

defined in Miller's essay titled "*Kairos* in the Rhetoric of Science." Miller combines the temporal and spatial metaphors of *kairos* to construct a definition that allows an ephemeral instant that, in turn, allows the opening up of newer or different thought.

The editors of this collection take hold of at least one point of the several contributions and demonstrate how that point might encourage further consideration in a number of areas. These areas, which serve as section headings for the remainder of the introduction, address the "modern era," methodologies and knowledge construction, issues and directions, and further inquiry in the discipline. In defining knowledge in a field and in speculating about the future of scholarship in written discourse, the editors recognize the instability of knowledge and how that instability affects further inquiry. In that spirit they have outlined several assumptions that they believe are reinforced by the essays in the collection (43). The assumptions revolve around issues such as these: writing as a constructive act, the various contexts of and purposes for writing, the cognitive and social aspects of writing, the study of writing processes and written products in a number of diverse settings, interdisciplinary approaches to studying writing, and the complex nature of writing that invites a variety of research methods and data gathering.

An easy negative criticism of a book written in honor of a scholar would be to search for instances in which the writers seemed merely to follow their own interests while indiscriminately patching in the name of the scholar they are to honor. Indeed, one might point out that Berlin, Herrington, and others mention Kinneavy's name only briefly or at the beginning and end of their essays, seemingly in passing, but this is a criticism that does not hold given the nature of the work. The essays are designed to appeal to a fairly diverse academic audience—students, teachers, and writers of many disciplines—and the contributors make good the editors' claim that Kinneavy's work is without question a fecund starting point for studies in written discourse. Thus, this collection does, indeed, honor James Kinneavy.

—Bill Bolin
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Evaluating Teachers of Writing—ed. Christine A. Hult; NCTE, 1994; 189 pp.; ISBN 0-8141-1621-3.

This collection of essays approaches evaluating teachers of writing by providing sections on "Background and Theory," "Evaluation Methods," and "Evaluating Specific Groups." A major theme of each section is that the evaluation of teaching takes place within the competitive

atmosphere of the academy and so is often misused for the weaker aims of meting out status, privilege, and power than the more important aim of improving the quality of teaching. Hult argues in her introduction that political and ideological reasons make evaluating writing teachers a problem. One, writing teachers on college and university campuses often are marginalized groups; two, "the composition profession has not arrived at a uniform consensus about teaching methodology in writing; and "there are questions about the evaluators' motives that confuse the issue of evaluating the teaching of writing" (3-5).

The essaysists of the second section, "Evaluation Methods," present an interesting range of approaches to the issue. One of the more interesting is "Peer Review of Writing Faculty" by Ellen Strenski. She articulates a perspective shared by several essayists in her section: one, that teachers and their peers should be more involved in the assessment process, and, two, more creative and felxible methods should be used for the assessment than the currenet measures. In addition, teachers should be evaluated by a number of measures not just one or two. In essence, the broades picture of a teacher's abilities and potentials should be drawn.

"Evaluating Specific Groups," focuses on adjunct faculty, teaching assistants, and teachers in WAC programs and in computerized classrooms. Noticeably and regrettably absent are teachers in writing centers, who certainly qualify for consideration since they are as involved in writing pedagogy as any populace in the academy—and often more so. There are no surprises here. Adjunct faculty are overworked and marginalized and not provided with the university support to work on professional development; teaching assistants learn best by learning the craft in conjunction with established faculty; traditional measures are even more ineffective for evaluating WAC teachers, especially since they work under a different set of pedagogical assumptions in crossing disciplinary boundaries; and teachers in computerised classrooms raise important questions about how technology is to be integrated into compositon programs and about how knowledge is to be constructed.

This collection is helpful for the questions it raises and less helpful in providing concrete solutions. As the essayists point out and make clear through real-life examples, there is no one way to assess the work done in diverse types of writing classrooms—and I would add, writing centers. Evaluations must take various forms and must be assessed through various channels and by a range of individuals and groups within the academy to achieve an evaluation system that is fair, equitable, and appropriate.

—Christina Murphy
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas