English 401: Composition IV: Theory and Research is designated in the Elmhurst College catalogue as “a writing course that introduces students to the scholarly field of composition studies.” It is part of a series of courses for English majors pursuing a degree with “Writing Emphasis,” for students seeking teacher certification, or for any interested upper-level students who have completed an advanced writing course beyond the traditional first-year composition sequence. Elmhurst College, located in the western suburbs of Chicago, is a four-year, comprehensive, liberal arts college (granting bachelor and masters degrees) with approximately 2,550 students, including traditional, non-traditional, resident, and commuter students.

Mary Kay Mulvaney, Assistant Professor of English and Director of the Honors Program at Elmhurst College, holds a Ph.D. in English, with a specialization in Language, Literacy and Rhetoric, from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her most recent publication (co-authored by David A. Jolliffe) is a 2005 WAC and genre theory-based rhetoric-reader published by Pearson/Longman Press, entitled Academic Writing: Genres, Samples, and Resources. Her 20+ year teaching career has focused primarily on the theory and practice of composition, from first-year through graduate-level instruction.
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INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

This course is an upper–level course that is offered as part of the writing sequence option within the English major. The audience is primarily English majors—most of whom are secondary education minors. A significant secondary audience is communication majors—some are interested in academia, some are pursuing corporate careers.

This course structure reflects the strength of the English department as a whole. The department allows students to select a traditional literature or a writing concentration. Within that elected “emphasis,” there are options not only for the more common “journalism” and/or “creative writing” offerings, but also for a substantial emphasis on Composition Studies and formal rhetorical study including this advanced composition theory and research course—not a common offering in most undergraduate English programs—especially at a small college. This course provides a valuable introduction to the theoretical groundings and to the practical realities of Composition Studies.

The inclusion of the “mentoring” component of this course complements three institutional characteristics: 1) the significant number of students who are seeking secondary education certification, 2) a campus-wide emphasis on service learning (though this course linking does not specifically meet that definition, the spirit of meeting human needs through reciprocity and the focus on learning through reflection upon that service were a significant part of this course design), and 3) a minimally developed Writing Center.

This course thus addresses the interests and needs of advanced-level students and simultaneously provides peer support for freshman composition students on a campus with minimal institutional support for the Writing Center, which is staffed by a handful of well-intentioned peer tutors but supervised by a faculty member who receives neither compensation nor release time for running it and, thus, is unable to provide substantial, ongoing tutor support.

THEORETICAL RATIONALE

This course aims to accomplish five things: 1) expose students to the rich complexity of the theoretical dimensions of Composition Studies; 2) raise awareness that Composition Studies is informed by a nearly 2,500-year history of writing instruction; 3) provide avenues for integrating theory and praxis; 4) hone upper-level research skills and nourish personal inquiries in Composition Studies, and 5) introduce students to various aspects of Composition Studies as a vibrant profession. Each of these five goals is motivated by significant theoretical, often overlapping, positions.
1. Complex theory

The first goal necessarily engages students in the exploration of composition theory by requiring extensive reading and discussion of composition theory and current research. Since I believe that theory is best presented at this level as a “work in progress” with a myriad of dissenting factions, I selected the Villanueva anthology that, while organized around salient topics, also notably offers conflicting views regarding those topics. In my second teaching of the course, I was able to broaden the currency of the assignments by using Villanueva’s second edition. Most significantly, I introduced the notion of “post-process theory,” utilizing Lee-Ann Kastman-Breuch’s excellent article summarizing and integrating the strands of post-process theory. By definition, post-process theory defies a neatly packaged explanation. Her ultimate argument that two factors—dialogue and the rejection of mastery—are the essence of the relevance of post-process theory to pedagogy were especially relevant to this course.

