

7-8-2004

Institutionalized on the Margins: An Organizational History of the Preparation of Teachers of College Composition

Gregory A. Giberson
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Giberson, Gregory A., "Institutionalized on the Margins: An Organizational History of the Preparation of Teachers of College Composition" (2004). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1046>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Institutionalized on the Margins: An Organizational History of the Preparation of
Teachers of College Composition

by

Gregory A. Giberson

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of English
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Debra Jacobs, Ph.D.
Gary Olson, Ph.D.
Lynn Worsham, Ph.D.
Joan Kaywell, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
July 8, 2004

Keywords: rhetoric, teacher-training, disciplinarity, modern language association,
national council of teachers of english, conference on college composition and
communication.

© Copyright 2004, Gregory A. Giberson

Dedication

I dedicate this project to my wife and best friend, Cami. Thank you for your unshakable love and your often-strained yet never-ending acceptance of me throughout our years together. You make me want to make you proud.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my director, Debra Jacobs. Her dedication, compassion, and generosity have taught me to be a better professional. Her kindness, empathy, and friendship have taught me to be a better person.

I would like to thank the rest of my committee, Gary Olson, Lynn Worsham, and Joan Kaywell for their time and support.

I would like to thank my parents, Tom and Susan. Their belief in me and unwavering support of everything I do continues to amaze and inspire me.

I would like to thank my son Tommy for all of the smiles and hugs as I struggled to finish this project.

Last, I would like to thank my brother, Tom . . . for everything.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Method.....	9
Organizational Histories and Teacher Preparation.....	10
Chapter Two: The MLA and the Modern Department of English: Creating an Underclass of Teachers of Writing.....	24
Harvard and the Codification of College Writing.....	26
Fred Newton Scott and Early Process Theory.....	33
The MLA Pedagogical Section and the Status of Composition.....	39
Marginalization and the Future of Composition.....	52
Chapter Three: NCTE and the Establishment of a Teacher Organization.....	54
NCTE, MLA, and Lingering Influences.....	56
Organizational Identity: Identifying the Issues.....	59
Internal Change and External Indifference	67
Composition, Status, and the NCTE.....	79
Chapter Four: Status and Stasis: CCCCs and the Struggle to Redefine Composition.....	83
Organizational Subject(s) of Identity.....	86
Beyond the Organization: Institutional Conceptions of Composition.....	98
Status and the Relegation of Preparation to the Local.....	103
Chapter Five: Forming Organizational Identities: Marginalization, Fractionalization, and Specialization.....	117
A Lingering Influence: Contemporary Understandings of Composition.....	125
Conclusion.....	129
Notes.....	131
Works Cited.....	139

Appendices

Appendix One: Chronological Bibliography of Articles Published on the
Preparation of Teacher of College Composition: *PMLA*,
English Journal, and *CCC* 1884-1973..... 147

Appendix Two: Supplemental Bibliography of Scholarship on
Teacher Preparation..... 154

About the Author..... End Page

Institutionalized on the Margins: An Organizational History of the Preparation of Teachers of College Composition

Gregory A. Giberson

ABSTRACT

The preparation of new college teachers of composition has been a disciplinary topic of interest as well as an institutional concern since the establishment in the late 1800s of the modern English department. In this project, I offer a critical history of the treatment of the topic of the preparation of teachers of college composition by the three most historically significant organizations to English as a discipline and Composition as a field of study within that discipline: the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication. By analyzing the treatment of the topic of the preparation college teachers of composition by the major publications of these three organizations during their formative years, I provide a topic specific history of the marginalization of composition within the discipline and its organizations. This project expands on the work of individuals such as James Berlin, Albert Kitzhaber, Stephen North, Robert Connors, and others who have written on the historical marginalization of composition within the discipline and Academy and offers a more specific interrogation of the position of composition within the discipline and the Academy in general.

In my work, I argue that the contemporaneous founding of the modern English department and the Modern Language Association allowed for the

institutionalized relegation to a low status of composition and teachers of composition. That institutionalized low status eventually led to the marginalization, fractionalization, and specialization of a group of composition scholars who believed teaching to be a central concern for the discipline, as well as to the development of NCTE and CCCC. I further argue that a similar fractionalization and specialization within these smaller groups has left intact the institutionalized notions of status that led to their formation in the first place. I conclude by suggesting that in order to raise the status of composition in the discipline and the Academy, it is necessary to address the sources of marginalization directly as opposed to fractionalizing and specializing in reaction to it.

Chapter I—An Introduction the Historical Conditions of the Preparation of Teachers of College Composition

In the president's annual address before the 1912 National Council of Teachers of English, Fred Newton Scott suggested that:

It is the fortune of teachers of English—whether good or ill will appear later—that they have to do with a subject of universal interest. Not everybody cares about algebra and geometry. A limited number are interested in Cicero and Virgil. Even history and civics and manual training are allowed to be the special property of a fraction of the community. But English is everybody's subject. Everybody uses it; everybody thinks he knows how it should be taught; everybody has some opinion about the success or failure of current methods of teaching it. (“Our” 1)

Scott's words, although almost a century old, are as relevant today as they were then. Teachers of English, and more specifically teachers of composition, are constantly scrutinized for the work they do by peers, colleagues, administrators and the public, all of who claim to know how writing should be taught. Our ability to determine whether the “fortune” of teachers of English is good or ill is still in question, not necessarily because teachers of composition have failed to improve their theories and methods for teaching composition, but because

compositionists as a group have been unable to attain the academic and social subjectivity that would provide them the authority outside of their own discourse community to change outsider understandings of what composition is and what teachers of composition do. The following history of teacher preparation for teachers of writing in the discipline of English is intended to critique the historically reoccurring notion within the discipline of English studies that teaching, and specifically the preparation for teachers of writing, is an integral yet problematic concern for the past, present, and future of the discipline.

Much like Scott's words still resonate today, John Gage in his introduction to Albert Kitzhaber's *Rhetoric in American Colleges 1850-1900* responds to Kitzhaber's assertion that in the 1870s there was a general "dissatisfaction with aims, curriculum, and teaching methods," in regards to the teaching of composition that:

If the watershed year were to change from 1870 to 1970 and "eighteenth" changed to "nineteenth," few, I think, would quarrel with the accuracy of such a description applied to our own more recent history. (xi)

This recognition of a lack of satisfactory improvement in the teaching of composition over that century suggests that during that century there was a lack of a concerted effort within the discipline to improve the teaching of writing; however, as this study will show, there was a rather extensive effort to improve the teaching of writing, but that effort was, as it still is today, influenced and

encumbered by an institutionalized and reified hierarchy within the discipline that was developed, sanctioned, and perpetuated by those professional and intellectual organizations and institutions that claimed to represent the interests of members of the discipline of English studies. Of primary concern for this study is the impact, both practical and theoretical, that the institutional hierarchy has had on the subject of the preparation of teachers of college composition.

The status of composition within the discipline of English and the Academy in general has been an important and often divisive issue for members of the discipline since it was officially accepted by the Academy as separate and distinct in the late 1800s. Robert Connors argued in 1991 that the composition teachers of 1900 were “increasingly marginalized, overworked, and ill paid,” and that they were “oppressed, ill-used, and secretly despised” by other members of the discipline at that time (55). Connors goes on to argue that, although the status of composition has improved to a certain extent over the last century, it will never achieve “genuinely equal footing with the work the department does” until “teaching and studying writing can be made work the entire English faculty wants to share in” (79). If this does not happen, he suggests, “irresistible social forces will maintain the underclass [of composition] and all of the unhappiness and poisonous inequality that have always followed in its train” (79). Connors’ concerns about the status of composition in the field are shared by many. However, as this study will attempt to show, although it has been well known and documented throughout the history of the discipline of English that composition

and teachers of composition have been relegated to a low status within the discipline, very little progress has been made to improve that status.¹

From the formation of the modern department of English in the late 1800s, issues related to the teaching of college composition and the training of college teachers of writing have been marginalized, a marginalization that has led to a pervasive and institutionalized negative attitude within the organizations that supposedly represent teachers of writing as well as the institution of higher education itself. This pervasive and institutionalized understanding of composition and composition teachers has played a key role in the discipline's inability over the last 130 years to develop and sustain a scholarly and intellectual interrogation of the subject of preparing college teachers of composition. Focusing primarily on the influence that the primary professional and intellectual organizations in the field of English studies have had on how the teaching of composition and the preparation of teachers has been understood and defined by those institutions, mainly the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication, I argue that the opinions about teaching and teacher preparation developed in the foundational years of these organizations have had long-term effects that have often furthered, yet primarily hindered coherent and sustained interest and inquiry into the topic. Although the topic of teaching composition and preparing teachers appears throughout the individual organizations' histories, which would suggest a sustained inquiry into the topic,

more often than not the publications approach these topics statically as opposed to dynamically. In other words, the authors of the individual articles, reports, etc. tend to examine the topic of the preparation for teachers of composition and its status at their particular historical moments. By not interrogating the history of the problems or issues identified, and by not offering alternatives to the problematic circumstances, this failure often lead to the reiteration or reification of the lower status that composition and the teaching of it has held throughout the history of English as a discipline.

As this history will attempt to show, the appearance of genuine interest in the object of teacher preparation follows a rather predictable pattern, appearing in publications when the historical circumstances were favorable, primarily when there were formative moments in English studies, such as the founding of the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication. However, attempts to initiate extended professional and scholarly conversations on the topic of teacher preparation have historically failed to attain a sustained and dynamic interrogation into its position within the field to achieve the goal of improving the training of new teachers as well as the status of teaching within the discipline as a whole. The possible reasons for this are many, but as this study will attempt to show, two of the primary historical factors that influenced the discipline's inability to address teacher preparation in any sustained way were the contemporaneous founding of the Modern Language Association and the formation and broad

acceptance in higher education in America of the modern department of English in the second half of the 19th century.

During the latter half of the 19th century, the conception of composition in the university was undergoing a drastic revision. As Albert Kitzhaber points out in his influential book *Rhetoric in American Colleges 1850-1900*, in the first half of the 19th century “political problems led to greater emphasis on instruction in oratory and debate,” as opposed to written composition (31). He goes on to state that “There does not seem to have been much actual writing done by the students,” and that “most attention was given to reciting the numerous rhetorical principles in the handbook” (32). However, beginning in the second half of the 19th century under the leadership of Charles Eliot, Harvard College spearheaded a movement quickly accepted by other colleges and universities to reform higher education. Eliot, in his inaugural address in 1869, “condemned ‘the prevailing neglect of the systematic study of the English language’ and he never ceased to regard English as central in the scheme of American education” (Kitzhaber 33). Indeed, Elliot issued the following charge:

The first subject which, as I conceive, is entitled to recognition of equal academic value or rank with any subject now most honored is English language and literature [. . .] English should be studied from the beginning of school to the end of college life” (qtd. in Kitzhaber 33).

Harvard's acceptance of English as a distinct and bona fide discipline quickly spread, and as with the development of any new discipline, English began its struggle for legitimacy by identifying the key issues that have become central to its existence and by defining the organization's stance on those issues.

At almost the same time, 1883, the Modern Language Association was formed. From its inception, it has been the organization through which the modern discipline of English has been defined. Donald Stewart, who has published extensively on the history of MLA and Composition, has suggested that MLA's founders, many of whom were professors of rhetoric and oratory, "were still preoccupied with the problems of teaching writing" (734), but they were nevertheless even more eager to define the new organization in terms of research and scholarship. Far from being primarily concerned with the teaching of writing, or the teaching of literature for that matter, the new organization was primarily interested in "demonstrating that the study of English and modern literatures was as intellectually legitimate and pedagogically beneficial as studying Latin and Greek" (734). In 1884, T. W. Hunt, from the College of New Jersey, in the first edition of the *Transactions of the Modern Language Association* in 1884 (which would become *PMLA*) called for an increase in the vigor with which members of the newly founded Modern Language Association worked to legitimate the discipline within the academy because "in the great body of our colleges [. . .] the place of English is quite subordinate to that of all other related departments" (120). Hunt further asserted that it was the responsibility of

professors of English to insist that its claims of equality with other established disciplines “are reasonable and should at once be heeded” (120).

The preoccupation within the discipline with the status of the discipline itself and how to define it within the auspices of higher education and the Modern Language Association is quite clear with just a cursory glance at the titles of many of the papers appearing in the *Transactions of the Modern Language Association* and the early volumes of *PMLA*. Titles such as “The Course in English and Its Value as a Discipline,” “The Study of Modern Literature in the Education of Our Time,” “The University Idea, and English in the University,” suggest that one of the main concerns for MLA was the status of English in the academy in relation to other recognized disciplines as it struggled to understand its own identity and justify its existence as a full fledged department in the university. Of course, the teaching of composition was a topic of concern, but the main concern seemed to be how to best cast it aside in regards to its prominence as an important aspect of the discipline. Ironically, Harvard’s attempts through the introduction of entrance examinations to codify and legitimate the teaching of college composition helped to define college composition in terms that would lead to a pervasive and influential institutional understanding of composition as secondary to literature, a view that continues to have a profound impact on the discipline today.

Method

This study will be a critical history of the evolution of the three most influential organizations that have affected the growth of Composition Studies as a recognized field of study within the discipline of English studies: the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Because the most direct historical record that is available from the formative years of these organizations are the publications of these organizations, this study will focus primarily on those texts, namely the *Publication of the Modern Language Association*, *English Journal*, *College English*, and *College Composition and Communication*. It seems reasonable that, because the individuals charged with charting the direction of the organizations (presidents, boards of directors, editors, etc.) are selected by the members of the organizations, the published record of these organizations would be representative of the professional, intellectual, and scholarly circumstance of any given time. Therefore, I have chosen to focus on these specific publications to develop a history of these organizations and their attitudes toward and approaches to composition in the university and the preparation of teachers of college composition.

Organizational Histories and Teacher Preparation

As noted earlier, in the late 1800s, Harvard was the most influential English program in the country. It was the first college to designate the study of English literature as a distinct field, and, most importantly for the teaching of writing, was the first college to codify the expectations for college writers through the establishment of a written entrance exam beginning in 1874 (Kitzhaber). The influence that Harvard had in higher education encouraged the majority of other colleges and universities in America to establish similar entrance exams. The exams were designed primarily to assess the ability of the incoming student to write correctly, emphasizing spelling, grammar, punctuation, and expression. As entrance exams were adopted around the country, these four categories came to define not only the skills that students should have upon entering college, but also the skills that should be taught in the first-year writing courses that, following Harvard's lead yet again, most schools were requiring of their incoming students. It was recognized early on and lamented about on several occasions, most vociferously by the Harvard Reports in the 1890s, that most students did not demonstrate sufficient skills in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and expression to satisfy those who were evaluating the exams.

At the same time as Harvard was establishing and refining its entrance exam, a large number of new textbooks appeared that were based on two "distinctly new versions of the composing process" (Berlin, *Writing Instruction*

58). Individuals such as Fred Newton Scott and Gertrude Buck represented one of the new versions of the writing process, while Barrett Wendell and Adams Sherman Hill from Harvard represented the other. This first, which was implemented at the University of Michigan for several years but was never widely accepted at the time, is reminiscent of what we understand today as process-oriented, while the latter has become known as current traditional. It appears that the growing popularity of the Harvard-inspired written entrance exams among colleges and universities, as well as the widespread use of the “new” current-traditional textbooks, were complementary in that they both emphasized correctness over content. This notion of college composition quickly gained wide acceptance in MLA because the majority of its members’ primary interest was research and scholarship. Many felt a great deal of disdain for the fact that composition had been relegated to the new department of English and were therefore interested in dismissing it as irrelevant to the new organization. There were only a few dissenting voices from within, primarily from the Pedagogical Section of MLA, which, after some rather progressive work from 1900-1902 under the direction of Fred Newton Scott, was disbanded in 1903. Thus, correctness, as sanctioned and institutionalized by the Department of English and MLA, became the primary criterion by which first-year writing students were judged by members of the discipline, the Academy, and society as a whole.

Because composition was defined as correctness, the discipline seemed to unquestioningly accept the notion that to teach it, one must merely be able to

use the language correctly him/herself. The reasons, however, for the acceptance of such a simplistic notion of composition should be understood within the historical context. Those who were engaged in legitimating the discipline of English Studies as such and those who were engaged in defining the professional positions of MLA had similar agendas in regards to what should be the primary focus of the discipline and what should be secondary. For the discipline, most believed that the study of English literature should be the primary emphasis; for MLA, research and scholarship on literature were determined as the most important. Composition was understood as a fundamentally mechanical skill with, therefore, limited potential to gain disciplinary status. Composition, therefore, was assigned secondary status and was dismissed rather quickly as an inconsequential concern for both the discipline and the organization. Not surprisingly, a few years after the founding of MLA and the disbanding of the Pedagogical Section, fewer and fewer articles and papers about the teaching of composition appeared in *PMLA* and on the program at the annual conference of MLA.

Nevertheless, there was still a certain contingent of teachers and scholars who were interested in the teaching of writing and with matters of teaching English in general who felt that that MLA did not represent them because, as Fred Scott suggested in an editorial in the inaugural edition of the National Council of Teachers of English's publication *The English Journal*, its "point of view is that of the scholar engaged in research rather than that of the teacher"

("Significance" 46). In 1912, the National Council of Teachers of English was founded to provide a needed national organization that represented teachers of English. Not surprisingly, the founding president was Fred Newton Scott, an outspoken progressive Professor of Rhetoric from the University of Michigan who had presided over the Pedagogical Section of MLA from 1900-1903 when it was disbanded. Much like MLA did for the first several years of its existence, NCTE spent several years formulating its identity by identifying issues and developing positions on those issues relevant to the organization and its members. In his opening remarks as president of the new organization, Scott identified what he believed was one of the most important problems facing the new organization. He asked, "How shall the efficiency of our teaching of composition be tested or evaluated?" (2). Taken in context when the dominant opinion in the discipline was that teachers of writing merely need be able to write correctly themselves to be qualified to teach others, this question takes on broader significance. Implicit in Scott's question is that the emphasis for evaluation is shifted to the teachers of composition as opposed to the skills of students. By emphasizing evaluation of *teaching*, Scott challenged the new organization to establish and interrogate potential criteria that would define parameters for quality teaching. To do this, it would be necessary for the organization to develop an alternative to the accepted notion of teaching composition that emphasized correctness over all else.

Because the emphasis on correctness was attributed primarily to individual student ability and not the performance of individual teachers, there

were no established standards by which individual teacher performance could have been evaluated. Before teaching could be evaluated certain standards for methodology, theory, outcomes, and training among other things would have to have been developed, so the performance of individual teachers could be evaluated against something. Prior to Scott's calling attention to the need for evaluating teaching, evaluation was reserved primarily to judge individual student's ability to write correctly. Although Scott's call for evaluation of teacher performance had few immediate consequences, the push for developing the standards necessary to evaluate teaching later became integral to the struggle for disciplinarity for Composition as a field of study. However, it is clear, based on the number of articles and reports published in *The English Journal* in those foundational years, that teacher preparation was an important topic of interest for the new organization.

In 1912, a preparation program for new teachers of composition was developed at Harvard based on the assumption that any perceived failures of new teachers of writing were due to their inability to write well themselves. That same year, Chester Greenough, who was in charge of the teacher preparation program at Harvard, read a paper to NCTE outlining a teacher training program developed at Harvard. The program consisted of only one course whose description listed "Practice in Writing, in the Criticism of Manuscript, and in Instruction by Conferences and Lectures," as the chief goals ("Experiment" 109).

Although the description seems to identify methods as important to the new teacher, Greenough states that:

the chief requisite for success in teaching Freshman to write is to be able to write [. . .] enough better than a Freshman can be expected to do it to make everybody concerned feel that the instructor belongs behind the desk and not down among the beginners on the benches. (110)

This was the conception of teaching composition sanctioned by MLA and the early English department that in part was responsible for the separation of NCTE from MLA in the first place. This deference to MLA's notion of teaching composition consistently appears throughout the first decades of NCTE.ⁱⁱ That notion of composition continued to permeate the articles in NCTE's *English Journal* until 1950, when the Conference on College Composition and Communication was formed along with its publication *College Composition and Communication*, which then became the primary publication for articles directly related to college composition.ⁱⁱⁱ

The Conference on College Composition and Communication was formed as an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English to address the fact that, as John Gerber, the first president of CCCC, stated, members of NCTE whose primary interests were in the teaching of college composition "had no systematic way of exchanging views and information quickly" (12). The group's newsletter, *CCC*, was developed to remedy that problem. Because the

newsletter, which eventually became a respected refereed scholarly journal, was “designed for a highly specialized group” (Gerber 12), it was meant to complement the other college-related NCTE journal, *College English*, not compete with it. Much like MLA and NCTE had done before it, the new organization went through a period of rapid intellectual growth in its early years as it worked to establish its own identity separate from and more specialized than its predecessors. Early on, it became clear that the preparation of new teachers of composition should be extremely important to this new group. CCCC’s members typically agreed that instructors in composition were poorly trained for their work and programs should be developed to address that concern. However, much like what NCTE experienced, CCCC as an organization struggled with the institutionalized secondary status of composition in higher education while watching its early efforts at reform die out as many members of the organization found it difficult to embrace composition as a legitimate and separate field of study within higher education, let alone the teaching of composition as a legitimate area of scholarly inquiry. Indeed, one of the many critiques of the current status of preparation programs for teachers of college composition is the fact that although there are some good programs, there is very little systematic guidance offered within the field.

Historically, issues related to teacher preparation and the low status attributed to those issues have been addressed at individual institutions, with little collaboration and even less interrogation of the broader implications those local

needs may have for the discipline. The failure of the organizations to establish an active, broad, and contiguous discourse on the topic of the preparation of teachers of composition and their status within the academy has contributed to the development of a recurring pattern: the organizations, which at their inception identified preparation for teachers of college composition as important and central to their organizational identity, have ended up reaffirming the institutionalized lowered status of composition through the consistent disappearance of those issues from the pages of their representative professional publications. This is why, after a flurry of publications on teaching composition and teacher preparation in the first few years of *PMLA*, and especially in the first few years of *EJ* and *CCC*, the number of articles related to teacher preparation began to decline. By delineating this historical pattern, I hope to provide a more thorough understanding of the roles played by the institutions of MLA, NCTE, and CCCC in defining and reaffirming the low status of composition within the field of English and higher education. I also hope to expand the discussion of the preparation of teachers of college composition to include questions concerning how scholars and practitioners within the field of composition studies may participate in revising the historical biases toward the teaching of composition within the many institutions and organizations that make up higher education.

