REPOSITIONING EMOTIONS IN COMPOSITION STUDIES

Emotions are essentially communicative, intercorporeal and intersubjective, constituted as physical and cultural dispositions through techniques of the body, forged within a particular social habitus.

Simon Williams

Emotion. The word conjures up diverse reactions from experts in academic fields such as composition studies. Some view emotions as separate from thinking—as unconscious reactions to external stimuli or as responses to biological processes—while others consider emotions to be biological processes that exist in the human body as part of a system of homeostasis. Still others see emotions as socially constructed, as part of a web of communication woven by interpersonal relationships, those shaped by our individual histories and an ever-present part of how we construct relationships with others. Regardless of how they are viewed, however, emotions are part of the human experience and, as such, should be regarded as important components of learning.

Despite the existence of a large body of work in composition studies dedicated to how students and teachers interact with each other and with knowledge, there seems to be less research that focuses on affective aspects of the student-teacher relationship. In order to highlight much of the work that does exist and to point to additional ways that we might explore emotions and their contribution to the teaching and practice of writing, I focus this essay on recent trends in composition (how the emotions have or have not been included in discussions emphasizing writing instruction) and on opportunities for further research that gives attention to emotion.

Kia Jane Richmond is Assistant Professor of English at Northern Michigan University, where she teaches courses in English education and composition. Her primary area of interest is the student-teacher relationship, and recent publications in journals such as Issues in Writing focus on matters such as believing and doubting, empathy, and emotion.
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KNOWING, FELT SENSE, AND CONNECTIONS TO EXPRESSIVISM

In “The War between Reading and Writing—and How to End It,” Peter Elbow suggests that many conflicts exist between readers and writers of texts. One of the conflicts is “over the relationship between language and knowledge” (272). Elbow asserts that readers often argue that all knowledge is linguistic; writers, however, frequently attest to the idea that knowledge sometimes precedes language, or that there is a kind of knowing that is “nonverbal.” The idea of a nonverbal knowing is not unique to Elbow’s work; many scholars and researchers in fields such as psychology, sociology, and philosophy, as well as those in English studies, have posited that some knowledge might be nonverbal. Alice Brand, for instance, mentions in The Psychology of Writing that “[o]bserving, intuiting, and imagining” are actions that emerge apart from verbalization unless they are “translated into language or we act on them physically” (33). Likewise, W. Ross Winterowd describes a kind of thought labeled “appositional,” which includes knowledge that is “[G]estaltist, imagistic, nonverbal, nonlogical” (98).1

Other theorists posit a “tacit or personal knowledge” or a “felt sense,” a phrase coined by Eugene Gendlin, which is “neither a cognition nor an affect but a bodily awareness that has meaning” (Brand, Psychology 55). Felt sense is “preverbal and preconceptual—body and mind before they split apart.” Sondra Perl introduced me to the concept of felt sense at a workshop I attended in the summer of 1999. Perl has worked extensively with Gendlin, who describes felt sense as the “soft underbelly of thought . . . [that] encompasses everything you feel and know about a given subject at a given time” (qtd. in Perl 151). Perl suggests that writers “draw on sense experience,” that they “pause and seem to listen or otherwise react to what is inside of them” (150).

At the summer workshop (sponsored by NCTE’s Assembly for the Expanded Perspectives on Learning), Perl led us in a felt-sense exercise, described by a fellow conference attendee as a “series of questions of what we could tell about ourselves at that time, our felt sense of what we most wanted or needed to write about” (Novak 7). Perl is one of a few scholars in composition studies to discuss knowledge that is not expressly linguistic. Other writing specialists who mention nonverbal knowing include contributors to The Presence of Mind: Writing and the Domain Beyond the Cognitive and The Spiritual Side of Writing: Releasing the Learner’s Whole Potential (see Fulkerson). These scholars focus on the spiritual or brain-connected aspects of writing; however, their work tends to be marginalized within the larger spectrum of publications in English.
(Those who are included in the mainstream are often associated with specific epistemological positions such as expressivism, an issue I will take up next).

While Elbow acknowledges that language is cognitive (writing as thinking) and social (writing as communication), it is his emphasis on the nonverbal or more specifically the nonsocial (writing as “the stringing together of exploratory discourse for the self”) that has led to his being vigorously criticized by others in the field (“Closing My Eyes” 267). Some (Harris; Berlin; Bartholomae) do not believe that the goal of personal growth (including the affective) is an appropriate goal for writing classes. Jeanette Harris in *Expressive Discourse* contends that helping students to “articulate their deepest emotions” is not the goal of composition (188). James Berlin and David Bartholomae have also expressed a lack of interest in the personal (and, by association rather than naming, the emotional). Their positions are not surprising given the way that composition, historically, has challenged the validity of the emotions. Nancy Welch notes that the “banishment of emotions from our professional discourse” might be the result of composition’s desire to legitimate itself in the academic community (45). Their displacement could also be a result of the relationship between emotions and certain ostracized pedagogical practices such as expressivism, as described by Fishman and McCarthy.

In 1988, Berlin cast Elbow in the role of “expressionist” in “Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class.” Elbow, Berlin says, views “power within society” as “vested in the individual” (485). Berlin accuses expressionistic rhetoric of being “inherently and debilitatingly divisive of political protest” and “easily co-opted by the very capitalist forces it opposes” (487). What he does not do, at least out in the open, is mention his opposition to affective elements of writing. Berlin’s response to Elbow, then, seems not specifically to be based on Elbow’s call for nonverbal knowing but on his lack of critique of any knowing that could be called individualistic.

In 1995, in “Writing with Teachers: A Conversation with Peter Elbow,” Bartholomae argued that Elbow’s work is “part of a much longer project to preserve and reproduce the figure of the author as an independent, self-expressive subjectivity” (65). This is in direct opposition to Bartholomae’s own contention that there is “no writing that is writing without teachers” (63). Bartholomae casts doubt on the goals of expressivists (including Elbow in a group with Britton, Moffett, and others), saying that they all “find ways of equating change with growth,
locating both the process and the mechanism within an individual psychology, equating the learner with that which must be learned" (68). As a result of this focus on the individual, Bartholomae argues, "schooling becomes secondary" and "a necessary evil in a world that is not well-regulated" (68-69). He is not at ease with this kind of agenda because it is not useful to his own, one which includes teaching students to "negotiate the ways they are figured in relationship to the official forms of knowledge valued in the academy" and to "negotiate the ways in which they are figured in the reading and writing that goes on in the academy" ("Response" 86-87).

What Bartholomae does not discuss is how students negotiate their affective responses to writing, to knowledge, or to the academy and its ambassadors. I would have liked to see him recognize the affective aspects of writing that evolve within the student-teacher relationship, which Lad Tobin describes as "dynamic, subtle, and highly charged" (Writing Relationships 15). Although Bartholomae mentions the positions of "power" that are "inherent" in our roles as teachers, he does not concede that within any human relationship emotional elements can complicate notions like "power, tradition, and authority" ("Writing" 66).

Thus, Bartholomae, in his debate with Elbow, does not really acknowledge the affective other than to say at one point that "many students will not feel the pleasure or power of authorship unless we make that role available" ("Writing with Teachers" 69). He emphasizes language as investigation and "critical inquiry" (66), which seems to be par for the course in current composition theory. "[W]ritten discourse," Brand tells us, "has become synonymous with critical thinking, which, for all intents and purposes, is the cognitive paradigm for writing" (Psychology 35). Her claim is supported by a quick glimpse at the table of contents of a popular graduate-level anthology, Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader. In this 1997 text, there are six articles on cognition and writing, and ten articles on writing as a social/political/cultural act. But there are no articles that specifically address the affective aspects of writing (at least, none that are not included as part of an expressivist pedagogy). The emphasis on the cognitive and the social in writing—supported by publications by Berlin, Bartholomae, and others—has encouraged compositionists to downplay the affective and its connection to writing. Furthermore, those who might opt to pay attention to emotions tend to be labeled instantaneously as expressivists, regardless of how emotions are related to their pedagogies or research. Being classified in
this way might discourage future writing teachers interested in emotions from publicly stating their positions for fear of being disenfranchised.

**Emotions and Composition Studies: (E)strange(d) Bedfellows**

The trend over the past thirty years or so in composition studies has been to encourage students to collaborate, to respond to their peers, and to work toward joining a specific discourse community. However, as Brand reminds us, “when we are poised in a reflective stance with our ideas[,] . . . when we sit at our desk, when we write at our computers, we are in the end alone” (“Social” 402). Susan McLeod in “Some Thoughts about Feelings” makes the following observation: “One does not have to watch freshmen at work to know that writing is an emotional as well as a cognitive activity—we feel as well as we think when we write” (426). McLeod argues, like Winterowd, that we have “tended to ignore the affective domain” in part “due to our deep Western suspicion of the irrational” (436). Our affinity for the rational and the scientific has left little room for anything that cannot be observed, counted, or measured. McLeod’s argument is supported by Pamela Annas’s assertion that the field of English studies as a whole values “hierarchy, competitiveness, detachment, and objectivity” (361). If that were true, there would seem to be little room for valuing connection, subjectivity, or the emotional.

Brand claims that in the history of English, the cognitive model of writing has ruled (Psychology 19). In “Social Cognition, Emotions, and the Psychology of Writing,” Brand traces “how emotions were eased out of early cognitive psychology and found a home in social psychology as well as in . . . social constructivism” (395-96). She points out that compositionists have embraced “socio-cognitive thinking” while rejecting the emotional (402). Part of that rejection (or what I would call marginalization) seems rooted in the interpretation of writing as a social act (see Fox), which can be easily planned for, politicized, and evaluated in the classroom. The other part seems connected to the view of writing that equates it with “problem-solving,” like the model of writing as a cognitive process developed by Linda Flower and John Hayes (McPherson and Fowler 40).

One of the scholars who has ventured into the risky world of sympathy for the affective (without dismissing the cognitive and without necessarily identifying herself as an expressivist) is Kristie Fleckenstein. In a recent article in *College English*, Fleckenstein (who has studied imagery and writing) reminds us that it is because of the “academic
domination of printed text” that we are predisposed to “think linguistically” (916). In my own classes, I find that even though I want to make room for nonlinguistic knowing (by asking students to use intuition, felt sense, or other nonverbal types of knowing), in asking students to produce written texts, I am perpetuating the domination of the word. This notion, our tendency to value writing above all other kinds of meaning making, is complicated by theories of multiple intelligence posited by Howard Gardner and a theory of emotional intelligence introduced by Daniel Goleman:

James Traub does a good job of explaining Gardner’s theories of multiple intelligence in a nutshell:

Gardner’s central claim is that what we normally think of as intelligence is merely a single aspect, or two aspects, of a much wider range of aptitudes; he has counted eight so far. Thus we have exalted the attribute measured by IQ tests—the hyperlogical style Gardner half-jokingly calls the ‘Alan Dershowitz’ model of intelligence—and have slighted our creative and interpersonal gifts. (20)

One of those gifts is emotional intelligence, described by Goleman as consisting of “self-awareness, impulse control, persistence, confidence and self-motivation, empathy, and social deftness” (Fisher 293). These components are rarely mentioned in discussions of the teaching of writing at conventions or in mainstream journals, or, when they are, it is typically with a nod to their relationship to cognitive processes of writing. For example, we often ask students to write statements or essays in which they reflect on their writing processes. In many first-year writing programs, they are asked to reflect on their individual projects or their progress as a whole at the end of a term. These reflective assignments encourage students to develop critical self-awareness; however, they tend to limit their focus to “metacognition”—defined as “thinking about one’s own thinking” (Tishman and Perkins 1). Thus, despite Goleman’s inclusion of self-awareness as a part of emotional intelligence, it is more often translated in the writing classroom into self-reflection by way of cognitive processing. Brand insists, though, that the “emotional aspects of writing cannot be defined out of existence, treated as unalterably postcognitive, or reduced to a cognitive auxiliary” (Psychology 213). Making room for the emotions will require writing experts to go beyond the cognitive as the only means of making knowledge. Regrettably, emotions are often viewed as tied to healing or rehabilitation, a connection that supposes a
therapeutic relationship between writer and teacher—a relationship that causes skepticism among composition specialists.

EMOTIONS AND THERAPY

Many in our field have avoided emphasizing emotions related to writing because of possible associations between writing and therapy (like those popularized in the decades of self-discovery—the sixties and seventies). Wendy Bishop suggests that we might not have researched areas related to “the personal, therapeutic, and affective aspects of our field because we are unfamiliar with psychological theory and practice and remain uncertain about the legitimacy of translating those theories and practices into our own classrooms” (503). As a writing teacher, I have integrated several elements of Rogerian psychology into my pedagogy. “Congruence,” “unconditional positive regard,” and “empathetic understanding” are just a few of the concepts described by Carl Rogers that I have found useful in the composition classroom (60-62). And I have, on more than one occasion, had to clarify to other composition specialists that using strategies from psychology (such as Rogerian response or Myers-Briggs personality theory) does not mean that I am practicing psychoanalysis in my writing classroom.