I had previously taught this course as a kind of “dialogue of theories,” which reflects my commitment to the Bakhtinian notion of dialogism as the most credible way to view knowledge-making in any field. But the Kastman-Breuch article made that necessity even more apparent. Admittedly, students found the entire notion of post-process theory unsettling as it rejects simplistic definitions, singular perspectives, or highly “teachable” solutions. The need to continue dialogue, not accepting one approach to composition as doctrine, is the major underlying principle I hoped to communicate. Of course, students’ confusion and mental “stretching” was direct evidence of the Vygotskian principle of the “zone of proximal development” at work—another major contributor to my overall theoretical framework. Students gradually came to understand that there are no easy answers in this field and that scholars are continually wrestling with indecision, new ideas, challenges to complacency. I continually encouraged them to view knowledge-making as a disturbing and sometimes painful process, pushing them to resist the comfort of single-faceted answers and to embrace the Bakhtinian notions of heteroglossia and intertextuality which inhere in language itself and, therefore, in all theories and practices employing language.

2. Historical roots

Believing in the value of an historical perspective, I also selected Murphy’s Short History of Writing Instruction as a central text of the course. Students continually commented on their ignorance of the fact that writing instruction had such a complex, centuries-old tradition, based largely upon
rhetorical theory, and that, indeed, many of the same issues continue to surface and resurface across time. Several students commented during class discussion that they were fascinated with the fact that many writing practices had existed for centuries and that teachers and theorists have struggled with the “best” ways to teach writing since the age of the sophists. One student commented on the exit evaluation that the most valuable aspect of the course was “the history of writing instruction from the Greeks until now.” Several other students discussed their newfound knowledge of the history of writing instruction for women to be particularly enlightening by noting “the belletristic movement essentially provided a platform for women to move into the classroom. Women were believed to be able to write beautiful language, mostly because they were emotional and eloquent” (Christy).

3. Research skills

Convinced that students need to explore their own areas of interest to begin to own this field for themselves, I required the students to extend their surface survey knowledge of some aspect of history or theory in their individual research projects. Of course, this belief is founded in the Bakhtinian notion of the necessity to bridge “academic discourse” and “personal discourse” in order for genuine learning to occur. The research project topics covered a wide range, including an exploration of Isocrates’s contribution to contemporary writing instruction, feminist theories of composition, exploration of theoretically informed strategies for collaborative learning in the junior high classroom, gender issues involved in the integration of technology in the composition classroom, and so forth. The expansion of student knowledge and insights also reflected the Vygotskian notion of the “zone of proximal development.” The very activity of research and discussion in the classroom and small groups helped expand my students’ zones repeatedly.

Interestingly, numerous students chose to write a structured dialogue (of at least three participants) on their topic as opposed to a traditional term paper. These dialogues deliberately resist closure while fairly representing the conflicting positions of theorists on numerous topics within the field. As such, they further emphasized the post-process rejection of a singular perspective or solution that prevailed throughout the course.

4. Theory and praxis

While the course title privileges a focus on theory and research, I believe that theory must be prodded and challenged by practice and, conversely,
that practice must be informed by theory—practitioner-articulated theory. (Admittedly, this is not always a common practice among practitioners of any discipline.) I believe the strength of Composition Studies is that theory is readily tied to a viable, universal practice—namely, producing discourse to effect societal change. Ironically, the simultaneous challenge and nemesis of our field is that we do, in fact, produce an immediate, tangible product (unlike Philosophy, perhaps) that makes us both vulnerable to being “reduced” to “tool sharpeners” or skill providers but at the same time gives us the opportunity to demonstrate that theory can truly effect practice both within and outside of academia.

Students most often experience the “theory” of Composition Studies only as participants or subjects in practice settings, with little knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings and/or politics of those settings. Integrating theory and practice, especially in English studies, where so much political marginalization of practitioners has occurred, allows students to reflect and analyze the ethical, practical, and theoretical dimensions of their own experiences. Thus, in order to conflate theory, research, and practice, I included a mentoring requirement by linking the students of this 400-level course with the students of my first-year composition course [English 105]. Students met weekly to discuss various aspects of the first-year students’ writing assignments.

