English 306 Rhetoric and Composition:

Getting Started

Lower Division English Policy Committee

August 1988

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

The 1987 syllabus was prepared by the Freshman English Policy Committee (1986-88), Professors Lance Bertelsen, Elizabeth Hedrick, Sheila Kearns, and John Slatin. Substantial material on the writing process and on various procedural matters was incorporated from the 1985 syllabus by Professors John Ruszkiewicz and James Kinneavy. Valerie Balester, former Assistant Director of Freshman English, Nancy Peterson and Mara Holt, Assistant Instructors, contributed ideas and editorial assistance to the larger project. Don Weeda, Senior Secretary, meticulously proof-read the document and made significant editorial and substantive contributions. The 1988 syllabus has undergone additional revision by Professors Linda Brodkey and Neil Nehring and Kay Halasek, Assistant Director of Lower Division English.

INTRODUCTION: TO NEW ASSISTANT INSTRUCTORS

The material in the following syllabus represents an approach to E.306 you may follow while you are an Assistant Instructor in the Department of English. As you become more experienced as a teacher of writing, you may want to rearrange elements of your course, emphasizing certain units more than others, varying the readings, working on those handbook units that seem to you most productive in a college-level class. But because the Lower Division English Policy Committee (LDEPC) expects E.306 courses to be reasonably consistent and generally to cover the same subject matter, you should rely on the syllabus for your basic approach to course materials and content. The following basic policies are in effect:

1. NUMBER OF ESSAYS REQUIRED. The LDEPC expects instructors of E.306 to require the equivalent of eight essays. You may number the journal, the library research paper, and the final examination as essays. This policy may be sensibly modified if you require regular and repeated revisions of papers. In all cases, the primary activity in a writing class should be writing, and students should be graded chiefly on the basis of their written work.

The LDEPC further suggests that at least two graded papers during the term be in-class work--both as a protection against plagiarism and as a way to sharpen impromptu (e.g., essay exam) writing skills. The diagnostic essay and / or final examination can be counted as these essays. The others may be handled in a variety of ways--as full in-class essays, for example, or as in-class drafts which are collected and then revised the next class day.

2. FINAL EXAMINATION. A final examination that requires students to write an in-class essay must be a part of every E.306 section taught by assistant instructors. The examination should be held during the three-hour final examination period scheduled at the end of each term. University policy does not permit final examinations to be administered during regular class periods, on the final class day, or on "dead" day.

3. RESEARCH PAPER. All instructors of E.306 should teach the research paper unit, even during the summer terms. The paper provides students with the basic research skills they need not only in E.306 but in subsequent university courses. The 1988-89 revision of the syllabus is specifically designed to introduce the students to research techniques early in the course and to build in an integrated, cumulative way toward the final research paper. You and your students may wish to take advantage of the comprehensive materials prepared by the staff of the Undergraduate Library (UGL): library tour, work sheets, study guides, and topic lists. The library unit also gives students practice in assembling and organizing an extended essay. Many instructors count the library research paper as the equivalent of two regular papers.

4. REVISION. The LDEPC now requires that instructors incorporate practice in drafting and/or revision into at least two papers during the E.306 course. You may also require drafts of all major writing assignments.

To Experienced Assistant Instructors

The basic policies listed in the preceding instructions to new Assistant Instructors also apply to more experienced instructors. It is important that sections of E.306 *Rhetoric and Composition* be reasonably equivalent. The variety of approved textbooks available for E.306, however, provides instructors with considerable latitude in their teaching methods and materials. Within the basic syllabus, you are encouraged to teach to your strengths--keeping in mind the basic focus on writing and rhetoric in E.306.

Regular faculty and experienced assistant instructors may request textbooks for E.306 other than those on the approved textbook list. They may also propose courses which depart substantially from the regular E.306 syllabus. If you are interested in requesting a variant text or in making a variant course proposal, see the appropriate section in the Freshman English Handbook. Requests for both must be submitted to the LDEPC during the long semester preceding the term you expect to use them. The University Co-op does not accept orders for lower division course texts that have not been approved by the LDEPC.

Versions of This Syllabus

This syllabus is the ninth version of a syllabus originally written in 1975. The 1975 syllabus was constructed by a comparison and collation of the topics common to the three rhetoric texts adopted for that year; these topics have continued to structure the later versions of the syllabus.

The 1975-1977 version included careful rhetorical analyses of the reading selections recommended for each unit. The 1978 course outline represented an attempt to provide students with their own version of the E.306 syllabus in simpler language and with enlarged instructions, examples, and assignments. The 1981-82 version presented a more compact and schematic syllabus designed once again for instructors. The 1983 version added new assignment suggestions, a short new section on teaching writing, and a bibliography. The 1984 syllabus included some minor changes and additions. In April, 1984, a special supplement to the basic E.306 syllabus incorporating process-oriented materials and assignments was prepared for summer sections of E.306. The 1985 syllabus followed the summer supplement in integrating a process methodology with the prevailing aims/modes approach. The revised 1986 E.306 syllabus deleted extensive discussion of the aims and modes approach, placed strong emphasis on teaching students to gather, evaluate, and present information (or evidence), and worked in an integrated way toward the final research paper. The 1987 revision incorporates suggestions from users of the 1986 syllabus and includes page references for two additional textbooks. The 1988 syllabus, revised to reflect the use of new texts, deleted reference to most of the particular writing assignment units and further emphasized researched writing assignments.

The following topics have been used in E.306 as diagnostic assignments:

1. Write several paragraphs introducing yourself. Explain where you are from, why you chose to attend the University of Texas at Austin, what kind of writing you like to do (if any), what you hope to get out of E.306, and in what specific areas (if any) you think you need help with your writing. Try to establish a clear relation between the biographical part of your essay and the part that relates to your potential work in E.306.

2. Present a brief history of some aspect of your own experience with writing. You might want to discuss a piece of writing with which you were pleased and explain why it pleased you, or you might discuss problems that you have had in writing, either in a particular situation or in general, and try to explain how and why you think these problems came about. You might describe what you do when you sit down to write, or you might describe the kinds of topics that you like best and explain why they appeal to you. You might want to discuss courses you have taken that have emphasized writing, explaining what you found valuable about them and why, or you may focus on problems that you had in these courses and why you had them.

3. a. A process description (e.g. explain registration procedures to a fellow student).
   b. A paraphrasing or summarizing exercise.

The Writing Lab also has a variety of assessment materials geared to sentence level skills, including a computerized diagnostic examination. The Lab is in Parlin 3. (For a description of the Writing Lab and its services, see the Freshman English Handbook.)

STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING E.306

Using Your Textbooks

The syllabus will suggest materials from the E.306 course texts you may want to cover in your class. A few experienced teachers do not use a rhetoric in their E.306 course, relying on their own knowledge of rhetoric and their ability to convey the appropriate concepts to their students. Less experienced teachers will find the rhetorics useful in giving scope and direction to their courses. This syllabus is based on the assumption that you are using The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers and One Hundred Major Modern Writers, supplemented by Writing in Context. The Collaborative Learning Appendix provides direction for those advanced instructors using A Short Course in Writing. We have also included references to various sections of the other approved texts in the E.306 syllabus.

A variety of readers is available to E.306 instructors, varying in organization and level of difficulty. Units will include suggested readings from the more frequently used texts that may prove valuable in a number of ways: as elaborations of specific topics, as examples of various writing techniques, as texts for close reading and analysis, and as models for student writing. Please note that Reading Critically, Writing Well is by the same authors as The St. Martin's Guide and should prove extremely helpful when used in conjunction with the Guide.

All sections of E.306 should require a handbook. A handbook is an important reference tool for most students; they should be encouraged to keep and use it even after E.306. The assignments recommended in this syllabus give shape and direction to E.306 but they do not, in themselves, explain to students how they actually go about composing a successful piece. Teaching writing involves considerably more than asking students to respond to a series of assignments. It requires instruction in audience, purpose, tone, and voice, and in invention, arrangement, style, revision, and editing. It is intimately related to practice in reading, analyzing, speaking, and arguing.

Writing students respond well to methods of instruction which explore interactions between writers and their audiences and which encourage processes of critical thinking and revising as essays move through draft states to final polished versions.

Assignment Procedures

Here are the procedures for making major writing assignments in E.306.

1. Ask your students to submit fully-developed drafts (approximately 500-600 words) of every assignment excluding the in-class essays but including the research paper. Every major assignment you give should be accompanied by a handout explaining the precise nature of the work, the required length (if any), the due dates involved (for drafts, final version), and any special features the essay should have (footnotes, accompanying notecards, copies of sources, drafts, bibliographies). Whenever possible, you should also state the criteria by which you intend to evaluate the draft and the final version. Don't make students have to guess about your intentions or expectations. In most cases, students will write better drafts if you define both a purpose for the assignment and a specific audience. When you have no specific audience in mind, you might direct students to write for their colleagues in the course or for the University community at large.