Some writing experts have investigated issues of personality in relation to writing preferences (see Jensen and DiTiberio) or the usefulness of psychological concepts with regard to teaching in a one-on-one relationship (see Murphy). Compositionists tend to be suspicious, though, of anything that is related to psychology. Bishop suggests this could be due to the negative connotations between “writing and the health professions”—teacher as doctor or therapist (507). Another possibility is that the marginalizing of psychological theories in literary criticism has bled over into other parts of English Studies. It is difficult, then, for teachers interested in the affective elements of writing to be successful in an environment that suspects corruption in anything related to psychological theories or emotions.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTS AND EMOTIONAL CULTURE

Despite an atmosphere of apprehension surrounding research on emotions, valuing the affective could be useful to composition studies as a whole. And there are a number of scholars who are actively working toward making connections between the emotional and socio-cognitive aspects of teaching writing. In Notes on the Heart: Affective Issues in the
Writing Classroom, Susan McLeod mentions a number of researchers who have shown interest in emotion, including, “Lynn Bloom, Brand, Fleckenstein, Flower (Construction), Larson, McLeod, and Sefte” (11). The move toward examining the emotions in writing is a marginal one, but one slowly gaining more acceptance in mainstream composition studies, as evidenced by the September 2001 issue of College English focused on personal writing (and emotions involved in writing and teaching writing), for example, and Richard Fulkerson’s 1998 College Composition and Communication review essay, “Call Me Horatio: Negotiating between Cognition and Affect in Composition.” In his review, Fulkerson asserts that regardless of the pedagogical approach one takes in teaching writing, reading books like those written by McLeod, Welch, and others reinforces the need to “pay more attention than we do to affective issues in our teaching” (111). Perhaps examining emotions related specifically to social relationships in the writing classroom—those between the teacher and the individual student, or between students in pairs or groups—would be a useful starting point for those with interests in cognitive processes, social construction, or critical inquiry.

E. Doyle McCarthy’s suggestion that emotions are “social constructs,” for instance, opens up room for dialogue among those with disparate positions in composition studies. He states that

[Emotions] are fabricated by human beings co-jointly. As part of human experience, they are rendered meaningful only within a society’s forms of knowledge. Emotions are both experiences and thought; emotions are feelings and reflections about feelings, which are analytically distinguishable but functionally indistinguishable. (67)

If that is the case, then examining emotions in the writing classroom would mesh well with the goals of the (current) dominant paradigm in composition studies (social construction, with an emphasis on cognitive processing or critical thinking).

One of the emotions that we have constructed as a means of communicating or as a way of facilitating communication is that of empathy. Various researchers have shown interest in the use of empathy as a connection between the writing teacher and the student writer (see Teich). In a 1999 article entitled “The Ethics of Empathy,” I argue that empathy requires two things: “sensitivity to the feelings of others and the ability to imagine that something that is not actually happening to oneself at that moment” (39). Empathy is an emotion with both cognitive and social components. Using empathy in the writing classroom means that
we treat students as “potential members of our community, as people whose ideas and feelings are just as worthy of attention as our own” (41). In describing empathy in this way, I blend Bartholomae’s call to invite students into the academic conversation with Elbow’s insistence that students need to be able to explore both verbal and nonverbal knowledge—a fusion of social and affective goals.

Empathy is just one way to bring the emotional into contact with the social. In Writing Relationships, Lad Tobin encourages us to investigate “envy” (107), “competition” (111), and “rivalry” (133) as emotions that find their way into the writing classroom as a result of interpersonal relationships between students and teachers. He suggests that the current emphasis in the writing classroom is on “cooperation.” Nevertheless, we may have “romanticized and reified the notion of a decentered, supportive, collaborative writing group without paying enough attention to what sorts of peer relationships inhibit writing and what sorts foster it” (89-90). Emotions, positive and negative, are a part of every human connection, including relationships we develop with students and the kinds that we ask them to enter into with one another. Emotions are a vital component of the social fabric that we create through conversations and nonverbal exchanges in and out of the classroom—a concept called “emotional culture.”