This mentoring component to the course draws heavily upon the theories of John Dewey and his increasingly popular (once again) notion of experiential learning. Dewey continually emphasizes that “all genuine education comes about through experience” (Experience and Education 25). Believing this, I challenged my upper-level students to bring their existing knowledge of writing from previous educational experiences, their relatively newfound knowledge of composition theory in this course, and their skills as four-year college practitioners to bear upon their experience as mentors of first-year college writers.

Dewey emphasizes, as Fishman discusses at some length, that experiences interact with other experiences over time and that, throughout every experience, an individual interacts with the environment. Students bring prior experiences to current ones and will continue to respond after the present experience. Thus, “every experience has interaction: it involves exchanges between an organism and its world or environment. Whether a particular experience is educative, however, depends on the quality of its continuities and interactions” (Fishman 31-2). The significant point is that “continuity and interaction work together when experience is fulfilling and meaningful” (32). I provided the upper-level students opportunities for quality “continuities and interactions,” to borrow Dewey’s phrase. They brought to the sessions their own previous experiences as first-year students, as fledging college writers,
and now as students of advanced composition theory, enabling an interactive link between levels of experiences. Genuine education occurs when students engage in experiences that encourage connections between known and unknown. Merely presenting information or facts assuming absorption of knowledge will not constitute the construction of interest (Dewey, *Democracy and Education* 149).

Of course, Dewey’s notions of continuity and interest can be clearly linked to Freire’s focus on the value of reflective practice or “praxis.” Both ideas complement each other as ways of thinking about learning: a perpetual process that functions by means of creating connections between the known and previously experienced and the newly encountered. Committed to Freire’s notion of the value of praxis, which insists on the interaction of reflection and action as the most valuable kind of pedagogy, I required my students to gain experience in the application of theory through practice and through reflection. This reflection component (described in detail below) clearly heightened their consciousness of interaction and forged continuities.

5. Professionalism

Finally, I made a very deliberate attempt to expose students to the professional aspects of Composition Studies. I frequently referred to professional societies and encouraged students to join either the NCTE or the ABC (Association of Business Communication) depending upon their academic major and interests. I encouraged attendance at different relevant professional conferences held in our area. Several students attended, encouraged by offers of extra credit. Students reported back to the class in awe of their first exposure to these professional venues for “cutting edge” discussions. I also included classroom activities such as a journal workshop, bringing in samples of numerous professional journals in the field and dividing the students into small groups to investigate them and professional association websites as well.

The process of bridging the gap from students to professionals demands the kind of “loan of consciousness” that Bruner describes as the scaffolding essence of learning. I also believe it harkens to the notions of post-process theory that writing is “public, interpretive, and situated” since participation within the professional arena of Composition Studies makes those characteristics continually evident.

**CRITICAL REFLECTION**

Having taught this course twice now, two years apart, I can sincerely say it is one of the most satisfying in nearly twenty years of teaching. Thinking back upon the source of the satisfaction, I find the notion of “education as
translation,” espoused by Alison Cook-Sather in a recent CCC article, especially helpful. Cook-Sather interrogates the multiple definitions of “translation,” indicating that translation can be a process of removing or changing a place or condition; it can be the creation of a new version by rendering something in one’s own language; or it can mean changing completely thereby transforming (94). Cook-Sather’s fascinating discussion of this complex concept in relation to her sophomore seminar rings true for my course as well—and further, I would posit, it represents the best of education in nearly any context.

Cook-Sather argues that translation is both a “process of communication and of decision-making” (94). Significantly, students are both translators and translated in the process of their education (94). I found this to be the case in teaching my course as well, perhaps because it focused upon supporting the senior-level student beginning the translation into professionalism; perhaps because it challenged students not to accept simple answers nor to embrace theoretical perspectives uncritically, but rather to constantly question and interpret, and then re-vision the texts, their perspectives on them, and their potential applications to their future work.

Indeed, my students evidenced a kind of self-translation in a variety of ways. Some did so by getting increasingly comfortable with the discomfort of conflicting theories—seeing the teaching of writing not as a set process, but rather, as post-process theory demands, as a consciousness of a complex system. In other words, they came to recognize writing as a public, interpretative, situated activity which defies simple transcription or duplication.

Some reached a level of self-translation largely through the mentoring component, finding links between theory and praxis to be windows to their own sense of ownership of their education. Encouragement for maintaining the mentoring component was provided by one of my male, secondary education majors, Gino:

Truthfully, my initial thoughts [when I heard we had to tutor beginning composition students] were that this was going to take a lot of time out of my already busy schedule. However, my experiences and meetings with John and Jim have been (probably) the most enlightening experiences that I have had at Elmhurst College. . . . The ten hours I spent with both students do not even compare to the amount of knowledge and experience I gained from our sessions.

Some students evidenced translation through their brushes with professionalism, attending their first professional conferences, commenting on their usefulness, and realizing, seemingly for the first time, that true “professionals” are never “finished” with learning and never satisfied that they have
“the answers,” but rather are only beginning to interrogate the tenets of their profession from a relatively informed base.

During this course, both academic and affective translations occurred. Academically, many mentioned that they found themselves improving as writers as they struggled to teach others to write. These students were forced to unravel some of their own uncertainties. They continually commented upon their increased knowledge of the theories of writing pedagogy we were discussing in class as they attempted to put them into practice. They struggled, for instance, with how to appreciate individual interpretation, even if it was obviously underinformed or how to phrase suggestions that would encourage greater reflection and not automatic, unquestioned adoption or how to value voice, while reminding students about certain conventions of Standard Written English. Within the affective domain, the tutors reported forming friendships and extremely satisfying relationships; I know at least one pair of students continued to meet for tutoring sessions the following semester when the first year student took Comp II. Many reported feelings of increased confidence in their own writing abilities and more confidence in their ability to become good teachers or mentors.

Looking back, I realize that another significant aspect of this course is the reflection piece. Embracing Dewey’s insistence upon reflection as key for effective pedagogy, I structured reflection as pivotal in this course in several ways. Students wrote nearly 20 response papers, reflecting upon their readings of the course’s theoretical and historical texts; kept journals of their mentoring experiences; and wrote serious reflective exit essays, focusing either upon the mentoring experience or upon their own growth as a writer and a pre-professional. Students commented on the value of the multiple facets of this course, saying things like Nikki who shared the following:

Before this class, I doubted that I had learned that much in my six years of college because I never really had a chance to apply any of my knowledge. What this tutoring assignment did was allow me to reflect on what I have learned and how it would be relevant to these tutees’ assignments. . . . The tutoring assignment was an outlet for me to tie all of this knowledge together in order to contribute to the knowledge of others.

Now I find myself reflecting on why this course was so successful. I believe it is the blending of theory, research, and practice. I think that combination allowed for what Belenky et al. would call a level of “constructed knowledge” that came together for these upper-level students only when they were challenged to contextualize in a personal relationship the ideas and theories they had been
studying and to maintain open dialogue in our classroom, interrogating competing theories of composition and wrestling with frustrations of the ever-unfinished nature of research. Belenky et al.’s study clearly established that successful learners generally progress gradually from more personally centered stages of knowing to connected knowing and, ultimately, to constructed knowing through varied experiences—specifically, scaffolded, structured opportunities of exchange, reinforced through reflection.

I strongly believe it is the blending of the five components of this course that accounts for its satisfaction for students and for myself. All of the components are necessary—even if they vary in emphasis (the second time I taught this course, not all students participated in the mentoring aspect at the same level as the first)—and yet, the dominant feature each time was the focus on continued dialogue. Prior to teaching this term, I never specifically articulated my belief that this course is an enactment of post-process theory, but, upon reflection, that is clearly the case. Viewing this course as a reflection of post-process writing theory, as perhaps a salient theory of education itself, is crucial for me. Indeed, is not education “public, situated, and interpretative” (as post-process theory characterizes writing)? Isn’t education ultimately necessarily based upon dialogue when it is truly successful—demanding as much of the teacher as it does of the learner? Doesn’t education, particularly at the highest levels, ironically reject mastery (as post-process theory demands) in its acknowledgment that knowledge is forever in flux even as it simultaneously promotes mastery of certain tenets and skills?

Did the course have problems? Of course it did. Some students didn’t meet with their tutees as regularly as others; some didn’t read the texts seriously and critically; a few fought the notion of ambiguity so completely that they gave up in a mode of frustration or, worse yet, closed their minds to anything new and clung desperately to some familiar theory. Yet, overall, it was clearly successful.

The next time I teach this course I will do even more to update the Villanueva reader, including further attention to discussion of social process and post-process theories of composition. I have considered shortening the time given to the history of writing instruction because although I find it fascinating, some students seemed restless with it. Nonetheless, in the final exams as I indicated, they seemingly gained valuable understandings from the historical perspective. I will certainly try to anticipate the tutoring difficulties that I addressed above, but I will definitely keep the linked course feature.

The multiple components of this course echo the theories of Bakhtin, Belenky, Dewey, and others regarding the essence of education and point to education as the kind of “translation of self” that Cook-Sather discusses. Genuine education is the re-rendering of texts and self in the creation of
something new and potentially transformative for self and for others. This course allows for, indeed encourages, that challenging process of translation—of both the field of Composition Studies and of the self. Therein lies my primary motivation to continue this course design.
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SYLLABUS

English 401: Composition IV -
Exploring the Field of Composition Studies

INSTRUCTOR INFO: Dr. Mary Kay Mulvaney
231 HC  Phones: O) 630-617-xxxx  H) 708-246-xxxx
E) marym@elmhurst.edu
Office Hours: 12-1 MW; 11-12 TR or other times
by appointment

COURSE PHILOSOPHY/GOALS:

This course is a pre-professional seminar that will begin to enculturate upper-level students into the academic discourse community of composition studies. This field is closely linked to the relatively recent reemergence of the ancient scholarly field of rhetoric. It pays serious scholarly attention to the generative act of writing and to the complex relationships between readers, writers, cultures, and texts. It is designed to:

• Introduce students to the major theories/concepts in the scholarly field of composition studies
• Foster an appreciation of the complexity and ambiguity of this academic endeavor
• Provide students with an historical perspective on writing instruction
• Advance students’ own reading, writing, critical thinking, and reflective skills through rigorous engagement with challenging texts
• Afford students the opportunity to learn through a mentoring role, offering service to novice members of their college community
• Cultivate an in-depth understanding of at least one aspect of this field through serious academic research

REQUIRED TEXTS:

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING:

1) **Participation/Informal Writing**, including regularly attending class; conscientiously participating in all seminar discussions; leading one of the discussions; collaborating with a small group on two informal presentations; writing response papers on readings -- 40%

2) **Mentoring**, involving mentoring/tutoring sessions with a freshman composition student and keeping a brief journal on the experience for seminar discussions, culminating in a short, reflective personal essay -- 20%

3) **Inquiry Project**, researching a specific topic of choice within the field, culminating in a 10-12 page seminar paper -- 25%

4) **Final exam**, demonstrating your grasp of key concepts/theories in composition studies -- 15%

CLASS POLICIES:

**Papers:** Format Issues: All papers must be typed, double-spaced with standard 1’ margins, stapled. Use a readable font such as Times New Roman or Courier, 11-or 12-point size. **Timeliness Issues:** Papers are due on time at the beginning of the class period. Late response papers will be not accepted, except in case of emergencies.