In Chapter Two, I argue that the teaching of college composition has been recognized as secondary to the study of English literature from the formation of

the modern English department because of the concurrent founding of the discipline itself, the development of entrance exams at Harvard and the subsequent pedagogies developed to suit those exams, and the formation of the Modern Language Association. I argue that as the new department of English struggled to legitimate itself as a discipline in the university that deserved equal status with other accepted disciplines, it made English literature its primary focus of interest, subordinating the teaching of composition so that it was regarded as more of a burden than an intellectual or professional concern. When Harvard, the most influential institution at the time, instituted its written entrance exams, which emphasized spelling, grammar, punctuation, and expression exclusively, it unwittingly aided in the demotion of composition within the new discipline by defining it as basic and elementary, which has been understood as synonymous with easy to teach. Indeed, the only requirement for teachers of writing that was advocated at the time was that they be able to write correctly themselves. Because MLA was also struggling to define itself at the same time and its members were primarily concerned with developing an organization dedicated to scholarship and research, the definition of composition developed in the early years of the English department was readily accepted. As these two powerful institutions were so self-consciously attempting to establish their legitimacy as professional and scholarly institutions primarily concerned with English literature, composition was summarily ignored as integral to the institutions and the discipline itself, even though a large portion of the resources of the discipline

were taken up by composition. I end this chapter by arguing that the hierarchy developed and accepted by the new discipline and MLA with composition and teaching at the bottom was accepted by and became institutionalized within higher education. The hierarchy has become a formidable force against which practitioners and scholars of composition alike have had to struggle.

In Chapter Three, I argue that from its founding, the National Council of Teachers of English has been so thoroughly imbricated with the institutionalized notions of teaching and composition that it has been unable to achieve, to any great extent, the goal of professional and intellectual parity with MLA. I relate NCTE's struggle for parity with MLA to teacher preparation by examining articles appearing in NCTE's inaugural journal *English Journal* from 1912, the year NCTE was founded, to 1939, the year that a new NCTE journal, *College English*, was established, which then became the organization's primary scholarly publication for higher education. Because the journals of these organizations are edited by and contributed to by members of the organizations, the journals can be read, in a sense, as historical records of the organizations. For NCTE, that historical record parallels the "real" struggle that it was having with the denigration of teaching by MLA. The articles that I examine not only demonstrate a struggle against MLA's prescribed notion of teaching as secondary but also show how members of the new organization were responsible for perpetuating many of the same biases made pervasive by MLA. One of the most compelling and repeated notions about the teaching of composition inherited by NCTE is the notion that

anyone who could use the language correctly could teach it. The consistency with which this notion appears in *EJ* before the founding of CCCCs demonstrates the pervasiveness and power of that institutionalized conception of composition first sanctioned by MLA.

As one of the most progressive and outspoken proponents for improving the professional status of teaching and teachers, the founding NCTE president, Fred Newton Scott, understood early on in the history of NCTE, and MLA for that matter, that teaching was and should be recognized as equal to scholarship and research. He published extensively in *EJ* and elsewhere, and was the first to call for the professionalization of the teaching of composition. Through analysis of several of his publications in *EJ*, as well as the publications of several other important scholars, I argue that the influence of Scott's progressive ideas concerning the teaching of writing and rhetoric in college and the failure of the discipline as a whole to embrace many of his most basic assumptions about the status of teaching in the discipline can be more readily understood based on the long-term achievements and failures of compositionists in terms of improving status of composition within the discipline of English studies and the academy in general.

In Chapter Four, I argue that although the Conference on College Composition and Communication was formed to bring needed professional status to the study and teaching of composition, it has still struggled, especially during its early years, with many of the same issues that NCTE did in relation to

the teaching of composition and the negative institutionalized identity it had acquired during the early years of MLA and the modern English department. The organization recognized early on that the preparation of teachers of composition should be an important issue to the group. From the outset, workshops were organized, reports were given, descriptions of programs were offered, and arguments were made about how to prepare new teachers of composition. But more often than not, the systemic hierarchy within the field of English studies mired any progressive thinking about the status of composition and composition teachers.

Unlike NCTE which struggled primarily with institutionalized biases about the abilities teachers of composition needed to be recognized as competent, CCCC tended to agree that the ability to teach composition was “not just a matter of being able to use Standard English oneself,” but that it was something much more complex (Allen 11). Nevertheless, an institutionalized bias against composition existed within CCCC, perpetuating the relegation of composition to a lowly status within the discipline of English Studies and higher education in general. For instance, in the report of Workshop No. 16 in 1951, the participants, after delineating the importance of providing new teachers of composition with adequate preparation for the job and stressing the professional legitimacy of teaching composition, suggested that “it is not now prudent, if it ever will be, for the graduate student to prepare himself exclusively to teach in the fields of composition or communication” (31). Similarly, Robert Hunting, who directed the

teaching assistants at Duke University, argued that any preparation program for new teachers of composition “should not seriously interfere with the normal pursuit of graduate studies [. . .]. It should be non-credit because it really involves extra-curricular work” (5-6). This perpetuation and acceptance of the low status of composition in the early years of CCCC hindered the growth of movements to legitimate composition as a field of intellectual study and the institutionalization of reform for the preparation of college teachers of writing.

In Chapter Five, I suggest that this critical history of the three major professional organizations with which compositionists are affiliated reveals a recurring pattern of marginalization, fractionalization, and specialization. These large organizations consist of individuals who share many of the same interests. Under the auspices of these large organizations, smaller groups, often identified within the organizations as interest groups, form and are either accepted by the larger organization as relevant or rejected as irrelevant. For instance, the Modern Language Association was organized to represent a large group of individuals who shared the same professional, intellectual, and scholarly interests in modern languages who believed that those languages deserved equal representation in American higher education. Within that group were teachers of English who were interested in issues related to the teaching of English. As MLA began to formulate its organizational identity, teachers became marginalized within the organization because the majority of its members determined that teaching should not be a primary concern for the organization. The teaching interest group

within MLA was marginalized and decided to fracture from the larger group and specialize in the teaching of English at all levels, leading to the organization of NCTE. Eventually, the interest group concerned with the teaching of college composition felt marginalized within the larger group of NCTE and fractured to form the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

This particular interpretation of the history of these organizations is meant to speak directly to the well documented concerns of many in the discipline who are interested in the preparation of teachers of college composition who have found it difficult if not impossible in their universities to achieve the sort of departmental and administrative support necessary to design and implement a coherent and thorough preparation program.^{iv} The difficulties are directly related to the institutionalized (negative) identity of composition and the teaching of composition identified in the previous chapters. To create the type of change that the majority of those in the field who believe teacher preparation deserves more recognition as a major part of our graduate programs and discipline in general, it is important to understand the nature of the institutional(ized) obstacles they face and the role their own discipline played and continues to play in affirming the historical yet outdated biases toward composition and the teaching of it. Understanding this process is essential if we are going to find ways of influencing or changing the deeply engrained negative attitudes toward teaching that have such an impact on teachers and students.

Chapter II— MLA and the Modern Department of English: Creating an Underclass of Teachers of Writing

In the late 1800s, there were two major efforts among groups of scholars and teachers of English to organize and legitimize the study of English literature in higher education. In the late 1860s, the modern English department began to become a recognized disciplinary entity within higher education in general. Within roughly the same time frame, the Modern Language Association, in 1884, began its work not only to organize, represent, and legitimize the study of English in the university, but all modern languages. In this chapter, I argue that these two events when understood in their historical context begin to explain how the hierarchy developed within the field of English studies, which places the teaching of composition at the bottom and the study of literature at the top. For many in the field it seems almost natural that the study of literature would be prized over the teaching of writing; however, it is important to understand that the status of composition determined during the formative years of the English department and MLA was adopted not only by the organizations themselves, but also by the institution of higher education in general, which has had long-term consequences for the development of composition as a field of study and the teaching of college composition. This acceptance by the academy in general has made ubiquitous

the notion that composition is secondary to the study of literature in the discipline of English.

As with the founding of any new organization or institution, both the department of English and the Modern Language Association went through a process of developing identities. The primary concern for the new department of English was establishing its legitimacy as a separate field of study within higher education. For MLA, its major challenge was to distinguish itself as a relevant and important scholarly and professional organization. (For the remainder of this study, when I refer to MLA, I am specifically referring to the contingency within that organization interested primarily in English studies, although I recognize that the organization represents all modern languages.) Because at the same time the requirement for the first-year writing course was being widely established throughout the country and the new departments of English were given the responsibility for those courses, the status of composition and the teaching of it was an issue for both organizations.

The following sections provide a critique of two of the most influential approaches to composition and the teaching of it that found at least some interest from individuals in these organizations in the early years of their existence. These two different and competing theories of composition have had an impact on the direction composition as a field of study has taken throughout the last century. Most compelling for this study is the different impact each theory could have had on MLA in the formative years and the consequences for

composition and the preparation of teachers of college composition that have been realized based on the choices made at the time.

Harvard and the Codification of College Writing

In the late 1800s, Harvard was the most influential English program in the country. It was the first college to designate the study of English literature as a distinct field, and, most importantly for the teaching of writing, Harvard was the first college to codify the expectations for college writers through its establishment of a written entrance exam beginning in 1874. As described by Albert Kitzhaber, these entrance exams required that candidates for admission to the college must be able to “write a short English Composition, correct in spelling, punctuation, grammar, and expression,” on subjects that would be announced by the college from time to time (*Rhetoric* 35). For Kitzhaber, this codification of the expected competencies of incoming first-year students at Harvard and the subsequent proliferation of similar exams at colleges and universities around the country demonstrates the profound influence that Harvard had on American higher education at the time. Harvard had a similar influence on the acceptance of the study of English literature and rhetoric as a separate and recognized field of study in the academy as it was one of the first to establish an autonomous department of English. Harvard’s influence placed it at the forefront of reform in higher education, which, as James Berlin points out, at the time was

beginning to overhaul completely the higher education system into one that was “to serve the middle class, was to become an agent of upward social mobility” (*Writing* 60).

Along with Harvard’s determination of the skills that students were expected to have upon entering college came the not-so-surprising realization that incoming students did not possess the rhetorical skills determined by the exam committee necessary to be considered prepared for college. Indeed, speaking in general of the compositions written by prospective students, John McElroy in 1884 says that:

If the dreary compositions written by the great majority of candidates for admission to college were correct in spelling, intelligent in punctuation, and unexceptionable in grammar, there would be some compensation; but this is far from being the case that the instructors of English in American colleges have to spend much time and strength in teaching the A B C of their mother-tongue to young men of twenty—work disagreeable in itself, and often barren of result. (199)

McElroy is suggesting that if students only could spell and use proper punctuation and grammar, they would be suitable college material, a suggestion that presupposes that those skills are basic and should be taught (or are not being taught well) in secondary schools.^v It is interesting, however, how McElroy acknowledges so uncritically that teachers of college English

have a difficult time with limited results teaching these basic skills to their under-prepared students.

Similarly, yet even more troubling, however, is the Harvard report of 1891, which suggested that the teaching of such skills was and should remain the responsibility of the secondary schools and therefore Harvard should raise its requirements for the entrance exam. This is troubling, not simply because the writers of the report have such a simple understanding of composition. More disturbingly, the notion that they adopt that composition is an elementary subject and therefore has no place in the college curriculum reaffirms the status of composition that had been established by MLA and the early English department. Considering the influence that Harvard had within higher education at the time, as Kitzhaber suggests, the identity of composition advanced by the writers of the Harvard report further alienated composition from the intellectual mainstream of the two organizations.

Although Harvard may have had the luxury of raising entrance exam requirements to avoid having to address the problems that most students of composition have, for most colleges, it was not possible simply to make the entrance requirements more difficult. With growing enrollment, it became obvious that colleges would have to accommodate in one way or another the deficiencies identified in the written entrance exams. It is no surprise that the texts and course descriptions adopted to address those problems were fundamentally based on the skills identified in the written entrance exam.

At the same time as Harvard was establishing and refining the written entrance exam, new textbooks appeared that were based on two new and distinct conceptions of composition (Berlin, *Writing* 58). Fred Newton Scott (who will be discussed at length below) and Gertrude Buck developed one of the new conceptions of writing, while Barrett Wendell and Adams Sherman Hill, who were both from Harvard, developed the other. This first, which was implemented at the University of Michigan for several years but was never widely accepted at the time, can be considered a precursor to what we understand today as process-oriented rhetorics, while the latter has become known as current-traditional. It appears that the growing number of colleges that began to implement written entrance exams based on the model pioneered at Harvard and the timing of the publication of textbooks based on the “new” current-traditionalistic paradigm of writing instruction was fortuitous for both the proliferation of entrance exams as well as the textbook publishers. Because the exams and the textbooks both adhered to the same objective epistemological understanding of the purpose of writing—to clearly and correctly state the truth which exists external of the observer/writer—both the exams and the underlying epistemological theories upon which the textbooks were based affirmed the legitimacy of the other. Given Harvard’s influence in higher education and the disposition of the new English department and MLA to view composition as of lesser value and interest than literature, it is no wonder that current-traditional rhetorics have maintained such prominence in pedagogy throughout the last century.

What Kitzhaber does not mention but Berlin alludes to is the profound effect that Harvard's steps to codify those skills as representative of the skills college students should possess had on the teaching of college writing (as well as the teaching of writing in secondary schools)—and therefore on the way teachers of college composition were prepared to teach. The Harvard report, which was developed to analyze and improve the entrance exam requirements at Harvard, was written by three Harvard professors who had no training in or experience with the teaching of writing, and, as Berlin points out, their report focused primarily on “the most obvious features of the essays they read, the errors in spelling, grammar, usages, and even handwriting” (Berlin, *Writing* 61). The emphasis placed on superficial correctness stipulated in Harvard's early written entrance exam requirements coupled with the Harvard reports and bolstered by the influence Harvard had on higher education at the time had far reaching consequences for matters of pedagogy and curriculum that are still felt today.

One of the most important and influential consequences of the actions taken by Harvard was the institutionalization of current-traditional rhetoric as the paradigm of writing instruction that would dominate the discipline for the next century. Although it is not exactly clear if Harvard's written entrance exam requirements are directly responsible for the development and rapid acceptance of current-traditional rhetoric, it is clear, as Berlin notes, that current-traditional rhetoric gained prominence in the last two decades of the nineteenth century “in

part due to [Harvard's] influence" (*Writing* 62). The four categories identified by the Harvard entrance exams, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and expression, reinforced by the acceptance of the current-traditional product-oriented theory of composition, have become the categories that have determined higher education's notion of writing instruction throughout the majority of the last 120 years of literacy education. As Berlin argues, "[c]hanges in rhetorical theory and practice will be related to changes in the notion of literacy, as indicated by developments in college curriculum" (*Rhetoric* 5). I would suggest also, and will argue more thoroughly later in this chapter, that changes in rhetorical theory and practices not only relate to changes in the notion of literacy; they also directly impact the field's understanding of the responsibilities of the teacher and the type and amount of training that he or she needs to be successful.

The well-known description of current-traditional rhetoric Berlin offers in *Rhetoric and Reality* is worth reviewing in order to consider its implications for teacher preparation. Current-traditional rhetoric, Berlin argues,

makes the patterns of arrangement and superficial correctness the main ends of writing instruction. Invention, the focus of Aristotelian rhetoric, need not be taught since the business of the writer is to record careful observations or the reports of fellow observers (in the research paper, for example). (9)

Since truth and knowledge are thought to preside outside of the writer, the writer need only to be taught to present as clearly and correctly as possible the outside

world to be an effective writer. The writing teacher's responsibility is therefore to teach clarity through "spelling, punctuation, grammar, and expression." So long as a teacher of college writing has mastered those skills himself or herself, that teacher is expected to be able to teach writing to others. As Betty Pytlik argues:

For at least 100 years after the Civil war, the preparation of college teachers in general was largely shaped by the belief that a good man will learn to teach by teaching, and the preparation of college English teachers in particular was shaped by the belief that if one could write English, he could teach others to write it. (4)

This rather grim picture of the history of teacher preparation both as a topic of intellectual and scholarly interest as well as of professional interest does not necessarily mean that there were not significant moments in that history during which the methods, or lack thereof, used to prepare teachers of college writing were not interrogated, or at the very least understood as a topic of importance to the organizations representing English and the members of the discipline.

It is not difficult to imagine that at any given moment in the history of the preparation of teachers of college writing as a professional topic of interest, the state of teacher preparation is determined by the accepted theories of writing that determine the pedagogy for writing classes. As suggested earlier, Harvard's codification of the skills incoming students should possess and the emergence and almost universal acceptance of a current-traditional paradigm of writing that emphasized superficial matters of punctuation and grammar came to dominate

the pedagogy of the writing classroom. Given the expectations for students of writing, what were the expectations for teachers of writing? What training did teachers have to teach their students punctuation and grammar? Although the answers to these questions may seem obvious, if somewhat dubious, it may be beneficial to explore each in the context of the late 1800s and early 1900s as English as a discipline was struggling to define itself, paying specific attention to the role that the teaching of writing would play in the discipline as well as the role teacher preparation would play. But first, I would like to complicate what thus far has been presented as a relatively simple narrative version of the emergence of the codification of the freshman writing course and the emergence of current-traditional rhetoric by considering the influence of Fred Newton Scott, a Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Michigan who was very active in conversations concerning the teaching of composition and the preparation of teachers of writing.

Fred Newton Scott and Early Process Theory

In the second half of the 19th century, a number of rhetorical textbooks began to appear, developed and written by four individuals that Kitzhaber identifies as “The Big Four,” including Adams Sherman Hill, John Franklin Genung, Barrett Wendell, and Fred Newton Scott. In his critique of the work of these individuals, Kitzhaber states,

Of these four men, Scott alone could be called an original thinker. Hill and Genung offered traditional theory, arranged more systematically than the earlier British rhetorics and sometimes given a different emphasis, but still making no distinct break with the past. Wendell, though he gave the impression of originality, really did no more than simplify existing doctrine and give it a fresher and more persuasive expression. Scott, however, made a genuine effort to formulate a comprehensive system of rhetorical theory drawing on new developments in such related disciplines as experimental psychology, linguistics, and sociology. More than this, he tried earnestly to vitalize rhetorical instruction [. . .] in the colleges. (59-69)

The rhetorical theory that Scott developed was in stark contrast to the more traditional theories espoused by Genung, Hill, and Wendell, and the current-traditional theory promoted by the Harvard writing program and accepted at the time almost universally by the discipline.

Scott spent his entire academic and professional career at the University of Michigan. He developed a rhetoric program at Michigan, and in 1903 he became head of the Department of Rhetoric, which he headed until he retired in 1926 (Berlin, *Rhetoric* 47). Scott's rhetoric recognized that truth and reality were socially constructed, "a communal creation emerging from the dialectical interplay of individuals. While this social reality is bound by the material, it is

everywhere immersed in language” (Berlin, Rhetoric 47). In stark contrast to current-traditional rhetorics, which held that truth and reality were external to the individual, Scott believed that, “It is instead the result of the interaction between the experience of the external world and what the perceiver brings to this experience” (Berlin 47). Along with his ground breaking theory of rhetoric, Scott was very interested in the subject of teaching and in the preparation of teachers of writing. In a 1913 *English Journal* editorial, Scott states his feelings about the importance of recruiting and producing highly trained and enthusiastic teachers:

If a candidate, when he is interrogated in confidence, confesses, albeit shamefacedly, that he prefers to teach composition and will be content to teach it all his days, he should be accepted and encouraged. If, on the other hand, he says that, although he detests the teaching of composition, he is willing to endure it for a little time as a halfway house on the road to literature, he should not only be rejected, but should be branded on the forehead with some sign that will indicate his ineligibility to all beholders. Nothing less than this will protect the innocent Freshman from his natural foe. (Editorial 457)

Although branding on the forehead an individual who would prefer to teach literature as opposed to composition is a bit extreme in my opinion, it is quite obvious that Scott was very concerned about who was teaching college students to write and what was being taught. The suggestion that the teacher of literature

is the “natural foe” of the first-year writing student suggests a unique, at least at the time, understanding of the function of language, which is consistent with the writing theory developed by Scott. Scott seems to be suggesting that, as the enemy of the student writer, the literature teacher encourages students to fixate not on his or her own language use, but on that of “masters” of language. The underlying notion is that studying the writing of others who have mastered their own use of language will somehow improve student writing. Knowledge, then, is something that is transferred, not created. Mastery of language, then, is based on students’ ability to regurgitate clearly and correctly knowledge that has been transferred to them through literature, textbooks, and the like. However, Scott believed that writing served an epistemological function and that students needed to understand writing as a process of creating knowledge and that therefore they needed to study their own language use and how it functioned as a way of interpreting their worlds. This is quite extraordinary considering the pervasive current-traditional understanding of writing at the time.

In 1889, Scott was appointed to the faculty of the English department at the University of Michigan, achieving full professorship in 1901. He became head of the newly formed Department of Rhetoric in 1903, which took over full responsibilities for all writing courses and developed several new and innovative programs in composition and journalism. The courses he took with him from the English department to the new Rhetoric department, as reported by Donald Stewart in his essay “Rediscovering Fred Newton Scott,” included:

the beginning composition courses as well as the advanced courses in rhetoric and criticism which he and others had been teaching. These included “Essays in Description and Narration,” “Essays in Exposition and Argument,” “Principles of Style,” “Theory of Prose Narrative,” “Methods of Teaching Composition and Rhetoric,” “Advanced Composition,” “Essays in Exposition,” and the “Seminary in the History and Theory of Rhetoric.” New courses developed by the department included “Prose Rhythms,” “Newspaper Writing,” “Interpretations of Literature and Art,” and “Reviews.” (541)

This is a rather impressive list of courses by any standards; as Thomas Wilhelmus suggests, “If we think about it, this listing of courses is truly remarkable, including not only what today would be some of our most popular courses (composition, advanced composition),” and “the theoretical courses that support them (History and Theory of Rhetoric—always, it seems, destined to be a seminar)” (“What”).

