prewriting, writing, and editing appeared in sequential patterns that were recognizable across writing sessions and across students" (31). Unlike Murray, Perl discovered students did not follow a straightforward path when writing and instead wrote in a circular, reoccurring pattern.

In 1980, Nancy Sommers further stressed Perl's objections to Murray's linear process model by providing results from a case study involving twenty freshman and twenty experienced writers' revision strategies. According to Sommers, what early process advocates failed to

account for was “the recursive shaping of thought by language” (“Revision Strategies” 43). Sommers discovered writers used all three of Murray’s stages continuously and integrated revision strategies throughout the entire process. To Sommers, writing should not be conceived as a linear start to finish endeavor; it should rather be conceived as a holistic endeavor “because each addition or deletion is a reordering of the whole” (51). Sommers claimed a universal classification system for the production of written artifacts could not be established. The production of discourse should instead be viewed as a representation of the writer’s unique process.

Based on the work of Perl and Sommers, composition instructors began to envision the process behind the production of written artifacts as a series of deliberate choices. Compositionists began drawing inspiration from the cognitive development theory of psychologist Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky’s relationship between language and learning as a way to articulate the choices students were making. Instead of trying to articulate the writing process as a chain of prescriptive linear stages, cognitive composition instructors began to explore the possibilities of attributing writing patterns to specific stages of mental processes based on the writer’s choices. The most influential attack on the linear nature of early process pedagogy came from the seminal work of Linda Flower and John Hayes with the publication of their 1981 article “A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing.” According to Flower and Hayes “[b]ecause stage models take the final product as their reference point, they offered an inadequate account of the more intimate, moment-by-moment intellectual process of composing” (275). Through the use of protocol analysis, Flower and Hayes successfully dispatched the belief system associated with the rigidity of early process theory and provided data demonstrating the writing process was a recursive method of invention where writers address the creation of written

artifacts from differing perspectives. The Flower and Hayes model, however, still failed to take into account the rhetorical tradition's view of audience, and continued the principle that process was an isolated endeavor.

Developing parallel to the process-pedagogy movement in composition studies was an expressive approach to writing instruction, where the textual focus shifted to the creation and nurturing of an authentic voice. According to W. Ross Winterowd and Jack Blum, composition studies during the 1960s underwent a "Romantic Revolution," which contemporary composition historians have labeled expressive-pedagogy and where self-expression became exalted, imagination replaced invention, the craft became devalued, and public discourse took a backseat to personal development (37). In "Expressive Pedagogy: Practice/Theory, Theory/Practice" Christopher Burnham explained, "[t]he movement originated in the 1960s and 1970s as a set of values and practices opposing" product-pedagogy (21). Expressive-pedagogy ideologically positioned students at the center of the written artifact's production rather than the student's product. Under expressive-pedagogy, the production of written artifacts occurred through moments of isolated brilliance.

Composition studies under expressive pedagogy focused solely on narration and the student's attempt to establish situational credibility through writing. The act of writing became a private act. Expressive-pedagogy placed assessment criteria completely on the writer's presence within the written artifact. Under expressive-pedagogy, it was the author's voice "whether explicit, implicit, or absent" that functioned "as a key evaluation criterion when expressivists examine writing" (Burnham 19). It was the expressive belief that writers should use their writing to foster personal expression, and the production of written artifacts became associated with

personal acts of exploration where spontaneity, expression of feeling, imagination, and the creation of a unique voice became the definitive characteristics of rhetorical eloquence.

Through the process of sharing personal experiences, composition instructors postulated writers could help others come to mutual understandings through the production of a desired response from readers. Expressive-pedagogy functioned under the assumption that the evaluation of rhetorical performance was not based on “whether the assertions make sense or are consistent but whether the reader feels the writer in the words- whether the reader believes that the writer believes it,” and insisted that the writer developed “the ability to have a voice, to find words; not to be incoherent, tongue-tied, or emptily verbose” (Elbow “Method” 122). Like process-pedagogy, composition studies, under expressive-pedagogy, became a private act and focused on the writers’ attempt to understand the world through experience and gain power over their surroundings through the production of written artifacts.

Under a traditional account of composition history, process-pedagogy and expressive-pedagogy helped moved composition studies out of the stylistically dogmatic principles of product-pedagogy. Both movements, unlike the rhetorical tradition, established a belief system where the creator of a text became the sole generator of written artifacts. By the mid 1980s, the concept of producing written artifacts as a completely individual effort would be challenged by a social movement within composition studies. Composition instructors began to speculate that process-pedagogy was incomplete because, like product-pedagogy, process-pedagogy still underestimated the role audience played in discourse. One of the strongest attacks against early and cognitive process-pedagogy came from Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford in their 1984 article “Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Practice.” Ede and Lunsford claimed a holistic version of process should be viewed as an

elaborate exchange between the writer and an audience throughout the entire writing process. Ede and Lunsford speculated that the choices students made during the production of written artifacts were actually attempts by students to accommodate audience needs, which stretched beyond their own cognitive processes.

By the mid 1980s, rhetoricians began to speculate that the production of written artifacts resulted from social interactions, rather than from composition studies' view of private interactions. In "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation," Richard Vatz critiqued Bitzer's conception of rhetoric claiming "I would not say 'rhetoric is situational,' but situations are rhetorical; not 'exigence strongly invites utterance,' but the rhetoric controls the situational response" (229). Vatz established a new function for rhetoric, where the rhetorician's work became the agent of social change instead of a tool to help promote an already discovered need for change. Vatz believed the true purpose of rhetoric was to discover situations requiring change and then argue for changes publicly. Unlike Bitzer, Vatz assumed once a rhetorician made a public argument; the argument itself would create its own audience. In 1989, Barbara Biesecker extended Vatz's criticism of Bitzer's assessment of rhetoric in "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from within the Thematic of *Différance*." In the article, Biesecker claims, "if we posit the audience of any rhetorical event as no more than a conglomeration of subjects whose identity is fixed prior to the rhetorical event itself, then we must also admit that those subjects have an essence that cannot be affected by the discourse" (233). According to Biesecker, rhetorical artifacts have no persuasive power if they are only targeting an existing audience because all the rhetorician can hope for is acceptance from an audience that already agrees with what was stated. Biesecker offered a new function for rhetoric where rhetoricians "see the rhetorical situation as an event that makes possible the production of identities and social relations" (243).

As we saw in the previous section, part of the problem contributing to the continued separation between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition up until the late 1980s can be traced back to rhetoric's removal from American English departments during the late 1800s. Since the 1800s, composition instruction in America has been handled by literary trained graduate assistants eagerly awaiting their opportunity to join the favored *Belles Lettres* discussion (Connors). Trained under *Belles Lettres* the majority of early composition instructors offering pedagogical approaches in composition studies were unfamiliar with the rhetorical tradition and the benefits it could provide. If composition instructors had continued the trend established by Corbett, Kinneavy, and others of looking at the rhetorical tradition for pedagogical inspiration, composition studies may not have struggled to find answers for product-pedagogy in other disciplines and some form of commonality between composition instructors could have been established. Instead, as Richard Fulkerson pointed out in 1990: "Ten years ago, genuine and extensive conflicts existed about what constituted good writing [...] Significant disparities, however, continue to exist about process, pedagogy, and epistemology" (411). It would not be until the late 1980s and early 1990s that a new breed of composition instructors would return to the work of Kinneavy and Corbett in an attempt to reconnect composition studies to the rhetorical tradition moving the discipline away from viewing writing as a private act to a social encounter.

The Social Turn: Discourse Communities and Cultural Studies

Prior to the mid 1980s, composition instructors became locked in an inner-disciplinary struggle over how to move composition studies away from the dominance of product-pedagogy first established during the Enlightenment. Composition instructors following process-pedagogy tried to break down the process of creating written artifacts into universally defined stages and

cognitive processes. At the same time, composition instructors following expressive-pedagogy tried to condition students to use their emotions and personal experiences to construct written artifacts that would help them better understand their place in the world. Under a traditional account of composition history, process-pedagogy and expressive-pedagogy did help move composition studies past the formulaic and stylistically appropriate assessment criteria of product-pedagogy, but also established a belief system where the writer was viewed as the sole contributor to a written artifact's production. Questions regarding the role of audience within the production process would, however, lead composition instructors to consider the production of written artifacts as a social endeavor rather than a private act.

The second attempt by composition studies to reconnect to the rhetorical tradition occurred during the late 1980s and early 1990s as composition instructors tried to formulate pedagogical ideologies addressing the social issues impacting the production of written artifacts. During the late 1980s, composition instructors returned their attention to the work of James Kinneavy and Richard Corbett and to rhetoricians like Bitzer and Vatz in an attempt to connect composition students to the audiences they were producing artifacts for. In response to early post-product-pedagogy, social constructionists lambasted the process model and the expressive approaches for not breaking away from the individualization of producing written artifacts. How composition instructors used social construction during the late 1980s and 1990s is, however, another major contributor to the concept of separation between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies. The reason is composition instructors used social construction as a way to alter classroom practice and never moved composition studies outside the composition classroom.

Social constructionists in composition studies began to speculate process-pedagogy and expressive-pedagogy were incomplete because they underestimated the role that contact with varying social discourse communities played in the process of creating written artifacts (see Britton, Bruffee, Dautermann, Faigley, and Keppel). As Barry Kroll pointed out, the “largely unconscious ‘sense’ of an audience - or a ‘second attention lurking in the mind’ - is, according to some accounts, an essential part of the composing process of skilled writers” (181). For the early social constructionists, writing became a discussion among members of a socially constructed group, where writers transmitted interpretations of their social surroundings to other members of a socially defined community.