**Attendance:** Quite simply -- **Attendance is expected!** This class is designed as a pre-professional seminar discussion course -- your participation is crucial for its success. Participation on all levels is a significant part of your grade. If you miss more than two classes, without very grave reason, your grade will be affected. If you know that you must miss class, please notify me ahead of time if at all possible. Be in touch with other students for class notes, announcements, etc.

**Tardiness:** Late entries are very disruptive. Please make every effort to arrive on time. Recurrent tardiness will be treated as unexcused absence.

**Plagiarism:** Presenting the work of another as if it were your own constitutes plagiarism. This is a serious academic and ethical violation that is unacceptable. All “borrowed” (directly quoted or paraphrased) material must be properly documented in standard MLA format. Consult your Elmhurst Student Handbook for details regarding the Code of Academic Integrity.

ASSISTANCE:

This is a demanding class that clearly requires that you “keep up.” I am more than willing to offer you assistance in interpreting these challenging texts—please don’t be timid about asking for help! I am available during office
hours, other times by appointment, and by email. You will soon discover that very little about this field (your texts readily admit) is “fixed,” “certain,” or “universally accepted”—perhaps therein lies the excitement (and the frustration) of higher-level learning.

CSTC 108 and 110 are computer labs available for all students. Our reference librarians here are fantastic! Get acquainted with them, if you’re not already.

Elmhurst College will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. If you have a disability that may have an impact on your work in this course, please contact the Director of Advising. 103 Goebel Hall, (630) 617-3450.

**Response Paper Guidelines:**

To aid you with grasping the challenging readings in this course and to help facilitate active seminar discussions, I am requiring that you prepare response papers for the major readings in the course. The readings are marked with a (R) in your syllabus. You must complete any 15 of the designated 20 for a grade of B or better in the “Informal Writing” component of this course.

These response papers, (1-2 typed pages), should: 1) Briefly summarize the author(s) main point(s)—essentially, write an “abstract” for the article and 2) Offer a personal reaction to the text (or at least some aspect of it)—agree, disagree, question, make connections to other pieces, challenge, extend, etc. They should demonstrate a serious, scholarly attempt to grapple with the reading(s).

**Mentoring Guidelines:**

There are three requirements to this aspect of the course: 1) Devote ten hours, over the course of the semester, to your apprentice. Ideally, you will meet once a week at a mutually convenient time during Weeks 5-15 for an hour or twice a week for one-half hour. Discuss papers/assignments in progress, review drafts, etc. (You’ll receive peer-tutoring training in class.) 2) Reflect on the experience of mentoring through brief journal entries (approximately one page) each time you meet with your “partner.” 3) Drawing upon those journal entries, write a 3-4 page reflective essay on the overall experience.

**Schedule (Subject to Change)**

Assignments are due on the day designated (they are not homework that day). (R) indicates response paper. K refers to Keywords in Composition Studies; SH refers to Murphy’s A Short History of Writing Instruction; CT refers to Villanueva’s Cross-Talk in Comp Theory.
Week 1
M - Orientation and Introductions

The Writing Process

W- Murray, “Teaching Writing as a Process not Product” 3-6; Emig, “Writing as a Mode of Learning” 7-15, and Sommers, “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers” 43-54; (CT)—(R); “process,” “revision,” “invention” (K)
F- Breuch, “Post-Process Theory” 97-126—(R); “composing/writing”(K)

Concept of Audience

Week 2
M- Labor Day — no class! Enjoy your final summer holiday!
W- Ede and Lunsford, “Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy” 77-98 (CT)—(R); “audience,” “literacy” (K)

Theories of Discourse/Discourse Pedagogy

F- Kinneavy, “The Basic Aims of Discourse” 129-140; Berlin, “Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories” 255-270 (CT)—(R); “argument,” “essay,” “pedagogy,” “teacher” (K)

Historical Overview of Writing Instruction

(All of the readings for this section are from Murphy, James J., ed. A Short History of Writing Instruction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.)

