1994

An NEH Fellowship Examined: Social Networks and Composition History

Stephanie A. Almagno
University of Rhode Island

AN NEH FELLOWSHIP EXAMINED: SOCIAL NETWORKS AND COMPOSITION HISTORY

BY

STEPHANIE A. ALMAGNO

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

ENGLISH

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1994

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION

OF

STEPHANIE A. ALMAGNO

APPROVED:

Dissertation Committee

Major Professor

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1994

ABSTRACT

Until now, histories of composition studies have been predicated on the idea that discipline formation stems solely from textual evidence generated by individual scholars; few histories, however, take into account the influence of social networks formed by the field's professionals. Addressing what Janice Lauer refers to as "loopholes" in composition history, this dissertation constructs a working definition of social networks while it also offers an extended example of their historical significance.

I focus on the 1978-79 NEH Fellowship, "Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process," directed by Richard Young at Carnegie-Mellon University. From oral and print sources including interviews with or texts written by the fellowship participants, I gathered information concerning the social network that developed from the 1978-79 fellowship. I present this history of the fellowship as a conversation among the participants and the director. In addition, a section of commentary following the conversation indicates social networks' integral position in composition studies.

In composition history, a discussion of discipline development is always complicated by its seemingly dissonant components which include journal formation, professional projects, conference presentations, and the role of networking among the field's professionals. A history of the field based on social networks, however, gathers these components and addresses them in relation to professional activity. This dissertation proposes a new way to examine traditional areas of inquiry within composition history.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My dissertation wouldn't have reached this point had it not been for the efforts of three groups of people who have been the most influential in my work at The University of Rhode Island. First, I'd like to thank my dissertation committee for their advice and guidance, especially the Rhetoric and Composition members, Nedra Reynolds, my director, and Celest Martin and John Trimbur, my readers.

Secondly, I'd like to thank the members of the NEH fellowship who answered endless queries, made their files and notes available to me and who encouraged me from the early stages of this project; I would be remiss here if I did not offer a special thank you to Victor Vitanza who not only provided me with responses to my queries, but also boxes of books, journals, and article references.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their support in more ways than I could possibly say, and a special thank you is reserved for MT, who encouraged me across the miles.

I'd also like to acknowledge the work of special friends who taught me to use e-mail, who copy-edited, and who listened to my gripes--to Elise Maglio, Judy Williamson

Hudson, Barbara Saez, Christina Felix, and especially to John Leo. In addition, I'd like to extend a heartfelt thank you to Marilyn Jamgochian and Lucinda Ugorji at URI's College of Continuing Education Library--Providence; these women retrieved articles and books with the speed of master librarians.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents - Continued

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Composition historians are challenging narratives of the field's contemporary genesis and evolution; the result is a debate focused on discipline formation (North, Phelps, Lauer 1984). Situated within current versions of the field's development, this dissertation offers a set of questions concerning the limitations of traditional histories of the field while it also introduces new sites for historical inquiry. I posit that composition studies has developed not only from the work of individual scholars but also from the social networks organized and maintained by the field's professionals.

Although largely unaddressed by studies concerning the professionalization of academic fields, face-to-face meetings and gatherings continue to play a significant role in the development of disciplines. For composition studies, this fact is obvious. The numbers of conferences and professional development seminars rise each year, and "talk" is the one characteristic they have in common.

Discussions, not limited to formal question and answer sessions, occur in hallways, bars, cars, or anywhere people gather. And although the "talk" for some people ends in a matter of moments, for others, social networks develop wherein discussions continue over time and eventually generate ideas and information that contribute to the field. Social networks may be informal or formal, evolving spontaneously or existing in a preordained time; a fellowship is one such example. Until now, social networks have been elided by histories of composition; however, this dissertation demonstrates that these networks are an integral component of the field's contemporary development.

New sites of historical inquiry have been made visible by critical analyses of traditional methods of writing the history of composition studies. Since the mid 1980s composition theorists have asked their communities to rethink histories of the field. From this re-evaluation, historians have begun to call for more than the "discovery" of textual evidence, which, for too long, has been the sole remnant of the field examined for historical purposes (Connors 1991). James Berlin, a noted composition historian, reflects on the limitations of contemporary histories of the field when he writes, "All accounts are

partial, but all reveal something about history and the movement of our thought in coming to terms with it ("Revisionary History" 59). Berlin goes on to suggest that historians should resee the nature of writing history as series of narratives, thereby denying that processes such as discipline development occur on a seemingly linear and neat timeline. This appears to indicate a need for episodic histories of the field, histories that tell multiple stories of a single event. The benefit of writing layered histories of moments in time is that new perceptions of the field are bound to emerge.

The Case In Point

During the 1978-79 academic year, ten post-secondary teachers of English, Speech, and Communication gathered at Pittsburgh's Carnegie-Mellon University for "Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process," a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) fellowship, directed by Richard Young. Here, work began that would influence and indicate major themes and directions in rhetoric and composition theory. The fellowship participants included Sharon Bassett, Lisa Ede, David Fractenberg, Robert Inkster,

Victoria (Winkler) Mikelonis, Victor Vitanza, Samuel Watson, and the late James Berlin, Charles Kneupper, and William Nelson.

I chose Richard Young's 1978-79 fellowship for two specific reasons: first, the fellowship members have mentioned, without fully articulating, the influence of the seminar on their professional development, interests, and products, and, second, the members created public evidence of the social network within the fellowship through professional products such as articles and conference papers. Numerous textual citations indicate that the fellowship members actively participated in each other's intellectual development.