2. Read and comment on these initial drafts, making the kinds of suggestions that will encourage students to revise substantially and significantly. You should not feel obligated to rework these drafts for your students or to mark each mechanical error. Students should clearly understand that they--not you--are responsible for the quality of the final version. Your marginal comments on the draft should be aimed at improving the content, organization, and rhetoric of the piece. Remarks should be suitably frank to indicate clearly to students where they stand in a course and what they have to do to improve a draft. Unacceptable work should be so labeled. However, you don't have to put a letter grade on the draft essays. When you begin putting marks on drafts, your editorial

comments can turn into justifications of the grade you assigned. And you may lead students to expect that the grades on their final versions will automatically be higher than those they received on their drafts.

The drafts your students hand in may be rough in style and content, but they should be complete essays, not fragments or freewritings. They must be legible. Return incomplete or illegible drafts unmarked; the student should be expected to resubmit a more suitable piece within a day or two.

Some teachers using the draft method allow students to turn in second and third versions of a paper. Others will review (not copy-edit) any work that has been substantially revised (new paragraphs, revised opening paragraph, altered conclusion). Each subsequent revision should receive less commentary to keep students from regarding instructors as their personal editors and proofreaders.

3. Use the drafts for in-class work and peer-editing. The original draft or a copy may become material for peer-editing or workshops. You can, for example, encourage your students to share passages from their essays as a way of getting suggestions and feedback. Allow class time for writing and editing. (See Collaborative Learning Appendix.)

4. Collect final versions of the essays. Some teachers using this method allow students a week to revise a draft after it has been returned with commentary. Others announce two due dates for papers during a long semester, one roughly midway through the term, the second near the end. Under this second method, students work on more than one essay at a time. The time available for revising essays drafted early in a term may be as long as four or five weeks. Students may, however, turn in an essay before a given due date, but a final version may not be revised further. When a student declares a paper "finished," she accepts responsibility for its quality.

Final essays should be graded holistically. Read through the paper carefully once or twice, evaluating it for its overall quality the way a well-informed reader might. The amount of commentary to be included on the final paper will vary with the individual instructor. Those who do extensive work on drafts will often refrain from making extensive comments on final papers. Others, however, may feel that a draft bears the same relation to the final paper as practice does to game day: the former, while necessary and helpful, means little if strategy, spirit, and execution do not combine to produce victory on the latter. Or, to shift to a culinary analogy: drafts--like ingredients, recipes, preheating--while necessary, do not insure that the final product won't taste awful. For these instructors, extensive commentary on the final paper is especially important. (Those of you who have written for publication will know what we mean.) Still other instructors will attach a checklist of strengths and weaknesses to the final papers. These checklists, which usually take only minutes to fill out, anticipate and answer many of the questions students have about their graded essays.

Those of you who choose to work extensively with drafts will probably need to tell students more than once not to expect substantial commentary on their final essays. If you have explained your grading policy clearly, your students shouldn't be unhappy or surprised by the lack of extensive remarks on their final essays. Nor should they be surprised by their grades.

To anticipate problems with students whose draft essays do not look promising, you should schedule conferences with all your students about a third of the way through the semester and/or before the first set of final papers is due. Let your students know how they are doing in the course based upon what you have seen in their early drafts, in their peer-editing work and in their revisions. Also require them to keep all of their drafts and other course materials--outlines, notecards, copies of sources--in a folder as a record of their work in case of grade or plagiarism disputes.

You may decide that your students do not have to turn in a final version of every essay for which they have prepared a draft. Instead, you might instruct them to hand in polished versions of four-out-of-six or five-out-of-seven original assignments. In this way you give them some additional

control over the essays they are revising and rethinking. They can decide which projects deserve additional effort and which are dead ends.

The advantages of reading and reviewing essay drafts are numerous. For one thing, it improves the relationship between the writer and the instructor. Instead of the teacher being perceived as a hostile evaluator or corrector, she becomes a sympathetic editor and audience responding to a paper at a time when criticism can help a writer reshape a thought or restructure a pattern of organization. Most professional writers regularly submit their work to colleagues and friends to gather suggestions and advice before they submit it for publication, and then revise on the basis of these comments. Of course, if the manuscript is rejected by a publisher on the basis of several reader reports, the professional writer will usually pay even more attention to these reports than to the advice of his friends. The analogy should be obvious.

On the other hand, it is just as obvious that comments on drafts are more timely and far less threatening than corrections and "red marks" on final versions. Students cannot intelligently ignore the suggestions a teacher has offered on first drafts, nor do they have cause to. The draft is a working text; it does not yet represent "best work." No egos (or grade point averages) are threatened if a teacher confesses to finding a piece promising, but underdeveloped; exciting, but stylistically clumsy. For the students, revising a paper becomes a natural part of developing ideas, not a punishment for work presumably done improperly the first time. And they can take more risks with their ideas because they are not gambling everything on a single version of an essay submitted blindly on a due date to fulfill an assignment.

If you decide to adopt a draft method, be sure to explain the approach carefully to your students. Let them know the logic behind your procedures; especially why they might not be receiving grades on their drafts or comments on their final versions. Make it clear to students that the responsibility for revision resides entirely with them, and that you are not obligated to point out all the defects in their drafts. Let them know that you expect their final versions to show improvements that go well beyond the comments or corrections you have made. And be sure to acknowledge the strengths in a draft; students learn more from their successes than their failures.

Journals

If you are interested in having your students keep a journal, you should probably assign it at the beginning of the semester. The journal is a semester-long project in most courses (although some teachers have employed it successfully for an intensive two-week period). Most instructors expect students to write regularly in a journal, dating their entries and producing a specific amount of writing: either a set number of entries per week or a specified amount of writing over the term. Students can be asked to record precisely and carefully their thoughts, observations, feelings, hopes, fears, ambitions, resentments, and so on. For students who are unfamiliar with journals, the Writing Lab has several textbooks that suggest how to make journal entries.

Some teachers make specific journal assignments; others give their students free rein in choice of subject matter and style. It makes particularly good sense to ask students to record their reactions to course readings in their journals. A reading journal of this sort can be an innovative and stimulating project for students not accustomed to habits of close reading. Students should be discouraged from writing diaries that simply narrate what they did on a given day. In all cases, the journal should help focus and stimulate student thinking and become--in the best of circumstances--a tool for invention, providing topics and ideas for subsequent papers.

In addition to having students keep the usual journal of thoughts, observations, etc., you might ask them to use their journals as a sort of writing log in which they make observations on their own writing process: how much time they spent on the different phases of producing a particular piece of writing, at which junctures they felt they were the most productive or frustrated, how they did or did not find their way out of a particular impasse, etc.

A journal technique that especially encourages students to pay attention to their own writing is a format that might be called a "double-entry journal," in which students use one facing page as they would a usual

journal and then use the other as a commentary on what they have already written. This commentary can take any number of forms. It can be a kind of revision in which the "original" writing is refined and developed (cf. James Boswell's practice in the London Journal); it can be a reflection on how and why the student came to write what she previously did; it can be a sort of debate in which previous thoughts and impressions are examined and interrogated; it can even be a parody of the writer's own prose. Students should be encouraged to be as innovative as possible in constructing these commentaries.

Journals are evaluated or graded in a variety of ways. Most teachers are reluctant to place a letter grade on the self-expressive material itself. Instead they evaluate the satisfactory completion of the journal assignment. You should feel free, however, to comment on the writing in a journal, praising what is vigorous or thoughtful and criticizing prose that turns into random record-keeping: "This morning I ate Raisin Bran and then headed for Math 101 where I ran into Miles...." Be sure your students understand the criteria by which their journals will be graded.

Respect your students' confidentiality. What goes into journals is private stuff never to be used for in-class exercises. If you assign journals, students will expect you to read them. If you can't handle all of the material (some students will write short books), at least read *in* them.

TEACHING THE WRITING PROCESS

An effective E.306 course should include instruction in the following:

1. INVENTION--the art of finding and developing ideas. Techniques of invention range from the formalism of classical stasis theory and the Aristotelian topoi to more contemporary systems and devices such as Kenneth Burke's "Pentad" and the tagmemic matrix of Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike. Less elaborate systems--such as the familiar "journalist's questions"--and other procedures as simple as classroom discussion or brainstorming can achieve satisfactory results. The goals of instruction in invention are to teach students how to explore ideas systematically and rigorously, how to discover new subjects, how to find arguments, how to formulate objections and rebuttals, and how to define issues. The rhetorics and handbooks for E.306 cover invention in detail.

2. ARRANGEMENT--the effective organizing of materials and the presentation of ideas and arguments in the order best suited to a given situation and audience. Advice about organization in E.306 should range considerably beyond the topic-sentence/five-paragraph essay models often presented to students in secondary school. Classwork should convey to students an appreciation of the various kinds of structures and strategies writers typically use to convey their ideas. Patterns of development (comparison/contrast, cause and effect, illustration, and so on) should be presented pragmatically, as aids to composition, not as rigid, prescriptive structures. Students should be made to appreciate the role played by cohesion, coherence, and skillful transitions in giving shape to an essay. Rhetorics and some anthologies ordinarily include treatments of arrangement and organization.

3. STYLE--the art of shaping language to suit the aim of a given piece. Students should be made to appreciate the power of language to control and define ideas. They should learn how to shape sentences and should understand how connotation, denotation, metaphor, simile, and other devices operate *in the context of their own writing*. They should learn how to avoid wordiness and clichés. Most important, they should be given the skill and confidence to use language on their own in ways satisfying both to themselves and their readers. The handbooks and rhetorics offer plentiful advice about improving style.

4. REVISION--the process of adding to, deleting from, substituting for, or rearranging the material of a paper to create a more effective piece. Students need to be encouraged to revise all their serious work. They usually benefit from practice in evaluating their own essays and those of their colleagues. They should learn to solicit legitimate advice about and commentary on their writing. They should learn to revise their work on a large scale, and when necessary, rethink the content, focus, organization, and tone of their essays rather than limit revision to the repair of mechanical or grammatical errors. Revision is a topic in both the rhetorics and handbooks available for E.306.

5. EDITING--the final step in preparing a draft, the systematic reworking of a text to remove mechanical and grammatical errors. While instruction in revision attends to large-scale matters, practice in editing should be concerned with smaller--though still very important--items: misspellings, agreement errors, format requirements, and so on. The handbooks selected for E.306 provide the reference material and exercises helpful in teaching editing.

For additional discussions or models of the "writing process" in your course texts, see:

> The Scott, Foresman Handbook Part One (Chapters 1-4) presents a detailed discussion of the writing process, including sample inventive procedures and numerous exercises.
>
> Writing in Context Part One (Chapter 1-3) and Part Three (Chapters 7-9) describe the writing process as well as collaborative learning in writing and revising.
>
> The St. Martin's Guide to Writing The entire text is designed to support a process methodology. The introduction suggests the procedures students may follow in preparing their essays. Subsequent chapters (2-10) describe the processes involved in writing different kinds of essays. Each chapter emphasizes invention, arrangement, and style.

The Bedford Guide Chapter 1, "Understanding the Writing Processes," follows the writing of an essay from invention through rewrite. Chapters 2-3 cover preparation for writing and peer-editing.

A Short Course in Writing The collaborative learning techniques in this text are based on the theory that writing is a social act. Students write extensive, directed commentary on each others' drafts.

Reading Critically, Writing Well Each chapter contains a discussion of the process involved in writing the kind of essay under consideration.

Theoretical and Critical Readings on the Writing Process

Emig, Janet. The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders. NCTE Research Report #13. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1971.

Faigley, Lester and Stephen Witte. "Analyzing Revision." College Composition and Communication, 32 (December, 1981), 400-14.

Mallonee, Barbara C. and John R. Breihan, "Responding to Students' Drafts: Interdisciplinary Consensus." College Composition and Communication, 36 (May, 1985), 213-231.

Perl, Sondra. "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers," Research in the Teaching of English, 13 (1979), 317-336.

Ruszkiewicz, John J. "Where Process Meets Product: Applying Kinneavy's A Theory of Discourse," English in Texas, 14 (1983), 34-35.

Sommers, Nancy I. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Writers," College Composition and Communication, 31 (1980), 378-88.

UNIT I: LANGUAGE, RHETORIC AND THE WRITING PROCESS

The following section is intended to provide you with an overview of major issues concerning language, rhetoric and the teaching of composition, which you will want to address during the first few class sessions of the term.

Introduction to Language, Rhetoric, and Ideology

Early in the course, it may be helpful to introduce the students to issues and ideas relating to the use and abuse of written language that go beyond the simple production of freshman-level expository prose. You all undoubtedly have your own approaches to these issues, but you may want to address the topics below, which have proved fruitful in provoking student discussion for other teachers of E.306. Let us stress that the suggested topics are intended to provide the instructor with material for possible use in the classroom and may be altered, revised, or ignored depending on the the particular needs and talents of your class.

You might ask the students to consider the following statements:

1. Writing is a time-binding, space-binding instrument. It allows us to communicate (with varying degrees of accuracy) with human beings long dead and yet to be born. It allows us to communicate over great distances. In both cases, the roles of the writer and of the reader are crucial to the creation of meaning. [This kind of opening can lead to useful discussions of the importance of context in both writing and reading, and to student "revelations" concerning the essentially relativistic nature of language (see below).]

2. Language is relativistic (this statement is itself disputable, but provocative for just that reason). An entry on George Dillon's Constructing Texts in the Bedford Bibliography (see Short Bibliography, below) states: "Psycholinguists, deconstructionists, and reader-response critics agree that to read is to create meaning, not merely to decode what the text encodes. The reader is enabled to create meaning by prior knowledge of the conventions governing text formation in a given discourse community and of patterns of concepts, or schemata, familiar within the discourse community. Conventions and schemata are cognitive in function, but they are not cognitively determined according to fixed, innate rules: they change gradually as the community itself changes." Such a statement, of course, goes to the heart of the debate now current in the field of literary theory and may allow you to import some of your own interests and speculations into the classroom. A relevant current example might be the word "gay." (In the last 20 years it has become tough to sing the Christmas lyric, "Don we now our gay apparel," without recent changes in the discourse community affecting the meaning in subversive ways.) A more subtle example might be "nice," the primary meaning of which used to be "fastidious, exacting, showing sensitive critical discernment"; today, of course, the primary meaning is "attractive or pleasing" (when applied to things) and "kind, considerate, pleasant" (when applied to people). For a word that totally reverses meaning, see "candour" (Brit. spelling). For an extraordinary overview of the semantic changes that have occurred in the dominant vocabulary of our culture, see Raymond Williams, Keywords (in bibliography at the end of this section). In the entry quoted above, the writer attempts to apply this relativistic theory of language to the teaching of composition: "Writing instruction should reflect this flexible definition of conventions and schemata rather than persist in treating writing as encoding information."

3. Language is ideological. This topic will undoubtedly provoke heated discussion, especially if you choose to stress the political dimensions of language. The meaning "ideological" as it is used above is not the Marxian "false consciousness" nor the more liberal "consciously-held system of ideas," but something closer to Gramscian *hegemony*:: "a dominant system of ideas, held at both conscious and unconscious levels, that keep a society politically intact." In its most positive sense, ideology implies a relatively uniform language embodying a shared set of cultural values; at its most negative, ideology becomes an instrument of political repression and domination--a way of saying one thing while doing another. A particularly current (and blunt) way of exemplifying the above might be to begin a discussion of the terms "freedom fighter" and "terrorist" as applied to the Contras and the PLO (or the PLO and the Contras). Or you might point out the political euphemism involved in the South African government's calling vast, arid stretches of the worst land in the country "black homelands." Here are George Orwell's concrete definitions of several twentieth-century political euphemisms: "Defenseless villages are bombarded from the air, the

inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called *pacification*. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called *transfer of population* or *rectification of frontiers*. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic lumber camps: this is called *elimination of unreliable elements*." (You will probably want to have your students read Orwell's classic essay, "Politics and the English Language," early in the course. It is available in MMW.)

The above relatively glamorous (and obvious) examples use language to mask or deflect political realities. Students, however, should also be made aware of the more subtle political and cultural dimensions of language. You might try this riddle on them (and on yourself):

A man and his young son were in an automobile accident. The father was killed and the son, who was critically injured, was rushed to a hospital. As the attendants wheeled the unconscious boy into the emergency room, the doctor on duty looked down at him and said, "My God, it's my son!" What was the relationship of the doctor to the injured boy?

As certain of the enlightened will recognize, the answer is that the doctor was the boy's mother; but we doubt that more than five of your students will figure this out. Once they are given the answer, the women in particular may have several interesting things to say about the ideological dimensions of language (e.g. "emergency room doctor" and "mother" seem to be mutually exclusive terms in modern American English).

4. Writing is thinking. One rather basic way to encourage students to begin to think about how writing is a process of conceptualization or cognition is to present to them a simple analogy between writing and mathematical calculation. We can easily calculate 2+2=4 without resorting to any kind of notation, but when it comes to (3,655+279) x 3=11,802, for most all of us some form of notation--"writing things down" in order to remember them--is necessary. (Students may be, or perhaps should be, somewhat dissatisfied with this analogy. Encourage them to explore both the ways in which it does and does not fit.) Beginning with this simple analogy, you can help your students to consider how writing not only allows us to record, but also to develop complex thoughts. Writing isn't simply a way of expressing or presenting thought; it is part of "making" thought and forming concepts. Writing offers a means of thinking beyond what we already know, by allowing us to record, revise, and rethink. It is in this sense that one can say that writing is cognition.

In general, having your students consider how writing is thinking can help you to move them from their sense that writing is the means by which they record or express their ideas to an understanding of how writing is the means by which they form, develop, and even "make" those thoughts. At they very least, you may be able to help them to see the problem with their notion that when they write, they know what they mean, but they just don't know how to say it clearly. Perhaps they will be a little less likely to assume that meaning and expression are separate categories.

5. In light of the above topics, students should be made aware that E.306 is a course designed to teach them to write expository essays in edited American English. This is not to say that this dialect is inherently "better" than others (Black English vernacular, for example), but simply to recognize that edited American English is the hegemonic language of the U.S.A. in the 1980s: it is the language of business, medicine, law, politics, and liberal arts (although each discipline has its own sub-dialects).

Short Bibliography: Language, Ideology, and Rhetoric

Eagleton, Terry. Literary Theory: An Introduction. Minneapolis, 1983.
Gorrell, Robert, et al., eds. The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing. Boston, 1984.
Hall, Stuart, et al., eds. Culture, Media, Language. London, 1980.
Tate, Gary, et al., eds. The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. New York, 1981.
Tompkins, Jane P., ed. Reader-Response Criticism. Baltimore, 1980.
Williams, Raymond. Marxism and Literature. Oxford, 1977.
-----. Keywords, rev. ed. Oxford, 1983.

Introducing the Writing Process

You are probably well into the second week of the semester; it is time to put the textbooks seriously to work. Begin making assignments from Part One of the The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers. Chapters One through Four describe writing as a process and include exercises designed to help students reflect on what they already know before learning new ways to approach their college writing assignments. The four chapters in Part One should be assigned in order and the contents discussed in class. E.398T includes several articles that describe and evaluate cognitive theory and research on writing as a process. Josephine Koster Tarvers' Teaching Writing: Theories and Practices, which accompanies The Scott, Foresman Handbook, provides several readings that explain what is usually meant by process and how "the process movement" has altered the teaching of writing. If you know next to nothing about writing as a process, read Chapter Four and "Writing Research and the Writer," John R. Hayes and Linda Flower in Teaching Writing before introducing your students to Part One of The Scott, Foresman Handbook.

The judicious use of suggested exercises in The Scott, Foresman Handbook is highly recommended and should help students and teachers alike learn how to use the text. You will probably return to this section or parts of it during the semester, but introduce students to the notions it teaches in the first weeks and give them ample time to learn which ones work for them. It is important to coordinate readings and exercises from The Scott, Foresman Handbook with the essays you assign so that students are learning to plan, draft, revise, and edit prose that means something to them.

You may also want to read Part One of Writing in Context as a supplement to The Scott, Foresman Handbook. Anson and Wilcox present the writing process in much the same manner as Hairston and Ruszkiewicz. In discussing organization and drafting, Writing in Context focuses first on a personal narrative (Ch. 2) and may be useful in developing the first writing assignment should you want to begin with a narrative assignment.

If do assign a personal narrative that emphasizes past experiences or influential persons, William Manchester's "How I Slew My First Man" from MMW is a stunning example of reminiscence, evocative description of an event, and ideological awareness. You might discuss the effect of Manchester's "flashback" technique, his use of academic reference to "objectify" his action, his handling of extreme emotional stress (without over-doing it), and his horrific, concrete diction. The combination of irony (universal), abjection (past), and cynicism (present) in the final line, of course, leads us back to Orwell and the ideological dimensions of language.

In addressing this or any other example from the rhetoric or the reader, try to work from a critical discussion of the piece to a more basic paragraph and sentence-level analysis of how and why the writer constructs prose in a given way (you can, of course, reverse the order here). Then let the students try their hands at the same kind of writing.

Suggested Readings

READERS

One Hundred Major Modern Writers Baldwin, "If Black English Isn't a Language, Then Tell Me, What Is?" p. 38; Boorstin, "The Rhetoric of American Democracy," p. 66; Chesterton, "On Sightseeing," p. 114; Davenport, "Finding," p. 138; Didion, "On Keeping a Notebook," p. 156; Hayakawa, "How Dictionaries Are Made," p. 304; Manchester, "How I Slew My First Man," p. 449; Muir, "Digging a Well," p. 512; Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," p. 553.

RHETORICS

Writing in Context Part One (Chapters 1-3) and Part Three (Chapters 7-9)

HANDBOOKS

The Scott, Foresman Handbook for Writers Part One (Chapters 1-4)

Suggested Assignments

The Scott, Foresman Handbook contains a number of useful exercises. Here are a few others:

1. Pick a scene from a novel and have the students take various character roles (and points of view), writing a paragraph on each. (Allows them to exercise different voices.)

2. Have students compare the following two passages (or similar parallel passages), noting the differences in word choice, tone, imagery, and overall effect. Ask them to write a paragraph similar to the first, and then another similar to the second (such exercises in imitation can be useful in other contexts as well). Work slowly and carefully, making sure to note the effects of each shift in diction and syntax.

a. The house stands in the middle of a block on the outskirts of a small mid-western town. There are no other homes on the block. The house was built in 1892, as the residence of a railroad baron, and it has fancy woodwork around the doors and windows, inside the peaks above the windows, and around the edges of the porch roof. The house is very large, with three floors and at least seven rooms per floor. At one side of the house among some sagebrush there is a coal chute, which is beside a set of wooden doors, nearly at ground level, that lead to the basement. The house is unoccupied, as it has been for the last eight years. The owner, who lives in a small apartment close to town with her two sisters, is an elderly woman named Irma Olivia Lunt. Mrs. Lunt suffered from a drinking problem and hallucinations when she vacated this house and moved in with her two sisters in order to be under their care. For several years before she moved to town, Mrs. Lunt was unable to maintain her property, and her house is now in very bad repair.

b. The structure looms up in the middle of a deserted block on the edge of a lonely mid-western town. There are no other houses around. The house was constructed in a period of misguided financial optimism in the year 1892, and it has tooled rosettes and cherubs clotting its moldings and dormers, mementos of entrepreneurial precocity now indistinguishable from rot. The house is ponderous, with at least three floors and seven hollow rooms on each floor. The opening of a collapsed coal chute hides among some brambles on one side of the house, near a set of wooden doors that lead to the cellar and creak uneasily when opened. The house is vacant. It has stood, ornate and dumb, for eight years now. The owner, who resides in a cramped apartment close to town with her two sisters, is a shrivelled little woman named Irma Olivia Lunt. Mrs. Lunt suffered from an increasing love of peach brandy and a decreasing tolerance for elaborately empty spaces when she fled from this place and moved in on Miriam and Mabbie Whitley, for the sake of company, eight years ago. For several months before her exodus, Mrs. Lunt had been unable to coat the walls of her house with paint or repair the unreliable furnace in the cellar, unable to ward off the weeds or avert the winds, and the house is now sprawling with neglect, as if its release from human discipline had allowed it, at last, to mushroom into the surrounding air and earth nail by nail, plank by plank, bolt by bolt, in both mood and matter, with a frighteningly bestial ease.

UNIT II: REPORTING INFORMATION

This unit is the first in a series intended to prepare students for the kinds of research and writing requirements that characterize a university education. You may assign the units in any manner you wish--as separate and distinct pursuits, or as a set of ongoing investigations into a particular topic. By introducing researched writing early in the term you can prepare your students more readily for the demands of the required formal research paper. Units II, III, and IV on reporting, evaluating, and analyzing information may function as a set of investigations by asking the students to select one topic, which they will then explore for the remainder of the term.

For example, if a student were to select bilingual education in Texas as a research topic, she could write, first, an essay reporting the current status of bilingual education in her hometown school system or a bill in the state (or national) legislature. In preparing an evaluative essay, she could then investigate and weigh the validity of the alternatives suggested by those who support and those who oppose bilingual education, reaching her own informed conclusion about the issue. In an analysis essay, the student may wish to explore the different advertising and persuasive appeals made by supporters of bilingual education in local or statewide newspapers. These preliminary essays will then aid her in preparing a final research paper by introducing her to the issues raised in discussions of bilingual education, the forms of arguments introduced, and plausible solutions to the problem.

The reporting unit should broadly engage questions ranging from "What is information and where do I find it?" to "How do I most effectively organize and report it?" You may wish to begin by discussing the extent to which what counts as "information" is context-dependent: a thunderclap in ancient Greece could convey specific political/theological information (Zeus is angry/happy about a given event, person, sacrifice); a thunderclap in 20th century America conveys nothing more than meteorological information (and often precious little of that). You might then outline basic evaluative benchmarks: source (a book from Princeton UP is usually more accurate than the National Enquirer); currency (new sources are usually more up-to-date, although not necessarily more accurate, than older ones); range (specialized sources are often more informative--in their circumscribed field--than generalized ones). You should be especially sensitive to the students' need to distinguish between generalized and particularized information. They need to know that any generalization necessarily suppresses those subordinate particulars which work against it (e.g. "The Renaissance was a progressive era," while generally accurate, suppresses the fact that there were many reactionary movements during the period). We are not saying that you should teach your students to avoid generalizations altogether--obviously they are necessary if information is to be conveyed in a condensed form--but that they should approach generalizations knowing that they seldom tell the whole story.