In the 1980s, composition instructors began to speculate that producing written artifacts did not result from a writer thinking individually through a problem. They instead began to view the production of a written artifact as the writer’s attempt to initiate dialogue with her social. According to the Victor Villanueva, research and introspection in composition studies began viewing the production of written artifacts as “the writer’s intentions in directing what is written to an audience: readers located in particular social contexts” (127). Writing, according to early social constructionists, became an activity of eliciting a desired role or reaction from a social community and the social community composition instructors were speculating about was the academic community students were producing written artifacts within.

In 1982, James Britton expanded on Kinneavy’s triangular communication theory in his article “Spectator Role and the Beginnings of Writing” by classifying writing as a functional means to a desired outcome, where the writer’s audience plays the role of spectator or participant. According to Britton, if a writer tries to get an audience to accomplish something or to change the audience’s opinion “then I remain a participant in my own affairs and invite him to

become one” (154). On the other hand, if the writer only wants to maintain the interest of an audience or entertain an audience so the audience shares in the writer’s experiences, “then not only do I invite him to be a spectator, but I am myself a spectator” (154). What Britton established was the early social constructionist’s view of the process behind constructing written artifacts as a purposeful activity of seeking out a specific relationship with an audience.

For early social constructionists, writing became a rhetorical tool people could use to create a dialogue with an audience and join the discussion of an academic discourse community. As David Bartholomae pointed out in “Inventing the University,” social constructionists believed that composition students had “to appropriate (or be appropriated by) a specialized discourse, and they have to do this as though they were easily or comfortably one with their audience” (628). According to Bartholomae, “[t]he student has to learn to speak our language, to speak as we do, to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community” (623). Acclimating students into a universally defined academic discourse community, however, proved problematic in composition studies because, at its core, pure social construction theory assumes the existence of a universally defined audience and discourse community everyone could easily join. Social construction theory also failed to recognize dissimilarities which differentiate and individualize members of the academic community (see Brodkey and Rose).

Once again, composition instructors seemed to be one step behind the rhetorical tradition. Traditional historical accounts generally claim composition studies and the rhetorical tradition would join forces in the late 1980s and early 1990s, as members of both disciplines began to see the pitfalls and shortcomings associated with pure social construction theories (See Bruffee, Farrell, Hariman, and Myers). As James Laditka stated, “we in composition now find ourselves

asking more often to what extent the theory of recent decades might present suggestions or imperatives for changing in our teaching” (298). What Laditka is addressing is the postulation of a composition course designed to break down the universal misconceptions of pure social-construction theory and a shift in the contemporary definition of composition studies. At the same time, rhetoricians began to see rhetoric as an instrument for the possibilities of social change rather than just a way to manipulate entrance into the public sphere. The problems composition instructors were facing with establishing universal discourse communities under social construction is one of the major contributors to the separation between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies. What occurred was a shift in the rhetorical tradition which viewed discourse as being “central to all efforts to bring about social change, as it is to the maintenance of social stability” (Lucaites et al. 381).

Rhetoricians like John Dewey had been asking the social question since the turn of the century and had constantly sought to keep rhetoric a public art since being reintegrated into English departments in the 1940s. Like the early social constructionists in composition studies, rhetoricians during the late 1970s had turned their attention to the social aspects contributing to the production of written artifacts and the problems of universalizing a written artifact’s target audience. To rhetoricians, social construction “maintained a commitment to preparing students for citizenship in a democratic society” (Berlin *Rhetoric, Poetics, and Cultures* 87). Unlike the early social constructionists in composition studies, rhetoricians took the concept of socially constructed discourse beyond the restriction of academic discourse communities and pushed their social theories into the public sphere where the concept of universality became an unattainable myth.

In 1970, Herbert Simons illustrated the problems with universalizing social approaches to discourse communities in the article “Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements.” Simons claimed a rhetorician must reach a multitude of audiences through the same written artifact, because failing to do so could potentially alienate some of the rhetorician’s strongest supporters. Simons’ reasoning was simple: “Actions that may succeed with one audience (e.g., solidification of the membership) may alienate others (e.g., provocations of a backlash). For similar reasons, actions that may seem productive over the short run may fail over the long run (the reverse is also true)” (Simons 385). In the 1975 article “In search of the ‘the People’: A Rhetorical Alternative,” Michael McGee expanded on Simons observation, claiming any rhetorical act directed at a fictitious representation of an ideal audience would automatically fail. McGee assumed individuals already possessed a tangible identity shaped by their social beliefs and “[o]ne manifestation of our continued orientation to conventional rhetorical topics is our general failure fully to exploit the organic conception of human existence presupposed in nearly all rhetorical documents” (341). The goal of discourse, according to McGee, was to persuade individuals to abandon their already socially constructed identities and to become part of the social identity the rhetorician was trying to construct.

As Donald Rubin pointed out in his 1988 article “Introduction: Four Dimensions of Social Construction in Written Communication,” the “rhetorical point of view postulates that the goal of rhetorical discourse is to affect audiences, either in the agonistic sense characteristic of classical rhetoricians or in the sense of inducing cooperation or ‘consubstantiality’ as in non-Aristotelian rhetorics” (7). Rubin believed written artifacts are reciprocally constructed through the writer’s attempts to negotiate the relationship between self identity and the social context of the written artifact. In order to successfully negotiate a socially defined reciprocal context,

students had to “accurately infer the audience’s beliefs and prior knowledge” (Rubin 7). If the author failed to negotiate the social context, her written artifact would fail to affect the members of the social community and would inevitably be rejected for being un-insightful. In “*Stasis and Kairos: Principles of Social Construction in Classical Rhetoric*,” first published in 1988, Michael Carter further stressed the social function of rhetoric, claiming “rhetoric is not an individual but a communal act of inquiry, growing out of a conflict of knowledge in the community and aimed at restoring knowledge of the community” (107).

What developed out of the discussions in both the rhetorical tradition and composition studies was a redefinition of social construction theory and a culturally grounded approach in composition studies to overcoming the shortcomings of universalizing discourse communities. As Diana George and John Trimbur noted in their article “Cultural Studies and Composition,” the “idea that cultural studies was about to become the ‘next thing’ in composition theory and practice appeared in the late 1980s and early 1990s, in the depths of the Reagan-Bush era of conservatism restoration and American Triumphalism” (71). The focus of cultural studies in composition was to introduce students to the cultural injustices “inflicted by dominant societal groups and dominant discourses on those with less power, and upon the empowering possibilities of rhetoric” (Fulkerson “Twenty-First Century” 659). Discourse, in composition studies, under what I am calling “cultural-pedagogy”, became a type of civic discourse concerned with overcoming dynamic political injustices by placing a new emphasis of multiculturalism and political literacy while breaking down the implications of gender biases, racism, and class based hierarchies within composition studies.

The idea of cultural studies took an even deeper turn in the rhetorical community, as theorists began to critically examine the exclusionary practices in the rhetorical tradition. As

Raymie McKerrow pointed out in “Critical Rhetoric: Theory and *Praxis*,” first published in 1989, “[i]f we are to escape from trivializing influence of universalist approaches, the task is not to rehabilitate rhetoric, but to announce it in terms of a critical practice” (441). According to McKerrow, critical discourse should examine historical and contemporary rhetorical artifacts and point out the rhetorical practices contributing to the domination of subordinate members of society by the powerful. McKerrow believed discourse should function as a way to show how subordinate members of society were being controlled through language and should offer the dominated a way to retaliate against their oppressor through written artifacts.

At the same time, composition studies picked up the critical analysis approach and began exploring ways of exposing the inequalities of institutionalized practices. In the article “Critical Pedagogy: Dreaming of Democracy,” Ann George claims that critical pedagogy should aim at providing students with the tools they need to enable them to challenge the inequalities discovered through cultural studies (92). Cultural-pedagogy became an emancipatory attempt to create social change through writing: “This, then, is the aim of critical pedagogy – to enable students to envision alternatives, to inspire them to assume the responsibility for collectively recreating society” (George 96). Through the critically focused lens of cultural studies, rhetoricians and composition instructors were able to broaden their perspectives and install a new form of inquiry that pushed the discipline even farther away from its dogmatic ancestry of product-pedagogy.

What occurred in the rhetorical tradition and composition studies was a reexamination of scholarly works to discover and eliminate former exclusionary practices of racism, sexism, and elitism. As Thomas Miller has pointed out, “current emphasis on the social construction of discourse has deepened rhetoricians’ traditional interest in how educational and political

practices shape concepts of rhetoric, and new philosophies of interpretation have contributed to ‘reversionary’ accounts of the major theorists” (70). Once the presence of cultural differences among members of the same discourse communities had been established, rhetoricians and composition instructors began looking through their own histories to find historically excluded works of women and minority writers and rhetoricians. In “Remapping Rhetorical Territory,” first published in 1995, Cheryl Glenn states “we are turning to a new map, or rather, to new, often partially completed maps that reflect and coordinate our current institutional, intellectual, political, and personal values, all of which have become markedly more diverse and elastic in terms of gender, race, and class” (287).