Social Networks & Collaboration

In keeping with the persistent perception of composition studies as a social field, a growing body of work examines collaboration as both a pedagogical tool (Bruffee; Reither and Vipond) and as strategy for knowledge production and division of labor of professionals (Odell and Goswami; Lunsford; Lunsford and Ede; Roen and Mittan); however, environments supporting collaboration among

students and composition professionals have not been adequately addressed in composition histories. The limitation of collaboration becomes one of visibility and invisibility; some professional activity has remained unnoticed, unseen, invisible because source citation, for example, includes only the most formal intellectual partnerships, and because methods of writing histories value only the information that source citations include. In Singular Texts/Plural Authors, for example, Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford write that

> assertions about the importance of collaboration are marginalized by appearing in prefaces or acknowledgments, rather than in the bodies of texts. Though many writers are convinced of the crucial importance and benefits of collaboration . . . they generally have not yet found ways to incorporate these concerns in the body of their texts, which as a rule do not challenge the conventions of single-authored documents. (1990; 239 - 40)

The question for this dissertation remains, then: how can a history of composition studies discuss social networks which have been sustained by previously invisible collaboration?

Oral History as Methodology

Unlike other histories of the field which focus on events more than a generation old and which can only be substantiated by textual evidence, my focus on a relatively current event opens a space for oral evidence to corroborate my central claims. Because the seminar ended only fifteen years ago, I was able to contact and interview the director and four of the surviving seven participants concerning their work during and after fellowship.

Oral history's place has been established as a viable method of information retrieval in various disciplines. Paul Thompson, a British oral history expert, writes:

> Oral history is a history built around people. It thrusts life into history itself and widens its scope. It encourages teachers and students to be fellow co-workers. It brings history into, and out of the community. . . . Oral history offers a challenge to the accepted myths of history, to the authoritarian judgement inherent in its tradition. It provides a means for a radical transformation of the social meaning of history. (21)

Or to put it another way "The goal is to save sources from oblivion, to come to a first assessment of the event/ situations studied and to promote consciousness among the

actors of the happenings themselves" (Vansina 13). The central goal, no matter who's describing the work of oral history, is to have persons intimately knowledgeable with a particular event to tell its story. In this case, the story is told by the 1978-79 fellowship participants and director.

Oral history has a recognizable lineage as a legitimate methodology, in general, and in rhetoric and composition, in particular. Its most modern roots reach back to the Columbia Oral History Project begun in 1948. Yet despite its nearly fifty year history as a viable method of data discovery, historians still focus nearly exclusively on textual evidence and, consequently, overlook oral evidence; this leads to the mistaken conclusion that oral evidence is insignificant and/or unavailable. Three significant markers of the legitimacy of oral history as a viable methodology include 1) the publication of journals dedicated to the topic and practice of oral history; 2) the plethora of monographs and books discussing and influencing the nature, theory, and practice of oral history as a method of data collection; and 3) oral history projects published and/or available from libraries' special collections.

Journals, book-length studies, and oral history projects are becoming more readily available. There are at least six significant journals dedicated specifically to the study and application of oral history both in America and internationally. Another site for the discussion of oral history theories and projects is OHA-L, the oral history association's electronic discussion list available via the Internet, the worldwide linking of computers.

Secondly, monographs and books concerning oral history projects store oral history evidence and information. Some texts, such as Portelli's The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories or Gluck and Patai's The Feminist Practice of Oral History, are theoretical, while others are examples are topical, based on a variety of subjects such as immigrant experience, slavery, teaching, native American concerns, and Vietnam. What these texts have in common is story telling from multiple personal perspectives. In each of the topical histories the voices may have little more in common than the connection to an event or a moment in time. Collections' editors have not synthesized information; instead, they demonstrate the viability of histories written through a series of micro-narratives which are:

> limited and localized accounts that attempt to explore features of experience that the grand narratives totally exclude. . . . This is often history from the bottom up, telling the stories of those people and activities typically excluded from totalizing accounts. (Berlin "Postmodernism" 1990, 172)

Finally, reference collections at most libraries include indices of oral history collections. These make access to collections by region or topic easier. They also indicate holdings in special collections. The proliferation of special collections of oral histories establishes this technique as a significant research tool. For example, during the Depression of the 1930's the US government created jobs for unemployed persons by beginning the Federal Writer's Project. A piece of the Federal Writer's Project, housed in the Library of Congress, includes 10,000 pages of former slaves' voices and was the source of information for Hurmence's Before Freedom, When I Just Can Remember: Twenty-seven Oral Histories of Former South Carolina Slaves.

Libraries in major U.S. research universities and ethnic heritage museums across the country are also broadening their holdings of oral histories. Two projects

particularly important to historians focusing on working class people are the "Women, Ethnicity, and Mental Health, an oral history study of three generations of Italian, Jewish, and Slavic women in the Pittsburgh area" which can be accessed through the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania or the Hillman Library at the University of Pittsburgh, and the second project is the "Ethnic Fraternal Organizations Oral History Project" (collection number 76:25) held by the Archives of Industrial Society also housed in the University Library System at the University of Pittsburgh.

Significant for new readings of the development of composition studies, oral history as a methodology complements readings of historic moments and also indicates spaces left unexamined by traditional histories. Furthermore, oral history allows the inclusion of multiple readings of a single event, time period, or topic, thus indicating a central reason for its applicability to this dissertation's topic.