At this point, you will want to introduce students to the skills of summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting. The Scott, Foresman Handbook includes a short section on these skills. Chapter 22, particularly, covers basic information about selecting topics, gathering material, preparing bibliography, summarizing and paraphrasing, early drafting, formatting, and documenting. Writing in Context, as well, offers an interesting alternative to researching in Chapters Five and Six in which students address issues of importance to their own interests. Those interested in doing more extensive work with these reporting skills might refer to Bazerman (see bibliography at the end of this unit).

In discussing techniques for reporting information, you may want to take students through several essays which report information and provide extensive commentary on the authors' techniques of presentation and organization.

Guide students through the process of preparing an essay that reports information. Special emphasis is placed on finding a subject, developing a thesis, and using several writing strategies: definition, classification, illustration, and comparison/contrast. Throughout their college careers, students in every discipline will be expected to classify and define ideas, objects, and individuals. Yet while almost all freshmen know what it means to classify and define, a great many cannot do it with ease, precision, or a sense of purpose. It is essential to show students how classifications and definitions operate in the world around them, particularly in the courses they are taking and the majors they are pursuing. Again you should think about how these strategies operate on various organizational levels: essay, paragraph, sentence. Many practical exercises are included in The Scott, Foresman Handbook and the rhetorics which should

prove useful to your students. You may also wish to begin using the material provided by General Libraries for familiarizing your students with the UT library system and procedures.

Suggested Assignments

1. You will definitely want to have your students engage in intensive practice in paraphrasing and summarizing. Many expository essays in the readers can serve as texts for these exercises.

2. The Scott, Foresman Handbook defines and illustrates summary and paraphrase (Chapter 22) but does not offer exercises or essay assignments. We offer a suggestion: Report on a specific historical phenomenon, incorporating at least two perspectives (sources). No overt evaluation of the source's accuracy is necessary; contradictory information may be reported as being contradictory. Rationale: students are required early in the course to confront the probability that one source will not provide adequate, unbiased information.

READERS

One Hundred Major Modern Writers Asimov, "Pure and Impure: The Interplay of Science and Technology," p. 26; Golding, "Thinking as a Hobby," p. 277; Huxtable, "Houston," pp. 333; Huxley, "Selected Snobberies," p. 328; Calder, "The Comet is Coming," p. 96; Naipul, "The New Tehran," p. 527; Mailer, "Marilyn Monroe," p. 444.

RHETORICS

Writing in Context Part Two ("Building on the Knowledge of Others") Chapters Five and Six.

HANDBOOKS

The Scott, Foresman Handbook Chapters 22-24 on the research paper.

Suggested Reading

On summary and paraphrase, see Charles Bazerman, The Informed Writer, 2nd. ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985), pp. 38-106.

UNIT III: EVALUATING INFORMATION AND EVENTS

In this unit students should be made aware that there are two major levels on which the process of evaluation takes place:

1. the evaluation of sources or media--the vehicles of communication by which information is conveyed;
2. the evaluation of the information or event itself.

Obviously in practice these two levels are virtually indistinguishable because, as we have seen earlier, the language or conceptual framework which makes perception possible necessarily has an effect on what is perceived and how it is perceived. In Unit II we assumed for heuristic purposes that one can report (or classify, describe, and define) information in an "objective" way (i.e. without evaluating it). In Units III and IV, however, we ask students to see "information" in more complex ways, as material which deserves closer study in itself (both message and medium), and as material with which to build a larger argument. Unit III draws clearly upon Unit II by requiring students to paraphrase and describe, classify and define. But Unit III is also closely related to Unit IV, "Analyzing Texts," and in both these units, whether the students are writing essays of their own or examining texts produced by others, they should be made aware of the expansive character of persuasion--of the close relationship between making an argument and the means through which an argument is made.

In Unit III students practice what is perhaps the most common form of academic and editorial writing: the essay that pronounces judgement on a given subject by assessing evidence logically and presenting it persuasively. In particular, this unit focuses on various processes through which evidence can be shaped to produce a finished piece of work. Although we have not formally included a unit on cause and effect, you may wish to discuss this structure on your own as a sub-category of evaluation. And because neither The Scott, Foresman Handbook nor Writing in Context contains a formal discussion of inductive and deductive reasoning, it may be helpful to your students if you review the basic principles of these two approaches to evaluating and presenting evidence.

Inductive reasoning allows one to make general judgments on the basis of general evidence and / or examples. The generalization may take the form of a definite conclusion, a hypothesis, or a recommendation. On the basis of certain kinds of evidence, a generalization may be 100% true (within the limits of truth allowed by language). For example, if a professor says, "No one in my 9:30 class received a failing grade," the generalization can be accepted as universally true, since it is based on all possible examples. Most generalizations, however, are based on high probability. Doctors prescribe barbiturates on the high probability that they will put you to sleep, not kill you. The gathering of particular evidence from a large number of past cases allows them to prescribe on the basis of this generalization. However, barbiturates can, in unusual circumstances, kill you. The more contradictory or skimpy the evidence, the more likely the generalization will be weak. The weaker the generalization, the more likely the evidence will be exaggerated, falsified, or twisted by the language in which it is conveyed (or created): political debates thrive on this kind of "induction."

Deductive reasoning allows one to draw inferences from general statements or to use generalizations to apply what is true in one instance to what is true in a related instance. Deduction therefore has a certain predictive value. Through it one general statement can be used to imply another, provided that the first statement is clearly established at the outset of the argument and then related to the deduction through a series of logical connections. Deductive reasoning always involves these steps in some way, but it is easy to manipulate or abuse, most often through incomplete information or loose analogy. For example, a student who reasons speciously might deduce that because the professor above had given no failing grades in his 9:30 class (induction), she (the new student) would not fail if she took the professor's 9:30 class (faulty deduction). "Reasoning by analogy" that masquerades as deduction is quite common in student essays: e.g. Rome was a corrupt empire and Rome fell; America is a corrupt empire; therefore, America will fall.

Students should be familiar with the traditional inductive organizational structure: introduction, thesis, definition of terms, procedures for gathering data, presentation of data, analysis of data, conclusion. They should similarly be able to recognize, assess, and use the basic elements of a deductive system: axioms,

conclusions, rules of inference, and rules of definition. And they should be familiar with the basic deductive organizational structure: introduction, definitions, axioms, inferences, and conclusions.

You should emphasize again and again to your students the importance of reading closely and analytically with rigorous attention to the validity and persuasiveness of both particular evidence and larger generalizations.

If you wish to have your students analyze an evaluation that focuses on ethics, you might want to turn to Ephron's "The Boston Photos" in MMW (p. 200). The ethical issues involved in the decision to print the photos are those which confront news editors every day and could provide the basis for student essays evaluating editorials, newscasts, etc. (see below). Additionally, MMW contains a wonderful essay by Barbara Tuchman on the Black Death (p. 636).

Suggested Assignments

1. Analyze and evaluate the content of The Daily Texan editorial page to determine if the editorial staff has a particular political, social, or academic bias. Analyze all the editorials in the paper for a given week (or longer). Use them as your data and quote them as evidence for your generalizations. Use other evidence in the paper to demonstrate your point. Do not, however, include "Letters to the Editor" or guest editorials as part of your sample since they do not represent the viewpoint of the editorial staff.

2. If someone (say your great great grandson or granddaughter) were to read your journal 150 years from now, what generalizations about college students of the 1980s might she draw from the material you have written so far this semester? Rely on the details in your journal as the evidence for your generalizations. Look for patterns or themes in your entries that characterize the way you and your generation think and behave. What will future generations think of you and your friends?

3. Analyze and evaluate a nightly newscast over a period of several days. What kinds of stories tend to run first? last? (i.e. what is the structure of the newscast?). What might this tell us about the relative values of the production team? How are the stories presented? Is there any evidence of bias on the part of certain reporters? Is language used in an ideologically neutral way? (e.g. does "capitalism" carry positive or negative connotations? how about "communism"? "Contras"? "competition"?).

4. Read a persuasive essay from your anthology (or one of the speeches available in the Lower Division Office) and analyze the premises or values on which the author bases his or her argument. What values are explicit in the work? Which are implicit? Are they coherent or contradictory? Does the author assume that his or her audience will accept the premises of the piece, or does she offer a defense for them?