After Scott became the first Chair of the newly created Rhetoric department at the University of Michigan in 1903, in 1907, he was selected as the 24th President of MLA; from 1911-1913 he served as the first president of NCTE; in 1913 he became president of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Stewart, *Rediscovering* 540).^{vi} This abbreviated yet impressive résumé suggests just how influential and important Scott was at the

turn of the century. However, somewhat ironically, Stewart points out that although there “was hardly an English teacher in America who possessed the extraordinary intellectual gifts and prestige of Fred Newton Scott of Michigan,” in the second half of the 20th century there was “almost [a] complete lack of knowledge about him among English teachers in America” (“Rediscovering” 539). Indeed, in 1978, Donald Stewart administered a rhetoric quiz to a mixed group of high school and college English teachers with advanced degrees who were in attendance at that year’s annual NCTE convention; and of the seventy four, only seven had ever heard of Scott. This is indeed unfortunate.

Although the preceding discussion of Scott merely scratches the surface of his forgotten contributions to the field of rhetoric (for there is still great body of work that can be attributed directly to him on the topic of teaching composition), it will suffice for now simply to state that his groundbreaking work has had little lasting effect beyond the time he was working in the field, and it has only recently been revived and recognized for its extraordinary vision. As Stewart points out in his discussion of the reassimilation of the Rhetoric Department by the English Department at the University of Michigan after Scott’s retirement, “a great chapter in the university’s history ended. Perhaps I should say that that chapter was nearly obliterated” (Rediscovering 542).

Instead of lamenting along with Stewart the discipline’s failure to commit to Scott’s progressive rhetorical theories, I will offer an extensive critique of three documents developed by the Pedagogical Section of the MLA under the direction

of Fred Newton Scott while he served as President of the Pedagogical Section of MLA from 1900 to 1902 before it was disbanded. These documents offered a different version of the possible future of composition in the field of English studies, a future that unfortunately has been summarily ignored and marginalized by MLA and the institution of the Department of English. Scott shows us that composition was not naturally the subordinate of literary study. In effect, his work suggests that those organizations that were in the position to subjugate composition to a lower status made the choice to do so—and quite consciously it would seem, as the following section suggests.

The MLA Pedagogical Section and the Status of Composition

In 1900, the Pedagogical Section of MLA, which first appeared in the proceedings of MLA in 1889 and offered their first “report” in 1890, began a series of three studies designed to investigate the status of rhetoric in the university. In the years between the Pedagogical Section’s establishment and the appointment of Fred Scott as its President in 1897, the section had accomplished very little in relation to its mandate to study and report on pedagogical matters relevant to the teaching of English. However, in 1897 and during the next six years, the section “suddenly developed a very unusual, if not alarming energy, the credit for which belongs entirely to Professor [Fred Newton] Scott, the President of the Section” (Mead, *Graduate* xx). The lack of accomplishment or

interest in the section prior to 1897 certainly was an early indication of the degree of importance issues related to pedagogy and teaching were to MLA.

As a result of the new energy Scott injected into the section, over 100 circulars were sent out to teachers and scholars of English from across the country. The circulars contained the following questions:

1. Is Rhetoric, in your opinion, a proper subject for graduate work?
2. If so, what is the proper aim, what is the scope, and what are the leading problems of Rhetoric as graduate study?
3. If Rhetoric, in your opinion, should not be admitted to the list of graduate studies, what do you regard as the strongest reasons for excluding it?

(Mead, Graduate xx)

Although Mead claims that the Pedagogical Section was not advocating either view of the viability of rhetoric as a subject for graduate study, their opinion on the topic is quite clear and consistent with the Section's president's view on Rhetoric, Fred Newton Scott, who, as previously identified, was the founder and head of the Department of Rhetoric at the University of Michigan, which offered an extensive graduate curriculum in Rhetoric and Composition. Although the committee's report seemed to emphasize the need for the inclusion of rhetoric in graduate studies, it does much more, as do the two subsequent reports from the Pedagogical Section in 1901 ("The Undergraduate Study of English Composition")

and 1902 (“Conflicting Ideas in the Teaching of Writing”), which will be discussed later in this chapter.

The numerous quotations from individuals in the field who participated in the study offered in the Section’s report provide a unique insight into the attitudes and practices of that time period in regard to rhetoric and the teaching of composition, as many of the respondents understood rhetoric and composition as synonymous. Their responses indicate that individual conceptions of rhetoric had little to do with individual opinions about the suitability of the topic for graduate study. Indeed, the responses suggest that those surveyed shared for the most part similar notions of rhetoric and composition earlier identified as current-traditional. For the topic at hand, teacher preparation, the following quotes are intended to provide a background of the historical attitudes toward the teaching of writing that were prominent during the formative years of English studies as a recognized discipline to emphasize how pervasive and consistent the current-traditional understanding of composition teaching was and the enormous impact that that would have on the future of the teaching of writing. The following comments, which are numbered for ease of reference, were from individuals who were against the inclusion of Rhetoric in graduate curriculum.

1. I think that Rhetoric is only useful in so far as it is practically helpful to the student in enabling him to write better.
2. If by ‘Rhetoric’ we are to mean, as popularly, composition, I think that the place of that study is in the college, not in the university. I

see no sphere for 'Rhetoric' as a graduate study except in a trespass upon literature, logic, or pedagogy—if it attempt the art of teaching how to teach composition.

3. The chief reason (for excluding Rhetoric) would be that Rhetoric, as a compendium of general principles, can be easily expounded in a single volume.
4. The object of teaching Rhetoric is, in my judgment, not theoretical but practical, as propaedeutic to composition and literature, and the undergraduate course should suffice for this.
5. Regarding Rhetoric as the art of speaking and writing correctly, I am of the opinion that it is an unsuitable subject for graduate study. When a man has obtained his A. B. degree he ought to be able to write his language with sufficient correctness to be responsible in the future for his own style. If he has not thus learned to write reasonably well he probably never will learn.

(Mead, "Graduate" xxi-xxxi)

The next set of comments have been excerpted from those who advocated the study of Rhetoric at the graduate level:

6. Rhetoric, in my opinion, is a proper subject for graduate work leading to a degree, but not in so far as it is composition, which should be an undergraduate study, or, if graduate, should not count toward degree.

7. I confess I do not see why a degree may not be earned by achieving knowledge of how present literary form has been evolved, or by acquiring the power to use the modes of masters consciously and confidently and with scientific selection.
8. I doubt the value of rhetorical study even for undergraduates, beyond a certain point. What the young need is practice in actual composition, with a minimum of theory and a maximum of correction.

(Mead, Graduate xxi-xxxi)

Although Mead provides little analysis of the excerpts from the surveys, he does provide a “personal opinion” of the Pedagogical Section that “may venture to suggest that the term Rhetoric as heretofore generally employed, may well be enlarged in meaning so as to include much more than practical composition and that the field thus opened will afford abundant opportunity for investigation by the serious student” (“Graduate” xxxii). Not surprisingly, the committee headed by Fred Newton Scott seemed to support the inclusion of rhetoric in graduate studies and seems to favor a broadly conceived notion of it as well. Indeed, as Stewart points out, the members of this committee by undertaking this study in the first place “were opening up the subject to many of the lines of inquiry we pursue today: historical studies, interdisciplinary studies [. . .] and refinements of our pedagogy” (“Status” 740). However, the attempts of this group to introduce topics that were more than likely not going to become major topics of

interest for the members of those groups, was ambitious to say the least given the short history of MLA, the English department, and the status of composition within the two institutions.

Concerning the “expert” respondents included in this study, I suggest that the attitudes on display come from a relatively current-traditional understanding of rhetoric and composition. Take for instance excerpt number 3. The reference to the “single volume” apparently refers to commonly used undergraduate handbooks of general principles of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and expression, which, as Robert Tremmel suggests, were “the only form of writing teacher education available” at the time to most teachers of composition due to the prevailing current-traditional practices of teaching writing (3). Number 4 makes reference to the propaedeutics of composition, which in context would be understood as grammar, punctuation, spelling, and expression.

As the excerpts show, even those who supported the study of rhetoric in graduate education were careful to exclude composition and the teaching of it as a concern for higher education. The author of quote number 6, while advocating graduate study of rhetoric, was careful to qualify his opinion by stating that graduate study of rhetoric should not count toward a degree, reaffirming the low status of composition in the discipline. Quote number 7 refers to the study of rhetoric not as the study of rhetoric itself, but as the study of the “modes of masters,” which graduate students would then be able to use themselves—a reification of the current-traditional notion of composition widely held at the time.

In quote number 8, the respondent is careful to exclude theories of composition as they relate to the undergraduate classroom as worthy of study suggesting that undergraduates need correction not instruction in composition theory, implying, no doubt, correction of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and expression. Of course, this became a recurring theme that would permeate discussions for the next 70 years about what new teachers of composition needed to be prepared for to teach.

The following year, 1901, the Pedagogical Section of MLA offered its second report under Scott titled “The Undergraduate Study of English Composition.” Mead writes that the second report “has endeavored to test the opinions of competent judges on the question of whether the methods of teaching composition now so widely followed are beyond the reach of criticism” (x). To do this, the committee selected a passage from an article from *The Century Magazine* which they believed represented “an attitude of extreme hostility” toward the pervasive practice of assigning frequent themes which were corrected and returned to students (x). This passage is provided below:

A wide reader is usually a correct writer; [. . .] We would not take the extreme position taken by some that all practice in theme-writing is time thrown away; but after a costly experience of the drudgery that composition work forces on teacher and pupil, we would say emphatically that there is no educational method at present that involves so enormous an outlay of time, energy, and

money, with so correspondingly small a result. (qtd. in Mead,
Undergraduate x-xi)

The passage goes on to support this claim by citing as evidence the experience of a “specialist” who had read several hundred sophomore themes written by students who had either taken a freshman composition course based on theme writing their freshman year or a Shakespeare course involving no theme writing or instruction in composition. For their study, the Pedagogical Section asked participants for comments about the claim that theme writing with correction (which participants seemed to interpret as instruction in composition) was not beneficial to student writers, details of similar experiments, and the possibility of conducting an experiment or experiments that could help to furnish proof of the value or futility of the practice. The report notes that the majority of respondents were skeptical about the experiment mentioned in *The Century* article and that there had been very few if any credible experiments on the topic available. Most important to this study, however, are the comments from the respondents concerning the claim made in the passage in the *The Century*. The following are excerpts from those respondents who agreed that theme writing had little effect on student writing:

1. I feel strongly that the daily themes which by custom of the institution I must require of them, are not only unproductive of good, but by their monotony they depress the student, and render him less capable of genuine pleasure in composition. [. . .

.] My own plan would be to give two-thirds or three-fourths of the time to reading, and to require few themes.

2. For, by reading, the student attains a vocabulary, an array of phrases and idioms, and a notion of the qualities of style.

(xviii)

In the report, only three responses were offered that agreed with the original passage. The influence of the prevailing current-traditional conception of composition is quite obvious (as is an obvious preoccupation with the respondents' beliefs that writing is a literary act and something that students can not do). Consistently, the respondents' focus on the written products as opposed to the writing of the products, whether that focus is on the correctness of student writing or on the study of literature as a means of teaching composition.

Theme writing as institutional policy is a reminder that the current-traditional approach developed at Harvard and accepted and perpetuated by The English department and MLA had become widespread by 1901. However, those who disagreed with *The Century* article's author did not necessarily display an opposing view concerning what good writing was and what about it should be taught. Consider the following responses for example:

3. In every college are to be found students who spell badly, who punctuate indifferently, whose diction is meager and inaccurate, who have little feeling for idiomatic phrasing or for sentence-structure, who will write an entire essay in one or two

paragraphs, or who will make a paragraph of each sentence [. . .]. much can be done toward the correction of faults, something even in the direction of positive excellences.

4. A pupil may read ever so widely and still go on using the split infinitive in his own writing. Again, some of the larger characteristics of good expression will often be missed by even the widest reader if his attention has not been especially directed to such matters.

(xx-xxi)

These responses and the others included in the 1901 report are as much a report of the then current state of composition in higher education as they are a direct response to the passage from *The Century* magazine. Although the individuals quoted here maintain opposing viewpoints concerning the influence of reading literature on the writing of college students, it seems relatively clear that they share a similar institutionalized view of college writing as correctness. Quote number 3 suggests that “much can be done toward the correction of faults,” and quote 4 suggests that for students to become better writers, their attention must be directed to matters of correctness (being taught correct use of infinitives as opposed to relying on reading correct infinitive use).

As important as the 1900 and 1901 reports from the Pedagogical Section of MLA were, they seem to be merely the prologue to the 1902 report, which was the final report, titled “Conflicting Ideals in the Teaching of Writing.” Considering

the unique approach to rhetoric and the teaching of writing that Scott adhered to which permeated the Pedagogical Section of MLA under his direction, these first two reports suggest a sort of stagnancy in the discipline concerning the teaching of writing. Although the authors of the report do not directly analyze the theoretical consistency among the respondents to the two circulars regardless of their stated opinions for or against graduate study in rhetoric or for or against the use of theme writing in composition courses, it seems clear that they understood it. The final offering of the Pedagogical Section makes it even clearer. In his analysis of the final report, Stewart suggests that, "In effect, [the members of the Pedagogical Section of MLA] were opening up the subject to many lines of inquiry we pursue today" (Status 740). Certainly, as president of the Pedagogical Section, Scott had his own agenda in regards to graduate study in rhetoric and the teaching of composition, that reflected his progressive theories of composition and rhetoric.^{vii} So, the work done by the Pedagogical Section, culminating with the 1902 report, was a tangible effort on the part of Scott and his sympathizers to bring about a change in the status of rhetoric within MLA similar to that which Scott accomplished at the University of Michigan with the development of an autonomous rhetoric department.

The 1902 survey of the Pedagogical Section asked individuals to respond to seemingly conflicting notions of the appropriate aspirations of the teacher of writing. The first quote from the London Academy asks "is it well to teach the literary art to English schoolboys?" and answers an unequivocal "No" (viii). The

second passage, from Genung, suggests that rhetoric deals, “in all its parts and stages, with real literature in the making, and composition, however humble its tasks, as veritable authorship” (viii). In other words, teachers of composition should strive for their students to produce literary writing. The authors of the survey asked the respondents to answer three questions:

1. Which of these lights do you think the teacher of composition should follow?
2. Should there be any difference in the ideals of the teacher of composition [at different educational levels]?
3. In your opinion is it in any sense “alien to the genius” of this nation to teach schoolboys (as a class—rank and file) to ‘think literary thoughts and write them down with literary force and grace,’ or to lead them to suppose that in their themes they are undertaking ‘veritable authorship’?”

(ix)

As one would expect, the opinions expressed by the respondents varied dramatically. For the present study, however, the actual opinions, which in fact mirror the pattern of the previous surveys in which the majority of the respondents’ differing opinions were still based on similar current-traditional theories of composition, are not as important as the intentions of the Pedagogical Section for distributing this particular survey. Mead states,

In a purely objective way the attempt has been made to learn what are the actual opinions current on the fundamental questions of aim and method [(which was the stated intention for the 1900 and 1901 surveys)]. We may regret as much as we please that other people do not think as we do; so much the worse for them. But surely the first step toward conversion is to discover how much we hold in common and how widely at certain points our opinions diverge. (ix)

It is most interesting that the committee speaks directly of conversion of those who disagree with the authors of the survey. The surveys, as suggested earlier, were not exactly objective, and, in fact, seemed to have biases in favor of rhetoric as appropriate for graduate study and in favor of the activity of composing as integral to the teaching of composition but with special emphasis placed on “unity of conception, logical development of a theme, [and the] proportion of parts” (Mead, *Undergraduate* xvii), which are concerns typically associated with process theories of composition, as they are understood today. It is quite extraordinary that the members of the Pedagogical Section take such a radical interest in composition, at a time when the majority of their colleagues working to define the field of English and MLA as an organization were working so hard to remove composition as a topic of interest to either group. Understood in this context, the fate of the Pedagogical Section comes as no surprise.

Marginalization and the Future of Composition

Although it appeared that the Pedagogical Section was establishing a sustained interest within MLA in rhetoric and composition, it did not last, at least in its institutionally sanctioned form, beyond 1902. In 1903, MLA revised its constitution and provided that “the Association may, to further investigation in any special branch of the Modern Language study, create a Section devoted to that end” (xi). With that change in the MLA’s constitution, all sections that had been previously established were disbanded; thus, the pedagogical section ceased to exist. Considering that MLA made it clear that it was primarily interested in research and scholarship and not pedagogy, it is no real surprise that, after the disbanding of the Pedagogical Section, fewer and fewer articles or papers appeared in *PMLA* or in the annual program. It is easy to overlook the significance of the changing of the constitution of MLA as it relates to the status of composition and rhetoric in the organization. Its removal as a special section reified the organization’s predilection to identify the status of composition and rhetoric as lower than the study of literature and effectively silenced and marginalized in many ways those members of the organization who believed composition and rhetoric should play an important role in the organization and in departments of English. Some of the respondents to the three questionnaires sent out by Scott’s Pedagogical Section supported the further inclusion of issues of rhetoric and composition in the organization. However, the reification of a hierarchical stature of composition within MLA and the marginalization of those

who believed composition deserved equal status and greater attention within the discipline appear to be directly responsible for the development of a new organization dedicated to the study of issues related to the teaching of English including, and, at least to a certain extent, the teaching of college composition: the National Council of Teachers of English. This group would be the first to attempt to substantively address issues related to the preparation of college teachers of English. However, as the following chapter will demonstrate, the organization found it very difficult if not impossible to separate completely from the influence of MLA, demonstrating a tendency to reaffirm many of the biases of MLA even as it attempted to dismantle them.

Chapter III—NCTE and the Establishment of a Teacher Organization

Much like MLA was founded as a means of providing scholars and researchers with a central organization through which they could represent themselves collectively in a time of transition and reform in higher education, the National Council of Teachers of English was formed to represent teachers of English at all levels. Many teachers of English felt that the English section of MLA did not represent their interests, and, as is the case with the Committee of Ten who were responsible for an increase in interest in issues relevant to primary, middle, and secondary educators, called for the creation of an organization that was better suited to address their needs. As baffling as it may seem now, the Pedagogical Section of MLA, which under the direction of Fred Newton Scott was far ahead of its time in recognizing and attempting to bring to the forefront issues that since have proven to be some of the most important for the contemporary English department, was disbanded in 1903. At the time that MLA disbanded, however, the Pedagogical Section may not have been quite as surprising given that the “advancement of the philological study of modern life and culture” (Bright xlix) was the primary concern of the association; it “was most certainly not a teacher’s agency nor was it centrally concerned with pedagogical problems” (Stewart, “Status” 737). Stewart does recognize that prior to the early 1900s,

there was at least some interest in issues concerning teachers of English composition. He points out that in the presidential addresses of 1899, 1901, and 1903, each focused on differing issues of concern to teachers of composition. However, after the association revised its constitution in 1903 effectively disbanding the Pedagogical Section while providing that it could create a section devoted to the issues raised by the Section should the interest and need arise, the number of papers addressing issues related to pedagogy and composition appearing on the MLA's annual program and in the pages of *PMLA* began to diminish, virtually down to zero by 1910.

In 1912, the National Council of Teachers of English was founded. With the emergence of NCTE, a pattern within the discipline of English was beginning to become apparent in regards to its relationship with composition. Before it was disbanded, the Pedagogical Section of MLA was primarily concerned with the teaching of composition and its status within the discipline. A look through the titles of papers appearing on MLA annual program makes it quite clear that composition, as far as MLA was concerned, was to be *taught* by teachers, while literature was to be *offered* to students through scholars, thus setting up a hierarchical relationship that the discipline still struggles with today. When issues related to pedagogy found their way into the annual program or the pages of *PMLA*, they were overwhelmingly related to composition as a specialty and the pragmatics of teaching it to first-year students. On the contrary, very little, if any, practice-oriented articles related to the teaching of literature found their way onto

the annual program or into *PMLA*. The only exception would be articles offering arguments concerning what authors and what works should be offered in the literature courses. As to how those works were taught, it seems assumed (as it is today) that those who know the works well can teach them well. The notion that knowledge of a subject qualifies one to teach it is interesting in this regard. The attitude about teaching being directly related to knowledge of a subject (literature or composition) appears on the surface to equate literature and composition. However, the difference in status becomes evident when we understand who was seen as qualified to teach literature and composition. For literature, the professor of literature was the only one qualified to teach literature, while anyone who could write English well could teach composition (and should, to lessen the burden of the professorate of teaching composition). Given this state of affairs, it became obvious that for those who considered themselves teachers first and foremost to have a national organization that supported their work and furthered their interests, they would need to organize it themselves. Because the new organization was comprised mainly of teachers of English as opposed to scholars, one of the main areas of interest taken up by NCTE soon after it was founded was the status of composition within the new organization.

NCTE, MLA, and Lingering Influences

Much like MLA did for the first several years of its existence, NCTE spent several years formulating its identity by identifying issues relevant to the organization and then attempting to understand the implications to the organization and its members of those different issues. Fred Newton Scott, who was the first president of NCTE and the only President in the organization's history to serve two terms, justified the creation of NCTE in the first edition of the organization's flagship journal *The English Journal*:

The organization of another society of teachers will seem to many, on first thought, quite indefensible. [. . .] The fact remains, nevertheless, that there are numerous unsolved problems of English teaching; witness the discontent. Nor does it seem likely that the existing organizations will ever solve them. [. . .] The Modern Language Association of America includes English in its subjects of discussion; but the point of view is that of the scholar engaged in research rather than that of the teacher, and the members come almost entirely from the higher institutions.

("Significance" 46)

Scott's justification for the existence of NCTE must have been exciting for those teachers who felt under- or misrepresented by the English Section of MLA, but it is telling how the institutionalized representations of the teaching of composition

and its status within the discipline as determined by MLA helped to define the parameters by which the organization of NCTE was able to identify and address the issues they deemed relevant and important to teachers. As I suggested in the previous chapter, the teaching of composition as a professional and intellectual activity, from the beginning of MLA and the modern English department, occupied an ancillary position within the field. Codified by the proliferation of the current-traditional understanding of college composition developed at Harvard, which conceptualized teachers of composition as second-class citizens within the discipline, the teaching of composition was defined for NCTE, at least in the early years, by and, in some cases, against MLA's conception of it.