Oral History & Composition Studies

This dissertation broadens the list of acceptable documentation for historical projects by merging textual and oral evidence. Composition historians like Robert Connors and others across academic disciplines are keenly aware of developments and changes of available evidence. Connors, for example, in support of methodological changes in historiography within composition studies, writes that "full scale biographies and memoirs of the central figures in composition history have yet to be written," but that "oral histories are beginning to pick up some of that interpersonal and detailed work" (60-61). Connors, like other historians in the field, does not assume that oral evidence will replace textual evidence, but that the synergy of the two will create a historical product better than the sum of its parts. For example, Connors, at the University of New Hampshire oversees the Richard S. Beal Collection, the archives for composition and rhetoric studies, housed at the University's Dimond Library. An expanding portion of the Beal Collection includes oral history tapes of first-generation rhetoric and composition scholars interviewed by second and third-generation

scholars. A number of interviews, for example, were conducted at the 1992 UNH conference and are available for research via the library's Special Collections' office.

Second and third-generation composition historians are heeding Connors' call for oral histories and are producing practical projects. Gerald Nelms' 1990 dissertation, for example, "A Case History Approach to Composition Studies: Edward P.J. Corbett and Janet Emig," incorporates interviews with both Corbett and Emig and weaves them with the text to review the early days of the field. The benefit of work like Nelms' lies in the combination of oral history and textual evidence thus marking a place for histories that are topic-driven, specific to a particular place and time, and, most importantly, supported by personal narratives.

Both Nelms' and Connors' articulations situate oral history as a methodology allowing historians to conduct open-ended conversations, structured interviews, or a combination of the two. This change in methodology makes room for the collection of evidence which leads to a renegotiation of histories of the field. Oral evidence will fundamentally change history's sole reliance on textual evidence; furthermore, oral evidence introduces an

urgency to gather micro-narratives rather than to write epic histories attempting to cover composition studies' entire lineage.

Oral history allows composition historians the flexibility to create new histories. The techniques necessary for the implementation of the theory are not so different from any historian traveling to special collections for specialized textual documentation; with oral histories, however, memories and recollections from specific subjects are the special collections. Unlike the research projects focusing on broad representative samplings of target populations, my dissertation is organized narrowly around a select group of subjects and a particular moment in composition studies.

A Modern Twist on Traditional Face to Face Meetings

While historians utilizing an oral history technique traditionally assume that interviewers and subjects meet face to face, I've reconsidered the implementation of this methodology in light of available electronic capabilities. Electronic capabilities become a particular advantage when

subjects and interviewers live great distances from each other, as is the case with this project. Therefore, I incorporated electronic mail (e-mail) interviews via the Internet, the world-wide electronic linking of computers, as a modification of the in-person meetings. The initial contact with more than half the subjects for this project was made through e-mail on the Internet. We discussed the limitations and possible pitfalls of the dissertation, and I received many subjects' confirmation for participation via e-mail. In the cases where e-mail was not a viable option, because subjects do not have Internet capabilities, initial contact was made by phone or postal mail. Since the initial contact, I have spoken to each individual via telephone.

For projects such as this, the disadvantages and benefits of electronic interviews were complicated. The most significant drawback to electronic interviews denies the opportunity for non-verbal communication between interviewers and subjects. Interviewers who would read the traditional body-language signs indicating that subjects are interested, bored, confused, or would like to either further discussion or move on to a new topic no longer have this option. Interviewers cannot see if a line of

questioning should be pursued, adjusted, or terminated. Similarly, interviewers could possibly miss subjects' inflections, tone of voice, and pauses. What might appear straight-forward on paper, might have been accompanied by an ironic look or utterance, something which could not have been communicated electronically. Lastly, the time lapse while awaiting responses detracts from the spontaneity of face to face interviews. Interviewers must begin to develop new signals with which to build a rapport with their subjects. Fortunately, e-mail already has certain general conventions to convey mood and tone. These have become more important for this project which, obviously, cannot rely solely on verbal clues.

Although researchers may be concerned with the loss of important secondary information such as non-verbal communication, the benefits of electronic interviews outweigh the losses. First, e-mail messages can be sent on a schedule convenient for both subjects and interviewers. Utilization of this technology is limited only by the hours of a computer lab or access to a modem. Researchers can, therefore, send questions, queries, or requests for information at any hour of the day and on any day of the week; subjects can respond in kind. In this way,

electronic interviews alleviate the frustrations of conflicting schedules. Second, the subjects have time to reflect on the prompts and compose their responses. Each response can be revised, expanded, or altered as the subject sees fit. Third, researchers may contact as many subjects as needed. Cost and time constraints, which might otherwise prevent researchers from undertaking historical recovery projects such as this one, become a non-issue. And the fourth benefit is admittedly a very practical one: researchers do not have to transcribe hours of tape because subjects' responses (the electronic conversations) come to the interviewer as already printed text. This saves precious time and money for recovery projects not traditionally funded by enormous grants. And if finances do allow, electronic discussions can always be coupled with face-to-face interviews. Enhanced by electronic technology, oral histories still best support this dissertation's structure which juxtaposes voices and information once excluded from other histories.