READERS

One Hundred Major Modern Writers Tuchman, "This Is the End of the World: The Black Death," p. 635; Ephron, "The Boston Photos," p. 199; Borges, "The Disinterested Killer Bill Harrigan," p. 78; McLuhan, "Classroom Without Walls," p. 459; Parker, "Mrs. Post Enlarges on Etiquette," p. 566; Mitford, "On Embalming," p. 487; Mumford, "Sport and the Bitch-Goddess," p. 516; Kael, "Movies on Television," p. 370.

HANDBOOKS

The Scott, Foresman Handbook Part Two, Chapters 6, 7, 8,12; Part Five, "How to Write a Review or Evaluation" (762-770).

Suggested Theoretical and Critical Readings

For inductive and deductive logic, see

Wesley Salmon, Logic. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

On induction, see

John Day, Inductive Probability. New York: Humanities Press, 1961.

Toulmin, Stephen, R. Rieke, and Allen Janik. An Introduction to Reasoning. New York: Macmillan, 1979.

UNIT IV: ANALYZING TEXTS

Unit IV is intended to build upon the skills and patterns of inquiry covered in Units II and III: summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, defining, classifying, illustrating, contextualizing, evaluating. All these writing practices interact complexly in the analysis of both literary and non-literary texts.

The problem of the analysis of texts--"reading" in its broadest sense--is central to contemporary theoretical debates in many humanistic disciplines. What, in the first place, is a "text"? Must it be written-words-on-paper- read-sequentially (in different directions depending on the conventions of the language)? Can the position of seemingly discrete "texts" in relation to other seemingly discrete "texts" be read as a larger text (e.g. newspaper layouts, signboards, and all the other materials which so interest students of the semiotics of popular culture)? Can an athletic event be a "text" (e.g. the semiotics of baseball)? Can any event whose meaning is partially determined through overt or covert cultural agreement be a text? (i.e. is anything with a context a text?). What is the relationship of a text to the other texts that constitute it (intertextuality)? To what degree do texts contain meaning? To what degree do readers create meaning? What is the relationship of these two phenomena (i.e. can a text without a reader have any meaning at all)? These, and many other questions, are being warmly debated in scholarly circles and may provide a useful way of introducing the complexities of the problem to your students.

Literary Texts

One alternative of this unit can focus on the critical analysis of literary texts--a skill the students will need in E 316K. Again, the questions surrounding this seemingly conventional practice are complex and confusing--beginning with "what is literature?"--but for the moment we must beg them. You may approach a "classic" text ("Young Goodman Brown," for example) using the methodology of the New Criticism, with a bit of historical contextualism tossed in for good measure. We think that this is probably the best way to proceed with E.306 students, although--as elsewhere in the course--you may want to make them aware that such approaches are not "givens" but choices: choices which necessarily leave out a great deal. All of the issues about language which were raised in Unit I are relevant here and may serve as useful qualifications to this approach.

At the nuts and bolts level, you should be especially concerned here with perfecting your students' skills in summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, and annotating.

If you are interested in including some poetry in this section, The Conscious Reader provides a useful selection. If you are using a different reader and wish to bring in xeroxed material, you might think about using a poem such as Keats's "On First Looking Into Chapman's Homer"--a work which is both a poem and a piece of literary criticism. It also has the virtue of being relatively easy for students to explicate (within a New Critical tradition). You might also wish to bring in some parallel examples of Chapman's translation and Pope's translation (one of the translations to which Keats was implicitly comparing Chapman's). Such a comparison can lead to useful discussions concerning the interpretive dimension of translation and, by extension, the interpretive dimension of paraphrases or summaries in the same language: thus, we hope, leading the students to reflect critically on what they are doing in their essays. (Copies of parallel passages from Chapman and Pope will be available in the Lower Division Office.)

Expository Texts

In the second alternative of Unit IV, which may more directly relate to the research project, you have the option of teaching your students to analyze a variety of texts other than those that might be labeled "literary." These texts can range from the expository essays in your anthologies to song lyrics, advertisements, photos, statues, architectural styles, social rituals, etc. Many of you who choose the second option will already be acquainted with the work of Roland Barthes, Stuart Hall (and the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies), John Berger (Ways of Seeing), Terry Eagleton, and others (see bibliography at the end of Unit I). While there is simply not space in this syllabus for a short course in this kind of analysis, let us suggest that you contact other AI's and faculty who regularly employ such

methodology [any of the members of the LDEPC, Carolyn Warmbold (AI), Professors Kruppa, Whigham, Renwick, Saldivar, et al.] for suggestions and approaches that may prove useful. None of your rhetorics provide instruction in this kind of analysis, but MMW includes a number of appropriate essays. We would especially direct your attention to Fussell, "The Boy Scout Handbook," pp. 261-67, Stephen J. Gould, "A Biographical Homage to Mickey Mouse," pp. 286-97, and Pauline Kael, "Movies on Television," pp. 370-81. The Conscious Reader contains two sections on "The Cultural Tradition" (Popular Culture and Art and Society).

Suggested Assignments and Essays

1. Write an analytic paraphrase of a short literary piece (e.g. Keats's poem cited above). Pay close attention not only to what the author "says," but also to how the way she says it influences the overall effect of the work.

2. Write an ideological analysis of a segment of a political text. Using, for example, The Declaration of Independence, one might ask: What does "liberty" mean here? Who does it exclude? What constitutes "tyranny"? What is the "pursuit of happiness"? Why, in America, might it have replaced "property" in the British phrase "Life, liberty, and property"?

3. A New Critical reading of any of the "literary" pieces in the anthologies. (This might be the best option in light of the requirements of E 316K.)

4. A topic bringing together both literary and cultural "texts." For example, an analysis of George Orwell's "A Hanging" as a literary text (a short story) describing a cultural text (a ritual execution).

5. An analysis of a familiar cultural text along the lines developed by Gould in his treatment of Mickey Mouse (e.g. Wonder Woman, Madonna, Prince, et al.).

READERS

One Hundred Major Modern Writers Fromm, "The Nature of Symbolic Language," p. 228; Fussell, "The Boy Scout Handbook," p. 261; Gould, "A Biographical Homage to Mickey Mouse," p. 286; Kael, "Movies on Television," p. 370; Mailer, "Marilyn Monroe," p. 444; Sontag, "Science Fiction Films," p. 609.

The Conscious Reader Anything from the "Cultural Tradition" sections; Faulkner, "The Bear," p. 100; Huxley, "Conditioning the Children," p. 491; Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," p. 515; Lincoln, "The Gettysburg Address," p. 521; King, "I Have a Dream," p. 540; Orwell, "The Principles of Newspeak," p. 561.

Reading Critically, Writing Well Chapter 10 ("Literary Analysis"); review Chapter 1.

RHETORICS

The St. Martin's Guide to Writing Chapters. 9, 11.

The Bedford Guide Chapters. 6, 21.

HANDBOOKS

The Scott, Foresman Handbook Part Five: "How to Write a Literary Analysis" (742-761).

UNIT V: RESEARCH AND WRITING STRATEGIES

Unit V is designed to provide an intensive review of writing strategies and an early introduction to the procedures for developing a research paper. You should assess your students writing skills and assign appropriate chapters and exercises, focusing particularly on individuals who seem to be in trouble. You should stress to the students that the research paper is not something entirely different from the kind of writing they have done throughout the course, but is designed to build naturally on the experience they have already had in reporting and evaluating information and analyzing texts.

Invention

Students must first generate a research paper topic. (The length of time you spend on review will necessarily dictate the extent to which you can begin this process during Unit V.) You may wish at this point to introduce the students to various library packets described in Unit VI. Prospective topics might then be run through the various invention strategies in The Scott, Foresman Handbook, Chs. 2, 22(A), and 24(A). Once a student has defined and limited a topic, she should begin preliminary research toward developing a thesis.

Proposals and Abstracts

The research thesis might then be presented as a proposal or abstract--a strategy which would allow both you and the student to discover early on whether the thesis is workable.

You can use the general idea of writing a proposal or abstract for a research project as a way of explaining to your students that a research paper is not simply a collation of information on a certain subject, but a presentation that has a certain point to make and employs specific strategies in making that point. See Part Five of The Scott, Foresman Handbook, "How to Write an Abstract" (734-737).

One way of adapting the notion of writing proposals to the specific task of the research project is to have your students write what might be called a "research proposal." You might ask your students to write a proposal in which they:

1. define the problem or issue that they wish to investigate in their research;
2. propose the point they wish to make in presenting their material (students need not actually propose an argument: they may propose to do something as simple as inform an uninformed audience about a particular subject);
3. indicate the particular writing strategies they plan to employ in presenting this material.