Steven Gorden introduces the concept of emotional culture in an article included in The Sociology of Emotions. The term refers to the “patterns of meanings” manifested in “symbols, by which people communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward emotions” (115). He argues that emotional culture is communicated through “language and rituals,” among other symbol systems. This could be important to studies of the writing classroom as a subculture of society or what Bartholomae calls “substations in the cultural network” (“Writing” 66). For instance, I have often asked my students to discuss their writing rituals with their classmates. They usually produce variations on the same (affective) themes: avoiding beginning projects by doing something else (fear/procrastination), setting up the writing environment the same way each time (control), preferring to use a specific type of pen or computer font (comfort), and so forth. When students discover that their seemingly individual emotional responses to a writing assignment or situation are similar to those of their classmates, they can construct (or acknowledge a culturally constructed) shared vocabulary of emotions, which facilitates peer response and their willingness to discuss their own writing.
Just as important as students’ emotions are teachers’ emotions and habits, including rituals (using a red pen versus typed comments, for instance), a department’s published or unpublished policy about writing, and other “symbolic vehicles of meaning” that convey socially acceptable emotions or attitudes (Gordon 115). When we study writing classrooms as cultures, whether ethnographically or quantitatively, we should include an examination of emotions as more than just threads in the social fabric. Furthermore, as Simon Williams suggests, we should divest ourselves of centuries of former dualistic thinking which has cast emotions as the poor relation, if not the scandal, of reason. Not only do emotions, as embodied, relational modes of being, underpin our most intimate thoughts and actions in the social world, they are also, as we have seen, central to the very process of rational thought itself. Accordingly, an examination of cognitive or social processes in the writing classroom would not be complete without considering how the emotions are involved in every thought, decision, and related action.

E MO TIONS, T HE M IND, A ND S E L F-E F F I C I C Y

Though I’ve been emphasizing the examination of emotions within student-teacher relationships, emotions should also be studied with respect to individual student writers or teachers. Some of these emotions—“writing anxiety, motivation, beliefs”—McLeod tells us, are “ripe for study in terms of affect” (“Some” 431). Another area that would be useful to scrutinize is the writer’s or teacher’s “unconscious,” which can be “an enormous reservoir of energy, symbolism, and memory” (McPherson and Fowler 46). Investigating the unconscious is complicated, given our limited understanding of how it is formed and accessed; however, with new research and technologies that offer glimpses into the brain’s activities (with scans such as the MRI, PET, etc.), the future looks more promising with regard to this affective component of writing.

Another research possibility that combines social and affective components of writing or teaching writing is work on “self-efficacy.” This idea—that one can have a positive effect on another—combines “internal, psychological factors” with “environmental and social factors,” according to McLeod (“Pygmalion” 377-78). Thus, a teacher’s beliefs or feelings about students could influence students’ writing in ways that we are only beginning to understand. For example, if teachers view themselves as “guardians of standards,” they might view their relationship to students as
more adversarial than facilitative, which might have an impact on the way students write to or for them (378). Similarly, we may shape our students’ writing by choosing to conceal our emotions in our responses to them. For instance, Tobin asserts that we “co-author” our students’ essays (“Reading” 81). In those roles, we often ignore our feelings or attitudes in service of neutrality and objectivity (80). If students believe that we don’t care about their ideas or about them, they might alter the way they write in our classes. Brand notes that researchers “McCarthy, Meier, and Rinderer (1985) have found that students with strong efficacy expectations demonstrate improved writing performance” (Psychology 201). Thus, students’ and/or teachers’ efficacy seems another sphere available for future scrutiny.

**Opportunities for Future Research on Emotions**

There are many prospects for research involving emotions and the writing process and/or the teaching of writing that have begun to capture the interest of composition scholars. The study of “flow,” for instance, is already a part of our field’s research agenda. *Flow* refers to “being in tune with the environment, experiencing enjoyment or even total euphoria, clarity of purpose, a sense of mastery, high intrinsic motivation, and total absorption in the task” (Kellogg 177). Investigating how or when students or teachers identify a sense of flow could have some bearing on writing and reading practices in the composition classroom. For instance, in my own preliminary research into emotions and writing, I have found that students use fewer coping strategies when they feel a sense of connection to their writing. However, I did not make the association between “flow” and “connection” until after I had concluded the study. If I were to do another project on the same issue, I would more specifically ask students to talk about their sense of flow during and out of class.