Chapter two of this dissertation contextualizes my argument within historical, textual evidence. I offer a closer look at traditional representations of discipline formation in current histories of composition studies and

call attention to what cannot be said in these histories of the field. Chapter three offers the social network history of Young's 1978-79 NEH fellowship utilizing testimony and textual evidence from the participants. The history of the fellowship is a constructed conversation, or a polylogue, offering first-hand testimony of work accomplished during this one moment in composition history. And chapter four is an extended interpretive commentary on the information presented in chapter three. Here I discuss the formation and function of a social network based on both textual and interpersonal introductions to the field of composition studies, and I indicate the influence of the network on composition's development as a discipline.

I see this project entering a growing conversation in composition studies concerning the nature of the histories of the field. Although I make no grand claim that the tight focus of this dissertation, one particular moment in time, is representative of all the experiences of all the persons who have ever been a part of a social network, I believe that this study offers one more way, among many viable ones, to write a piece of composition history.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORIES OF COMPOSITION STUDIES: A REVIEW OF THE CURRENT LITERATURE

The central aim of this dissertation is to draw attention to the ways in which rhetoric and composition is propelled by on-going intellectual activity within social networks. This study is necessary because these networks have been rendered invisible by histories of rhetoric and composition which consistently reinforce readings of the field that exclude the social dynamics of discipline development and professionalization. Therefore, in this chapter, which is a review of composition's historical literature, I examine textual strategies of the field's current histories in order to demonstrate spaces for further investigation. The function of chapter three, then, becomes to write a history of composition studies which fills in the gaps delineated in the histories identified, here, in chapter two. In other words, chapter three identifies a particular social network and traces the work generated therein.

Traditional histories of composition studies have clustered around styles, themes, information, and methods of information analysis. Below I offer six narrative styles through which composition history has been presented; these include Histories of Major Figures, Histories of Textual Artifacts, Histories of Professional Organizations, Histories of Curricular Concerns, Histories of the Field, and the newest group, Histories of the "Extracurriculum of Composition." A close examination of these histories indicates that styles of information presentation are repeated among the texts in the discrete clusters. Furthermore, the reliance on these particular strategies guarantees that historians will reinvoke similar versions of composition studies' move to professionalization, and, consequently, historians will duplicate evidence and conclusions concerning discipline development.

Histories of Major Figures

Particular figures central to rhetoric and composition have become indelibly linked with their work, the changes they initiated, or theories they developed. Albert

Kitzhaber, for example, is credited by North and others for marking the "birth of modern composition"; his 1953 dissertation "Rhetoric in American Colleges" has been an underground classic and was finally published in 1990. In addition, Kenneth Bruffee is traditionally associated with his early articulation of theories of collaboration; he's written prolifically on the topic via journal articles and his textbook, A Short Course in Writing: Practical Rhetoric for Teaching Composition Through Collaborative Learning (1972), a staple of American writing classes, is in multiple editions. Mina Shauhnessy's early work in error is showcased in Errors and Expectations (1977), and Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike will always be linked with tagmemics.

Pairing is not an isolated strategy; this focus on the individual has carried over to histories of the discipline as well. One example central to this method of writing histories concerns the earliest manifestations of rhetoric in American colleges. Although the contemporary field of composition studies dates to World War 2, historians have traced early roots of the profession to late eighteenth century Scotland and England. Many of these histories focus primarily on individual's intellectual achievements.

Major-figure histories primarily cluster around late eighteenth, early nineteenth century professors who published treatises and textbooks of rhetoric used in America. The central figures in this cluster are George Campbell, Hugh Blair, and Richard Whately, best known for their early construction of Current-Traditional Rhetoric. George Campbell, whose treatise, Philosophy of Rhetoric (1776), was widely used in America and remained influential and popular into the nineteenth century is credited with seeing rhetoric as a science (see Ehninger 1950, 1955, and 1963, Bevilacqua 1964, and Berlin 1984).

The second member of this cluster is Hugh Blair. His Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (1783) was known for its practicality, more so than Campbell's, and is credited with 130 American and English editions between 1783 and 1911. Blair is significant historically for a focus on Belles Lettres, a move to focus on written rather than oral discourse for the classroom, and the utilization of literature for teaching of writing (Berlin 1984; Corbett 1954, 1956, 1958; and Ehninger 1955 & 1963).

Richard Whately, the last of this cluster, published Elements of Rhetoric in 1828; this text was specifically designed for classroom use and, consequently, became an

influential model for subsequent textbooks. Credited with an emphasis on correctness and style, Whately's legacy today is our concern with an essay's unity and coherence (Ehninger 1955 & 1963; Berlin 1980 & 1984).

Figures from the generation immediately after Whately, Campbell, and Blair have also received significant individual attention in recent histories of the field. Fred Newton Scott, head of Michigan's English Department in the late 1880s, was rescued from obscurity by Donald Stewart. Stewart's histories of Scott show him to be the unsuccessful foil to Campbell, Blair, and Whately's current-traditional rhetoric. Unlike his predecessors, Scott saw language as something over which students already have control and something that must be affirmed by formal coursework. Also unlike his predecessors was Scott's belief in the nature of reality. He saw "reality as a social construction"; consequently, he saw students' written work as something vital, "as a living product of an active, creative mind" (Berlin 1984). The silencing of his voice for over 100 years set the stage for the hegemony of current-traditional rhetoric; now, however, he has been receiving attention primarily from Stewart (see Stewart 1978, 1979, & 1982).