It will probably be useful to your students if they have several opportunities to refine and develop their proposals. You might want them to begin simply by proposing a topic and identifying the kinds of problems or issues to which this topic might give rise. As they investigate their topic more fully, you might ask them to define more precisely the point they hope to make in presenting their research. Finally, you might ask them to propose specific strategies for making this point and to discuss specific sources they will use and how they will use them. You might even ask your students to construct a brief annotated bibliography of possible sources. In their annotations students could offer brief summaries of the works cited and explain how particular sources might be useful to their project.

Audience

You should encourage your students to think carefully about the kind of audience they envision for the project and how this potential audience may influence their choice of writing strategies. You might even ask them to project a specific context for their essay: for example, they might imagine it as a feature article for a newspaper, an article for a particular type of magazine or journal, or even an assignment for a specific university course. Certainly, they will need to keep these projections within a range that is accessible to a

relatively general audience, but within this range they should be able to arrive at a specific set of criteria that will be useful both to them in constructing their research paper and to you in giving them guidelines for presenting their material effectively. Throughout this unit you should emphasize to your students that their proposals do not lock them into a particular approach to a topic. You don't want to encourage your students simply to drop an approach or topic without giving it some serious thought, but you do want them to be able to recognize when a particular strategy is not working so that they can then search for more effective strategies.

Suggested Exercises and Assignments

1. Invention and inquiry exercises in Scott, Foresman, Part Four, Chapter 22; St. Martin's Ch. 18.

2. Have your students write a research proposal that (a) defines the topic and the point to be made in presenting the research material; (b) proposes specific writing strategies, including a consideration of audience and a projected context; (b) identifies probable sources and explains briefly how they might be used. In writing the proposal, students will have to make specific rhetorical choices in order to persuade you to let them go ahead with the project. In effect, you will be teaching them proposal writing strategies as you help them develop their research project.

READERS

Reading Critically, Writing Well Chs. 8-9 ("Proposal," "Position Paper").

RHETORICS

Writing In Context Part Two, Chs. 5, 6.

The St. Martin's Guide Chs. 6, 18, 20.

The Bedford Guide Ch. 15.

HANDBOOKS

The Scott, Foresman Handbook Part Four, Chs. 22, 23, 24.

UNIT VI: THE LIBRARY RESEARCH PAPER

The library research unit is designed to teach students a systematic method for doing college-level research. In preparing their papers, students develop a strategy for using the basic research tools available to them in a major university library. They are introduced to specialized encyclopedias, indexes, and reference works serving particular disciplines and fields. They learn how to locate, evaluate, use, and document sources. In assembling this paper of greater-than-average length and complexity, they should come to appreciate that research is a serious activity certain to be an important part of their professional and intellectual lives.

Many students have done research papers in high school, but few have had the experience of working in libraries as large and sophisticated as those in the University of Texas system. Fewer still have been taught a serious research strategy, and most are poorly informed about the proper use of sources. For these reasons, the research paper in E.306 has been coordinated with materials prepared by the professional staff of the Undergraduate Library (UGL).

Assignment and Supporting Materials

The staff in the Undergraduate Library provide the assignment and materials for the library paper. They mail topic lists and library tour information to the instructors early in the term. The instructors themselves can pick up library packets, containing research paper worksheets and study guides, in Parlin 130 shortly after the beginning of the semester. These materials are revised every year; the UGL requires that only current materials be distributed to classes.

Please be certain your students have read the appropriate library materials before they go to the UGL.

The research paper should combine the expository and argumentative skills students have developed throughout the semester in E.306. Most teachers require a paper of approximately 1000-1500 words, fully documented, and supported by reliable sources. Rather than prescribing the time-honored "five sources (excluding encyclopedias) on 3x5 note cards in a chartreuse recipe box" (an arbitrary formula that students often mistake for the essence of the research paper), we hope that instructors will emphasize the research paper as a process of discovery, evaluation, and presentation, the enabling instruments for which will vary according to the topic and the researcher. This does not mean that the students should submit no supporting material, but that the formats for these materials may vary (e.g. some students may type notes directly into a word processor, in which case a printout of these notes might be appropriate for submission with the final product). If, however, you wish to follow The Scott, Foresman Handbook procedure with regard to note-cards (Ch. 22C), that is perfectly acceptable (and it does allow for a uniform evaluation). Many instructors confer with their students either about their topics and research strategies or about the drafts they have produced. Some instructors may wish to review full drafts of the essays before final versions are due. Instructors who use the proposal method (see Unit V) may choose to develop other monitoring strategies. Beginning September, 1985, documentation used in E.306 research papers should follow the new MLA guidelines as described in the approved rhetorics and handbooks. The new MLA form differs from older forms in permitting the use of in-text parenthetical documentation. See your Scott, Foresman Handbook for details if you are unfamiliar with the new system. As you explain the research paper to your students, you should distribute and discuss the following materials:

> Self-guided Tours of the Undergraduate Library. You can ask your students to take the self-guided library tour early in the term to make them more familiar with a facility they should be using regularly for many of their courses. As the students take the tour, they answer a series of questions about services, facilities, and reference materials in the UGL. Be sure to collect and mark the tour sheets. Several versions of the tour are distributed in each section of E.306 so that students cannot simply copy a classmate's answers.
>
> Topic Lists. The topic lists have been carefully prepared by the library staff. They represent a distribution of topic ideas that can be supported by the collection in the UGL. You can be sure that students who work with subjects drawn from the library-prepared lists will find background information, appropriate indexes, and an ample supply of books and articles. For this reason,

instructors in E.306 may not assign a topic other than those on the approved lists without prior approval of the Undergraduate Library staff. (Those instructors using the Bruffee research paper should check with Kay Halasek about UGL materials.)If a student in your class cannot find a topic on the list distributed to your section of E.306, other lists are available at UGL. But students should have your permission before they consult a second list and such permission should not be given routinely.

Research Paper Worksheet (optional). The worksheet is designed to lead students step-by-step through the research phases of preparing the library paper. You can use the list of due dates on p. 2 of the worksheet to pace your students' work, requiring them to select a preliminary topic, do background reading, and develop a thesis by a given day (Worksheet sections I & II), to locate five to ten books by a second date (Section III), to consult periodical indexes and locate ten articles by a third (Section IV), and finally to turn in the completed paper with bibliography cards, note cards, and other supporting materials.

Using the Library For Research. This study guide outlines a research strategy for undergraduates. It includes advice on choosing a subject, narrowing a topic, finding background information, formulating a thesis, finding books and articles, taking notes, avoiding plagiarism, and writing the paper. Students should give special attention to the section on avoiding plagiarism.

Finding Background Information. This study guide directs students both to specialized encyclopedias in particular areas (social sciences, humanities, science and technology) and to more general works (Colliers, Britannica) which they may consult early in their research to gain an overview of their preliminary topics.

Finding Books. This guide explains to students how to use the Library of Congress Subject Headings, the library subject catalog, and the name/title catalog. It shows students how to interpret information on a catalog card and explains the arrangement of books on the library shelves. Because the university libraries use both the Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress cataloging systems, students sometimes find it difficult to find the book they are seeking.

Finding Articles in Periodicals. This study guide provides an annotated list of the most important periodical indexes in major academic fields.

How to Use Periodical Indexes/How to Find Periodicals. These are short guides printed back-to-back, giving students the facts they need to work with periodical literature.

The English Department Writing Lab (Parlin 3) also offers materials and support services for the research paper unit.

Avoiding Plagiarism

Problems with plagiarism arise more often with research papers than other assignments because many students do not understand how sources should be used and credited. It is an instructor's job to explain these matters to students. When confronted by a paper that does not seem like a student's own work, it is important to distinguish between academic failings (misreporting of sources, misunderstanding of the occasions when documentation is required, inadequate number of sources, improper documentation forms) and instances of actual scholastic dishonesty (buying a paper, deliberately copying uncredited material, falsifying sources). The procedures for handling instances of scholastic dishonesty are explained in the Freshman English Handbook. Make certain that you and your students have read and discussed 23E, "How to Avoid Plagiarism and Collusion" in The Scott, Foresman Handbook and/or that you have made yourself clear concerning these issues--in handouts and discussion. They must be followed carefully to be sure that a student's rights are fully protected.

Some instructors believe that the topic lists contribute to occasions of scholastic dishonesty by making essays on certain topics widely available on campus. In fact, the lists--when properly used--can discourage

the buying or borrowing of papers because teachers can more easily track a student through an approved topic than through one for which the library system provides no support. With an approved topic, students cannot pretend that they are unable to locate an adequate number of sources, nor can they readily ignore suggestions teachers make on draft versions to find additional materials, to expand given citations, or to explore other aspects of a topic. Teachers know that the material for revisions, additions, and emendations is available in the UGL if the student makes an honest effort to find it.