All of the emotional issues I’ve mentioned here seem important to composition studies because in one way or another they are related to an individual writer’s emotions, a teacher’s emotional state, or interpersonal relationships in the writing classroom. Further opportunities for research exist in the areas of intuition, spirituality, fear, and health. For instance, James Pennebaker has done studies that have considered connections between emotions and writing and health benefits (Waddell 65). It is possible that connections exist between our emotional health and our choices in writing subjects or styles. Waddell suggests that some students use writing to work through emotional issues, even in classrooms in which the teacher does not adopt a therapeutic stance (63). Of course, they could
be prompted to write in response to emotions on a biochemical rather than conscious level.

Viewing emotions from a biological perspective might seem strange, given the contemporary focus on the writer as a social being; however, Christine Watling notes that “numerous studies on the biological foundations of emotions confirm that emotions have directional properties, which focus attention, that they aid memory, and that they color our auditory and visual perceptions.” If those studies are accurate, then the biology of emotions certainly affects decisions that writers make about what they write and how they organize that material.

Research into biochemical aspects of writing and emotion—such as depression, social anxiety, and obsession and/or compulsion—would allow us to consider the writer (or the teacher) as a biological and chemical being. Perhaps future studies will look specifically at the connections between psychopharmacology and writing (I could imagine, for instance, a study of student writers on Paxil or Zoloft), or those between chemical imbalances in the brain and students’ attitudes toward (or success with) writing assignments (I could conceive of a study of students with Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder or Bipolar Affective Disorder). My hope is that by highlighting different aspects of emotion (sociological, psychological, biochemical), I have offered a broader picture of how emotions might relate to writing (or the teaching of writing), and, in doing so, have encouraged a reexamination of composition’s tendency to resist discussions or studies focused on emotions.

Some Final Thoughts (and Feelings)

Jane Tompkins identifies the “real objection” to a holistic approach to education—one which would attempt to acknowledge students’ “initiative, creativity, energy, and dedication” as well as their abilities as decision-makers and cooperative learners—as a “fear of emotion, of the imagination, of dreams and intuitions and spiritual experience that funds commonly received conceptions of reality in this culture” (213-14). She posits that the current trend in American education at all levels is an “externally oriented” curriculum (221). Even courses that deal with internal processes (health, spirituality, thinking) focus on mastery of “externalized bodies of knowledge.” A course in psychology, for instance, is not a course in self-exploration but a course on mastering theories of knowing and feeling. Based on my experience as a secondary teacher of language arts and psychology, and as a teacher of writing at the college level, I would agree with Tompkins’ assertion. I was taught, during my
training as a secondary educator and in my courses on pedagogy in composition, that a student’s emotional well-being is not as important to my teaching (or his/her learning) as his or her intellectual development. I believe, however, that this attitude toward students suggests an educational philosophy that emphasizes humanistic education without wanting to view its participants as (fully) human.

Thomas Newkirk argues that “ambivalence about the appropriateness of emotion reflects an academic and class bias that schools seek to pass on to students” (26). Taking his point and applying it to the work that Berlin, Bartholomae, and others ask us to do (that is, critical inquiry, especially with regard to how a society imparts a dominant ideology to its constituents), it would seem appropriate to critique why emotion has been marginalized in composition studies in particular and in the academy in general. Especially important to this critique is Brand’s assertion that in “affective structures,” there exists a “greater democracy” than is available in “intellectual ones” (Psychology 213). She points out that being emotionally stable is not a privilege of the rich or the educated. I would add that being emotionally unstable is not merely a circumstance of one’s finances or social status. Emotions cross the lines of race, class, sexuality, and gender; they are historical and cultural, biochemical and related to cognition. Their study should be of great importance to teachers of writing, no matter what their pedagogical disposition, and not relegated to the margins of composition studies as they have been until rather recently.

Marquette, Michigan

Notes

1 Appositional knowing, Winterowd argues, is not typical of “Western” definitions of knowing, which tend to be biased toward “verbal, prepositional, ‘logical’ sort[s] of mental activity” (98).

2 Richard Fulkerson points out that perhaps our binary classification of composition theory as either cognitive or social is flawed. He posits that we should contradict the social with the personal, and that the “cognitive/affective dichotomy” should fit in with the personal. He notes, though, that “cognition and affect are influenced by social forces” (102).

3 Brand calls emotion the “currency by which social intercourse is transacted” (Psychology 1).

4 In “Embracing Contraries,” Elbow discusses how our views of our students and ourselves influence not only how we teach but also how students learn (66).

5 The Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning is hosting a summer workshop in June 2002, the focus of which is “Writing and Healing.” Scheduled guest speakers include Peter Elbow and Gabrielle Rico.
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