Histories, primarily articles or book chapters, have focused on other central figures from composition's past. One such example is Francis James Child, the Fourth Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard between 1851 and 1876. And in 1876, Child also became Harvard's first Professor of English. Stewart shows how Child "took a struggling elective subject [English] and turned it into a major discipline" (120-21; Also see Douglas 1976; Reid, Paul 1960 & 1969; Reid, Ronald 1959; Stewart 1982).

Other figures who have been the sole subject of historical investigations include John Genung, a composition teacher at Amherst. His treatise, The Practical Elements of Rhetoric (1886), was one of the earliest true textbooks for rhetoric and remained in print until 1914. And in keeping with the spirit of the times that fostered practice drills, Genung also wrote a workbook, Outlines of Rhetoric (1893). Interestingly, most histories of Genung have been written for speech professionals; Stephen Mathis' thesis (1991) is an exception (also see Allen; Ettlich 1966; Berlin 1981).

Andrea Lunsford's history of Alexander Bain challenges the widely held belief that Bain was solely responsible for the introduction of the four forms of discourse (Description, Narration, Exposition, and Persuasion). She actually traces these back to Campbell, approximately 90 years prior to Bain's English Composition and Rhetoric (1866). Although Lunsford does recognize his use of the four modes, she posits that Bain "used them as analytic, not productive, tools" (Aley 1994; Lunsford 1982; Rodgers; Kitzhaber).

In addition, Barrett Wendell, a contemporary of Child (Douglas; Self 1975; Newkirk), John Locke (Corbett 1981), John Dewey (Fishman 1993), and Joseph McKean, the second Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard (Reid 1960), have also been subjects of individual historical inquiry.

Of the contemporary field's first generation of rhetoric and composition scholars, Edward P.J. Corbett and Janet Emig, the only woman to receive such individualized attention, have also been subjects of micro-narratives. In his 1990 dissertation, Nelms' case history focuses on the careers of Corbett and Emig; in addition, Corbett was the subject of an extensive interview conducted in 1987 by

Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede (Connors 1989), and Janet Emig was interviewed in 1983 by Dixie Goswami and Maureen Butler.

In addition, the profession is now beginning to reclaim its foremothers. Stewart's article on Child and Scott, for example, mentions three of Scott's top students, Gertrude Buck, Ruth Weeks, and Helen Mahin (1982, 122). In addition, Anne Righton Malone's 1994 CCCC presentation "Women are not Theoretical Footnotes: Reclaiming Our Heroines" places women like Gertrude Buck into the litany of major figures in the history of composition studies.

Yet, while this cluster demonstrates the achievements of key figures in the field, it also institutionalizes the role of "atomistic inventor" (LeFevre 125), the belief that theories or ideas are developed by a sole author without any influence from life outside his [sic] study. Admittedly, the proliferation of these histories perform significant work in archiving and chronicling the careers of distinguished and noteworthy members of the profession; the drawback to these narratives concerning the development of composition studies, however, lies in their structure.

A close reading of an individual's career usually eliminates an examination of interplay between subjects in collaborative or social situations. The primacy of author/ity and individualism has been the cornerstone of methods of writing histories; however, the myth of the individual agent of change is being rethought by historians in all fields of inquiry. Lest this sound as if composition has the market cornered on perpetuating historiography linked to individual careers, one historian of the American civil rights movement, when discussing the image of Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote that "America has a near-pathological need to codify everything of importance in terms of personalities (even better, in terms of a single personality)" (Powledge xiv).

Writing history need not perpetuate the myth of the isolated individual or cult of the personality; rather, histories of a discipline's development could illustrate the dialectical relationships that key figures enter into throughout their careers. New histories would challenge the notion of the individual agent of change, demonstrating the social and collaborative tendencies that people have had throughout the centuries, despite histories fostering the opposing perspective.

In contrast to the reliance on the centrality of individual intellectual property, my contention is that composition develops because social networks among its professionals produce information driving discipline development. One effect of this argument is to shift the metaphor of writer alone in "his" garret, or what Linda Brodkey has called "'the reigning trope' for writing, "the solitary scribbler," (qtd. in Lunsford and Ede [1987] 20) as the creative agent to a discussion of perceptions of multiple authorship. This shift would offer the discipline multiple creative agents and multiple narratives of development within a single history. Moreover, it would also acknowledge that knowledge is socially constructed and would foster an examination of environments affecting the work of the fellowship participants. In this way, discipline development could be discussed in terms of both the professionalization of the field's scholars in social networks and the knowledge generated in the networks that drives the discipline.

Histories of Textual Artifacts

Histories of major figures sometimes overlap with histories concerned with discovering textual evidence, or what Bob Connors calls the artifacts of a discipline. Rhetoric and composition artifacts would include textbooks or writings left behind by students and faculty. Even in a composition studies' newest manifestations since World War 2, the field's professionals have already left traces of their activities, and historians have dutifully begun to study and catalogue them.

Most articles concerning rhetoric and composition artifacts recount the evolution of the discipline and its common paradigms and pedagogies through a close examination of textbooks, both historical and contemporary. Some of the first examples of histories focusing on textbooks are John Nietz's Old Textbooks (1961) and Janet Emig's Harvard qualifying paper on Early American Rhetoric and Composition Textbooks (1963). And reviews like those constructed by Richard Ohmann in English in America (1976) could also be included here.