Even though cultural-pedagogy has pushed composition studies and the rhetorical tradition to new levels of introspection regarding the role of discourse in society, many critics have challenged the liberation potential of cultural studies: “While an understanding of the generic conventions of a society at a given time is undeniably important social knowledge, such knowledge is only useful if it is social knowledge: if it can account for the range of conventions that texts display in social practice” (Gilbert 78). As Maurice Charland claimed, “power will not be restructured by the intellectual’s fascinated gaze upon the oppressed; power will be changed through both their mobilization and through discursive and non-discursive acts that win concessions from the powerful” (469). Composition instructors on the other hand, see an additional flaw in cultural and critical theories because it can lead to “the likelihood of indoctrination. Teachers dedicated to exposing the social injustice of racism, classism, homophobia, misogyny, or capitalism cannot perforce accept student viewpoints that deny such views or fail to register their contemporary relevance” (Fulkerson “Twenty-First Century” 665).

Part of the problem with cultural studies is that it is a metaphor created to illustrate how an individual's cultural surroundings impact the production of written artifacts, but offers no plausible explanations for how it should be implemented into a writing curriculum. Under cultural-pedagogy, writing became an ephemeral activity, because individuals are changed by a multitude of culture encounters everyday and there is no way to account for every cultural influence affecting the production of written artifacts. An additional problem with cultural-pedagogy in composition studies is it developed out of Americanized social construction speculations about how the social nature of language can impact the production of written artifacts. Under social construction, the production of written artifacts was only possible through positive and negative social interactions and was a metaphor without practical application. As Michael Markel has explained, “[a]rranging the chairs in a circle is the easy part of peer-group writing instruction. The hard part is dealing with the truculent, ignorant student who convinces the good student to change an excellent passage” (510).

What traditional historical accounts of composition studies and the rhetorical tradition have produced is a situation where we have all this information regarding the nature and purpose of writing without a practical means for writing instruction. “The metaphor of social construction once had excellent shock value, but now it has become tired. It can still be liberating suddenly to realize that something is constructed and is not part of the nature of things, of people, or human society, but construction analyses run on apace” (Hacking 35). The result of our traditional accounts of history is the establishment of an ideology among contemporary composition instructors viewing the rhetorical tradition as having limited value in the composition classroom and the rise of a new form of “current-traditionalism” within our teaching pedagogies.

Modern Dogma: The Return of “Current-Traditionalism”

As this chapter has illustrated, how traditional historical accounts of composition studies and the rhetorical tradition are written points the way to the separation between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies. What traditional historical accounts illustrate is that the rhetorical tradition and composition studies have different opinions regarding the proper function of discourse. Throughout the brief history of composition studies in America, instructors have continued to focus on what their students were producing for specific composition courses, while rhetoricians have constantly speculated about how discourse should function as a public art. Understanding how this separation has impacted contemporary assessments of composition studies is pivotal because it shows there is a need to reconnect composition studies to the rhetorical tradition. Doing so will establish the framework for reconstructing the history of composition studies, because it will demonstrate what needs to occur in order to move composition studies and the rhetorical tradition into the future as a joint discipline. It will also illustrate how we can use previous “theoretical assumptions” to formulate a practical pedagogical identity for composition studies.

The problems associated with making speculations about universalized discourse communities and the separation between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition since the late 1800s have helped perpetuate the creation of a new form of “current-traditionalism” within composition studies, which I am calling “traditionalist-pedagogy.” A traditional historical account of composition studies is really a history of changing assumptions regarding the production and proper form of written artifacts; it is the evolution of composition studies through the process of fixing what appeared to be problems with earlier assumptions. How written artifacts are supposed to look and what written artifacts are supposed to be doing is, by

traditional standards, the purpose of composition studies. By labeling major pedagogical shifts in composition studies, historians have tried to illustrate how current practice has tried to correct the deficiencies of previous pedagogical ideologies. In reality, all we have done is create new labels to account for old problems.

Contemporary composition instructors view writing instruction as a social process with the goal of helping students become better writers. Contemporary composition instructors, however, disagree over what type of classroom practice best facilitates that goal and the process students should use to produce written artifacts. What contributed to the rise of traditionalist-pedagogy in composition studies was the attempt by composition instructors to acclimate students and their writing into a social community, which resulted in socially constructed products that never left the classroom. The reason composition instructors seemed to struggle, shifting composition pedagogy into a social or public context, was because product-pedagogy and process-pedagogy never left composition studies. What historians like Richard Fulkerson and others have failed to take into account is that pedagogical approaches to the production of written artifacts are rhetorical speculations. Every pedagogical ideology in the history of composition studies attempted to help instructors better address the needs of a growing student population at a specific moment in history by expanding previous pedagogical approaches rather than eliminate them from practice. Process-pedagogy tried to fix the mimetic and dogmatically stylistic assumptions of product-pedagogy. The social constructionist tried to fix the rigidity and individualized assumptions of process-pedagogy. And cultural-pedagogy tried to fix the elitism of universal approaches to discourse communities as presented by early social constructionists. Each new approach to composition instruction, however, is one aspect of traditionalist-pedagogy that continues to thrive in composition classrooms.

The first aspect of traditionalist-pedagogy in composition studies is the legacy of product-pedagogy. The pedagogical shift which occurred during the 1800s in composition studies is still a predominate component of contemporary composition studies. Contemporary practitioners need to acknowledge that product-pedagogy was a successful answer to a predominant problem during the 1800s and has never been removed from composition studies. Product-pedagogy worked because it allowed composition instructors to teach writing to large groups of middle-class students who were not prepared for the demands of 19th century American college curriculums. Before the Civil War, student populations in American universities were relatively small and instruction generally focused on the rhetorical principles of taste and style. “Up through the Civil War, most colleges had only a few hundred students, and it was common for college classes to really be composed of a whole class” (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 10). Following the conclusion of the Civil War and the passage of two Morrill Acts in 1862 and 1877, technical colleges and state universities began opening across the United States to accommodate the new technological need which swept through the country.

New educational institutions and a growing need to have a larger percentage of the population become educated resulted in increased classroom sizes and a need to shift pedagogical practices to accommodate the new middle-class students. “Instead of facing a class of thirty-five men, a teacher might find himself striving to grade essays by a class of close to one hundred students” (Connors *Composition-Rhetoric* 10). Faced with a larger classroom, composition instructors needed a practical way to teach writing to hundreds of students who lacked the classical training the upper-class students once possessed, and the mimetic principles of product-pedagogy was a workable solution. Composition instructors could assign theme

essays to their students and then manageably grade them based on how students adhered to the required style and mimicked what was considered to be proper form.

Product-pedagogy will always be viewed as the “current traditional” model of composition studies because, even though it was never a “traditional” model, it will always be a traditional aspect of contemporary instruction because we still use product for assessment. As this chapter has illustrated, regardless of what pedagogical assumptions composition instructors have historically based their classroom practice around, the students’ final product has always been the basis of assessment. The only aspect of product-pedagogy that has changed historically is what composition instructors searched for in the products they collected. Its legacy is still part of the “current” dichotomy of discourse inquiry, because, if it was not, the grades students receive in composition and rhetoric courses would not be so dependent upon the written artifacts they produce. Contemporary instructors in composition studies still use the concept of teaching through example and, although we look at the products our students produce differently, assessment is still based on the product’s representation of growth.

The second aspect of traditionalist-pedagogy in composition studies is the continued use of process-pedagogy. The pedagogical shift which occurred during the 1980s in composition studies is still a predominate component of contemporary composition studies. As Barry Kroll has pointed out, “many composition theorists continue to view writing as a process of conveying information, a process in which the writer’s job is to produce messages that facilitate processing and comprehension” (178). Process-pedagogy is still a predominant facet of composition studies because of early process-pedagogy practitioners. Even though the rigidity of early process-pedagogy failed to take into account the dynamic, mental processes students of composition used to construct written artifacts, later process-pedagogy adherents did open the door to a new way of

viewing the process of writing. What contemporary composition instructors need to realize is, like product-pedagogy, process-pedagogy was a workable solution to the open door policies of the 1970s and the influx of lower-class students into composition classrooms.

During the 1970s, an open admission policy swept through the American college system and anyone who wanted a college education could get one. Government research during the late 1960s, spawned by the equal rights movements, demonstrated a lack of minorities and lower-class students in the American college population, which led to a shift in government policies. Through open admissions and affirmative action policies, the United States government opened the possibility of a college education to lower-class students who did not have the education backgrounds of the middle and upper-class students who once dominated American colleges. Once again, composition instructors needed to shift their pedagogical stance in order to accommodate a growing population of students lacking “basic” writing skills, and the concept of introducing students to stages of written artifact production worked. Composition instructors could use class time to illustrate for their students how brainstorming and the organization of ideas could help the students write and then rewrite their essays. Process-pedagogy provided inexperienced and struggling students with a start to finish plan for the production of written artifacts.

Although many composition instructors shifted their attention to the social factors contributing to the production of written artifacts, process has never left composition studies. All historical pedagogical approaches to the production of written artifacts have maintained the element of process. The only aspect of process that has changed over time is what we see as the major contributors to our students’ individual processes. The idea that students had a reoccurring process behind the production of the products turned in for a grade is still predominates.

According to Victor Villanueva, “that doesn’t mean that at the end of the process there won’t be a product. The idea is to place greater emphasis on the process than on the product” (2).

Contemporary composition instructors still view process-pedagogy as a useful addition to their contemporary pedagogical assumptions. As Lynn Bloom has pointed out, “[a]s long as the fundamental narrative retains its usefulness, elegance, and beauty-and the process paradigm does so to this day-it will not perish from the composition studies universe” (43). The problem, as James Berlin has claimed, is that not all composition instructors teach identical processes and the contemporary view of process is a lingering adaptation of Flower and Hayes’ assessment: each student has their own process for the production of written artifacts.