One of the main interests of those who were working to define the new organization was conceptualizing what it meant to be a teacher of English at all different levels. For teachers of college English and composition specifically, the founding of NCTE would prove to be significant but would not provide the needed guidance Scott strove for to change the professional status of compositionists. In regards to teacher preparation, the formative years of NCTE provided an organizational structure within which individuals were able to discuss and test ideas relevant for the teaching of writing and the training of teachers of writing. In the following section, I offer a critique of the issues related to the teaching of composition and teacher training published in *English Journal* in the first few years after NCTE was founded and argue that although the newly formed organization did focus on issues relevant to teachers, it had not successfully

separated itself from the definitions of teacher, teaching, and composition established and sanctioned by MLA (with the exception of the work of the Pedagogical Section). As I will show, the founding of the Conference on College Composition and Communication is very much foreshadowed as it becomes more and more apparent that NCTE was dominated by the traditional definitions of English and the teaching of composition that it inherited from MLA.

Organizational Identity: Identifying the Issues

As may be expected by those who have even a casual knowledge of the cyclical nature of the history of rhetoric and composition as a field of study, many of the issues recognized as important to NCTE in its early years are still relevant and contested today. Issues of evaluating writing, pedagogy, professional status, graduate education, and the like were all identified early on as relevant to teachers of English and the organization. One of the most important developments for composition that came from the founding of NCTE was that it provided the first dedicated, national space in which teachers, scholars, and administrators could discuss in a concerted way the preparation of teachers of college composition. Prior to the founding of *English Journal*, which was the primary publication of NCTE, there was very little discussion of how, or if it was even necessary to, prepare teachers of composition, not necessarily because there was no need or interest in the topic, but simply because there was no

space dedicated to such conversations. The first article to appear in *EJ* on the topic of teacher preparation for college composition instructors was in 1913, the second year of *EJ*'s publication.

In 1912, Fred Scott in the President's annual address before NCTE identified what he believed were the most pressing problems confronting the newly formed organization. Scott articulated one of his main concerns in the form of a question: "How shall the efficiency of our teaching of composition be tested or evaluated?" ("Our" 2). Scott then proceeded to describe and to critique a newly designed scientific method for evaluating student texts developed by a Dr. Hillegas, a psychologist from Columbia University, which utilized a 1000 point scale and models that were used to compare student texts to sample texts as a means of establishing a score (Noyes 532). Scott explained that the scores Hillegas' method generated, at least as far as advocates of the evaluation method were concerned, could then be used to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of individual teachers as well as the ability of the student. Concerning the evaluation of individual teachers using student scores based on this method, Scott argued that "when it is proposed, as it is, to use the scale forthwith *in the teaching process*, that is, in testing the efficiency of the teacher's work, I am disposed to advise caution and deliberation" (*emphasis added*) ("Our" 4).

That Scott was especially concerned with the notion of interfering with the "teaching process" is noteworthy given the dominate view of the teaching of writing at the time. To acknowledge that teaching is a process suggests the

possibility, which some others in the early years of the organization pick up on, that there is a significant role in the classroom for the teacher of writing. That there is/are process(es) also suggests that there are potentially methods or content for teaching writing, some of which may be better than others. Although Scott's observation is noteworthy considering the dominant notion of writing instruction at the time, his observation is even more important because he was the founding president of NCTE. As president, he was in a position to have a significant influence in guiding the development of the organization's notion of writing instruction, which suggests at the very least that there was a possibility that NCTE would be able to break away from the current-traditional model of teaching composition, which provides no content beyond correctness and therefore no substantive "process" for teaching. Evaluation, as any writing teacher who is familiar with the modes of writing knows, is based on whether or not something, in this case the teacher or teaching, meets certain criteria.

When Scott recognized and emphasized that evaluation of the teaching of writing was one of the main issues facing the new organization, he was more correct than he might have known. By emphasizing evaluation, he was challenging the new organization to establish and interrogate potential criteria by which teaching could and should be evaluated. Although there are no specific direct responses to Scott's address that make this connection, it does not seem like too great a leap to assume that his leadership in the early years of NCTE helped to establish a new interest in the practical as well as intellectual and

professional culture of the organization and its approach to teachers of *and* the teaching of composition. Further, by establishing evaluation of teaching as one of the main issues confronting the organization, Scott provides a space within which the notion of teacher preparation can be discussed. By determining the means and criteria by which teaching may be evaluated, goals for the training of teachers can be developed, thus opening up the discussion of teacher preparation as a subject of intellectual and professional interest.

Concerning the use of Hillegas' method as a means of evaluating individual students, Scott states,

The student's composition, as the teacher should look at it, is the expression of the student's life. To evaluate it is to evaluate life itself in one of its most delicate manifestations. When, however, applying to it a scale such as this, we strip it of its individual character and reduce it to an abstraction, we excise at one stroke the most significant and essential features. ("Our" 4)

Like much of Scott's other work, his progressive understanding of the nature of the teaching of English is shared by only a few of his contemporaries. His concern about using acontextual student performance as the sole criteria for evaluating individual students suggests an understanding that learning, much like teaching, is a process and that at any given time, a student's ability and progress must be evaluated contextually as opposed to acontextually. He provides two examples of individual students, one who may receive a 900 on the Hillegas

scale but is degenerating instead of advancing, the other who rated 400 but is on his/her way to becoming a powerful writer. Scott emphasizes that these are aspects of each student's abilities that cannot be measured scientifically and can only be accounted for by the teacher. To illustrate this point, Scott offers the following scenario and questions:

Suppose that instead of asking, Is this composition, written by some unknown X, better than that, written by unknown Y? we ask, Which is the more sincere expression of some growing individuality? or, Which will be more legitimately effective in its appeal to a certain audience? ("Our" 5)

Words such as audience and expression of individuality were not commonly used in reference to quality and student writing at the time. The presentation of these concepts by the new president of the newly formed NCTE provided some hope for the future of the teaching of composition and for improving teacher preparation.

Beyond Scott's pronouncement of the most pressing issues for NCTE, other scholars who were beginning to champion the improvement of teacher preparation emerged in the early years, some of who referred directly to the training of teachers of composition. In 1913, Chester Noyes Greenough from Harvard offered a report of an experimental "teacher preparation" program developed there to address the feeling among members of the English department that

The equipment of the men whom it has been sending forth to teach English has been inadequate on the side where beginners are most likely to be tested, namely, in their ability to teach elementary English composition. This inadequacy has been perceptible both in the very moderate skill displayed by most graduate students in writing theses and reports, and in the dismay with which even the best of them have approached the unfamiliar task of teaching Freshman to write. (109)

I quote directly because Professor Greenough's words are quite telling concerning Harvard's English Department's approach to the teaching of composition, which, as has been discussed previously, was shared by the majority of other English departments at other institutions. Greenough suggests that of primary concern in regards to the graduate students' ability to teach was the moderate skill of the graduate students to write their own theses and reports, implying that this inability itself made the new teachers ill prepared for the task. Indeed, he goes on to state that it is commonly believed that "the chief requisite for success in teaching Freshman to write is to be able to write everything a Freshman would be required to write" (Greenough 110). The solution developed in the English department at Harvard was the development of a graduate course titled "English 67—English Composition,"^{viii} which was a course primarily "in English Composition rather than a methods of teaching" course (Greenough 110). Although unique in its mission, the program still approached the teaching of

writing from the perspective that ability to write well was equivalent to the ability to teach writing. There were several response articles to Greenough's article, most of which echoed Greenough's claim that there was a *need* for training teachers of composition. None of the responses go further than Greenough did in suggesting better ways of doing it.

For instance, M. Lyle Spencer from Lawrence College suggests, after arguing vehemently that familiarity with specific works of literature and authors does not qualify one to teach literature, that the main problem with the new college writing teacher is that "he himself cannot write readable English," yet "that man is to teach the one fundamental course in the college curriculum" (117). To Spencer's credit, he does lament the fact that graduate students in English and new teachers are taught that composition teaching "is menial work, drudgery, a pursuit to be avoided" (118). He acknowledges that the negative attitude toward composition teaching is pervasive within the discipline and suggests that, to a certain extent, the failures of college composition teaching and the lack of professional attention on the topic can be traced to that negative attitude being perpetuated by graduate faculty who were encouraging it in their graduate students, a phenomenon that is alive and well still today. As Betty Pytlik points out, Harvard's course to prepare new teachers of composition was copied to only a limited extent; most graduate programs still did not have specific courses for training teachers (7). There is little doubt that programs were hesitant to institute such courses because, given the accepted notion of freshman writing at the time,

there was very little that could be taught in such a course above and beyond those courses in composition already offered to graduate students.

Reaffirming the need for effective preparation for new teachers of composition, Scott offered an editorial in the 1913 *English Journal* in which he criticizes the lack of adequate training teachers of college writing receive:

Instructors charged with the teaching of Freshman English, especially such as have acquired the Doctor's degree, are as a rule elaborately mistrained for the subject they are fated to teach.

("Training" 456).

Speaking primarily about the differences between training in literary research methods and training in the teaching of writing, Scott makes the claim, which must have been quite disturbing at the time to many in the discipline (and may still be today), that the two require quite different approaches. Responding directly to Greenough's and Harvard's training program, Scott contends that it is merely "another course, added to those already offered, in the art and practice of writing English" (457). Scott ends his editorial with what appears to be a challenge to his colleagues and suggests that teacher training needs to move beyond the cultivation of writing skills in the teachers to the "study of what may be called the strategy of the classroom" (458). Although some individuals heeded Scott's call, most still held firmly to the notion of composition institutionalized early in the history of English studies.

It is important to continue to look at some of the early *EJ* articles on teacher preparation because there are moments when the legitimacy of the institutional understanding of composition is questioned, providing an early glimpse of what would emerge several years later. Although many of the articles appearing early on in *EJ* begin to question the efficacy of the dominant mode of instruction, they also attest to the power of the engrained current-traditional understanding of composition in relation to the discipline and the academy in general. As I suggested in the beginning of this section, the majority of the members, or at least the majority of those publishing on the topic at the time, still held firmly to MLA's notion of the teaching of composition.

Internal Change and External Indifference: An Emerging Theme for an Emerging Discipline

Although the majority of articles during the early 1900s about the teaching of composition or the training of composition teachers approach the subjects not as ones that need to be explored as much as lamented, there were some that were equally progressive and forward-looking as many of Scott's articles. Yet most of these continued to display their bias for the current-traditional understanding of composition. Samuel Chandler Earle from Tufts College argued in 1913 that "In all this composition the main emphasis should be placed on the creation, not on the correct use of the tool." He states that "[c]orrectness of

language form is an important means but it is not an end in itself. The only real end is to have something to say and to be able to say it effectively” (485). Earle continues,

Every paper written, it may be, needs correction. We need to teach our pupils in composition to get their ideas on paper before their enthusiasm has cooled, then to correct and rewrite so that there will be no errors to distract the readers attention from the subject [. . .].

This method leaves the teacher free to train his heavy guns on the subject-matter. (486)

By what we can now recognize as a bold and progressive argument, Earle apparently advocates an early form of the process approach to writing. It would seem obvious then, since the overwhelming majority of individuals in the discipline subscribed to a current-traditional understanding of composition, which dictates that teacher training need only consist of drill for teachers in correct use of the language, that at least Earle would recognize that this understanding of composition as process would have important implications for the training of teachers and would also require a complete revision of the qualifications necessary for the teaching of writing. However, the values and principles upon which organizations, in this case the modern discipline of English, are founded tend to die slowly. Earle fails to recognize the significance of his own work by offering, what by this point has become somewhat of an historical cliché, “Anyone who can use the language correctly himself can teach the art” (480). But

this does not diminish the importance of these early individual recognitions that writing and the teaching of writing consists of more than mere correctness. As teachers and scholars began to question the status quo in the teaching of composition and began to believe that teachers could and should possess more specific skills for teaching composition other than the ability to use it correctly themselves, articles began to appear more frequently in the journals that began to look more closely at what teachers should know and how to best prepare them for the job.^{ix}

In 1916, the Committee on the Preparation of College Teachers of English published its final report in *EJ*. The committee was formed in 1912 after it was suggested by Fred Scott that teacher preparation was a proper topic for the English Section of the Central Division of MLA. Offered to the English section of MLA in 1912, the first report was based on questionnaires sent to department heads, PhDs teaching English to undergraduates, and presidents of colleges. The questionnaires asked each of these groups specific questions concerning their experience with and their opinions about what type of preparation for teachers of college writing was offered at the time, and what type of preparation should be offered. The MLA English Section members agreed that a committee should be formed to investigate the matter further. After the 1912 report, MLA passed responsibility for this committee to NCTE, which is why the subsequent report in 1916 was published in *EJ* and not *PMLA*.

Of the twenty-eight department heads who responded, the majority were content with their department's current practices, which for the majority of those departments included little if any specific preparation. A few reported special courses in the theory of teaching literature and composition, and others discussed limited apprentice programs, but most seemed to subscribe to the notion that "a good man will learn how to teach by teaching" ("Report" 20). Ironically, several of the respondents who did not support the notion that a formal preparation program was necessary for new college teachers of writing said that experience in teaching outside of the college before taking up teaching in college was essential to success in the teaching of college writing. One would assume that outside teaching experience would come from teaching in secondary schools, which typically required extensive preparation for teaching at the undergraduate level. So, one interpretation of that argument would be that those department heads actually believed that preparation for teaching is essential for success in the classroom, but not to the extent that it should be a responsibility of the department to provide that preparation.

On the contrary, of the seventy-one PhDs teaching college English who responded, the majority stated that they believed that "distinct improvement in current practice of the graduate schools" in preparing college teachers of English was possible and necessary (21). A small minority of this group believed that there was no need for change in the system of graduate work and "opposed the introduction of 'assimilative' courses or of direct methods of preparation for

teaching undergraduates” (21). Of the thirty-four replies from college presidents, there seemed to be very little interest in addressing the issues raised by the questionnaire at all.

The extended report that appeared in *EJ* shows just how little actual preparation was provided to teachers of college English at the time. Of the 278 college English teachers who responded, twenty-four reported specific professional training for the college classroom. Only nineteen reported taking courses in pedagogy, supervising other teachers, or reading professional literature related to the teaching of writing. The committee concluded the report by suggesting that several of the respondents from all of the groups represented

definitely refused to subscribe to teacher-training methods, pedagogics, etc. Theses usually take the stand that common-sense and practical experience in the field are the only salvation, or that time spent in such courses might more profitably be used in specific study of the subject, English. (31)^x

The statistics offered by the report as a whole suggest that the field of English at the time thought very little of the needs of the teacher of English, but it does suggest that there were individuals who believed the issue was important enough to continue to pursue. In fact, the chair of the committee, “acting entirely on his own individual responsibility,” asks:

Has the time not come for general agreement upon certain qualifications necessary to obtain the recommendation of a

department of English in a college or university to teach English in the Freshman and Sophomore years of college? (31)

The committee suggests that up until that point in 1916, any changes that appeared in any college or university concerning the preparation of college teachers of English were “entirely local and unrelated to one another” (26). The chair goes on to suggest certain qualifications that all teachers of college English should have, such as:

- Adequate scholarship and sound methods of study
- Acquaintance with specific aims of the courses usually given in the Freshman and Sophomore years
- Familiarity with the work of secondary schools, their conditions and limitations, and the necessary relations of such work to the courses in the junior college
- Genuine interest in teaching as distinguished from study, and also demonstrated ability to manage and instruct college classes
- Knowledge of current methods of English teaching, the ability to judge such methods in the light of educational principles, and the ability to evaluate the results of experiments in method.(32-33)

This list of qualifications and the impetus for developing them seem strangely familiar and relevant even today. For instance, Kathleen Blake Yancey argues in a chapter in the recently published edited collection *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices* that currently the discipline

offers “very little general guidance about how to develop a program [for preparing teachers of college English] or sense even of what features these programs might share” (63). She goes on to suggest, much like the 1916 committee, that “instead of working from a common understanding, we tend, I suspect, to think principally in terms of local needs” (63). The negative attitude toward the position within the academy and the discipline of teachers of college English displayed statistically by the 1916 report seems even more pervasive when one considers that one of the main emphasis of that report is still an important and often ignored issue almost ninety years later. Nonetheless, interest in the topic was piqued and the topic of teacher preparation continued to find its way into the *English Journal*.

In fact, during the year of 1916 several articles appeared in *EJ* that made teacher preparation their primary topic. J. M. Thomas, from the University of Minnesota, in “Training For Teaching Composition in Colleges,” argues for a more institutionalized approach to training new teachers and suggests that graduate programs need to recognize that a large portion of their graduates’ time as academics would be spent teaching composition—a common argument today. Thomas recognized, what most in the field tended to overlook, that “by some inverse sort of logic [. . .] it is assumed that if a man cannot teach beginners he must therefore be especially qualified to instruct older students” (448). He argued that including specific training for teaching composition in the graduate curriculum was crucial to the success of graduates as well as the credibility of the field, if only because recommendations made by professors for their graduates

were assumed to include a recommendation for the ability and preparedness of graduates to teach college students.

Thomas' argument seems sound enough; however, his plan for achieving this was to "insist that graduate students in English should be able to write well themselves" (453). In the case of Thomas, as well as the majority of others publishing on the topic at the time, the illogical arguments made by others that they are so critical of are often overshadowed by the questionable logic in many of their own enthymematic statements. For instance, Thomas argues at the very beginning of his article that the introductory course in composition is

considered, naturally enough, to be more elementary in character than courses open to upperclassmen, and by its nature makes demands upon an instructor's time not made by the latter courses.

For these reasons it is generally taught almost exclusively by young men who are just entering the teaching profession. (447)

In this statement, Thomas makes what he considers to be a logical argument for the status quo of staffing composition courses with new, untrained teachers. The term "elementary" in this argument appears to be synonymous with simple or easy, which would justify the staffing of those courses with under-prepared and unseasoned instructors. However, another way of understanding the elementary nature of the course is that what it teaches is elemental, as the foundations upon which other skills are built, and therefore extremely important. Understood in these terms, it would make sense that the most elementary classes should be

taught by the most qualified and best trained instructors. Although I will not suggest that at that time or necessarily now those instructors should be exclusively professors, it would seem that instructors of elemental courses should have the best preparation possible. Demonstrating just how imbricated the institutional bias against composition was, Thomas, like NCTE in general, had difficulty getting beyond it.

Similarly, A. B. Noble from Iowa State College published an article in *EJ* in 1916 on the topic of teacher preparation and offered several suggestions about what a teacher preparation program for college teachers of writing might consist of. Although his intentions are admirable, his simplistic understanding of the difficulties of teaching composition serve only to reify the pervasive notion, suggested by Thomas, that composition is elementary and therefore easy. Noble, however, offers something even more interesting. He suggests that the gulf between the study of English and the teaching of English cannot be bridged by courses in pedagogy, because the teachers of pedagogy have no special training in English and no experience in the teaching of English” (665). The argument seems to be, and this is made clear in the rest of Noble’s article, that pedagogy and the teaching of English cannot inform one another; the only thing that can improve the ability of teachers of English is experience, whether that experience is gained through personal experience or learned by other teachers sharing their experiences. Noble’s preparation program consisted of courses in the teaching of English that allowed experienced teachers to share their failures and successes

with the new teachers so they could avoid making “the same mistakes other beginners have made” (667). In a simplistic sense the notion that sharing experiences is beneficial to new teachers seems reasonable, but understood in the context that pedagogical soundness and the practice of teaching composition are mutually exclusive is troubling because it suggests that intellectual and scholarly inquiry cannot inform practice—that only practice can inform practice. Noble, and the majority of others who address the issue of teacher preparation of college English teachers in the pages of *EJ*, perpetuate the very myth that caused them to lament the problems of teaching composition. By claiming as unnecessary the examination of, in any intellectual or scholarly way, what composition is and how best to teach it, they inadvertently discredit their own efforts to intellectualize and improve, through inquiry and scholarship, the teaching of composition. To suggest that the best way to prepare new teachers to teach is to have other teachers who have never been taught how to teach themselves tell the new teachers how to avoid making “mistakes” (when the inability of those teaching the course to achieve satisfactory results is well documented) would seem to perpetuate bad teaching more than improve the abilities of new teachers. But, such was the prevailing attitude that was institutionalized by the influence of MLA among many of the members of NCTE.

The number of publications in *EJ* concerning the preparation of teachers of college writing began to diminish after the first half decade of its existence, much like issues related to composition disappeared from the pages of *PMLA* a

decade before, but for vastly different reasons. Although there were individuals^{xi} who recognized the historically significant inability of individuals in the field to question the status quo of the institution and who attempted to engage the members of the organization in a reorganization of the approach to composition and the teaching of it, the reification of MLA's conception of composition and its position within the field of composition persisted.

In 1918, J. V. Denney from Ohio State University made the distinction between those graduate courses that were of scholarly intention and those with distinctly "professional" intention. By scholarly intention, Denney was referring to those courses that would provide instruction and experience to guide graduate students' work with literature and literary topics once they had joined the professorate. By professional, he was referring to courses which would provide practical instruction in the teaching of composition to freshman and sophomores. He suggested that although "there are no courses in the graduate school that will not count to the advantage of the college instructor in his work with Freshman and Sophomores, very few of these courses have a distinctively professional intention" (323-24). In this case, Denney was intentionally separating the intellectual and scholarly work of professors and the professional work of the discipline, which we are to understand as that which is unrelated to the scholarly and intellectual work of the professor, namely, the teaching of composition. This separation of the scholarly and intellectual from the teaching of composition automatically identifies efforts to research and theorize composition as

intellectually fruitless. Although Denney was advocating for an increase in the number of “professional” opportunities for new teachers, his designation of composition teaching as “professional” work, or work unrelated to what scholars in English do, demonstrates a new zeitgeist for NCTE. This new zeitgeist permeated the organization for the next few decades and was at least somewhat responsible for the disappearance of the newly emerging intellectual and scholarly interest in teacher preparation of college composition teachers that had begun in *EJ* in the early years of its existence.