Histories focusing on textbooks sometimes overlap with the histories of major figures because the figures are remembered for their successful treatises and textbooks. The textbooks and treatises of Campbell, Blair, Whately, Hill, and Genung have received the most attention. Nan Johnson, on the other hand, offers alternatives to the Campbell, Blair, and Whately triad; she considers the effect of pedagogies based on the treatises of Franz Theremin, Eloquence A Virtue (1844; translated by William Shedd); Henry Day, Elements of the Art of Rhetoric (1850); and Matthew Hope, Princeton Textbook in Rhetoric (1854). Johnson recovers and reclaims these treatises while questioning the hegemony of a single version of composition development. These additional texts foster questions concerning the methods by which pedagogical theories come to dominant a field (Berlin and Inkster; Connors 1986, Crowley; Emig 1963 and 1983; Johnson; Nietz; Stewart 1978 and 1984; Woods 1981).

Textbooks are not the only artifacts available to composition historians; an analysis of journals' positions in the field also sheds light on discipline formation. In "Journals in Composition Studies," Connors' traces the history of journals in order to indicate rhetoric and

composition's legitimacy as an independent field of inquiry. He suggests three reasons why journals develop: the formalization of the existence of an academic discipline (manifesto foundings), the creation of "new outlets for scholarship" (developmental foundings), and personal needs (expansion foundings); moreover, these stages could also be said to correspond to the field's early history, its "adolescence," and its "maturity."

Other textual evidence of discipline development relies on hard-to-find material such as student papers and specialized magazines dating back to the nineteenth century (Connors 1991, 59). Two articles taking up the subject of student texts are David Joliffe's "The Moral Subject in Composition: A Conceptual Framework and the Case of Harvard, 1865-1900" and JoAnn Campbell's "Controlling Voices: The Legacy of English A at Radcliffe College, 1883-1917." The two become an interesting pair, one focusing on male and the other on female students and their writings.

Another artifact is highlighted in a recent article by Lucille Schultz. She investigates "First Books of Composition" as evidence that the nineteenth century was not a monolithic domain of current-traditional approaches

to composition instruction; "they [the texts] allow us to elaborate the story of our discipline" (11). Schultz argues that an expansion of the sites of historical inquiry will uncover theories that subvert the hegemony of current-traditional rhetoric. In this case, identification and study of artifacts of the profession offer narratives that have been previously avoided by histories and theories. Again, however, the focus of these histories has been on intellectual products of key individuals; thus, this cluster can only examine the intellectual property of the atomistic inventor, and, thus, continues to exclude discussion of any influences other than "divine inspiration."

Histories of Professional Organizations

The third cluster of histories focuses on the establishment of professional organizations to showcase and validate the work of a field's members. The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) are the two most prominent professional organizations for rhetoric and composition professionals. Histories of these groups

predominantly develop the argument that the Modern Language Association (MLA) did not fit the needs of teachers with pedagogical questions (Stewart 1985; Tuman 1986); therefore, the articles posit that NCTE and CCCC were born of necessity. John Gerber, the first Chair of CCCC--holding the position in both 1949 and 1950, wrote three histories of the group. Nancy Bird's dissertation focuses on the history and work of CCCC, and David Bartholomae pays homage to CCCC as a symbol of the diversity and growth of the field while J. N. Hook's personal narrative focuses on the development of NCTE. James Berlin's fact-filled pages in Rhetoric and Reality offer additional views of both NCTE and CCCC.

Rather than demonstrating the benefits of a site whereby rhetoric and composition professionals have a formal space to develop social networks, these historians focus on the institution itself. What the essays lack, obviously, is the acknowledgments of the many ways that social networks develop from the talking, the clustering, and the sharing of information in informal and formal ways during the course of the conference. None of the histories of professional organizations makes any attempt to indicate

that conferences and professional communities can influence the professionalization of its members specifically and of the field at large.

Histories of Curricular Concerns

This small fourth cluster of histories traces the activity in the Rhetoric/Writing/English classrooms over the centuries. These histories focus specifically on classroom activity, its origins and developments. The precursor of this section is Albert Kitzhaber's dissertation, "Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900." Book-length or monograph studies in this section include Applebee's Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974) and Richard Ohmann's English in America (1976) despite its focus on the literature component of English studies. In addition, James Berlin weighs in with Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges (1984) and "Writing Instruction in School and College English, 1890-1985." Other articles include Stewart's "Some Facts Worth Knowing About The Origins of Freshman Composition" and Michael Halloran's "From Writing to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900."

Again, discussions of the product, instead of the process, of the work of composition professionals is foregrounded. Furthermore, readers will receive information overlapping with the Major Figure and Textual Artifact histories.

The unnecessary repetition of information reinforces the perception of the individual as the sole agent of the field's development and professionalization; historians merely repackage already existing information. Histories written with this framework divorce themselves from studies of social networks of composition professionals and thus fail to illuminate theories of discipline development not tied to individual agents or textual artifacts, and, more specifically, they fail to offer a method for examining the events of composition studies's contemporary years.

Histories of the Field

Still other histories have centered on the institutional genesis and evolution of rhetoric and composition. Texts that come quickly to mind are The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field (North 1987), Rhetoric and Reality (Berlin 1987), and Composition as a Human Science (Phelps 1988).