Week 3
M- Enos, “Ancient Greek Writing Instruction” (SH)—(R)
W- Murphy, “The Key Role of Habit in Roman Writing Instruction” (SH)—(R)
F- Lanham, “Writing Instruction from Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century” (SH)—(R)

Week 4
M- Woods, “The Teaching of Poetic Composition in the Later Middle Ages” (SH)—(R)
W- Abbott, “Rhetoric and Writing in the Renaissance” (SH)—(R)

F- Discussion of peer tutoring and mentoring project. (Tutor training.)

Week 5  (REMINDER: Meet with your tutee this week. Remember to start your mentor journal.)
M- Ferrerra-Buckley and Horner, “Writing Instruction in Great Britain: The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries” (SH)—(R)
W- Wright and Halloran, “From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900” (SH)—(R)
F- Discussion of mentoring issues and initial tutee sessions. Share journal entries.

Week 6
M- Hobbs and Berlin, “A Century of Writing Instruction in School and College English” (SH)—(R)

Grammar/Basic Writing

W- Hartwell, “Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar” 205-234 (CT)—(R); “grammar” (K)
F- Shaughnessy, “‘Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing’ 311-318 (CT)—(R); “basic writing/writers” (K)

Week 7
M-Columbus Day -- no class! Enjoy “A film of autumn o’er the summer spread”!

Cognitive Issues of Composition

W- Flower and Hayes, “A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing” 273-298 (CT)—(R)
F- Berthoff, “Is Teaching Still Possible? Writing, Meaning, and Higher Order Reasoning” 329-344; Bizzell, “Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know about Writing” 387-412 (CT)—(R); “practice/praxis” (K)

Social Issues of Composition

Week 8
M- Bruffee, “Collaborative Learning and the ‘Conversation of Mankind’” 415-436; Trimbur, “Consensus and Difference in Collaborative Learning” 461-478 (CT)—(R); “collaboration,” and “social construction,” (K)

F- Discussion of mentoring issues. Share journal entries.

*Concept of Voice*

**Week 9**
M- Haefner 509-522, Kirsch and Ritchie 523-46 (CT)—(R); “voice,” “students” (K)
W- Royster 611-22—“empowerment” -- (R)
F- Flynn, “Composing as a Woman” 571-86; Hairston, “Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing” 697-714 (CT)—(R); “feminism,” “cultural studies,” “ideology” (K)

*Inquiry Project*

**Week 10**
M- Technology and Composition—Anson 797-818 (CT)—(R)
W- Rhetoric and Racism -- Villanueva, “Considerations for American Freireistas” 829-846 (CT)
F- Research day. Meet in the EC Library with Reference Librarian.

**Week 11**
M- Introduction of inquiry project—brainstorm for ideas
W- Research/Conference day. Meet in the EC Library.
F- (Class cancelled for attendance at MMLA--held in Chicago. Students encouraged to attend.)

**Week 12**
M- Project discussions -- Initial proposal and working bibliography for project due.
W- Research/discussion of Inquiry Project. Meet in Computer lab (location TBA).
F- Discussion of mentoring issues. Share journal entries.

**Week 13**
M- Drafting seminar paper. Style and documentation issues reviewed.
W- Conferences on projects (sign up for individual times.)
F- Workshop on professional journals in the field of composition studies.

**Week 14**
M- Draft of seminar paper due—peer review writing workshops.

---

108 Composition Studies
W- Discussion of mentoring issues.  Share journal entries.
F- Happy Thanksgiving break! -- No class. Enjoy!

Week 15
M- Final Project due. Review day for final exam.
F- Reflective Essay due. Share experiences on mentoring project.

Exam Week:  12/10  10:30-12:30  Final exam on readings/concepts.
GOOD LUCK ON FINALS -- HAVE A GREAT BREAK!