By not addressing MLA’s relegation of composition to a lower status than literature and NCTE’s uncritical acceptance of that status, NCTE as an organization helped to perpetuate the hierarchy established with English studies by MLA. The consequence of that perpetuation was the identification of composition and the teaching of it as merely a professional exercise, one which most members of the discipline have had or would have to deal with at some time in their career until they were able to get out of it through promotion, distinction, etc. The myth of teaching as professional exercise, which CCCCs struggled with in its early years and which the discipline still struggles with today, has defined composition studies for the last fifty plus years.

The separation of literature and composition began with the codification of composition as basic, a belief perpetuated by NCTE, which succeeded in the ultimate marginalization of composition *and* teachers of composition within the academy and beyond. The acceptance of the marginalization of composition by

the organizations that claimed to represent English studies as a whole has produced a systemic discounting of composition and the teaching of it. Even within a group dedicated to the interests of teachers of English, that systemic discounting of the work done by composition teachers has made it almost impossible to develop a sustained intellectual inquiry into how best to prepare teachers of composition, primarily because it was understood as more or less unimportant to the organization as a whole. However, there were individuals and groups within the larger organization that understood these problems and attempted to address them.

Composition, Status, and NCTE

As the interest in the topic of teacher preparation diminished within NCTE, evidenced in part by the diminishing number of publications on the topic, (after the flurry of publications during the first few years of the organization), it became clear to certain individuals that one of the main obstacles that teachers of composition had to deal with was the low status accorded to it by the discipline itself. In 1918, Frank Scott from the University of Illinois suggested that “[Composition] was at the beginning foreordained to an estate of poverty” (512). He accused the discipline and the university of failing to provide adequate resources for the first-year course from its initial implementation into the curriculum. He argued that, in its infancy, the composition course was developed

to achieve two different goals. First, it should relieve “the Freshman of his inbred and accustomed illiteracy and [bestow] on him some degree of facility [. . .] in the use of the mother-tongue” (512). Second, “it should be an essentially cultural influence, the sole, sufficient ornament, the touch of grace and finish in a college curriculum otherwise practical or technical” (512). He critiqued the then current practices of teaching composition, arguing that they abandoned any attempt at achieving the second goal and have uncritically allowed the first goal to be interpreted as teaching how to write correctly. He suggested that the “[m]akers of rhetorical texts have made the subject seem so simple and easy that the students,” and “in many instances the teachers too, had come to believe that the subject is too slight to merit the serious attention of a college Freshman [or teachers]” (515). He suggested that it was clearly understood among members of the discipline and especially junior members that in most of the colleges and universities at the time that the teaching of composition “leads nowhere, in the matter of promotion, and, so far as our curricula show, has no scholarly relationships” (518). Scott argued that the status of composition in the university and discipline was so low that very little intellectual or scholarly resources had been devoted to it. His stance that teachers themselves had come to regard the teaching of composition in the same hierarchical terms as MLA twenty years earlier is an indication of just how pervasive and institutionalized that hierarchy had become.

In regards to the intellectual and scholarly study of the first-year composition course, Frank Scott contended that,

Little encouragement to [study it] has been extended to [graduate students or scholars]. Where is he who wishes to do these things look for encouragement or courses? To whom should he go? [. . .] Is there in the curricula of our graduate schools any indication that a student is welcome, not to say encouraged, to work for a higher degree in this field? (518)

Even though the new organization NCTE was formed in no small part to address the fact that MLA was ignoring these same issues for teachers, what Frank Scott makes clear is that what recurred within NCTE, much like in MLA, was a hierarchy established and accepted by the majority of the organization, a hierarchy that manifested itself in the ways described by Scott, as well as others. Scott concludes by suggesting that what was needed to raise the status of composition within the field was

that the elementary course should be freed from all interests and influences that now in large measure take away from it the character of a primary discipline in the principles as well as the practice of rhetoric; [. . .] that the relation of the elementary course to the rest of the curriculum should be made closer and stronger by providing a scholarly succession in the field of rhetoric; and that recognition be granted to the need of making possible a

corresponding academic succession open to the teacher of rhetoric and composition. (520)

Incredibly, Scott was advocating for a completely new understanding of composition within the field of English studies. He was suggesting that composition deserved and teachers of composition deserved a dedicated curriculum designed to improve the teaching and study of composition. His argument not only advocated for but also assumed the intellectual and professional equality of composition with literature within English Studies—a rather progressive view at the time.

Scott likely was unaware of just how difficult it would be for the discipline to achieve those things he believed necessary to help to improve and legitimate the teaching of and teachers of college composition. Indeed, compositionists struggle with these issues still. What is obvious for the time, however, is that the status of teaching composition in the discipline of English and its relationship with NCTE was tarnished in that composition in the organization, much like in MLA, had been determined to be of secondary interest to its members. Witness the virtual disappearance of titles in *EJ* after 1918 concerning teacher preparation as a professional and intellectual topic of interest to the discipline. This disappearance is, in a sense, a very real reification or manifestation of the hierarchy established by MLA and perpetuated by NCTE. If the teaching of college composition was considered of little intellectual or professional importance, why would members of the discipline engage in any meaningful

inquiry into it? More specifically, if NCTE determined that the teaching of college composition was of little relevance to it, why would it publish articles about it?

One way to answer this question is to continue to examine the formation of subsequent professional organizations with regard to the recurring patterns of relegation to a low status of matters related to teaching composition and the preparation of teachers of composition.

Chapter IV—Status and Stasis: CCCCs and the Struggle to Redefine Composition

As NCTE's flagship journal, *English Journal*, began to focus primarily on the needs of secondary school English teachers, NCTE formed a new journal, *College English*, which was first published as a separate journal in 1939. Although *CE* was developed to publish research and scholarship focusing on issues important to college English, its editorial board, at least for the first few decades, had a rather specific definition of "college English." *CE* tended to cater to the needs of teachers and researchers of college literature.^{xii} With *EJ* focusing primarily on secondary English education and *CE* focusing on the issues relevant to literature, matters related to composition and the research and teaching of it had no space dedicated to it in any professional or intellectual forum. The response to this sense of "homelessness" once again felt by composition specialists by now has a familiar ring: a new organization was needed. Thus, much like the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, the Conference on College Composition and Communication was founded to serve the needs of a specialized community.

CCCC was developed to provide a space in which individual teachers and researchers of composition could come together to discuss issues in composition

in a collective and national forum. As John Gerber, the first chair of CCCC wrote in the first edition of the *CCC Bulletin*, “We have had no systematic way of exchanging views and information quickly. Certainly we have had no means of developing a coordinated research program” (12). Gerber’s initial address to the members of the new organization reveals much about the position of composition within the larger discipline. Although prior to the founding of CCCC and its journal there were two journals published by NCTE that were dedicated to issues important to teachers of English, after the first few years of the oldest, *EJ*, fewer and fewer articles were published on the teaching of composition. *CE* never consistently provided much space for it. As this chapter will show, CCCC was founded because individuals interested in the teaching of college composition and communication (primarily composition) were also interested in beginning a national dialogue among themselves that would, they hoped, bring about needed improvement in the methods of teaching. More importantly CCCC provide its members with a professional organization devoted to improving the legitimacy and status of composition teaching within the discipline and the academy.

During its formative years, CCCC went through a process of establishing its own identity, one that was to be distinct from the other organizations. A “conference within the National Council of Teachers of English,” CCCCs was also “autonomous, electing its own officers, setting its own dues, creating its own program” (Gerber 12). Much like MLA and NCTE, then, CCCC went through an early period of identifying who and what it was. For MLA, college composition

and the preparation of new teachers of college composition was summarily ignored as not at all important to the organization or the discipline for that matter.^{xiii} For NCTE, there was an early understanding that teacher preparation for college English was an important topic for the new organization. Indeed, as Donna Burns Phillips, Ruth Greenburg, and Sharon Gibson acknowledge in their 1993 article “College Composition and Communication: Chronicling a Discipline’s Genesis,”

In these early years, the composition classrooms and what teachers—and, to a lesser degree, students—did therein were the primary concerns: graduate programs in rhetoric and composition were non-existent and composition teachers were usually new hires, adjunct faculty, or graduate students in literature programs. (454-55).

Because so many of the teachers teaching college composition were new to it^{xiv}, training those teachers appeared early on in the history of CCCC as important, so at least in the earliest years of the organization, there was a large number of publications on the preparation of college teachers of composition. In an attempt to establish the organization’s relationship to preparation, there were also numerous workshops and reports offered to establish for the organization the sentiments of its members as well as the relevant issues related to the topic. However, much like NCTE, CCCC failed to achieve an extended or fruitful discourse on the subject during the first twenty-five years of its existence aside

from a relatively brief yet intense consideration of the topic in the first few years. NCTE failed to do this primarily because so many of the organization's members shared the MLA's understanding of the subject as elementary and basic and therefore not worth the professional or intellectual effort. For CCCC, the reasons are similar although the circumstances were somewhat different.

Organizational Subject(s) of Identity

In 1951, members of the CCCC's Workshop No. 16 provided the organization with its first official position statements on and first substantial recommendations for the preparation of teachers of college composition and communication teachers. According to the workshop members, although there were representatives from the field of communications, collectively the majority of their experience was with composition and therefore their report was slanted toward composition, which has been consistent throughout the history of the organization. The initial report from workshop No. 16 compiled a list of six opinions/assumptions about preparing teachers of writing:

- 1 . We agreed that instructors in composition and in communication do not now receive adequate training.
- 2 . Though some favored a specific graduate curriculum for future teachers of composition or communications,

predominant opinion favored, as a practical minimum, a single course supplementing the present curriculum.

- 3 . As the profession now stands, instructors must and should leave graduate school trained to conduct literary and linguistic research. We deplored the fact that good teaching, apart from research, is not rewarded in terms of rank and salary on par with good or even inferior research, apart from teaching. [. . .] general agreement was that it is not now prudent, if it ever will be, for the graduate student to prepare himself exclusively to teach in the fields of composition and communication.
- 4 . We were opposed to the suggestion that a distinctive degree be created for training in college teaching though we admitted the acceptability of such a degree [. . .] for secondary school teaching. (Teaching 31-32)
- 5 . The chairman distributed a questionnaire listing thirty subjects which might be considered suitable in a teacher training program. [. . .] Of these courses Apprentice Teaching under supervision, American Literature, Modern English Grammar, History of the English Language, and practice in English Composition were considered essential.

- 6 . As evidence that repeated discussions of our subject have borne fruit, we heard brief accounts of training courses existent or proposed at Chicago, Duke, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, and Stanford.

At first glance, these statements appear to advance the belief that the members of the workshop firmly believed that the teaching of composition and communication was important enough to warrant extensive teacher training programs. A closer look, however, reveals certain underlying assumptions that make it easier to understand why, after the first few years of CCCC's existence, teacher preparation was, for the most part, forgotten in the organization for several decades.

The first of the six statements indicates that the then current state of preparation for college teachers of composition and communication was inadequate, leaving new teachers to their own devices in determining how and what should be taught. To remedy this, some of the workshop members suggested a specific curriculum be developed for teachers; however, the majority disagreed, favoring the suggestion that one course in methods be added to the curriculum (statement 2), suggesting that teaching was not informed by theory. The argument advanced by statement 3 that teaching should be recognized on par with good research is undermined by the assertion that it will never be "prudent" for an individual to focus his or her entire career on the teaching of composition. In fact, such an assertion exposes or reifies yet again some of the

historical biases and assumptions about composition. To urge that the teaching of composition should be treated as professionally equal to the professional alternative (supposedly research in literature and the like), but then to proclaim that it is not professionally equal by endorsing the position that teaching composition itself is not a professionally viable pursuit, is to reaffirm the marginalized position of composition. For the new organization, it is certainly a problematic position for the workshop to take because that position lacks a new vision or revision of that which has come before (MLA, NCTE, and the ubiquitous marginalization of the teacher of composition). Such contradictory opinions on what the status of research in the teaching of composition ought to be reflects an early manifestation of what would become the zeitgeist for CCCCs: a struggle, both internal and external, for status in the discipline.

The workshop participants' opposition to the suggestion that a distinctive degree be created for the training of college instructors (statement 4) reaffirms yet again the organizational acceptance of composition's low status within the discipline. Statement 5 demonstrates the accepted notion of composition teaching as a practical activity as opposed to an intellectual activity considering that of the five courses considered by the participants as essential the two directly related to composition (Apprentice Teaching under supervision and Practice in English Composition) were experiential as opposed to intellectual. Although the report claims as evidence of the workshop's effectiveness the emergence of teacher preparation programs at several universities, the

connection seems tenuous at best. However, it is safe to assume that if the workshop was one of the main influences of the emerging preparation programs they probably had some major deficiencies.

The following year, 1952, the workshop participants met again to resume their efforts to provide “a clear, precise, and logically progressive formulation of fundamental questions on teacher training [that] could be a worthy first step in reaching valid conclusions” about training new teachers of composition (40). The workshop’s discussion for that year was based on four questions articulated in the subsequent report:

1. Is there an actual existing need for training the teacher of composition/communication?
2. Granted that a need exists, what should be the central purpose of such a training program?
3. In terms of its determined purpose, where and when can this training be best provided?
4. In terms of this purpose and allocation, what should be the scope and content of such training?

(40-1)

The answer to the first question, which was, of course, rhetorical, was a resounding “yes”; the workshop participants believed that teachers of composition were under-prepared for the job and that there certainly was a need for teacher training programs. There was not as much consensus on the second

question, however. The report states that the workshop participants “found themselves slipping into the quicksand of innumerable temptation to express prejudices, skepticism, cynicism, and narrow personal experiences” (40). The main issue that the workshop seemed to be grappling with, again, had to do with the inherited and assumed inherent low status of composition within the discipline and academy.

The workshop debated “the effect of such training on the teacher’s ability to secure his first post or to shorten the period of his on-the-job apprentice training” (40). The concern of many involved in the workshop about how or if teacher training in composition would help or hinder a potential job candidate’s chances and whether or not it would shorten the amount of time of his or her “on-the-job apprentice training,” reveals quite a bit about the lingering hierarchical notions of composition within the organization. The notion of “on-the-job apprentice training” seems quite innocent at first, but what was meant at the time was “the period the new faculty member teaches composition before being promoted to the teaching of literature” (41). This is problematic because many of new teachers in need of specialized training were not necessarily new faculty members, but the M.A. and Ph.D. students who taught (then as well as now) the majority of the first-year writing courses at the colleges and universities. What is most troubling is the fact that members of the workshop on teacher preparation seemed most concerned with how best to prepare teachers of composition so they would no longer be teachers of composition. This may be merely a reaction

to the professional realities at the time; however, as members of an organization that has made composition and the teaching of it its primary concern, the cynicism inherent in the notion of training that is offered not to improve the teaching of composition but to escape it seems inexcusable. Not surprisingly, there were no conclusions offered by the workshop on this topic.

In attempting to answer the third and fourth questions raised by Workshop No. 16, the disagreement among the workshop participants concerning the central purpose of a training program seemed to carry over. Although they agreed that training (for whatever ends) was a good idea, they were unable to agree on

whether this training should be given in Graduate School before teaching is undertaken, or in conjunction with apprentice training, or as a supplementary program connected with the first full-time appointment^{xv} (40-1).

For this particular workshop, it did not seem to be even an option that the study of and training for teaching of composition could or should become a part of the graduate curriculum at all. Teaching composition, it is quite clear, was understood by many in the group as a service that all or at least most individuals in the field would at some time have to fulfill if they were to pursue research in literature.

Similar attitudes permeate the early years of CCCC as the many workshop reports and articles in CCC continued to demonstrate. The inability

among the workshop participants to agree on when teacher training should occur is also indicative of something else, however. The disagreement does not reveal merely an inability to decide on what would be the most opportune time to provide training. Nor does it necessarily relate only to questions of the suitability of teacher training to the then accepted graduate curriculum. I suggest that the disagreement also indicates the organization's own lack of a formulated approach to dealing with the institutionalized secondary status of composition within the discipline of English. If CCCC as an organization had formulated a stance on the professional status of the teaching of composition within the larger discipline early on in its existence, there may not have been such a disagreement among members of the organization (i.e., the Workshop members) because there would have been at least some prescription for how to approach issues of status. The low status of composition in the discipline and academy continues to be one of the main problems for the organization and its members. Yet despite the lack of agreement on some issues relevant to teacher training and the new organization, the workshops continued.

The 1953 report from Workshop No. 4, which was entitled "Preparation of the Composition or Communication Teacher," attempted to pick up where the previous year's workshop left off. Unfortunately, the workshop did not attempt to critique the stalemate reached by the 1952 committee on the topic of when to offer training for teachers of composition, which may have proven fruitful; however, it did base its work on the fourth question posed by Workshop No. 16.^{xvi}

This workshop agreed that the training should be offered through the English department, during graduate study, in the form of a single course with teaching composition as its main subject. They agreed that the course should emphasize the study of current “practical philosophy of communication” so the teacher of composition would “be aware of which one he is using so that he can avoid the sort of chaotic sequence so frequently found in college composition courses” (81). The committee’s connection between teaching and communication theory was a real contribution in that for the first time the committee recognized the connection between the teaching of composition and theory.

Another contribution from the committee was the description of a training course with attributes very similar to training programs found at many universities today. They identify the use of peer and faculty mentors, the study of rhetorical theory, and discussion of methods and practices as potentially beneficial for new and seasoned teachers of composition. The workshop even went as far as to suggest that the PhD dissertation requirements should be modified to allow research in the teaching of composition as an acceptable topic. The workshop argued that institutions interested in developing teacher preparation programs should analyze the programs designed by Philip Wikelund at Indiana University and Albert Kitzhaber at the University of Kansas, which will be discussed below.

The next three years of the workshop, which were in fact the final three years, followed the agenda set by the previous workshops and shared the same objective: to develop an organizational approach to the training of new teachers

of college composition. These final workshops, however, experienced many of the same problems as the previous workshops.

For example, the report of the 1954 workshop states that

unlike some of the other workshops whose function is to reexamine what is being widely done and hence to bring new light to bear upon common practices, the function of this workshop is to start getting something done, even though that something may be inadequate. (99-100)

Similarly, the 1955 workshop

undertook to deal with the problem of how to get something done, lest the workshop become merely an occasion for directors or freshman programs to relieve their frustration over the difficulty of getting anything done” (131).

And, the 1956 workshop, realizing that the last two workshops had been, to say the least, unable to “get things done,” decided to get things done only to realize that their plan to get things done “proved to be too ambitious, considering the time available to the workshop,” and were only able to address some of the possible changes to the M.A. curriculum.^{xvii}

What these workshops meant by getting things done was informing, organizing, and energizing the larger organization, CCCC, so that it could begin to (re)form programs for the preparation of teachers of college English. The earlier workshops had suggested some feasible and not so feasible, some

relevant and not so relevant, opinions about what might constitute a meaningful and effective teacher-training program through which the discipline might begin to formulate a coherent and institutional approach to the teaching of composition. However, there was one fatal flaw in the agendas of the different workshops, which was imbricated in the early formulation of CCCC: the organizational lack of understanding of the professional implications of the lower status of composition within the discipline and the tacit acceptance of that status by members of *the very organization* that should be most concerned about addressing those issue of status.

In the 1956 report, the workshop members pondered the continuation of the workshop:

One argument advanced in favor of another workshop on teacher training was that, since the workshop meets each year in a different region and with somewhat different personnel, it affords an opportunity of informing a growing number of college faculty about questions of graduate preparation of c/c teachers. On the other hand, it was pointed out that interest in the subject as a workshop topic appears to have declined seriously. (139)

The possible reasons for the decline in interest are several. However, what the decline could *not* be attributed to was a lessened need for the training of new teachers. One of the most compelling reasons for the decline in interest can be

gleaned from the reports themselves, and it has to do with the status of composition both within the membership of CCCC and beyond.

For instance, as I quoted before, the 1951 workshop stated that “it is not now prudent, if it ever will be, for the graduate student to prepare himself exclusively to teach in the fields of composition or communication” (31). This one statement implies a secondary status for composition in two different ways, one external to the organization and one internal. First, those who would mentor the new initiates were warning that composition was not a prudent professional choice because the discipline itself rejects the notion that composition is a worthy professional pursuit. Second, the statement suggests that the members of CCCC who make up the workshop have accepted that conception of composition not only at that moment, but for the foreseeable future (“if it ever will be”). This acceptance of lower professional status made it difficult to begin a discourse on the subject. Indeed, if the workshop participants were convinced the low status of composition was somehow natural then why should they bother to work to improve that status? The acceptance of the lower status of composition was consistent throughout the workshops,^{xviii} and appears to be one of the main reasons that the workshops failed to “get things done.” However, even though the organization as a whole failed to establish an institutionalized approach to the preparation of teachers of composition, several local programs were in fact developed within departments of English, programs that emerged and were discussed in the pages of *CCC*.

Beyond the Organization: Institutional Conceptions of Composition

In 1952, Harold Allen from the University of Minnesota reported on a six month research expedition he took, funded by the Ford Foundation, to examine if and how teachers of college composition were being trained for the job. He reported that the majority of the fifty-seven institutions he visited adhered to the notion that “the kind of research required in seminars and in producing acceptable dissertations equip the doctoral candidate as a classroom teacher of ordinary freshman in composition” (4). In his report, Allen quotes a department chair whom he visited: “I didn’t know that anyone but a professor of education thought you had to train a scholar in order to make him a teacher” (4). Another chair stated, “We just hire Ph.D.’s, so we really don’t have to hold staff meetings or have any kind of training program for new instructors” (4-5), suggesting that the PhD degree somehow magically prepares individuals to teach.

Allen briefly comments on some of the training programs that he was able to locate, such as those at New York University, the University of Illinois, and the University of Iowa. Most of the programs Allen was able to find focused primarily on the teaching of the single class at the individual institution as opposed to providing preparation or professionalization for the teaching of composition as a part of a professional career. It seems clear that even at the institutions “enlightened” enough to provide training for composition teachers that the

teaching of composition was understood as a purely technical matter. Therefore, the training of teachers was a purely technical activity, bereft of any professional, intellectual, or theoretical implications.