The third component of traditionalist-pedagogy in composition studies is the idea of all written artifacts resulting from a socially constructed endeavor. The pedagogical shift which occurred during the mid to late 1990s is still a predominate component of contemporary composition studies. Social pedagogies like cultural studies continue to flourish in composition studies due to an expanding global market in the United States and the rise of ESL students in composition classrooms. Faced with an increasing number of students whose primary language is not English, or who come from non-English speaking households, contemporary composition instructors are being forced to realize they will continuously be teaching composition to students with different cultural backgrounds, which in most cases are not similar to their own. Most contemporary composition instructors still claim writing does not take place in a vacuum, and all written forms of communication are socially constructed discourses between numerous members of the writer’s cultural communities. As Donald Rubin has pointed out, the process “experienced and effective writers use to guide their mental representations [...] are not idiosyncratic

inventions, they are instead consensually understood patterns that writers internalize, interpret and execute” (3).

Proponents of social-pedagogy claim socially based assumptions of composition pedagogy “may well help to correct the tendency in some version of cultural studies to picture students as culture consumers instead of culture producers and thereby provide an impetus to imagine writing assignments that take students beyond the critical essay of culture analysis and critique into the rhetoric of public discourse” (George and Trimbur 86). The problem with cultural studies is that the knowledge of the impact of multiple cultural influences on student writing has never been incorporated into a practical pedagogical approach to composition studies. We know our students are impacted by a multiplicity of cultural encounters but do not know how to foster a student’s multiple cultural identities without returning to the Romanticism of expressive-pedagogy and a new concept of personal “voice” as a cultural representation of student development.

What we are left with is a situation where we do not know what our student’s products are supposed to look like, nor do we understand the process they use to produce texts, and we still do not understand how cultural studies should impact the student’s process or product. If we do not know what we are supposed to be teaching, how can we claim composition studies has a teachable content? In order to break free from the dominance of cultural studies and the traditionalist approach to composition instruction, contemporary composition historians need to move beyond the early work of Kinneavy, Corbett, Connors, Berlin, Bizzell and others in order to start creating a new history of composition studies that realigns composition studies to the rhetorical tradition. To rewrite the history of composition studies, we need to shift our focus

from how written artifacts are produced toward assumptions regarding how students increase their understandings of social knowledge.

III. A New History: Establishing a Sense of Unification

Pushing past the challenges associated with social construction and the rise of a traditionalist approach to composition pedagogy has become the contemporary historian's task. At the heart of the debate is the role discourse should play within American English departments. As Thomas Miller has stated, "interest in the social construction of discourse and our deepening understanding of the relationship between theory and practice should encourage us to rethink how we teach the history of ideas about rhetoric" (76). By realigning composition studies with the rhetorical tradition, composition instructors and rhetoricians could formulate a new pedagogical identity which I am calling, "discourse analysis," to bring practicality back to the production of written artifacts. Combining the history of composition studies and epistemic rhetoric, will allow us to claim we have a teachable content, because we can start basing our pedagogical assumptions on how students can gain a better understanding of cultural knowledge through writing. The new account of history I am proposing is intended to address the often debated concept of what it means to study discourse and what it is we should be teaching our students. In its most simplistic sense, a new history of discourse analysis should focus around historical assessments regarding how students acquire and use knowledge.

Fortunately, the ground work has already been established. Recently composition instructors have opened up new interests in the use of argumentation strategies, most noticeably to the work of Aristotle and Stephen Toulmin (see Lunsford and Ruskiewicz, Mitchell and Andrews, Fulkerson, and Weston). Looking into the past for answers has lead contemporary composition instructors to view writing as a way to introduce students to the production of probabilities and inductive modes of thinking while pondering the production of written artifacts.

Contemporary rhetoricians have also begun exploring the past to offer new explanations for Aristotle's three *pisteis* and have begun to take a holistic approach to his teachings by exploring ways to include all three *pisteis* into a single argument (see Enos and Agnew, Hesse, and Killingsworth).

Returning to the past as a way to augment contemporary practice has always been the tradition among composition instructors and rhetoricians. Up until the late 1980s, composition instructors usually returned to the work of Corbett and Kinneavy for inspiration on how the classical rhetorical tradition was useful to contemporary composition studies. Rhetoricians, on the other hand, turned their gaze to the Sophists in the 1980s. As John Poulakos states in his 1983 article "Toward a Sophistic Definition of Rhetoric," because rhetoric "came about as an activity grounded in human experience, not in philosophical reflection, we must approach it by looking at those who practiced it before turning to those who reflected about it" (25), which meant returning to the often ignored Sophistic tradition of rhetoric.

By focusing on the classical rhetorical tradition for inspiration, however, composition instructors and rhetoricians have overlooked a pivotal movement in the history of discourse analysis and the tradition of epistemic or philosophical rhetoric. The reason such a history is important to the discipline of discourse analysis is because whenever we ask students to participate in discourse, what we are really asking them to do is attempt the production of a truth claim by understanding the dialogical conditions governing their participation within a given discourse, rather than within a universally defined discourse community. In order for the student's truth claim to possess any sort of validity, however, it must adhere to an already established assessment criteria regarding the production of "truth," because any discourse

functioning around establishments of “truth” are formulated through epistemic conditionality. What the following historical account of discourse inquiry will provide is an overview of shared assumptions between composition instruction and rhetoricians regarding knowledge and “truth” to formulate contemporary ideological assumptions. As James Berlin has pointed out, “[e]very pedagogy is imbricated in ideology, in a set of tacit assumptions about what is real, what is good, what is possible, and how power ought to be distributed” (Berlin “Rhetoric and Ideology” 492).

Every historical pedagogical approach regarding the production of discourse is in actuality a rhetorical response to the current and historical conceptualization of epistemology, or how knowledge and “truth” are produced and transported from one interlocutor to the next. A new history of discourse analysis should focus on the idea of commonality existing between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition to illustrate the possibility of future unification among members of the discipline. In order to accomplish this, contemporary composition instructors and rhetoricians need to acknowledge both the rhetorical tradition and composition studies have always, albeit at varying points in their respective developments, generated common possibilities for answering the epistemological question: how we gain knowledge and make, or understand, “Truth?” The answer involves, “the concepts of knowledge, evidence, reasons for believing, justification, probability, what one ought to believe, and any other concepts that can only be understood through one or more of the above” (Fumerton 1). By pointing common threads of reasoning regarding the epistemological question it should become obvious that every historical pedagogical approach to composition was based on shared concepts of knowledge acquisition. It is in the shared ideological assumptions regarding knowledge and “truth” where one can find the existence of flourishing commonality between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition, rather than the traditional view of separation.

One of the strongest historical connections between composition studies and the rhetoric tradition, prior to the removal of rhetoric from Harvard's curriculum in the late 1800s, resides in the developing ideologies of Enlightenment Rhetoric - the birth mother of composition studies - which established discourse analysis as the formulaic representation of "truths" discovered outside the rhetorician's realm of reason. What occurred was a transition in rhetorical performance by 18th century elocutionists dominated by and revolting against the Cartesian rationalism first proposed during the Renaissance by Descartes and modified throughout the Enlightenment by Kant, Hegel, and others. Through the work of Enlightenment philosophers, rhetorical talent became the ability to effectively communicate *a priori* knowledge plainly and effectively. During this period of *a priori* knowledge acquisition is where the foundational elements of unification between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition can truly be found resting under the broad canopy of product-pedagogy. The reason for this rests in the principles of the Cartesian model of epistemic rhetoric, where thought and knowledge can be scientifically rationalized, but pure reasoning and "truth" exist at the moment the human consciousness can no longer rationalize an explanation for the existence of knowledge. According to Kant, "an empirical knowledge of phenomena, is possible only by our subjecting the succession of phenomena, and with it all change, to the law of causality, and phenomena themselves, as objects of experience, are consequently possible according to the same law only" (83). Kant believed pure "truth" could not be known to an individual who must accept understanding purely through belief or passed down by a divine being when experiences could not dictate understanding. Under Kant's version of epistemology the purpose of rhetoric was to translate the knowledge we cannot rationalize on our own to others.

Under the influence of Enlightenment rhetoricians, discourse analysis continued the belief that rhetoric was a tool for the simplistic explanations of discoveries provided by other fields of inquiry. Rhetoricians during the 1700s began to view the creating of written artifacts as an activity where the rhetorician helped construct understandings in the minds of others.

According to John Locke, the purpose of rhetoric was to “make known one man’s thoughts or ideas to another: Secondly, To do it with as much ease and quickness as is possible: and, Thirdly, Thereby to convey the knowledge of things. Language is either abused or deficient when it fails of any these three” (Locke 408). Thoughts and ideas were considered to be knowledge by Locke and knowledge was acquired through mental determinations of how new experiences impacted old understandings through the philosophical use of words. “By the philosophical use of words, I mean such a use of them as may serve to convey the precise notion of things, and to express, in general proposition, certain and undoubted truths which the mind may rest upon and be satisfied with, in its search after true knowledge” (Locke 586). Discourse during the Enlightenment was not a tool for the construction of knowledge, but was instead the instruments rhetoricians could use to *discuss* knowledge through the principles of product-pedagogy as outlined in the previous chapter.

In *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, George Campbell furthered Locke’s perspective, claiming the proper function of rhetoric was “either to dispel ignorance or to vanquish error” (Campbell 903). According to Campbell, a rhetorician could use logical reasoning to help others understand information they may not have known or to help others overcome misunderstandings through the production of written artifacts. “When a speaker addresseth himself to the understanding, he proposes the instruction of his hearers, and that, either by explaining some doctrine unknown, or not distinctly comprehended by them, or by proving some position disbelieved or doubted by

them” (Campbell 903). Campbell believed discourse analysis should function as a way to present previously discovered “truths” to others through language. “The sole and ultimate end of logic is the eviction of truth [...] Pure logic regards only the subject, which is examined solely for the sake of information. Truth, as such, is the proper aim of the examiner” (905).