These histories construct "blueprints" concerning the branches of composition studies; in other words, they offer taxonomies of composition studies and the field's professionals. Phelps puts it this way: "One story [in this text] is the development of composition studies from an adolescent stage in the 1970s toward self-reflective maturity" (vii-viii) and North wants to the reader develop a "new understanding of composition studies" (6). And in the introduction to Berlin's text, Donald Stewart writes: "He has told us who we are and why we think the way we do about the field of English" (xi). These quotations are all intriguing, but the texts they represent offer three distinct versions of rhetoric and composition's genesis and evolution, and despite the chronological distance which finally allows histories like these, no single version of rhetoric and composition's history is possible.

Large epic histories of the field remain insufficient because they perpetuate the story of composition's isolated and individual agent of change, the "atomistic inventor" to use Karen Burke LeFevre's phrase (125). Or they focus solely on textual evidence divorced from any social context. And in doing so, histories avoid any questions

concerning the significance of social networks on the development of composition studies. What's missing from the above quotations, therefore, is a footnote reminding readers that even epic histories are partial accounts.

Histories of Extracurriculum

The last cluster of histories is one of the most recent historical approaches to the field. In Writing Groups (1987), Anne Ruggles Gere examines the social networks both in and outside of academic institutions. Although she doesn't label the work done in writing groups as "social networking," she does posit that writing groups influenced written work produced not only by school boys but also by members of Benjamin Franklin's Junto, for example (32-33). In a more recent article, "Kitchen Tables and Rented Rooms: The Extracurriculum of Composition" (1994), Gere extends her theory of writing groups to two specific examples, the Tenderloin Women's Writing Workshop, in San Francisco, and farmers gathering around a kitchen table in Lansing, Iowa, to discuss their own writing. A move to include non-traditional academic sites would foster a new reading of the effect of group support and activity concerning not

only the formal act of writing but also the stages in the writing process, from topic generation to finished copy.

Histories like Gere's that chronicle the significance of the social network of knowledge production purport a social element to writing and validate the effect of the group experience on the end product. Writers are not seen as atomistic inventors; therefore, histories like this could give concrete examples to LeFevre's position that "invention is a social act." To accomplish this, however, would mean a shift by historians in their methods of recording and writing history; strategies such as taxonomies and monologic renderings of the effect of composition studies would have to be replaced by strategies incorporating examples of collaborative knowledge production. Too often, however, historians position themselves as the bearer of the "True" history of the discipline, invoking the omniscient narrator who develops a history based on textual evidence alone. Reversing this trend would force an abandonment of the position of atomistic inventor and constitute a shift in the perception of the field's creation and dissemination of knowledge. And although traditional techniques like a works cited page would seem to demand this reimaging, the many ways that

scholars collaborate and develop social networks is seldom a concern when evaluating the usefulness of an academic history.

What I've been suggesting throughout this chapter, then, is the necessity of a history that offers insights into composition's development as a discipline by asking new questions concerning how the field's professionals are trained, how knowledge is generated, and for what purposes are histories of the field constructed. Chapter three takes up this concern in the history of Richard Young's NEH fellowship.

CHAPTER 3

A SOCIAL NETWORK HISTORY: RICHARD YOUNG'S 1978-1979 FELLOWSHIP

In "Composition Studies: Dappled Disciplines," Janice Lauer writes:

> From the beginning, the field of composition studies has been permeated with a sense of community. New work attempts to build on previous studies rather than to ridicule or demolish them. . . . newcomers carve out niches for themselves by enlarging loopholes in previous work, composition scholars huddle together in the face of tidal waves of problems whose solutions demand collaboration. (27 -28)

What's important in Lauer's comment is the sense of composition study's ability to use professional artifacts as building blocks to retrace the field's development.

I continue the utilization of past histories as building blocks for current histories via my discussion of social networks in composition studies; instead of negating

the work of previous histories of the field, I identify that which has remained unexamined and seek a means by which to discuss and present this new information. My extended example of a new site for historical inquiry in composition studies is Richard Young's 1978-79 NEH fellowship "Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process."

To present the history of the fellowship, I construct a polylogue, or conversation, wherein it appears that each person responds to another's prompts. Actually, I have used the participants' own responses to my initial queries, which are the questions I developed concerning the fellowship (Appendix A), as the voice of the fellowship members. My voice enters into the polylogue only to introduce speakers or to explain unclear references.

Precedent, Preparation, & Benefits of A Multi-Voiced Narrative

I've chosen to write a history of the 1978-79 NEH fellowship in the form of a multivoiced narrative; although it initially appears visually different from traditional histories' presentation of information, this style has distinct precedent in composition studies. Not only have actual conversations been transcribed and published, but

conversations have been constructed. Added to this, transcriptions of interviews are a familiar technique to readers of composition journals. These seemingly unconstructed styles are actually finely tuned tools by which to present information in non-linear fashion.

Interviews in Journal of Advanced Composition, for example, are a viable method of information acquisition and dissemination. In addition, Olson and Gale's Inter/Views: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Rhetoric and Literacy, is a collection of Journal of Advanced Composition's previously published interviews. The result is a reliance by the field on a transcription of orality offering "first hand" recollections and responses to pressing issues in composition studies.

More to the point of this history is an example of a transcribed conversation. For the roundtable conversation, "The Politics of Historiography," held during the 1988 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), eight theorists gathered to publicly discuss historiography. A written transcript capturing the conversation's dynamics and personality clashes was published with the signature "Octalog" in the Fall, 1988 Rhetoric Review. No single voice is listed as author;

knowledge is generated collectively. Furthermore, the conversation, itself, is not a linear "argument." Instead, it is a collection of thoughts on a topic.