Allen's description of his many meetings with deans and department chairs suggests that, at the time, there was no wide recognition of a need for the training of teachers of composition. As administrators, these were persons who were in positions that, if they deemed it necessary, could empower their English departments to institute meaningful teacher-training programs. As I have explained earlier in this study, CCCC, from its inception recognized the lack of training for teachers of composition as a very important topic for the organization and the academy. Allen makes it quite clear that the rest of the academy did not necessarily agree with CCCC. In his final paragraphs, Allen concludes that

If there is to be any real impetus, any concerted drive [to develop training programs] it seems to me that it must be found within the ranks of our own organization. We are the ones to determine the standards of good composition teaching. We are the ones to define the competently prepared teacher of composition and communication. We are the ones to press in our own institutions for insistence upon professional integrity in the preparation of our future teachers. (13)

It is difficult to disagree with Allen on any these points; however, his report suggests that accomplishing his goal is much more difficult that he may

understand. Because composition and the teaching of it occupies such a lowly position within the department, discipline, and university, it is doubtful that anyone outside of CCCC would be interested or willing to listen to what CCCC's members might be calling for. The pervasive understanding of composition at the time is reflected by those few institutions that prepared their new teachers for the day-to-day work of the classroom, a "nuts and bolts" approach to teacher training that leaves such programs bereft of any intellectual or theoretical content. That composition was merely a local, practical concern was the pervasive departmental and institutional opinion. Indeed, I suggest that that is one of the main reasons that training programs have never developed on an institutional level within the discipline. They have been developed primarily to address local, practical, transient needs of individual programs and teachers.

In an effort to begin to evaluate the status of composition in the discipline and academy, the report on the 1953 Workshop, "Status in the Profession of the Composition Teacher," offered several reasons why "a rather small number of persons are teachers of composition exclusively" (90). The workshop's observations about the status of composition teachers in the discipline bears citing because it reveals some significant parallels with CCCC's emerging and uncritical acceptance of the hierarchical notion of professional status of composition and literature:

At many schools people find themselves discouraged from working in composition (1) because they see promotions and salary

increases reserved as rewards for work in literature, especially research; (2) because *they lack previous training in composition in graduate schools*, where the attitude often is that *composition teaching is an apprenticeship* to be lived through before escape into literature; (3) because they regard composition teaching as a mere proofreading job that they themselves lack respect for; (4) because their teaching loads are likely to be heavier in the period of their careers in which they teach composition; and (5) because respect in a scholarly community goes mainly to those engaged in literary research. [(emphasis added)] (90)

As this passage indicates, the concerns raised by the 1952 workshop on teacher training are quite similar to those of the discipline as a whole. The 1952 workshop's concern about whether or not training in the teaching of composition would shorten the apprenticeship period for new faculty, identified by the 1951 workshop as the period during which junior faculty teach composition before advancing to literature, reveals that even for a significant number of members of the new organization, CCCC, there was no interest in improving the status of composition within the discipline, as if its position was somehow natural. If teacher training was to be embraced by some of the members of organization it must serve the purpose of making sure that new faculty taught as little composition as possible before advancing to literature. Interestingly enough, the 1951 workshop suggested that the status of teachers of composition was

satisfactory at some schools, “especially in those technical institutions where most of the English that is taught is composition.” It appears that, “In such schools the composition instructor has no problems of status different from those of faculty members in other departments,” suggesting that the low status of composition within individual departments is contingent upon composition’s position in the curriculum in relation to literature. In other words, if, in an individual institution, composition is not forced to compete for the faculty’s and administration’s professional attention with literature because literature courses are not offered, composition as an academic subject and the teachers of it are recognized as equals to other faculty members. In other words, it is not necessarily “natural” that composition is understood as lower in status than literature. In truth, it appears that composition’s institutionalized lower status is a matter of professional circumstance. Another statement made by the workshop on status demonstrates the participant’s optimism concerning composition’s status within the discipline, while also exposing CCCC’s membership’s inability to understand, early on in the history of CCCC, why the organization existed in the first place:

In spite of the low regard in which composition is often held, the workshop felt that there are some ways in which writing is gaining prestige [. . .] Status is [. . .] raised by organizations and their meetings and publications; the meetings of CCCC and the

publication of its *Bulletin* are probably the best examples of this improvement in status. (90)

That is certainly one interpretation; however, another interpretation, and possibly a more plausible one, of the formation of CCCC and its bulletin would be that the group of teachers and scholars it was formed to represent were marginalized in the former groups that were supposed to represent them. They were forced to develop their own publication because other venues were closed to them (*PMLA*, *EJ*, *CE*). In this sense, the formation of CCCC can be seen as a group of like-minded individuals accepting their relegation to lower status within those larger groups. In that sense, the original members were empowered through their marginalized status to form CCCC, but that did very little if anything to improve the status of composition in the organization they broke away from. In fact, it may have made addressing the issue of status within the large discipline more difficult because the interest group that became CCCC no longer maintained a significant presence in NCTE—and virtually no presence in MLA.

Status and the Relegation of Preparation to the Local

During the first seven years of the publication of *CCC*, six articles were published describing individual teacher preparation programs.^{xix} The programs discussed in these articles, although they are all very different in their methods, intentions, and philosophies, share one common attribute: they were developed

because the individual institutions recognized there were problems arising from the lack of preparation of the composition instructors that needed to be addressed. Although CCCC at the time was attempting to “get something done” and develop and sanction a teacher-training program, the organization provided very little guidance for the development of such a training program. An analysis of these early programs provides insight into the problematic status of teachers of composition in the academy and suggests how little has changed over the history of the English department.

In 1951, Robert Hunting from Duke University offered his vision of a training program for teachers of composition. Although he does not offer many specifics about what the program would be designed to do, he does offer a significant amount of insight into the status of composition within the field. The training program that he discusses consists of a one-year, non-credit, voluntary training course offered through the English department. The graduate students who had selected to be a part of the program would serve one semester as an assistant for one section of students. In the second semester they would be assigned their own course in which they would teach the same material they had watched being taught the previous semester. Throughout that year, the teacher-training course would meet. According to Hunting, the “seminar hour could be most profitably devoted to the consideration of specimen freshman themes mimeographed for the occasion” (4). Obviously, Hunting adheres to a rather simplistic understanding of the teaching of composition, emphasizing correcting

themes as the most important activity; however, what is most compelling about Hunting's discussion of teacher training concerns the perceived difficulties of implementing such a program, as well as his questions concerning the need for it.

Hunting suggests that early on in graduate education students are "made aware of the fact that one usually cannot afford to take such an interest in freshman composition that he becomes a recognized authority on the subject"

(3). From the graduate student's point of view,

it is absurd to waste time in training to teach a course which, even though it is extraordinarily important in the whole academic program, a wholesome regard for his own professional advancement compels him to think of as a mere stepping-stone. (3)

Hunting's concern for the graduate students' careers is commendable, but he fails to critique the possible reasons why graduate students have that perception about composition. Again, the low status of composition appears to be understood as natural and is therefore not critiqued. Ironically, at the same time he is offering a plan for a teacher-training program for teachers of composition, he is making a case against students taking it; it may just hurt their career.

Indeed, there is little question that the bias against composition that graduate students have had is not a natural phenomenon, but merely a reification of the discipline's conception of composition. Hunting goes on to explain that "it is my conviction, and the basic premise of this report, that the prospective teacher will

profit very little from a training course” (4). However, if graduate students are made to participate in such a program, “The amount of work demanded by [it] should not seriously interfere with the normal pursuit of graduate studies [. . .] because it really involves extra-curricular work” (5-6). Although Hunting goes on to explain that the status of any teacher-training program will be dependent on the status of freshman composition itself, he fails to recognize the fact that the approach he takes in his own articulation of a teacher-preparation program perpetuates that lowered status of composition that he suggests precludes it from serious professional consideration. This acceptance and perpetuation of the low status of composition manifests itself in different ways in the different local programs discussed in CCC during the early years of CCCC.

Interestingly, as the organizational interest in the topic began to decline and fewer people were attending the workshops on teacher training at CCCC annual meeting, the number of publications about local training programs continued to rise. Perhaps it was the case that members of the organization realized that the organization itself had very little influence beyond its members to improve the institutional conception of composition enough to gain wide and organized acceptance of teacher training as important to the discipline and the academy in general, which could help explain the subsequent decrease in the organizational workshops on the topic.

In response to considerable criticism from outside of the academy concerning the quality of teaching in higher education, a training program was

developed at Indiana University which recognized that the “need for training is especially great in departments of English since they must furnish instruction in the almost universal requirement—Freshman English” (Wikelund “Indiana” 14). In his description of the evolution of the program he developed at Indiana, Philip Wikelund states that the program was originally conceived to “afford a broad professional training for the graduate student, who almost certainly will teach one or more sections of Freshman English in his first post” (“Indiana” 14). The original description of the proseminar, as they called it at Indiana, delineated the following objectives:

1. to acquaint the graduate-student teacher of composition with his professional status and responsibilities;
2. to inform him regarding the history, philosophy, and methods of his field of teaching and its relationship to the work of the whole university;
3. to familiarize him with the student’s high school instructional background in composition;
4. to inform him of the main sources of information in his professional field;
5. to train him to meet routine and special problems in the teaching of college composition.

(15)

By today's standards, this would be a rather comprehensive program, assuming all of these goals could be met within the parameters set for such a proseminar. Although Wikelund's course was designed primarily for new teachers of composition, it was open to all interested graduate students. As this program and the others discussed in this study predate the development of graduate programs in rhetoric and composition, it is likely that such proseminars or training courses in the teaching of composition were the only introduction that most graduate students had to rhetoric or composition as a professional and intellectual topic. Indeed, this outline of a proseminar is similar to today's ubiquitous "Issues" courses in composition and would appear to provide needed positive professional exposure for graduate students to the field of composition studies. However, Wikelund reports that the course, after only three years, had been redefined as a "practical, intensive, in-service training program restricted to those graduate-student members of its composition staff who lack the requisite experience" (15). Although Wikelund does not suggest reasons why the proseminar's character was so drastically changed, it is not difficult to posit at least one plausible explanation.

Wikelund describes the materials used for teaching the proseminar course:

At the heart of the work in composition stands the student theme, and the focus of the proseminar is fixed steadily on the problems connected with the assignment, marking, and grading, correction,

and revision, and classroom analysis of themes [. . .] No texts are used in the proseminar. Instead mimeographed bibliographies on such subjects as grammar and usage, punctuation, spelling, sentence structure, logic in composition, academic freedom, reading materials, and linguistics are given out. (17-18)

The assertion that the student him or herself stands at the heart of work in composition implies that composition has no professional material beyond what the student produces, which is probably why the objectives of the Indiana course were revised in such a way that any implication that composition itself had professional status was removed. Consider Wikelund's own beliefs about teacher training and how substantive or intellectually challenging the proseminar course should be:

Let me hasten to say, I do not think that this training need be formally conducted: I have known a group of young instructors who, over coffee or beer, gave themselves intensive training through their keen and persistent concern about their own teaching and their mutual problems. (19)

Wikelund is not exactly advocating for a formalized or institutionalized teacher-training program for Indiana University—or for any other, for that matter. It is no wonder that the proseminar, which, as described had such potential, became wholly practical, as a means to aid in the correction of themes. What is most disturbing, yet telling, concerning the pervasive attitude within the discipline that

composition is wholly practical, is that Wikelund and the other individuals who were publishing on the topic at the time believed themselves to be advocates for the teaching of composition when they were in fact perpetuating the very notions of composition established as a means of relegating it to the lower status it has historically assumed.

During the next few years, several more program descriptions appeared in the pages of *CCC*, including programs at the University of Tennessee, the University of Kansas, and the University of Illinois. Each of these programs in their initial descriptions seemed promising, but inevitably were undermined in their professional and professionalizing potential either by the very people who were in charge of developing them or other circumstances at the given institutions. In response to the appearance of a significant number of preparation programs for teachers of composition, Ellsworth Barnard from Chicago writes that the teaching of composition “can have no standard technique and no body of knowledge [. . .] that can be specified as essential” (25). He praises teaching as an art that individuals are either born with the ability to perform or not. However, even though the program descriptions appearing in *CCC* in the mid-1950s make it quite obvious that there was a pervasive conception of composition held by individuals both within and without composition as a sub-field of English, some of these program coordinators recognized and began to address the problem of status.

Albert Kitzhaber recognized the potential for the preparation of new teachers of college composition to not only improve the teaching of composition itself, but also for providing a better “understanding of the problems of composition work [for graduate students in literature], and a keener appreciation of its importance, than I am afraid many literary scholars now do” (195). Kitzhaber also recognized that one of the main reasons that composition continued to maintain such low status in the discipline was due to the fact that its low status originated within the discipline and was perpetuated by the indoctrination of graduate students into the prevailing belief system. This is what is so troubling about programs like Wikelund’s at Illinois at the time. Far from improving the status of teachers of writing, it worked to perpetuate the long engrained myth of composition as beneath literary pursuits. Kitzhaber appears to have been one of the first scholars to have recognized the potential of elevating the status of composition through effective and proper professional training for the teaching of it.

Perhaps the most energetic and optimistic defense of the existence of a program to prepare teachers of composition in the early years of CCCC came from Joseph Schwartz of Marquette University in 1955. He argued that the need “for a formal course in the teaching of college composition has always existed. It is only recently that this need has been admitted” (200). Schwartz was convinced that there was a need for a more complex notion of the teaching of composition and that the

fundamental principles of rhetoric apply no matter how composition or grammar is taught [. . .] without an understanding of the basic principles of rhetoric, the most that an instructor can do is mark errors in spelling and punctuation. *Invention, disposition, and style* are still the fundamental tools of the writer. (200)

Schwartz, whether he was aware or not, was making an argument for the professional status of composition. His contention that teachers of composition have their own body of knowledge that would, could, and should have a positive influence on their teaching of their subject was a relatively new argument. Fortunately, it was one that was heard and endorsed by some of the members of CCCC.

During the first five years of CCCC's existence, the preparation of new teachers of college composition was identified as an important topic to the organization, one which needed to be addressed in a formal and institutional way. By the end of those five years, it became obvious that the membership and therefore the organization as a whole had lost faith in the organization's ability to address the topic in any broad way, hence the decline in interest and attendance at the annual workshop and the emergence of the local institution models offered in CCC beginning in 1954. The analysis that I have offered thus far of that process identifies the low status of composition and the organization's inability to recognize and address in a concerted and institutional way the practical and professional manifestations of that low status. As the first decade of CCCC's

existence came to a close, little progress in raising the status of the composition teacher had been made and articles concerning the preparation of teachers of composition disappeared from the pages of CCC. However, there were efforts at least to address the issue of status at the end of the decade.

In 1957, Edward Sparling, the president of Roosevelt University, was invited by CCCC to speak at its annual convention about the status of the composition teacher within the academy. His comments, although thoughtful and insightful at times, reinforce many of the long-held, institutionalized notions of composition which have contributed to and help to maintain the lower status of composition in the first place. Although Sparling's remarks are not extraordinary by any means, the fact that he was invited by the organization, CCCC, to speak on the topic as a keynote speaker at its annual convention suggest that his remarks deserve some attention. In his opening statement, he laments that "It is a little difficult to give constructive suggestions on improving the status of the composition teacher when [I believe] that there really should not be composition teachers as such" (67). He goes on to justify his belief by stating that because composition is "the most important overall skill to be sought in educational training," that "every faculty member, regardless of department, should require written work and be as much concerned with expression in marking student papers as with thought, because clear expression is evidence of clear thinking" (67). Although to many this may seem like an ideal situation, it certainly does not portray an accurate nor productive picture of the work composition teachers do or

the qualifications good teachers of it must have. Indeed, Sparling seems to be adhering to the then common misperception of the teaching of composition as elementary and therefore easy. He also seems not to recognize the incredible amount of time it takes to teach composition. The suggestion that any faculty member from any discipline has the requisite skills to teach composition is certainly based on the notion that any one who can write correctly can teach composition, a notion that members of CCCC, for the most part, would strongly contest, otherwise they would have had to consider disbanding their organization. President Sparling, however, did recognize one consistent and inimitable truth when he states that “many teachers, even if they had time to do so, would refuse to correct faults of expression, regarding this as irrelevant to the teaching of subject matter such as history, science, or government” (67). Certainly, faculty from other departments, and indeed even, perhaps, the majority of the English department, would not want to take the time to teach students what Sparling himself identified as the most important goal of higher education: the ability to write and speak clearly.

Interestingly, many of the problems with the teaching of composition identified by Sparling are reiterated still today from administrators as well as faculty both inside and outside the department of English. Sparling argues that freshman students would be better writers upon entering college if he “had been trained from the early grades in composition,” which of course he *and she* were (68). He suggests smaller classes. He argues that all senior members of the

English department should teach composition. The suggestion that all faculty should teach composition is a relatively common suggestion for improving the teaching of composition. The possibility that all faculty would teach composition at all institutions, which is not likely to happen in the near future, might help to improve the status of composition somewhat simply because faculty would be teaching many of the courses as opposed to instructors and teaching assistants who, it is widely known, occupy the lowest position in the department and discipline in terms of status; Sparling's suggestion, however, is based on a different premise: that English Faculty would be better teachers of composition. Again, the historical and institutional conception of the teaching of composition is seen again. His suggestion is that English faculty would be the best teachers of composition because they, of all faculty, are the most literate. He never claims that they are better trained for the job; on the contrary, he states that the English professors at the time were "highly trained in their specialized fields," they "were heirs to the very lacks in writing education of which we now speak" (68). In that sense, it would seem reasonable that the faculty, most if not all of whom were specialists in literature and criticism, were no more prepared for teaching composition than the instructors and assistants whom Sparling is so critical of. Indeed, this must have been a frustrating paper to listen to for members of CCCC. But it is one of the more compelling examples of the institutionalized secondary status of composition and composition teachers that members of the

discipline of Composition Studies have yet to find an adequate and effective way to counteract.

Chapter V—Forming Organizational Identities: Marginalization, Fractionalization, and Specialization

The previous chapters have provided separate critical histories of the three professional organizations that have most influenced the development of English as a discipline and the establishment of rhetoric and composition as a field of study within that discipline. In this final chapter, I analyze those three histories as a continuing process of formation and reformation. Of course, the process I have attempted to analyze and elucidate could be continued. Within composition as a field of study, other groups have expressed frustration with CCCC and have developed their own organizations and their own journals, such as the Council of Writing Program Administrators and its journal *Writing Program Administration*, and the Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition and its journals *JAC* and *Composition Forum*. It should suffice for now to state that the processes of organization formation within composition studies and the discipline of English continues. I believe that the formation of new organizations is, for the most part, good for composition because it provides intellectual, scholarly, and professional space for a much broader range of interests and voices, most of which help to legitimize further the work of composition as a whole.

However, I do find problematic for the future of composition studies certain aspects of the processes by which the organizations I have analyzed were formed. As I will attempt to show in this chapter, these organizations tend to go through a process of identifying what will be relevant and irrelevant to the organization early on in their existence. That process of identification tends to marginalize some groups within the organization by identifying them as irrelevant to the organization or by relegating those groups and the issues relevant to them to a lower professional status within the organization. For those groups who are deemed irrelevant to the organization or who are relegated to a low status within the organization, the issues important to them are either abandoned altogether from an organizational standpoint, or those issues become the basis for the fractionalization of that group from the original organization and the founding of a new organization that specializes in those issues.

When the modern English department first started to take shape in higher education in the late 1800s, the Modern Language Association was also founded. This concurrent formation of two distinct yet complementary institutions, although fortuitous for each, has been historically problematic for composition as a legitimate field of inquiry. As the Department of English struggled for legitimacy in the academy, MLA became a national institution that facilitated English's ascendancy in the academy while helping to identify the parameters by which departments of English have been defined ever since. MLA determined early on that it was going to be primarily concerned with the "advancement of the

philological study of modern life and culture” through the study of literature and literary matters (Bright xlix). Although a few articles were published in *PMLA* about teaching in its early years, they were almost exclusively about the teaching of literature as opposed to composition.

From the founding of MLA, composition and the teaching of it have always been relegated to a lower status, which has also been the “ruling tendency in the English department since its inception” (Berlin, “Rhetoric” 3). A more accurate depiction may be that it was summarily dismissed as relevant to the discipline of English by the organization which has been and continues to be the primary public and professional representative of it since it was founded. From the beginnings of the English department and MLA, composition was understood as a part of both, but mainly because the responsibility for teaching composition was relegated to the new department. As I argued earlier, the majority of those in the new department and organization found the work in composition to be tedious and elementary and therefore irrelevant. This dismissal of composition as irrelevant is especially apparent based on the 1903 disbanding of the Pedagogical Section of MLA, which had been doing quite a bit of work on issues directly related to the teaching of writing. It is interesting to note that this disbanding occurred even though the work of that committee seemed rather well received by members of the organization based on the substantial participation in the surveys and questionnaires sent out by the section. It is possible that the positive reception and invigoration of the Pedagogical section from 1900 to 1902

was such that it became a threat to the established identity of the organization as devoted to research and scholarship.

The disbanding of the Pedagogical Section, of course, did not eliminate composition as an area of interest for teaching or scholarship for those members of the organization who believed it to be relevant and, in fact, integral to the discipline of English. It did, however, eliminate the one discursive space available within the organization in which issues related to teaching and composition could be discussed as an organizational matter. Thus, those whose primary interests were teaching and composition were marginalized within MLA in the early years. As the recognized representative organization for English studies as a whole, the MLA's identification of teaching and teachers as non-entities within the organization forced that group within the organization to fracture from it to establish a professional and intellectual space beyond the reach of the MLA within which it could address issues it deemed relevant and important. (Of course, the organization never fully escaped the biases established by MLA.) That group of teachers of English formed the National Council of Teachers of English, which intended to become the organization that would represent all teachers of English. Within the professional space provided by NCTE, issues related to teaching could be discussed as intellectually and professionally relevant to the discipline as a whole, as well as to the organization itself among its members who, it can be assumed, shared at least the basic assumption that the teaching of English at all levels was important in one way or another.