The best way to discourage plagiarized research papers (and many other kinds of essays) is to insist that students follow the complete research and writing procedure outlined in the library Worksheet and in Unit I of this syllabus. Require students to provide you with evidence of their preliminary research, with lists of reading materials, and most important of all, a full draft of the paper. Comment on these early versions extensively, and don't hesitate to recommend major changes or additions even to competent drafts. Students who are doing their own work will appreciate your remarks; students whose drafts are based on papers they either bought or borrowed will find themselves having to revise that material. When the final version is due, collect all supporting materials--including notecards and drafts. In your research paper assignment sheet you can include a statement like the following:

> Materials. You must keep all notes and drafts you use in preparing this research paper and turn in all such materials in an envelope with your final version. Your records should make it possible for me to reconstruct the process by which you produced your paper. If your supporting materials prove inadequate, your final grade on the library paper will be lowered substantially.

Do not allow students to change their topics within two or three weeks of the final due date, or after you have reviewed the draft--unless you recommend the change yourself. In many of the plagiarism cases investigated by the Lower Division Office, students suddenly abandon a topic they have been working on and change to a new one just days before the paper is due. What has sometimes happened is that they have located a paper they believe is more promising than the essay they are developing themselves. The changed topics rarely reflect any interests the students have shown up to that point in the course and are often remarkably specific: a student who had been unable to narrow a topic as broad as "Sex Roles in America" is now writing about "English Usury Laws as Depicted in Elizabethan Domestic Comedies."

You can also discourage plagiarism by making students responsible for the sources they use, requiring them, for example, to provide photocopies of any material they quote from *directly*, with the quoted material highlighted. You may also insist that students use materials available in UT libraries. Some students are honestly so intimidated by the size of the campus libraries that they return to their high school or hometown facilities for their information--an understandable strategy, but one which defeats a purpose of the research paper unit. Other students, however, in plagiarism investigations, regularly claim that their disputed sources are from libraries in Houston or Dallas, and supposedly beyond easy recall. To discourage situations of either kind, you may include a statement like the following in your research paper assignment sheet:

> Sources. Your source materials for this paper must be available on the University of Texas at Austin campus. Books, articles, magazines, and other documents must be from UT libraries, preferably the Undergraduate Library (UGL). If you write off for information or do interviews, you must include copies or transcripts of all such supporting materials with the final version of your paper. If you are unable to document any of your sources or if your documentation is inaccurate, you will receive an "F" on your research paper for improper use of sources.

Finally, you should redirect your students' attention to Ch. 23E in The Scott, Foresman Handbook and the Freshman English Statement on Scholastic Dishonesty distributed to them during the first week of class. Go over its major provisions and ask if there are any questions.

With these precautions and procedures, you will substantially reduce the likelihood of receiving plagiarized papers.

READERS

Reading Critically, Writing Well Appendix.

RHETORICS

Writing in Context Part Two.

The St. Martin's Guide to Writing Chs. 20-21.

The Bedford Guide Chs. 16-19.

HANDBOOKS

The Scott, Foresman Handbook Chs. 22-24.

The handbooks and rhetorics (with the exception of Writing in Context) contain sample research papers.

APPENDIX: A SHORT HISTORY OF RHETORIC

(Because many AI's are not rhetoric specialists, we have included below a short history of rhetoric and its relation to the teaching of composition. A good deal of the following material is drawn from The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing.)

Much of what we teach in composition classes and much of modern composition theory comes to us from the ancient practice and theory of rhetoric. Classical Greek and Roman rhetoric, which was studied and debated by the Sophists, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintillian, and others, was concerned chiefly with the art of persuasive oratory. Aristotle considered rhetoric a heuristic (a method of systematic inquiry) whereby an orator (or rhetor) might discover "in each case the existing means of persuasion"; Quintillian, whose rhetorical theories were most influential in the Renaissance, defined rhetoric as the art of "the good man speaking well."

Another very influential strain of modern rhetorical theory comes from Scottish rhetoricians of the 18th century. Hugh Blair (Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, 1783) shared the view of Quintillian and Cicero that the rhetor was a leader and was thus obliged to be morally upright and well educated. His lectures for University of Edinburgh students placed a great deal of emphasis on defining "taste," an enterprise that required him to quote extensively from literary texts, thus weakening the ancient emphasis on persuasive discourse as the sole province of rhetoric. George Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric (1776) was rather different, but at least as influential as Bain's work. Like Aristotle, Campbell defined rhetoric as that "art or talent by which discourse is adapted to its end" and like Blair, he did not confine himself to persuasive discourse. He tried instead to relate rhetoric to the faculty psychology of his day. It was another influential Scot, Alexander Bain, who in 1866 introduced the modes of discourse that many a modern rhetoric still teaches: narration, description, exposition, and argument.

The history of rhetoric and composition in American colleges is both complicated and controversial. In the nineteenth century, Harvard set the tone. There, chiefly under the influence of Edward T. Channing and Francis J. Childs, the concentration of rhetoric shifted from oratory to writing, with increased attention to literary exempla. Style, organization, and grammar were taught from literary texts, in an increasingly prescriptive way.

In twentieth-century America, many forces began to work against the Harvard tradition of teaching rhetoric from standardized lists of classics. The NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English) was formed in 1911 under the leadership of Fred Newton Scott to re-emphasize self-expression and the adaptation of prose to social purposes. Deweyites and progressive educators of the day believed that education should integrate the diverse immigrant populations and produce useful, productive citizens; they viewed the Harvard approach to teaching writing through canonical literary study as elitist. But the progressives were not very successful in divorcing composition and literature, especially in the colleges and universities. Throughout this period, writing instruction offered by English departments was primarily concerned with the analysis of literary works. In the 1930s the advent of the New Criticism, with its emphasis on texts as complex structures of meaning, offered a theoretical model which allowed the relationship of thought and language to be seen as fundamental rather than superficial. This was to have a profound effect on writing instruction.

In the 1960s there was a revival of interest in classical rhetoric. Edward P. J. Corbett (Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, 1965) based courses in writing on the classical parts of an oration (invention, arrangement, and style--omitting memory and delivery), on Aristotle's topics ("topoi" means "places" in Greek, and topics are places to find arguments), and on appeals to *ethos* (the character of the rhetor), *logos* (the intellect of the listener), and *pathos* (the emotions of the listener). This interest in the parts of an oration was reinterpreted in the 1960s, resulting in a renewed interest in the stages of the writing process.

Invention became the focus of Gordon Rohman's studies; he developed "prewriting," a method that melded the 60s with the ancients by encouraging writers to practice meditation. Also in the spirit of the 1960s, an interest developed in self-expressive writing which encouraged students to find their personal voices. Peter Elbow (Writing Without Teachers, 1973) and Ken Macrorie (Uptaught, 1970) both developed influential methods that emphasized freewriting to discover an authentic voice, and teaching methods that included peer tutoring and workshops where students and teachers wrote drafts and explored the writing process together.

The emphasis in the 1970s shifted to the cognitive aspects of the writing process with Janet Emig's classic study, The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders (1971),. Currently, researchers like Linda Flowers and John Hayes are studying in detail the cognitive aspects of the composing process. Other composition theorists have begun to view writing as a way of thinking. Ann Bertoff (The Making of Meaning: Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing Teachers, 1981), for example, sees composing as "the active formation of understanding by the imagination, an act of sorting and selecting experiences according to our needs and purposes."

While some researchers continue to stress the cognitive aspects of writing, there is a developing interest in the social contexts of writing. In classical rhetoric, Aristotle classified orations according to social function: deliberative speeches persuade the audience to accept some course of action (political); forensic speeches accuse or defend (legal); and epideictic speeches praise or blame (ceremonial). In medieval rhetoric, when the political climate had changed and rhetoric was no longer as viable in the political arena or the courts as it had been in ancient Greece and Rome, rhetoricians like Augustine expounded on the art of preaching, while others taught the art of letter writing.

Traditionally, rhetoric has been concerned with discourse adapted to some social end (whether it be domination or liberation). In the 1970s, in part because large numbers of minority students (whose first dialect was not standard English) were being admitted to American universities, composition theorists began to reevaluate how discourse is shaped by social function. James Kinneavy's A Theory of Discourse (1971) was influential at this time because he united the modes of discourse developed by Bain and modern communications theory that stressed the speaker (writer), hearer (reader), subject matter and medium (language). Literary theorists, notably Stanley Fish (Is There a Text in This Class?, 1980), have also been interested in the social dimensions of discourse and in how they define "interpretive communities." Of course, the political and ideological implications of dominant dialects have long been a central focus of Marxist literary criticism. Most recently, composition theorists such as Charles Bazerman, David Bartholomae, and Patricia Bizzell have explored the social aspects (or situational context) of discourse and how they affect the teaching of composition.

Few people today will argue that there is a single best way of teaching students to write. There is, however, general agreement that for all writers, from the naive to the sophisticated, the process of putting words on paper in a coherent way is just that, a process: one that begins before the pen hits the notebook and that includes extensive critical re-reading and revision. Writing is pre-writing, writing, and rewriting.