The Enlightenment is important to the history of discourse analysis because it established the ideological assumption in composition studies where discourse assessment was based on the clear presentation of already discovered knowledge. The epistemological assumption of most early composition instructors mimicked Enlightenment rhetoric by assuming knowledge should come from the written artifact under study, rather than from the student, and it was pedagogical practice to base assessments regarding the student’s work on how well the students understood and explained the textual knowledge. According to Adams Sherman Hill, rhetoric “is an art, not a science: for it neither observes, nor discovers, nor classifies; but it shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation, discovery, or classification” (v). By following a pre-constructed format, composition students could produce formulaic representations of the information they were trying to convey, reducing composition studies to the Cartesian model where written artifacts were simply a written record of *a priori* knowledge or knowledge found outside the rhetorician’s realm of reasoning.

By the end of the 19th century, the function of creating written artifacts, according to rhetoricians, became the public manifestation of *a priori* produced knowledge and truths passed on to the rhetorician from other sources. The role of the rhetorician during the 1800s was to simply dress the knowledge in an understandable way. According to Blair, “[k]nowledge and science must furnish the materials that form the body and substance of any valuable composition. Rhetoric serves to add the polish” (951). Knowledge, according to the elocutionists, was

provided by spiritual texts or the hard sciences. The only influence rhetoricians had on knowledge and “truth” was the formation of a plainly constructed vessel to clearly transport the knowledge to people who could benefit from it or use it productively. According to Herbert Spencer, discourse analysis should be viewed as “an apparatus of symbols for the conveyance of thought” (155).

Although rhetoric was removed from College English departments near the end of the 1800s, composition studies would retain the epistemological assumptions of the Enlightenment well into the 1960s. For nearly five decades, writing instruction revolved around the concept of knowledge existing outside the student’s realm of reasoning, and writing was simply a tool to record the findings of others. Rhetoricians, on the other hand, and philosophers following in the footsteps of Plato, Descartes, and Kant, attempted to move epistemology away from the dominance of the “Cartesian Cogito.” Epistemic rhetoric began to view the rhetorical act as an attempt to discover meaning, and epistemology became associated with the belief that “truth” and knowledge were discovered through the manipulation of language rather than scientifically proven. One of the first to postulate this idea was Martin Heidegger, who stated “[t]he truth of the statement about the essence of man can never be scientifically proven. It cannot be established by reference to facts, nor can it be derived from principles in a formal-logical manner” (Heidegger 56). Philosophical rhetoricians began to view knowledge as the logical relationship between human understandings or misunderstandings according to a representational self existing in the material world.

What occurred was an epistemological movement away from the Kantian philosophy of first principles regarding pure reasoning and proof resulting from experiences, or the lack of experiences, to establish the concept of pure knowledge resulting from *a priori* acquisition.

Instead, rhetorical speculations turned to attempts at establishing rational explanations for knowledge based on principles for the discovery of the essence of things in relation to what is not apparently obvious. “Truth” according to Heidegger, “is correspondence. Such correspondence obtains because the proposition is directed to the facts and states of affairs about which it says something [...] So truth is correspondence, grounded in correctness between proposition and thing” (2). “Truth” and knowledge, according to Heidegger, were actually representations humans construct as a way to discover the concealed aspects of objects. “Only on the basis of the divorce between the true and the untrue does it become clear that the essence of truth as unhiddenness contains an essential connection with hiddenness and concealing” (Heidegger 66). Heidegger, using Plato’s cave metaphor, postulated “truth” was conditional to our own perceptions. The only way to find “truth” was to uncover the missing aspects of our perceptions, rather than claiming “truth” was acquired through *a priori* understanding.

Heidegger’s analysis of “truth” was rooted in language and focused on the idea of humans using language to attempt an explanation for the material world. The movement in the rhetorical tradition regarding epistemological assumptions of knowledge constructed through understanding knowledge, rather than existing *a priori*, is the second point of commonality between composition studies and the rhetorical tradition. Epistemic rhetoric followed the path of language producing truths which are conditional. According to I. A. Richards, rhetoric was the process of overcoming the misconceptions of language in order to produce logic. More specifically, “[h]ow words mean, is not a question to which we can safely accept an answer either as an inheritance from common sense, that curious growth, or as something vouched for by another science” (Richards 1281). The concept of truths and knowledge existing as a transitory element meant knowledge could never be a static element of human understanding,

because how we shape textual representations of the world are directly conditional to an individualized understanding of the world. The reason for this is that “[i]f human reality were limited to the being of the ‘I think,’ it would have only the truth of an instant” (Sartre 60-61).

It is the realization of the conditionality of truth, meaning, and understanding which makes epistemic or philosophical rhetoric so important to the field of discourse analysis. “It is only the permanent, remote meaning in terms of which I can understand what I am writing in the present, and hence, it is conceived as being; that is, only by positing the book as the existing basis on which my present, existing sentence emerges, can I confer a determined meaning upon my sentence” (Sartre 37). What developed was a new purpose for discourse analysis in composition studies and the rhetorical tradition, as noted by Robert Scott in 1969, where rhetoric could “be viewed not as a matter of giving evidence to truth but of creating truth” (135). By the mid 1900s, epistemological assumptions regarding the production of written artifacts became associated with the possibility of a constructing knowledge and “truths” through language. Scott believed discourse “must consider truth not as something fixed and final but as something to be created moment by moment in the circumstances in which [the rhetorician] finds himself and with which he must cope” (138). With the help of Scott, rhetoricians following the epistemic rhetorical tradition developed the assumption that “truth” represented the rhetorician’s current understanding of knowledge.

Following the return of rhetoric into college English departments, composition instructors began speculating about how writers create, transpose, and manipulate meaning through the production of written artifacts. Many composition instructors, however, failed to realize this movement away from product dominated assessment criteria was an epistemological movement away from *a priori* knowledge acquisition, which philosophical rhetoricians had already been

challenging. Composition instructors had begun to question the “Cartesian Cogito” and began to speculate human knowledge developed through interactions with the world, rather than provided by other disciplines. In “Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories,” James Berlin claimed that composition instructors began to accept the idea that “knowledge is not simply a static entity available for retrieval. Truth is dynamic and dialectical, the result of process involving the interaction of opposing elements” (264). During the late 1960s and early 1970s, two branches of discourse analysis developed in composition studies as composition instructors began speculating about the production of written artifacts and the concept of creating knowledge, or “truth,” through the act of writing.

One group of composition instructors returned to Romanticism as a way to establish an expressive approach to composition studies, and the other focused on developing explanations for the stages students proceeded through while constructing written artifacts as a way to establish a process focused pedagogy. Even though many early composition instructors disagreed about how students produce written artifacts, one of the strongest commonly held beliefs in composition studies was the idea of learning and creating knowledge through the textualization of thought. A student, according to early process theorists, should be judged “not for his product, not for the paper we call literature by giving it a grade, but for the search for truth in which he is engaged” (Murray 5). By following and taking the proper time to complete each stage of the process, a student could use language to discover a solution or “truth” and then explain the discovered “truth” to others. By the early 1980s, composition instructors, began to explore the possibility of attributing writing patterns to specific stages of mental processes and became interested in how the mind forms and structures knowledge through language. Under expressivist ideology, “truth” and knowledge were to be established through the rhetorician’s interactions

with the text and a reflection on previous experiences or interactions with the world. “Meaning” according to expressivists resulted “from the interaction of teacher and students, writers and readers, process and product -- all accomplished through language” (Burham 24). Through the process of sharing personal experiences, composition instructors postulated writers could help others come to mutual understandings of knowledge. According to Berlin, “[t]he underlying conviction of expressionists is that when individuals are spared the distorting effects of a repressive social order, their privately determined truths will correspond to the privately determined truths of all others” (“Rhetoric and Ideology” 486).

Through the work of composition instructors adhering to both process-pedagogy and expressive-pedagogy, composition studies shifted to the same epistemological assumptions rhetoricians following the epistemic tradition had developed. As Janet Emig has stated, early composition instructors envisioned writing as a process where “the symbolic transformation of experience through the specific symbol system of verbal language is shaped into an icon (the graphical product) by the enactive hand” (10). Discourse, according to Emig, connected “the three major tenses of our experience to make meaning” through “the breaking of entities into their constituent parts” and “combining or fusing these, often into fresh arguments or amalgams” (13). The initial stages of the post-product-pedagogy movement in composition studies continued the epistemological tradition of discovering and creating “truth”, or meaning, through the production of written artifacts. During the 1980s, social constructionists in both composition studies and the rhetorical tradition began to question the epistemological assumption of knowledge and “truth” as individual efforts, and began to explore the social aspects contributing to the production of knowledge. The shift in epistemological assumptions toward social explanations regarding the construction of knowledge and “truth” is one of the strongest

examples of commonality existing between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies. Composition instructors and rhetoricians shifted from assuming knowledge and “truth” were a universally understood entity constructed by individuals which could be disseminated to all audiences. Instead, knowledge and “truth” became postulated possibilities of understanding current conceptions regarding socially constructed situations.