As chapter three suggests, there were certainly differing opinions among the members of NCTE concerning the relevance of teaching to the profession, not to mention the position of composition within the profession. As I argued, NCTE's conception of composition and its status within that organization was influenced primarily by MLA's relegation of composition to a low status. Nevertheless, the space that NCTE provided for issues related to teaching was positive for composition. For the first time there was a national forum in which issues related to teaching composition could be discussed, and, among those issues, the preparation of teachers of college composition was only one of many important issues that received attention during the early years of NCTE's existence. However, during the years when NCTE's *English Journal* published articles related to teacher preparation, the organizational understanding of the issues identified as relevant to teacher preparation tended to reify the MLA's conception of composition which served merely to reaffirm the lower professional status of composition within the discipline and within the academy as a whole. Karen Fitts and William Lalicker make this point in a recent article in *College English*. In their discussion about the influence that MLA has on the public's and Academy's understanding of composition as a field of study, Fitts and Lalicker compare that influence to a metaphor offered by Ernesto Laclau and Lilian Zac that suggests that "Whatever decision the lord takes as a result of his status, it will express not only his identity but also that of the serf" (18).^{xx} Obviously, in this scenario, MLA is the "lord" and teachers and composition are the "serfs," an apt

metaphor considering the low status that composition has had within the discipline throughout its history.

As NCTE grew as an organization, the uncritical acceptance by NCTE and the majority of its members of the lower professional status of composition in the discipline led, yet again, to the marginalization of that group that believed that composition was and should be a primary professional and intellectual concern for the discipline. In the early 1930s, NCTE began publishing two different versions of *English Journal*, one of which was identified as the “*College Edition of the English Journal*” and included articles addressing issues related to the teaching of college English, both literature and composition. This development can be understood in two different ways. First, it could mean that the organization deemed the teaching of college English as so integral to its existence that it deserved a special publication for issues related to it; or it could mean the exact opposite—that the teaching of college English was so ancillary to the organization that it did not belong in the primary publication of the organization. Based on the founding of the journal *College English* in 1939 and the disappearance from the pages of *EJ* of articles on issues relevant to the teaching of college English, the first explanation may seem to be the most plausible. However, in the early years of *CE*, there were no articles that took as their primary topic the teaching of composition. There were articles on the teaching of English. However, in the pages of *CE* in those early years, English was synonymous with Literature. So, as I suggested above, after the early years of

NCTE when the teaching of college composition and the training of college composition teachers was identified as important to the new organization, it disappeared as a topic of interest from the professional publications of NCTE. The combination of the emergence of *CE* as NCTE's primary college-level publication and *CE*'s lack of interest in topics related to the teaching of composition marginalized, yet again, those who still believed in the professional importance of composition within the organization that, at least at one time, proclaimed to represent them officially. Again, that smaller group fractured and formed the even more specialized organization, the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

As I argued in chapter four, CCCC has struggled with its identity from its formation within the discipline of English. Because the marginalization of composition by the organizations from which it originally fractured was so complete, both within the discipline and the academy in general, CCCC struggled for many years after it was formed to justify its existence not only to the Academy and the other organizations concerned with the discipline of English, but also to itself. When compositionists were finally able to come to terms with their marginalization within the academy, they began to professionalize composition studies and to reorganize the organization in such a way that eventually led to the broad yet still somewhat tentative acceptance of composition studies as a legitimate field of scholarly and professional interest. However, there remains one slight problem.

Although composition has been able to establish some professional status within the discipline, it has yet to find a way to address in any meaningful way those institutionalized notions of composition within the larger organizations that still dominate the academy's and the public's understanding of what English as a discipline is. Unfortunately, the most significant and pervasive consequence is that the low status of composition is continually reaffirmed by the Modern Language Association, as discussed by Fitts and Lalicker. That process of marginalization, fractionalization and specialization, although it has had the consequence of providing at least some professional legitimacy to the marginalized groups, has left intact the hierarchies established early in the history of the English department and sanctioned by the MLA that continue to relegate composition studies to a lower professional status. The fact that there are over sixty colleges and universities with rhetoric and composition PhD programs speaks to the proliferation of interest in the field. Also, articles on composition and the teaching of it now appear in journals such as *CE*, which for the majority of the journal's existence would never have published such scholarship. However, composition studies has yet to reach such a status where members of the discipline of English studies can open up the pages of the *Publication of the Modern Language Association*, which is still considered The publication of the discipline of English, and find articles relevant to Composition studies and the teaching of composition, unless those articles in one way or another reify or reaffirm the low status of composition.^{xxi} In other words, the

historically-resistant-to-change Modern Language Association continues to reaffirm and to resist accepting composition as an equal partner with literature, and this reaffirms within the academy in general those long-held notions of composition's lower status, thus hindering the professional and intellectual ascension of Composition studies as a legitimate area of graduate study.

A Lingering Influence: Contemporary Understandings of Composition

Composition's status has slowly improved within the discipline over the last few decades. The professionalization of the members of the field, the ever increasing intellectual and scholarly work in the field, the proliferation of Ph.D. programs in rhetoric and composition, and the increasing number of tenure-track positions for rhetoric and composition specialists—all indicate that the field has gained a certain amount of legitimacy. However, there are still indications that some of the long-held, institutionalized notions of composition which have contributed to its low status remain.

The author of an article published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* on the use of instructors from fields other than English to teach composition states that English professors “would much rather teach literature courses than spend time correcting grammar and punctuation” (Wilson). In another portion of the same article, the author refers to an interview with an associate professor of English at Illinois who is also the director of the rhetoric division and the Illinois'

freshman composition program: “There are good writers and good writing distributed throughout the university,’ he says. ‘There is no reason to privilege English as the site of good writing’” (Wilson). Although it is impossible to be sure, I would imagine that this quote was taken out of context by the author, or was extensively abridged, which the broken quote in the middle of the sentence suggests. The notion that is advanced, in any case, is that talented writers exist outside of the English department and that those writers, because they can write well, would be good teachers of writing. In any event, it is clear that the writer for the *Chronicle* is convinced that the ability to write well equates to the ability to teach writing, a lingering misapprehension about the teaching of composition since the founding of MLA.

In another *Chronicle* article entitled “The New ‘Theory Wars’ Break Out in an Unlikely Discipline,” the author (who has written a few articles on composition, which would make one hope that he at least has some understanding of its history), provides another glimpse into the academy’s, as well as the public’s, familiarity with and understanding of composition studies and the teaching of composition:^{xxii}

People outside the field are often surprised to learn of its internal conflicts—or even that there is something called “composition studies” in the first place. What possible intellectual stakes could there be to teaching freshmen to write a coherent paragraph? (It sounds like having a theoretical debate about how to drive: a

distraction at best; at worst, an accident waiting to happen.)

(McLemee)

Obviously, McLemee is attempting to make a point through sarcasm about the lack of public knowledge of the existence of Composition studies. However, the fact that he utilizes sarcasm to identify widely accepted negative notions of an established yet publicly misunderstood field of academic expertise reaffirms just how institutionalized the low status of composition is. Three particular aspects of McLemee's comments stand out. First, the suggestion that people outside of composition studies would be surprised to learn of its existence reaffirms that composition still has yet to be fully accepted by the academy as a separate and legitimate field of study (which should not be surprising since we have only been producing PhDs for some twenty-five years now). Second, the question concerning what the intellectual stakes could be to teaching freshman to write a coherent paragraph is another reification of the institutionalized notion not only of what teachers of composition teach (coherency and paragraphing being a part of expression, which is one of the four component parts of composing identified and codified by Harvard in the late 1800s) but also of the professional status within the discipline and the academy of composition as a field of study. I would imagine that most compositionists would find this characterization of the profession, especially in the year 2003 when the article was published, as rather offensive and condescending. Third, the author's comparison of a theoretical debate in composition studies to a theoretical debate about how to drive reaffirms

the historical notion of composition as a wholly practical activity and the teaching of it as elementary and therefore simple, which is a fallacy that has been pervasive throughout composition's history.

As I have said, the low status of composition is still quite alive within the discipline and in the academy in general. What is to be done about it is well beyond the scope of this study. However, this study does make some implications about where things need to be done. The history concerning relations of power among smaller groups in larger organizations within the discipline of English studies is based on those organizations' treatment of composition and the preparation of teachers of college composition. Fitts and Lalicker suggest that those most powerful within a group will not only define themselves both internally and externally, but will also define those less powerful who, by circumstance or else, are understood as affiliated with the larger group. In this case, the organization with the most power to define composition and English studies continues to be the Modern Language Association.

Unfortunately, MLA is the organization that has the most at stake in accepting or not accepting composition studies as an equal with literature in the organization; it has also been the most resistant. As Fitts and Lalicker argue, "Making lit-comp relations in the English departments more egalitarian [. . .] would cut deeply into the substrate of bourgeois ideology," (432). This attack on the dominant ideology would ideally be so compelling that the discipline and the academy would be forced to completely reevaluate and rearticulate the discipline of English entirely.

However, and I think most in the field of Composition would agree, the possibility of that happening any time soon is quite remote.

Conclusion

This study has been a critical history of the treatment of the topic of preparing teachers of college composition and its relationship to the organizations that have defined English as a discipline and composition as a field of study during the first 100 years of the discipline's existence. My intention was not necessarily to provide a complete history of *how* teachers of college composition have or have not been prepared for their work, although that history has a significant place in this study. Instead, I have attempted to provide insight into the development of composition as a legitimate field of study through the organizational treatment of one issue which is and has been recognized in one way or another as significant to the organizations I focused on. Through this specialized history, we may come to understand more thoroughly the significance of the decisions our representative organizations make to our discipline and our field of study. As I have shown, composition has, throughout the history of English as a discipline, been relegated to low status based on the organizational approaches formulated by the individual organizations and perpetuated by their members. If we understand and accept this and we wish to continue to work to improve the status of composition in the discipline and the academy in general,

we must begin with an organized effort to force to the margins those institutionalized notions of composition and the teaching of it that continue to be pervasive in all of the organizations that represent or are publicly or professionally assumed to represent the interests of those who are understood to be members of the discipline of English.

If we cannot begin to address and change the institutionalized low status of composition in the organizations that continue to have the power to define composition as such for the academy in general, composition studies as a discipline will continue to struggle with its marginalized identity. To continue to address the topic amongst ourselves within the safe confines of our marginalized groups while lamenting the myths that have marginalized us in the first place, our low status will continue to be perpetuated within the academy and discipline by those organizations from which we fractured. Instead of continuing the process of fractionalization and specialization, it seems necessary that we find ways to address the marginalization that leads to the fractionalization and specialization at the source if we ever hope to find our way out of the margins. Perhaps those organizations that I have identified as well as others that have fractured from the larger organizations in reaction to their marginalization within those organizations that continue to define English Studies for the Academy (primarily MLA) would be well served to begin to work together to (re)establish meaningful and significant roles in those larger organizations. By doing so, those who have felt and continue to feel marginalized by the organizations that have historically and continually

misrepresented them may begin the long process of institutionalizing a more positive and representative notion of their professional identity within the Academy and the department of English while improving the state and status of themselves and the work they do within the Academy.

Notes

ⁱ The following list consists of several historical articles in chronological order that address the same topic demonstrating how the status of composition has been an issue throughout the history of English, but has never been adequately addressed: Baker, Franklin T. "The Teacher of English."; Davis, William Hawley. "The Teaching of English Composition: Its Present Status."; "Status in the Profession of the Composition Teacher: The Report of Workshop Number 8."; Sparling, Edward J. "Improving the Status of the Composition Teacher."; Lauer, Janice and Andrea Lunsford. "The Place of Rhetoric and Composition in Doctoral Studies."; Connors, Robert. "Rhetoric in the Modern University: The Creation of an Underclass."; Fitts, Karen, and William B. Lalicker. "Invisible Hands: A Manifesto to Resolve Institutional and Curricular Hierarchy in English Studies." As the titles suggest and the actual articles show, the status of composition has been a topic of interest throughout the history of English Studies; however, the fact that the issues have remained the same over time suggest that very little has been done to address that low status.

ⁱⁱ Although the titles of the following articles seem to suggest that the preparation of teachers of composition was a serious topic of interest for NCTE, the actual arguments made in the articles suggest that members of NCTE were perpetuating the low status of composition as sanctioned by MLA: J. H. Cox

“What is the Best Preparation for the College Teacher of English?” F. T. Baker
“The Teacher of English,” R. M Alden “Preparation For College English
Teaching,” J. M. Thomas “Training for Teaching Composition in Colleges,” A. B.
Noble “The Preparation of College Teachers of English,” and others.

ⁱⁱⁱ Although the scholarly journal *College English* was first published by NCTE in 1939, it did not publish many articles related to composition and it published none on the preparation of teachers of college composition. It did, however, publish articles on the teaching of English, which, at the time, was synonymous with the teaching of Literature.

^{iv} Current discussions of these issues appear in the following essays: S. Wilhoit “Recent Trends in TA Instruction” and “Identifying Common Concerns,” I. Weiser “When Teaching Assistants teach Teaching Assistants to Teach,” R. Tremmel “Striking a Balance—Seeking a Discipline,” J. Harris “Meet the New Boss, Same as the Old Boss: Class Consciousness in Composition” and many others.

^v for further discussions of the responsibilities of secondary education see Garnett, Spofford, and Hunt.

^{vi}See for example Scott's works: "Training and Mistraining." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 456-58.; "English Composition as a Mode of Behavior." *English Journal* 11 (1922): 463-73.; "Our Problems." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 1-10.; "What the West Wants in Preparatory Education." *School Review* 17 (1909): 10-20.; "The Significance of the Organization of the National Council." Editorial. *English Journal* 1 (1912): 46-8.

^{vii} Clarence Thorpe, a former graduate student in rhetoric of Scott's characterized graduate study under Scott as:

Broadly liberal [in] point of view in linguistics, with a consistent emphasis upon the growth of language as a social phenomenon and as an instrument for current needs, but also by critical attitudes which had their bases in psychological investigation and in an examination of literature and in its relation to life (qtd.in Stewart, *Rediscovering* 541).

Concerning the teaching of writing, Berlin suggests that Scott's "conception of an organic composition process is superior to that found in current-traditional rhetoric," because it makes "composing a process that involves a holistic response to experience," as opposed to the means by which experience is transmitted (*Writing* 84).

^{viii} The course description is as follows: “Practice in Writing, in the Criticism of Manuscript, and in Instruction by Conferences and Lectures. Discussion of the Principles of Composition and of the Organization and Management of Courses in English Composition” (109).

^{ix} until the founding of *College English*, *EJ* was the primary outlet for issues related to the teaching of composition

^x In this instance, English is synonymous with literature; so, the argument being made is that literature is the proper subject for study; as opposed to the teaching of composition.

^{xi} For instance, William Haley Davis in 1917 asked about the teaching of college composition in an *EJ* article “Is it possible that we have not sized up our job? Do we recognize that it is not comparatively easy? Have we analyzed it fitly, organized it intelligently, and provided ourselves with the necessary means of performing it?” He goes on to suggest that “to size up our job as a comparatively easy thing—[is] to size it up incorrectly” (289-90). This understanding of composition and the teaching of it, which was not widely accepted at the time, was the predominant opinion that provided the impetus for the organizing of the

Conference on College Composition and Communication, which will be the focus of chapter four.

^{xii} See for instance, Bentley, Gerald Eades. "The Graduate School as a Preparation for Teachers." *College English* 12 (1951): 330-35. and Samuel, Irene. "How Can We Train Teachers of English for Colleges?" *College English* 12 (1951): 346-47. or Cowley, John. "Training Teachers of English." *College English* 13 (1952): 223-24., or Knoll, Robert E. "Whence the New Professors." *College English* 20 (1958): 77-80. One of the most striking and interesting aspects of these articles in *CE*, is the fact the "English," in all of them, is assumed to be synonymous with literature. It is quite telling about the status of composition in the field at the time when it is not even discussed by members of the discipline as a part of the accepted title of it.

^{xiii} See appendix one for a bibliography of publications in each of the journals specifically on teacher preparation.

^{xiv} It is well documented that the majority of new hires often had little if any experience teaching the composition when they were hired.

^{xv} It's interesting to note that the report or Workshop No. 16 discusses teacher training as an issue of concern to "holders of the Ph.D.," while it was widely known at the time that the majority of courses at a large percentage of colleges and universities at the time were taught by individuals who did not hold the Ph.D. and were not studying for the degree. The lack of concern by the Workshop of this large contingent of individuals teaching composition is a troubling, yet not unexpected revelation of the internal hierarchy within the organization itself about whom the organization represented.

^{xvi} "In terms of this purpose and allocation, what should be the scope and content of such training?" (Teacher 41).

^{xvii} The 1956 workshop's recommendations for the revamping of the master's degree reaffirmed, in many ways, composition's status as a professional and practical activity. The suggestions included training in

- a . modern English grammar
- b . English and American literature, considered with equal attention to the critical as well as to the historical approach
- c . Oral communication (for those who plan to teach in a communications program)

d. Mass media of communications (for those who plan to teach in a communications program)

(139)

^{xviii} The 1952 workshop recognized teacher training as a way of expediting new instructors term in “apprentice training” which was synonymous with teaching composition. The 1954 workshop quoted a director of a freshman course as stating the “*The only training a man needs in order to teach composition is what I give him when he writes his dissertation.*” In 1956, the workshop seemed to give up altogether because of a lack of interest and attendance at the annual workshop.

^{xix} Hunting, Robert S. “A Training Course for Teachers of Freshman Composition.” CCC 2 (1951): 3-6.; Barnard, Ellsworth. “On Teaching Teachers.” CCC 6 (1955): 25-8.; Roberts, Charles W. “A Course for Training Teachers at the University of Illinois.” CCC 6 (1955): 190-94.; Kitzhaber, Albert. “The University of Kansas Course in the College Teaching of English.” CCC 6 (1955): 194-200.; Schwartz, Joseph. “One Method of Training the Composition Teacher.” CCC 6 (1955): 200-04.; Hazo, Samuel J. “The Graduate Assistant Program at Duquesne University.” CCC 8 (1957): 119-21.

^{xx} Fitts' and Lalicker's article "Invisible Hands: A Manifesto to Resolve Institutional and Curricular Hierarchy in English Studies" from the March 2004 *College English* offers a similar critique of the power MLA has over defining for insiders and outsiders alike The English Department and Composition's status within it. Through an analysis of the MLA publication *Profession* from 1997-2001, Fitts and Lalicker analyze the representations or lack there of of composition in that publication which they identify as reflecting and reproducing "the institutional and curricular hierarchy in English departments," which is the critical issue under investigation in this study.

^{xxi} See Fitts and Lalicker.

^{xxii} The fact that the author would suggest in his title that Composition Studies is an unlikely field in which a theory war might happen is obviously unfamiliar with the contentious relationship that composition has had with itself, its counterpart organizations, and the Academy in general. Composition, almost by nature, is engaged in power struggles, which the "Theory Wars," of course, are.

Works Cited

- Alden, Raymond MacDonald. "Preparation for College English Teaching." *The English Journal* 2 (1913): 344-56.
- Allen, Harold B. "Preparing the Teacher of Composition and Communication. A Report." *CCC* 3 (1952): 3-13.
- Baker, Franklin T. "The Teacher of English." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 335-43.
- Barnard, Ellsworth. "On Teaching Teachers." *CCC* 6 (1955): 25-8.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. "The Graduate School as a Preparation for Teachers." *College English* 12 (1951): 330-35.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures: Refiguring College English Studies*. Urbana: NCTE, 1996.
- . *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- . *Writing Instruction in the Nineteenth-Century American College*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984.
- Boynton, Percy H. "Sorting College Freshman." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 73-80.
- Bright, James Wilson. "Concerning the Unwritten History of the Modern Language Association of America." *PMLA* 17 (1902): xli-lxii.
- Bright, James Wilson, J. M. Hart, and C. Sprague Smith. "The University Idea, and English in the University." *Transactions of the Modern Language Association* 3 (1887): liii-lix.
- Buck, Gertrude. *A Course in Argumentative Writing*. New York: Holt, 1899.

- College Section. *English Journal* 6 (1917): 58-61.
- Connors, Robert. "Rhetoric in the Modern University: The Creation of an Underclass." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Post Secondary*. Eds. Richard Bullock and John Trimbur. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1991. 55-84.
- Cowley, John. "Training Teachers of English." *College English* 13 (1952): 223-24.
- Cox, John Harrington. "What is the Best Preparation for the College Teacher of English? Training for Teaching and Training for Research." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 207-14.
- Davis, William Hawley. "The Teaching of English Composition: Its Present Status." *English Journal* 6 (1917): 285-94.
- Earle, Samuel Chandler. "The Organization of Instruction in English Composition." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 477-87.
- Fitts, Karen, and William B. Lalicker. "Invisible Hands: A Manifesto to Resolve Institutional and Curricular Hierarchy in English Studies." *College English* 66 (2004):427-51.
- Gage, John T. Introduction. *Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900*. By Albert Kitzhaber. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1990. vii-xxii.
- Garnett, James. "The Course in English and Its Value to the Discipline." *PMLA* 2 (1886): 61-73.
- Garnett, James, et. al. "The Course in English and Its Value as a Discipline." *Transactions of the Modern Language Association* 2 (1886): xxvii-xxx.

- Gerber, John C. "The Conference on College Composition and Communication."
CCC 1 (1950): 12.
- Genung, John F. *A Study of Rhetoric in the College Course*. Boston: Heath,
1887.
- Gott, Charles. "An Experiment in Teacher-Training for College Instruction."
English Journal 18 (1929): 589-93.
- Greenough, Chester Noyes. "An Experiment in the Training of Teachers of
Composition for Work with College Freshman." *English Journal* 2 (1913):
109-21.
- . "The New Plan of Admission in English to Harvard College." *English Journal* 1
(1912): 364-74.
- Hopkins, Edwin M. "Four Problems for the Council." *English Journal* 1 (1912): 49.
- Hosic, James F. "The Influence of the Uniform Entrance Requirements in
English." *English Journal* 1 (1912): 95-120.
- Hunt, T. W. "The New Requirements in Entrance English Their Literary Value."
Modern Language Notes 13 (1898): 129-33.
- . "The Place of English in the College Curriculum." *Transactions of the Modern
Language Association* 1 (1884): 118-32.
- Hunting, Robert S. "A Training Course for Teachers of Freshman Composition."
CCC 2 (1951): 3-6.
- Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900*. Dallas: Southern
Methodist UP, 1990.