Rhetoricians following the epistemic rhetorical tradition also began to view the production of knowledge and “truth” as current representations of shifts occurring in a larger conversation. During the 1980s rhetoricians began to make the epistemological assumption that knowledge and “truth” were not an individual construct, but rather a socio-linguistic construct of growing assumptions among members of a cultural community. According to Rorty, “if we see knowing not as having an essence, to be described by scientists or philosophers, but rather as a right, by current standards, to believe, then we are well on the way to seeing conversation as the ultimate context within which knowledge is to be understood” (389). It was the belief among rhetoricians that knowledge and “truth” were human constructs revolving around the principle of interactions occurring within cultural contexts where each member of a social community contributed to understanding through the production of written artifacts. As McGee has claimed, “[h]uman beings are ‘conditioned,’ not directly to belief and behavior, but to a vocabulary of concepts that function as guides, warrants, reasons, or excuses for behavior and belief” (“Ideograph” 428). Cultural and social understandings, according to epistemic rhetoricians, became malleable pre-constructions augmented every time cultural interaction occurs and whenever a member of a specific culture tries to illustrate understanding through the production of written artifacts. According to Burke, “[c]ritical and imaginative works are answers to

questions posed by the situation in which they arose. They are not merely answers, they are strategic answers, stylized answers” (77).

Based on the epistemological assumption of knowledge and “truth” as changeable understandings, rhetoricians began to examine the possibility of discourse analysis being the accumulation of all previous cultural encounters and linguistic attempts toward understandings. In 1990, Michael McGee claimed “texts are understood to be larger than the apparently finished discourse that presents itself as transparent. The apparently finished discourse is in fact a dense reconstruction of all the bits of other discourses from which it is made” (“Text, Context” 70). Under the lens of shifting epistemologies regarding the production of discourse, assessment among rhetoricians became based how well the written artifact could continue a culturally generated discussion. Composition instructors also began to assume knowledge or “truth” in written artifacts was discovered through both the writer’s interactions with the other members of a socially defined group and the social context surrounding the production of written artifacts. As we saw in the previous chapter, discourse, according to composition instructors, became a socially constructed activity where the writer attempts to join the discourse of a specific community of peers and knowledge became associated with the writer’s attempt to offer a new perspective on shared information. “In other words, the ways in which the subject understands and is affected by material conditions is circumscribed by socially-devised definitions, by the community in which the subject lives” (Berlin “Rhetoric and Ideology” 489).

As Kenneth Bruffee pointed out in “Collaborative Learning and the ‘Conversation of Mankind’,” social construction theory, in composition studies, was fundamentally grounded in expanding the belief of writers producing texts in socially constructed discourse communities. “We first experience and learn ‘the skill and partnership of conversation’ in the external arena of

direct social exchange with other people” (Bruffee 419). By nurturing social exchanges through collaborated learning, social constructionists speculated students would be more knowledgeable and would become stronger writers. It was the belief of the social constructionists that writers do not produce written artifacts in a vacuum. Social constructionists charged instead that all written forms of discourse are socially constructed discourses between numerous members of the writer’s community. They see the idea of an isolated writer discovering knowledge individually as an implausibility (see Dautermann, Bruffee, Faigley, and Rubin). According to Bruffee, “[i]f thought is internalized public and social talk, then writing of all kinds is internalized social talk made public and social again. If thought is internalized conversation, then writing is internalized conversation re-externalized” (422).

Contrary to the process and expressive belief that writers discovered knowledge through writing, “social constructionists argue that language and indeed writers are social, rather than personal constructs” (Keppel 121). Under social construction, as I illustrated in the previous argument, the role of the writer was to continue the train of socially acquired knowledge through the act of producing discourse focused toward other members of a discourse community. Under social construction the creation of knowledge and language became a mutually created endeavor where writers never write alone. For social constructionists, discourse became a discussion among members of a socially constructed group where writers transmitted interpretations of their socially acquired knowledge to other members of the group. As Richard Fulkerson has pointed out, composition instructors “rejected quantification and any attempts to reach truth about our business by scientific means, just as we long ago rejected ‘truth’ as derivable by deduction from unquestioned first principles” (“Twenty-First Century” 662). It was the assumption among composition instructors through out the 1990s that assessment should be based on how well a

writer could use written artifacts to communicate socially acquired knowledge to other members of the writer's community.

As this section has illustrated, by following developments in common epistemological assumptions regarding knowledge and "truth," a new history of discourse inquiry can be constructed which illustrates one aspect of commonality between the rhetorical tradition and composition studies. What the reader should notice is that both the rhetorical tradition and composition studies have at various times made common speculations regarding how knowledge is produced and how understanding knowledge shapes the production of "truth." The next question that needs to be addressed, however, is where does this new history situate contemporary discourse analysis? What we have now is a situation where knowledge and "truth" are envisioned as a social or cultural byproduct of an individual's continual interactions among various socially constructed communities. We continuously accept the epistemological assumption that "there can be no universal truths, no truths free from contextual particularities. Everything contains reflections, to some degree or other, of the cultural, historical, and political contexts in which inquiry takes place" (Villanueva 413).

Because the history of discourse analysis is generally written from the traditionalist standpoint instead of an epistemological standpoint, we are left with an assessment of discourse and the production of written artifacts based around Barthes' assumption of authorless texts. Contemporary instructors of discourse analysis are now facing the dilemma of nurturing the development of students under the epistemological assumption that culture creates written artifacts and should be the main component of assessing the rhetorical value of written artifacts. A careful examination of the history of epistemology, however, shows us the individual writer is an essential part of the process behind the production of written artifacts, because it is always the

individual's interpretation of culture which guides the production process. We need to bring the student back to our epistemologies regarding the production of written artifacts. To accomplish this goal, we need to combine traditional history, as outlined in chapter II, and the history of understanding knowledge as presented here. Once we agree on a common view of how knowledge and "truth" are produced, we can then formulate a defensible argument that composition studies has a teachable content and a unified pedagogical identity.

IV: Moving on Moving Forward: A Plea for Practicality in Discourse Inquiry

As the previous chapter has illustrated, a unified pedagogical identity is attainable, but it requires interlacing a new historical account of the rhetorical tradition and composition studies with our traditional histories. By connecting writing instruction to assumptions of how knowledge and “truth” are construed, we can begin to create a practical pedagogical identity focused around helping students gain a better understanding of knowledge through the production of written artifacts. Creating a new pedagogical identity based on helping students gain and understand knowledge will provide the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition with a teachable and defensible content. It will also provide composition instructors with a better way to help our students learn and grow through writing.

To begin establishing a new pedagogical identity, I first want to return to John Poulakos, who claimed rhetoric “is the art which seeks to capture in opportune moments that which is appropriate and attempts to suggest that which is possible” (26). Poulakos’ claim is important because it offers a way to connect persuasive argumentation through suggestion with the assumption that knowledge is conditional to specific situations. The claim also illustrates the need to continue using the traditionalist pedagogical approach, as outlined in chapter II, because in order to “suggest that which is possible” student writing needs to be represented appropriately inside a product and then distributed to the members of a social community at the opportune moment. The production of an “appropriate” product is only possible through the process of discovering an issue within a social community and offering a “possible” solution for change. A new pedagogical identity “consists in encouraging writing that is not restricted to self-expression or the acontextual generation of syntactic structures or the formulaic obedience to rules, but

instead keeps in view the skills and contingencies that attend a variety of situations and circumstances” (Covino 37).

Using argumentative strategies to teach the production of written artifacts is nothing new to the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition. As Anthony Weston points out in *A Rulebook for Arguments*, “Arguments are attempts to support certain views with reasons” (xi) and, as Andrews points out, “[w]e argue not only to persuade, but to clarify, to discover real issues under ostensible reasons for arguments, to prove, to win and to resolve, and we use a wide range of spoken and written means for achieving” (9). Most pedagogical views on the teaching of argument traditionally stick to the Toulmin model, which views a successful argument as a movement from data to warrants to claims (Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz, Mitchell and Andrews, Fulkerson, and Weston). In the Toulmin model of argumentation, the arguer first collects data to support the argument and concludes with a claim using warrants to connect the data to the claim. Other forms of teaching argument tend to break the process down into a four-step question-to-realization process, where arguers begin by asking the following questions: “(1) What is this thing? (2) What caused it or what effects does it have? (3) Is it good or bad? (4) What should be done about it?” (Fahnestock and Secor “Teaching Argument” 23).

The model and question approach to argument, however, both miss three important features necessary to formulate a new pedagogical identity. The first missing component is Cicero’s idea of “Propriety,” or “what is fitting and agreeable to an occasion or person” (76). The second missing component is an understanding of the community the writer is producing written artifacts for, because in order to create persuasive discourse a writer must know the social community they are trying to persuade. The third missing component is the existence of the arguer within the argument, because “a narrative dimension underlines the entire text, even the

structure at the very heart of Aristotle's rhetoric, the enthymeme. Enthymeme shares the same epistemological ground as plot, both depending on the configuration of wholes from parts through casual connection in time" (Hesse 34). To bring students to the center of a practical pedagogical assumption we need to augment composition studies' traditionalist pedagogical assumptions. The traditionalist version of discourse pedagogy views the production of written artifacts, or products, as individualized processes which are conditional to social and cultural conditions (for a full description see chapter II). Under traditionalist-pedagogy, however, there is no unified version of what our student's products are supposed to look like, nor are we supposed to understand the processes they use to produce texts or how social and cultural communities should impact the student's process or product.

The first aspect of traditionalist-pedagogy that needs to be corrected in order to construct a new pedagogical identity is process. Rather than using the term "process" to describe how students complete specific assignments, we should use the term to describe how students develop growing understandings of specific topics, which means changing classroom practices. To augment the meaning of the term "process", classrooms should provide progressive writing assignments that allow the student to continue developing social knowledge of particular topics over the duration of an entire semester. One example would be to have students research current issues in their local communities over the duration of the semester and produce a persuasive essay arguing for change. According to James Reither, "academic writing, reading, and inquiry are collaborative, social acts, social processes, which not only result in, but also-and this is crucial-result from, social products: writing processes and written products are both elements of the same social process" (291). Rather than viewing process as the path students take to complete

a product, we should view process as the developments and changes students make to products over time.

A new version of process should also take into account the fact that knowledge and “truth” are conditional to situational understanding and they change as our students’ circumstances change. We need to realize our students’ understandings of the world are impacted and changed daily. As such, our model of process needs to facilitate our students’ deepening understandings. Although the linear nature of Murray’s process approach has been challenged for its rigid start to finish pattern of product construction, “writing” and “re-writing” are still critically important aspects of the social writing process and have practical application value for a contemporary pedagogical identity. Composition courses should be designed around one principle: building a conditional “truth” claim. Students should be given the opportunity to change their minds as they progress through a composition course, which means creating assignments that build on each other. One way to accomplish this goal is to have all composition classrooms require some form of portfolio system for assessing student growth. In lower-division courses, students should be given small “writing” assignments throughout the semester and then “re-write” them for their portfolio at the end of the semester. In upper-division courses, students should work towards the production of one large “writing” assignment, or “truth” claim, through the process of completing and “re-writing” exploratory, preliminary, and final drafts. In both cases, students should be given the opportunity to conduct peer-reviews and discuss their paper topics with their peers. Through the process of “writing” and “rewriting” students would be able to “re-write” their own understandings and, by the end of the semester, develop a socially determined situational “truth” claim.

The second aspect of traditionalist-pedagogy that needs to be corrected is the concept that written products are socially and culturally constructed. To augment the social aspect regarding the production of written artifacts we should begin to view social interactions as experiences which help foster student learning. Rather than claim the production of written artifacts is a way for students to join socially constructed academic discourse communities, we should instead view the production of written artifacts as an attempt to persuade the local community into accepting new understandings of social knowledge. “Knowledge,” according to Berlin, “after all, is a historically bound social fabrication rather than an eternal and invariable phenomenon located in some uncomplicated repository - in the material object or the subject or the social realm” (“Rhetoric and Ideology” 489). To facilitate the social and cultural aspects contributing to the production of written artifacts, composition classrooms should function as a forum for discussion.

Instructors in composition studies and the rhetorical tradition need to be reminded we are not pedantic preachers teaching from the pulpit. Our versions of knowledge and “truth” are not mandated principles we should be forcing on our students. We have to be reminded that our own understandings are also socially and culturally determined constructs that should be malleable through interactions with the students we teach. Classroom practice, then, should be designed to revolve around social interactions. Classroom material should focus on contemporary issues affecting how our students understand the world or their social community. According to Reither, “students and teachers function best as co-investigators, with reading and writing being used collaboratively to conduct inquiry” (291). For this to occur, classroom material should directly correlate to contemporary social concerns and should function as an entry point for further discussion and cultural inquiry. Discussion topics should be based around verbal

interactions between students and teacher so all participants have a chance to add to and learn from group understandings. Additionally, the practice of peer-review editing sessions and individual writing conferences should be mandated activities in all composition classrooms, so students can share their social understandings with each other and practice their situational “truth” claims with other members of their social community.

The purpose of written artifacts is the third aspect of traditionalist-pedagogy that needs to be corrected. Contemporary composition instructors and rhetoricians need to acknowledge product will always be a component of writing instruction. Instead of claiming a composition instructor’s development should be determined by their separation from product-pedagogy, we need to embrace the functional aspect of product-pedagogy. Our students’ products should not be assessed on how well they represent *a priori* knowledge or individual brilliance, and should instead be assessed as social constructs. We should view all written products as attempts by our students to produce “truth” claims based on their socially understood knowledge, and we should continuously try to create assignments that push our student’s products into their culturally constructed communities outside academia. Our students “might, if given enough encouragement, be empowered not to serve the academy and accommodate it, not to write in the persona of Every student, but rather to write essays that will change the academy” (Sommers “Between the Drafts”, 285). To accomplish this goal, writing assignments in all composition classrooms need to be viewed as unfinished drafts of social arguments that could eventually function as a public rhetorical act.

We need to start basing the development criteria of our discipline on the production of culturally understood knowledge. We need to be reminded that how those epistemological assumptions are assessed is how we judge student development. According to Peter Elbow, “our

commitment to knowledge and society asks us to be guardians or bouncers: we must discriminate, evaluate, test, grade, certify” (“Embracing Contraries” 55). Contemporary composition instructors should also not ignore the developments regarding “eloquence” in product-pedagogy, because the need to teach our students to be clear with their prose is just as important now as it was then. One way to facilitate this need is to design assignments which stretch our students' written artifacts into public arguments for social change. To do this, composition instructors need to network with communication based businesses in our local communities. We need to create a situation where there is the possibility for all of our students to have the opportunity of having their written products published in magazines, in news papers, on public websites, or some other mass communication endeavor.

By combining the functional aspects of traditionalist-pedagogy with a new history based on developments in how we view knowledge and “truth,” contemporary composition instructors could formulate a unified pedagogical identity based on helping students gain knowledge. Establishing a unified pedagogical identity could also help the discipline of composition studies move beyond unaccountable speculations regarding how much cultural influence should impact our pedagogical ideologies. As a unified discipline of professionals committed to the same pedagogical identity, we may also be able to finally answer the critic’s declaration that Rhetoric and Composition has no real content. A new pedagogical identity could also provide instructors with a practical way to teach the rhetorical tradition. Once we have established a unified concept of content, we may even be able to begin constructing a “vertical,” or progressive, writing curriculum designed to help our students become active participants and advocates for social change through the public use of discourse.

Ellen Cushman's concept of a "vertical writing curriculum" is only possible through the standardization of composition studies. Each course in Rhetoric and Composition should function as a way to prepare students for the next course, which means establishing strict rubrics for our composition courses. Benchmarks need to be established for every composition course, so when we get a new group of students we will automatically know what skills they possess and what skills they will need for the next course they take. Some would argue, however, that by establishing a unified pedagogical identity and strict benchmarks for success that we would be reducing the creative potential of our instructors and students. Establishing a unified pedagogy and establishing a strict benchmark of success would actually increase the creative potential of our instructors. As long as some commonality is established in the way we teach composition and assess student growth, how we go about reaching that goal should completely be dependent on the individual instructor. As Elbow has pointed out, "there is obviously no one right way to teach, yet I argue in order to teach well we must find some way to be loyal both to students and to knowledge or society. Any way we can pull it off is fine" ("Embracing Contraries" 64).

Part of the problem contributing to the creation of a unified pedagogical identity or a "vertical writing curriculum" is due to the fact that many, if not most, first-year composition courses are still taught by literary trained graduate students with limited exposure to the rhetorical tradition or composition studies. It is time for this practice to change. Professionals working in the field of Rhetoric and Composition need to re-situate the first-year composition courses by making sure our graduate students and college faculty are teaching them and we need to insure literary students are aware of our pedagogical goals before they step into a composition classroom. A "vertical writing curriculum" is attainable, but we first need to move beyond the eternal struggles associated with differing pedagogical assumptions for the production of written

artifacts. We also need to remember that composition studies was created by the rhetorical tradition as a way to record public rhetorical acts intended to promote action, and without the rhetorical tradition composition studies could remain locked inside traditionalist-pedagogy for many years to come.

Works Cited

- Andrews, Richard ed. *Rebirth of Rhetoric: Essays in Language, Culture and Education*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Antezak, Fredrick J., Cinda Coggins, and Geoffrey D. Klinger. Eds. *Professing Rhetoric: Selected Papers From the 2000 Rhetoric Society of America Conference*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Bain, Alexander. *English Composition and Rhetoric*. Bizzel and Herzberg 1145-1148.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image Music Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. Union Square, NY: Hill and Wang, 1978.
- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." Villanueva 623-654.
- Berlin, James A. "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories." *College English* 44 (1982): 765-777.
- *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class." *College English* 50 (1988): 477-494.
- "Poststructuralism, Cultural Studies, and the Composition Classroom: Postmodern Theory in Practice." *Rhetoric Review* 11 (1992): 16-33.
- *Rhetoric's, Poetics, and Cultures: Refiguring College English Studies*. West Lafayette, ID: Parlor Press, 2003.
- Biesecker, Barbara. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from within the Thematic of *Differànce*." Lucatites, Condit, and Caudeill 232-246.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." Lucatites, Condit, and Caudeill 217-225.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Beyond Anti-Foundationalism to Rhetorical Authority: Problems Defining 'Cultural Literacy'." *College English* 52 (1990): 661-675.
- "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know about Writing." Villanueva 387-411.

- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin, 2001.
- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 331-340.
- Blair, Hugh. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. Bizzell and Herzberg. 950-979.
- Bloom, Lynn, Donald Daiker, and Esward White. Eds. *Composition Studies in the New Millennium: Rereading the Past, Rewriting the Future*. Carbondale: South Illinois University Press, 2003.
- Bloom, Lynn. "The Great Paradigm Shift and Its Legacy for the Twenty-First Century." Bloom, Daiker, and White 31-47.
- Britton, James. "Spectator Role and the Beginnings of Writing." Villanueva 151-174.
- Brodkey, Linda. "On the Subjects of Class and Gender in 'The Literacy Letters'." Villanueva. 677-696.
- Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'." Villanueva 415-436.
- "Social Construction, Language, and the Authority of Knowledge: A Bibliographical Essay." *College English* 48 (1986): 773-790.
- Burke, Kenneth. *On Symbols and Society*. Ed. Joseph Gusfield. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Burnham, Christopher. "Expressive Pedagogy: Practice/Theory, Theory/Practice." Tate, Rupieter, and Schick 19-35.
- Campbell, George. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Bizzell and Herzberg 902-946.
- Carter, Michael. "Stasis and Kairos: Principles of Social Construction in Classical Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 7 (1988): 97-112.
- Charland, Maurice. "Rehabilitating Rhetoric: Confronting Blindspots in Discourse." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 464-473.
- Connors, Robert J. "The Differences Between Speech and Writing: Ethos, Pathos, and Logos." *College Composition and Communication*. 30 (1979): 285-290.
- "Rhetorical History as a Component of Composition Studies." *Rhetoric Review* 7 (1989): 230-240.

---“Dreams and Play.” *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Eds. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992, 15-36.

--- *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997.

--- “Introduction to Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy.” *Selected Essays of Robert J. Connors*. Eds. Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford. Urbana, IL: Bedford/St Martin’s, 2003, 316-334.

Corbett, Edward P.J. “The Usefulness of Classical Rhetoric.” *College Composition and Communication* 14 (1963): 162-164.

---“What is Being Revived?” *College Composition and Communication* 18 (1967): 166-172.

Corbett, Edward P.J., Nancy Myers, and Gary Tate. *The Writing Teacher’s Sourcebook*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Covino, William A. “Rhetorical Pedagogy.” Tate, Rupieter, and Schick 36-53.

Cushman, Ellen. “Vertical Writing Programs in Departments of Rhetoric and Writing.” Bloom, Daiker, and White. 121-125.

Dautermann, Jennie. “Social Context of Writing.” *Writing at Good Hope: A Study of Negotiated Composition in a Community of Nurses*. Ed. Jennie Dautermann. Greenwich, CT: Albex, 1997. 5-20.

Descartes, René. *Meditations and Other Metaphysical Writings*. Trans. Desmond M. Clarke. NY: Penguin, 2003.

Dewey, John. *How We Think*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1991.

Ede, Lisa and Andrea Lunsford. “Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy.” Villanueva 77-96.

Elbow, Peter. “A Method for Teaching Writing.” *College English* 30 (1968): 115-125.

-- *Writing With Power*. Oxford, NY: Oxford UP, 1981.

-- *Writing Without Teachers*. Oxford, NY: Oxford UP, 1998.

--- “Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process.” Corbett, Myers, and Tate 54-65.

Emig, Janet. “Writing as a Mode of Learning.” Villanueva 7-16.

- Enos, Richard L., and Lois P. Agnew, eds. *Landmark Essay on Aristotelian Rhetoric*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.
- Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal." *College English* 48 (1986): 527-542.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne, and Marie Secor. "Teaching Argument: A Theory of Types." *College Composition and Communication* 34 (1983): 20-30.
- "Classical Rhetoric: The Art of Argumentation." *Argument Revisited; Argument Redefined*. Eds. Barbara Emmel, Paula Resch, Deborah Tenney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996. 97-123.
- Farrell, Thomas. "Practicing the Arts of Rhetoric: Tradition and Invention." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 79-100.
- Flower, Linda, and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 32 (1981): 365-387.
- Fulkerson, Richard. "Four Philosophies of Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 30 (Dec. 1979): 343-348.
- "Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity." *College Composition and Communication* 41 (1990): 409-429.
- *Teaching the Argument in Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1996.
- "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century." *College Composition and Communication* 56 (2005): 654-687.
- Fumerton, Richard. *Epistemology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.
- Gebhardt, Richard C. "Initial Plans and Spontaneous Composition: Toward a Comprehensive Theory of the Writing Process." *College English* 44 (1982): 620-627.
- George, Ann. "Critical Pedagogy: Dreaming of Democracy." Tate, Rupieter, and Schick 92-112.
- George, Diana, and John Trimbur. "Cultural Studies and Composition." Tate, Rupieter, and Schick 71-91.
- Gere, Anne R. "Teaching Writing: The Major Theories." *The Allyn and Bacon Sourcebook for College Writing Teachers*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2000. 10-25.
- Gilbert, Pam. "Voice/Text/Pedagogy: Re-Reading the Writing Classroom." Andrews 67-80.
- Glenn, Cheryl. "Remapping Rhetorical Territory." *Rhetoric Review* 13 (1995): 287-303.

- Hacking, Ian. *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Hariman, Robert. "Status, Marginality, and Rhetorical Theory." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 35-51.
- Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." Villanueva 205-234.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. Trans. E.S. Haldane. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Essence of Truth: On Plato's Cave Allegory and Theaetetus*. Trans. Ted Sadler. NY: Continuum, 2002.
- Hesse, Douglas D. "Aristotle's Poetics and Rhetoric: Narrative as Rhetoric's Fourth Mode." Andrews 19-38.
- Hill, Adams Sherman. *The Principles of Rhetoric*. New York: American Book Company, 1895.
- Hubbell, H. M. *Cicero in Twenty-Eight Volumes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1971.
- Keppel, Tim. "The Personal and the Social Self: Reconciling Expressionism and Social Constructionism." *The Writing Instructor* 14 (1995): 121-133.
- Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. "Rhetorical Appeals: A Revision." *Rhetoric Review* 24 (2005): 249-263.
- Kinneavy, James L. "The Basic Aims of Discourse." Villanueva 129-140.
- Knoblauch, C.H. "Rhetoric Constructions: Dialogue and Commitment." *College English* 50 (1988): 125-140.
- Knoblauch, C.H., and Lil Brannon. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1984.
- Kroll, Barry M. "Writing for Readers: Three Perspectives on Audience." *College Composition and Communication* 35 (1984): 172-185.
- Laditka, James N. "Language, Power, and Play: The Dance of Deconstruction and Practical Wisdom." *Rhetoric Review* 9 (1991): 298:311.
- Lardner, Ted. "What Works? Rethinking the Theory-Practice Relationship in Composition." *The Writing Instructor* 15 (1995): 5-17.

- Lindblom, Kenneth J. "Toward a Neosophistic Writing Pedagogy." *Rhetoric Review* 15 (1996): 93-108.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995.
- Lucaites, John Louis, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill. Eds. *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1999.
- Lunsford, Andrea A., and John J. Rusckiewicz. *Everything's an Argument*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.
- Lynn, Steven. "Reading the Writing Process: Toward a Theory of Current Pedagogies." *College English* 49 (1987): 902-910.
- Markel, Michael H. "The Writing Process: Teaching the Writing Process Revising." *College English* 50 (1988): 509-510.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 341-356.
- "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 425-440.
- "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 65-78.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis." Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 441-463.
- Miller, Susan. "Writing Theory : : Theory Writing." *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Eds. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992. 62-83.
- Miller, Thomas. "Teaching the Histories of Rhetoric as a Social Praxis." *Rhetoric Review* 12 (1993): 70-82.
- Mitchell, Sally, and Richard Andrews. *Learning to Argue in Higher Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2000.
- Murray, Donald M. "Teach Writing as a Process Not Product." Villanueva 3-6.
- Myers, Greg. "Reality, Consensus, and Reform in the Rhetoric of Composition Teaching." Villanueva 437-459.
- "Octolog: The Politics of Historiography." *Rhetoric Review* 7 (1988): 5-49.

- “Octolog II: The (Continuing) Politics of Historiography.” *Rhetoric Review* 16 (1997): 22-44.
- Perl, Sondra. “The Composing Process of Unskilled College Writers.” Villanueva 17-42.
- Poulakos, John. “Toward a Sophistic Definition of Rhetoric.” Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 25-34.
- Reither, James. “Writing and Knowing: Toward Redefining the Writing Process.” Corbett, Myers, and Tate 286-293.
- Richards, I.A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Bizzell and Herzberg 1281-1292.
- Rorty, Richard. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1997.
- Rose, Mike. “Narrowing the Mind and Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism.” Villanueva 345-385.
- “The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University.” Villanueva 547-569.
- Rubin, Donald L. “Introduction: Four Dimensions of Social Construction in Written Communication.” *Social Construction of Written Communication*. Eds. Bennett A. Rafoth and Donald L. Ruben. Norwood, NJ: Albex, 1988. 1-33.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. Kensington: Citadel Press, 2001.
- Scott, Robert. “On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic.” Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 131-139.
- Simons, Herbert W. “Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements.” Lucaites, Condit, and Caudill 385-369.
- Spencer, Herbert. *The Philosophy of Style*. Bizzell and Herzberg 1145-1167.
- Stewart, Donald C. “Some History Lessons for Composition Teachers.” *Rhetoric Review* 2 (1985): 134-144.
- Sommers, Nancy. “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers.” Villanueva 43-54.
- “Between the Drafts.” Corbett, Myers, and Tate 279-285.
- Tate, Gary, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick eds. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. Oxford, NY: Oxford UP, 2001.

- Vitanza, Victor J. "Critical Sub/Versions of the History of Philosophical Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 6 (1987): 41-66.
- Weston, Anthony. *A Rulebook for Arguments*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2000.
- Winterwod, Ross W. and Jack Blum. *Composition in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1994.
- Wood, Allen. Ed. *Basic Writings of Kant*. NY: The Modern Library, 2001.
- Woods, William F. "Composition Textbooks and Pedagogical Theory 1960-80." *College English* 43 (1981): 393-409.
- Vatz, Richard. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *Lucaites* 226-231.
- Villanueva, Victor. ed. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2003.