- . "The University of Kansas Course in the College Teaching of English." *CCC* (1955): 194-200.
- Knoll, Robert E. "Whence the New Professors?" *College English* 20 (1958): 77-80.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Lilian Zac. "Minding the Gap: The Subject of Politics." *The Making of Political Identities*. Ed. Ernesto Laclau. London: Verso, 1994. 11-39.
- MacAlister, James. "The Study of Modern Literature and the Education of Our Time." *Transactions of the Modern Language Association* 3 (1887): 8-16.
- Manchester, Frederick A. "Freshman English Once More." *English Journal* 6 (1917): 295-307, 384-98.
- McElroy, John. "The Requirements of English for Admission to College." *PMLA* 1 (1984-85): 195-203.
- McLemee, Scott. "Deconstructing Composition: The 'New Theory Wars' Break Out in an Unlikely Discipline." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 21 Mar. 2003. 24 Mar. 2004. <<http://chronicle.com>>.
- Mead, W. E., C. S. Baldwin, F. N. Scott. "The Undergraduate Study of English Composition." *PMLA* 16 (1901): x-xxv.
- Mead, William E. "Conflicting Ideals in the Teaching of English." *PMLA* 17 (1902): viii-xxiii.
- . "The Graduate Study of Rhetoric." *PMLA* 15 (1900): xx-xxxii.
- Miller, George Morey. Discussion. *English Journal* 2(1913): 119-21.

- Noble, A. B. "The Preparation of College Teachers of English." *English Journal* 5 (1916): 665-70.
- North, Stephen. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1987.
- Noyes, Ernest C. "Progress in Standardizing the Measurement of Composition." *English Journal* 1 (1912): 532-36.
- Osgood, Charles G. "No Set Requirements of English Composition in Freshman Year." *English Journal* 4 (1915): 231-35.
- Pendleton, Charles S. "The New Teacher of English." *English Journal* 6 (1917): 575-83.
- Phillips, Donna Burns, et. al. "College Composition and Communication: Chronicling a Discipline's Genesis." *CCC* 44 (1993): 443-65.
- "Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher: Toward a Comprehensive Program." *CCC* 7 (1956): 138-40.
- "Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher: The Report of Workshop No. 4." *CCC* 6 (1955): 131-2.
- "Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher: The Report of Workshop No. 4." *CCC* (1954): 99-102.
- "Preparation of the Composition or Communication Teacher: The Report of Workshop No. 4." *CCC* (1953): 81-2.
- "The Professional Status of the Composition Teacher." *CCC* 3 (1952): 10-2.

- Pytlik, Betty P. "How Graduate Students Were Prepared to Teach Writing—1859-1970." Pytlik and Liggett. 3-16.
- . "Teaching the Teacher of Composition: Evolving Theories." *The Writing Instructor* (Fall 1991): 36-50.
- Pytlik, Betty P. and Sarah Liggett, eds. *Preparing College Teachers of Writing*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- "Report of the Committee on the Preparation of College Teachers of English." *English Journal* 5 (1916): 20-32.
- Rinehart, Keith. "Teaching Freshman Composition." *College English* 13 (1952): 450-54.
- Roberts, Charles W. "A Course for Training Teachers at the University of Illinois." *CCC* 6 (1955): 190-94.
- Samuel, Irene. "How Can We Train Teachers of English for Colleges?" *College English* 12 (1951): 346-47
- Schwartz, Joseph. "One Method of Training the Composition Teacher." *CCC* 6 (1955): 200-04.
- Scott, Frank W. "The Relation of Composition to the Rest of the Curriculum." *English Journal* 7 (1918): 512-20.
- Scott, Fred Newton. "Training and Mistraining." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 456-58.
- . "English Composition as a Mode of Behavior." *English Journal* 11 (1922): 463-73.
- . "Our Problems." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 1-10.

- . "What the West Wants in Preparatory Education." *School Review* 17 (1909): 10-20.
- . "The Significance of the Organization of the National Council." Editorial. *English Journal* 1 (1912): 46-8.
- Sparling, Edward J. "Improving the Status of the Composition Teacher." *CCC* 8 (1957): 67-72.
- Spencer, M. Lyle. Discussion. *English Journal* 2 (1913): 115-19.
- "Status in the Profession of the Composition Teacher: The Report of Workshop Number 8." *CCC* 4 (1953): 89-91.
- Stewart, Donald C. "The Status of Composition and Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1880-1902: An MLA Perspective." *College English* 47 (1985): 734-746.
- . "Rediscovering Fred Newton Scott." *College English* 40 (1979): 539-547.
- . "Comp vs. Lit: Which is Your Job and Which is Your Strength?" *College English* 40 (1978): 65-69.
- "Teacher-Training for Composition or Communication: The Report of Workshop No. 16." *CCC* 2 (1951): 31-32.
- "Teacher Training for Courses in Composition/Communication: The Report of Workshop No. 16." *CCC* 3 (1952): 39-44.
- Thaler, Alwin. "The University of Tennessee Program of Training for Teaching College Composition." *CCC* 5 (1954): 73-75.

- Thomas, J. M. "Training for Teaching Composition in Colleges." *English Journal* 5 (1916): 447-57.
- Tremmel, Robert. "Striking a Balance—Seeking a Discipline." Tremmel and Broz -16.
- Tremmel, Robert, and William Broz, Eds. *Teaching Writing Teachers or High School English & First-Year Composition*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2002.
- Wendell, Barrett. *A Literary History of America*. New York: Scribner's, 1901.
- Wilhoit, Stephen. "Recent Trends in TA Instruction: A Bibliographic Essay." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 17-27.
- Wiklund, Philip R. "'Masters' and 'Slaves': A Director of Composition Looks at the Graduate Assistant." *CCC* 10 (1959): 226-30.
- . "The Indiana University Program of Training for Teaching College Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 4 (1953): 14-19.
- Wilhelmus, Thomas. "What the Midwest Wants in PhD Preparation." *ADE* 93 (1989). 22 Jan. 2004
<http://www.ade.org/bulletin/frames_browse.htm>.
- . "The Indiana University Program of Training for Teaching College Composition." *CCC* 4 (1953): 14-19.
- Wilson, Robin. "Universities Scramble to Find Teachers of Freshman Composition." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 30 Oct. 1998. 25 Mar. 2004. <<http://chronicle.com>>.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "The Professionalization of TA Development Programs:
A Heuristic for Curriculum Design." Pytlik and Liggett 63-74.

Appendices

**Appendix One: Chronological Bibliography of Articles Published on the
Preparation of Teacher of College Composition: *PMLA*, *English Journal*,
and CCC 1884-1973**

Publication of the Modern Language Association

1884-90 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

1891

Babbitt, E. H., et. al. "Preparation of Modern Language Teachers for American
Institutions: Discussion." *PMLA* 6 (1891): xlv-xlix.

1892

Babbitt, E. H. "The Preparation of Modern Language Teachers for American
Institutions." *PMLA* 7 (1892): lii-lxi.

1893-1912 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

English Journal

1913

Boynton, Percy H. "Sorting College Freshman." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 73-80.

Greenough, Chester Noyes. "An Experiment in the Training of Teachers of
Composition for Work with College Freshman." *English Journal* 2 (1913):
109-21.

Appendix One: (Continued)

Cox, John Harrington. "What is the Best Preparation for the College Teacher of English? Training for Teaching and Training for Research." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 207-14.

Baker, Franklin T. "The Teacher of English." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 335-43.

Alden, Raymond MacDonald. "Preparation for College English Teaching." *The English Journal* 2 (1913): 344-56.

Scott, Fred Newton. "Training and Mistraining." *English Journal* 2 (1913): 456-58.

1914-15 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

1916

"Report of the Committee on the Preparation of College Teachers of English."
English Journal 5 (1916): 20-32.

Noble, A. B. "The Preparation of College Teachers of English." *English Journal* 5 (1916): 665-70.

Thomas, J. M. "Training for Teaching Composition in Colleges." *English Journal* 5 (1916): 447-57.

1917

Pendleton, Charles S. "The New Teacher of English." *English Journal* 6 (1917): 575-83.

Appendix One: (Continued)

1918

Denney, Joseph Villers. "Preparation of College Teachers of English." *English Journal* 7 (1918): 322-6.

1919-22 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

1923

Royster, James F. "Preparation of the English Composition Teacher." *English Journal* 12 (1923): 397-404.

1924-27 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

1928

Miles, Dudley. "The Council and the Classroom Teacher." *English Journal* 17 (1928): 1-8.

1929

Gott, Charles. "An Experiment in Teacher-Training for College Instruction." *English Journal* 18 (1929): 589-93.

1930-32 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

Appendix One: (Continued)

1933

Harbarger, Sada A. "A Summer School for Teachers of English in Technical Colleges." *English Journal* 22 (1933): 465-72.

1934-39 No articles were published on the topic during these years.

College English—the time between the establishing of *College English* in 1939 until the establishing of *CCC* in 1950, there were no articles in *CE* that were specifically about preparing teachers of composition. However, there were a several articles concerning the preparation of teachers of Literature.

College Composition and Communication

1951

Hunting, Robert S. "A Training Course for Teachers of Freshman Composition." *CCC* 2 (1951): 3-6.

"Teacher-Training for Composition or Communication: The Report of Workshop No. 16." *CCC* 2 (1951): 31-32.

1952

Allen, Harold B. "Preparing the Teacher of Composition and Communication. A Report." *CCC* 3 (1952): 3-13.

“Teacher Training for Courses in Composition/Communication: The Report of Workshop No. 16.” CCC 3 (1952): 39-44.

1953

“Preparation of the Composition or Communication Teacher: The Report of Workshop No. 4.” CCC (1953): 81-2.

1954

“Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher: The Report of Workshop No. 4.” CCC (1954): 99-102.

1955

Barnard, Ellsworth. “On Teaching Teachers.” CCC 6 (1955): 25-8.

“Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher: The Report of Workshop No. 4.” CCC 6 (1955): 131-2.

Roberts, Charles W. “A Course for Training Teachers at the University of Illinois.” CCC 6 (1955): 190-94.

Kitzhaber, Albert. “The University of Kansas Course in the College Teaching of English.” CCC 6 (1955): 194-200.

“Preparation of the Composition/Communication Teacher: Toward a Comprehensive Program.” CCC 7 (1956): 138-40.

Schwartz, Joseph. "One Method of Training the Composition Teacher." CCC 6 (1955): 200-04.

1957

Hazo, Samuel J. "The Graduate Assistant Program at Duquesne University." CCC 8 (1957): 119-21.

1963

Barry, James D. "Training Graduate Student Teachers At Loyola University (Chicago)." CCC 14 (1963): 75-8

Bowman, John S. "Training Graduate Students as Teachers At Pennsylvania State University." CCC 14 (1963): 73-5.

Ferrell, Wilfred A. "Training Graduate Student Teachers At Arizona State University." CCC 14 (1963): 78-80.

Moake, Frank B. "Training Graduate Student Teachers At the University of Illinois." CCC 14 (1963): 81-84.

1964-73 During this extended period, although there were many publications in CCCs about what to teach in composition courses, there were no articles specifically about preparing college composition teachers as a distinct topic of interest to the organization.

Appendix Two: Supplemental Bibliography of Scholarship on Teacher Preparation

- Bamburg, Betty. "Creating a Culture of Reflective Practice: A Program for Continuing TA Preparation after the Practicum." Pytlik and Liggett.
- Bender, Gita Das. "Orientation and Mentoring: Collaborative Practices in Teacher Preparation." Pytlik and Liggett 233-41.
- . "The Basics and the New Teacher in the College Composition Class." Bridges 13-26.
- Blakely Duffelmeyer, Barb. "Learning to Learn: New TA Preparation in Computer Pedagogy." *Computers in Composition* 20 (2003): 295-311.
- . "New Perspectives: TA Preparation for Critical Literacy in First-Year Composition." *Composition Forum* 13 (2002): 67-80.
- Braddock, Richard. "Reversing the Peter Principle to Help Inexperienced Graduate Assistants Teach Freshman Writing." *CE* 32 (1970): 45-9.
- Bridges, Charles W. *Training the New Teacher of Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 1986.
- Brobbel, Amanda, et. al. "GAT Training in Collaborative Teaching at the University of Arizona." Brown 411-28.
- Broder, Peggy F. "Writing Centers and Teacher Training." *WPA* 13 (1990): 37-45.
- Brown, Betsy E., and John T. Harwood. "Training and Evaluating Traditional and Non-Traditional Instructors of Composition." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (1984): 63-73.

Appendix Two: (Continued)

- Brown, Stuart C., et. al., eds. *The Writing Program Administrators Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*. Mahwah: Earlbaum, 2002.
- Clark, Irene Lurkis. "Preparing Future Composition Teachers in the Writing Center." *CCC* 39 (1988): 347-50.
- Diogenes, Marvin, Duane H. Roen, and C. Jan Swearingen. "Creating the Profession: The GAT Training Program at the University of Arizona." *WPA* 10 (1986): 51-9.
- Ebest, Sally Barr. "Mentoring: Past, Present, and Future." Pytlik and Liggett 211-21.
- Elbe, Kenneth E. "Preparing College Teachers of English." *CE* 33 (1972): 385-406.
- Farris, Christine. *Subject to Change: New Composition Instructors' Theory and Practice*. Cresskill: Hampton, 1996.
- Ford, Wendy S. Zabava. "Identification and Validation of Training Needs for Teaching Assistants." *The TA Experience: Preparing for Multiple Roles*. Ed. Karron G. Lewis. Stillwater: New Forums, 1993. 25-36.
- Foster, David. "Training Writing Teachers in a Small Program." *WPA* 10 (1986): 43-50.
- Gage, John T., and John C. Schafer. "Humbolt State University's Master's Program in the Teaching of Writing." *WPA* 7 (1984): 27-34.

Appendix Two: (Continued)

- Gebhardt, Richard. "Balancing Theory with Practice in the Training of Writing Teachers." *CCC* 28 (1977): 134-40.
- . "Unifying Diversity in the Training of Writing Teachers." *Bridges* 1-12.
- Gefvert, Constance J. "An Apprenticeship for Teaching Assistants." *Freshman English News* 10.3 (1982): 16-9.
- Goleman, Judith. "Educating Literacy Instructors: Practice Versus Expression." *Pytlik and Liggett* 86-96.
- Graham, Margaret Baker, and Carol David. "What's Up on Monday Morning? TA Training and Freshman English." *Writing on the Edge* 7 (1996): 59-72.
- "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs." *CCC* 22 (1971): 303-13.
- Hairston, Maxine. "On Not Being a Composition Slave." *Bridges* 117-24.
- . "Training Teaching Assistants in English." *CCC* 25 (1974): 52-5.
- Hanson, Kristine, et. al. "Collaborative Learning and Teaching: A Model for Mentoring TAs." *The TA Experience: Preparing for Multiple Roles*. Ed. Karron G. Lewis. Stillwater: New Forums, 1993. 251-59.
- Hattenhauer, Darryl, and Mary Ellen Shaw. "The Teaching Assistant as Apprentice." *CCC* 33 (1982): 452-56.
- Hunt, Maurice. "Essay Evaluation as a Framework for Teaching Assistant Training." *Freshman English News* (1985): 19-21.
- Imscher, William F. "TA Training: A Period of Discovery." *Bridges* 27-36.

Appendix Two: (Continued)

- Kennedy, Mary. *Learning to Teach Writing: Does Teacher Education Make a Difference?* New York: Teachers College UP, 1998.
- Kimme Hea, Amy C. "Exploring and Evaluating Non-Program Teacher Training." *Kairos* 7 (2002).
- Kimme Hea, Amy C., and David Menchaca. "Computer Space Configuration for Teacher Technology Training." *Kairos* 7 (2002).
- Krauthamer, Helene. "Teaching the Teachers." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 30 (2002): 117-87.
- Krupa, Gene H. "Helping New Teachers of Writing: Book, Model, and Mirror." *CCC* 33 (1982): 442-45.
- Leverenz, Carrie Shively, and Amy Goodburn. "Professionalizing TA Training: Commitment to Teaching or Rhetorical Response to Market Crisis?" *Writing Program Administration* 22 (1998): 9-32.
- Liggett, Sarah. "After the Practicum: Assessing Teacher Preparation Programs." *The Writing Program Administrator as Researcher: Inquiry in Action and Reflection*. Eds. Shirley K. Rose and Irwin Weiser. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1999. 65-80.
- Lindemann, Erika. *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Marshall, Bethan, Anne Turvey, and Sue Brindley. "English Teachers-Born or Made: A Longitudinal Study of the Socialisation of English Teachers." *Changing English: Studies in Reading and Culture* 8 (2001): 189-201.

Appendix Two: (Continued)

- Martin, Wanda and Charles Paine. "Mentors, Models, and Agents of Change: Veteran TAs Preparing Teachers of Writing." Pytlik and Liggett 222-32.
- Maxfield, Beth. "The Preparation of Graduate Writing Teachers: Creating Substance Out of Shadows." *Reforming College Composition: Writing the Wrongs*. Eds. Ray Wallace, Alan Jackson, and Susan Lewis. Westport: Greenwood, 2000. 213-23.
- Moran, Charles. "A Modeling for Teacher Training Programs in the Field of Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (1981): 64-78.
- Murphy, Michael. "New Faculty for New University: Toward a Full-time Teaching Intensive Faculty Track in Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 52 (2000): 14-42.
- Nemanich, Donald. "Preparing the Composition Teacher." *CCC* 25 (1974): 46-8.
- Posey, Evelyn. "An Ongoing Tutor-Training Program." *Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*. Eds. Robert Barnett and Jacob S. Blumner. Boston: Allyn/Bacon, 2001. 326-31.
- "Position Statement on the Preparation and Development of Teachers of Writing." *CCC* 33 (1982): 446-49.
- Potts, Maureen, and David Schwalm. "A Training Program for Teaching Assistants in Freshman English." *WPA* 7 (1983): 47-54.

- Pytlik, Betty P., Sarah Liggett, and Richard Faulkerson. *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Reynolds, Thomas. "Training Basic Writing Teachers: Institutional Considerations." *Journal of Basic Writing* 20 (2001): 38-52.
- Rice, Warner G. "The Preparation of College Teachers of English." *CE* 24 (1963): 635-38.
- Rickly, Rebecca J., and Susanmarie Harrington. "Feminist Approaches to Mentoring Teaching Assistants: Conflict, Power, and Collaboration." Pytlik and Liggett 108-20.
- Ritter, Kelly. "Professional Writers/Writing Professionals: Revamping Teacher Training in Creative Writing Ph.D. Programs." *College English* 64 (2001): 205-27.
- Roberts, David D. "Survival and Prosperity: TA Training Colloquia." *Freshman English News* 10 (1982): 4, 12-14.
- Rose, Shirley K. "Mentoring for Teaching Assistants in the Introductory Writing Program at Purdue." Tremmel and Broz 86-92.
- Rose, Shirley K., and Margaret J. Finders. "Thinking Together: Developing a Reciprocal Reflective Model for Approaches to Preparing College Teachers or Writing." Pytlik and Liggett 75-85.
- Ruszkiewicz, John J. "Training Teachers Is a Process Too." *CCC* 38 (1987): 461-64.

Appendix Two: (Continued)

- Sandy, Kirsti A. "After Preparing TAs for the Classroom, What Then?" Pytlik and Liggett 28-39.
- Seyfarth, Sue. "The Professional Development Program: More than an Opportunity at Iowa." *Freshman English News* 10 (1982): 16-19.
- Simpson, Isahiah. "Training and Evaluating Teaching Assistants through Team Teaching." *Freshman English News* 15 (1987): 4, 9-13.
- Taylor, Todd. "Teacher Training: A Blueprint for Action Using the World Wide Web." *Electronic Communication Across the Curriculum*. Eds. Donna Reiss, Dickie Selfe, Art Young, Cynthia Self. Urbana: NCTE, 1998. 129-36.
- Tremmel, Robert. "Seeking a Balanced Discipline: Writing Teacher Education in First-Year Composition and English Education." *English Education* 34 (2001): 6-30.
- Tumley, Melinda. "Potential Models for Teacher Technology Training." *Kairos* 7 (2002).
- Weiser, Irwin. "When Teaching Assistants Teach Teaching Assistants to Teach: A Historical View of a Teacher Preparation Program." Pytlik and Liggett 40-49.
- . "Surveying New Teaching Assistants: Who They Are, What They Know, and What They Want to Know." *WPA* 14 (1990): 63-71.

Appendix Two: (Continued)

- Weiser, Irwin and Karen Dwyer. "The CCCC's 'Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing': Implications for Writing Program Administrators and Teaching Assistants." *The TA Experience: Preparing for Multiple Roles*. Ed. Karron G. Lewis. Stillwater: New Forums, 1993. 19-24.
- Wilhoit, Stephen. "Identifying Common Concerns: A Response to 'Striking a Balance—Seeking a Discipline'." Tremmel and Broz 18-21.
- . "Conducting Research: An Essential Aspect of TA Training." *Kentucky English Bulletin* 39 (1989): 48-55.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Greg Giberson received his B.A in English from Alma College and his M.A. in English with a Rhetoric and Composition specialization from the University of Akron. While working on his Ph.D. at the University of South Florida, he received several awards for his teaching and scholarship and served as the Graduate Assistant to the Director of Composition for two years. As assistant to the Director of Composition, he worked on the development and implementation of a nationally recognized NCTE Preparing Future Faculty program.

Mr. Giberson has been an active member of the profession. He has presented academic papers at the national conferences of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on College Composition and Communication. He has published book reviews and articles in journals such as *Composition Forum* and *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, and co-authored with Debra Jacobs a book chapter in *Culture Shock: Training the New Wave in Rhetoric and Composition*, edited by Virginia Anderson and Susan Romano. Mr. Giberson has recently moved from Tampa to Salisbury, Maryland where he resides with his wife Cami and their son Tommy.