Two examples come to mind specifically concerning constructed conversations. The first is the final chapter of Into The Field: Sites of Composition Studies (Gere 1993). Titled "Not a Conclusion: A Conversation," Gere, as editor of the collection, constructs a conversation based on written reactions of each author to other articles in the collection. Gere writes that "This polyvocal exchange resists the impulse to conclude by raising new questions and suggesting further sites of interaction for the restructuring of composition studies" (6). In addition to Gere, Richard Lanham's final chapter of The Electronic Word is titled "Conversation with Curmudgeon" wherein Lanham dialogues with himself about his "hopes for . . . the electronic word" (258).

As with Lanham and Gere's constructed conversations, the following narrative of the 1978-79 fellowship resists conclusion and offers a history demonstrating that the work of the fellowship was more than the sum of the projects undertaken to complete the NEH requirements. Instead, the fellowship should be remembered for the ways the

participants supported each others' intellectual and professional development, and, consequently, how the field has developed from the work conducted within and because of these social networks.

This project is predicated on the discovery of new information concerning the field's development as a discipline; therefore, traditional means of information discovery were insufficient. No traditional sources were available to assist me with this historical study. Consequently, my preparation for this project required special circumstances and activities. In addition to the questions I wrote with which to solicit and gather information from the fellowship members, I also planned to videotape a reunion of the 1978-79 fellowship participants and director at CCCC 1994 in Nashville. But as Murphy's Law predicts, what can go wrong will.[1] The gathering never materialized. The majority of my information, then, was culled from postal and electronic mail responses to my queries. I have also incorporated quotations from printed sources. Each person's response is followed by parenthetical information which includes either the interview date or the text's publication date from which their responses were taken.[2]

The benefits of the polylogue concern the presentation of information and the lively juxtaposition of voices. When beginning this project and choosing a method to present the voices of the fellowship participants, I chose a style that allowed a topical arrangement of information. To give the sense of an actual conversation moving in various directions, I needed to construct the conversation in a framework that could be expanded to include additional areas of investigation if the fellowship director or participants desired; coupled with this need for elasticity within the presentation style, I also needed a method useful for quick reference for the reader. The constructed conversation gave me both.

Background on the Fellowship

The National Endowment for the Humanities' sponsorship of this fellowship intrigued me because the NEH boasts a successful program of professional enhancement fellowships and seminars.[3] And the 1978-79 fellowship, "Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process" represents only one of many successful programs directed by Richard Young under NEH auspices.[4]

Prospective participants for the 1978-79 fellowship applied with a written project on an element of rhetorical theory that they wanted to pursue over the course of the the fellowship. In addition, some of the fellowship participants either had or continued connections with the NEH. Sam Watson, in 1977, and Charles Kneupper, in 1978, were awarded Summer Seminars prior to their participation in the 1978-79 year-long fellowship; James Berlin participated in a Summer Seminar in 1980.

When he first proposed the fellowship, Richard Young was affiliated with the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor. Young, however, moved to Carnegie-Mellon University after he was accepted the grant for the fellowship. The move was inconvenient for some participants and the political climate in Carnegie-Mellon's English department, of which he was chairperson from 1978 to 1983, forced Richard Young to contend with more than the seminar during the 1978-79 academic year.

The goals of the fellowship appeared to determine its format and activities. Because the object of these fellowships was the production of independent research, adequate library facilities and study areas were a necessity. For this particular fellowship, the

participants remember more structured conversations during the fall semester, with more time for conferences and lectures and the study on cognitive processes in writing during the spring semester.

Of the original 10 fellowship members, William Nelson, Charles Kneupper, and James Berlin, have died. Thus far, five of the remaining eight persons associated with the fellowship have responded to my queries. They are the Director, Richard Young, and four fellows: Lisa Ede, Robert Inkster, Victor Vitanza, and Sam Watson. Moreover, the availability of published testimony concerning the fellowship allowed me to include Jim Berlin, for example, in the conversation.

Richard Young, the seminar's director, is Professor of English for Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.

James Berlin, before his untimely death early in 1994, was Associate Professor of English at Purdue University, Indiana, and was best known as a composition historian. At the time of the fellowship, Berlin was Assistant Professor of Composition, Wichita State University, Kansas.

Lisa Ede is Associate Professor of English at Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon. Ede is also well known for her work with Andrea Lunsford on collaboration.

At the time of the fellowship, Ede was Assistant Professor of English and Director of Composition Studies for SUNY College at Brockport.

Robert Inkster is currently an Associate Professor and English Internship Director for St. Cloud State University, Michigan. He has lectured extensively on adult education and has taken a number of years to try his hand in the business community. At the time of the fellowship, Inkster was an Instructor for the English Department at Eastern Wyoming College in Torrington, Wyoming.

Victor Vitanza is now Associate Professor at University of Texas-Arlington. At the time of the fellowship, he was Assistant Professor at Eastern Illinois University. He is the founding editor of PRE/TEXT.

Sam Watson, Associate Professor of English, University of North Carolina-Charlotte directs the University Writing Programs. At the time of the fellowship, Watson was Assistant Professor of English and the Director of Composition for UNC-Charlotte.

One History of

"Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process"

The Director Speaks First

YOUNG: The seminar ha[d] three basic goals: an understanding of four modern methods of invention (classical invention, Burke's dramatistic method, Rohman's prewriting, and Pike's tagmanic discovery procedure); an understanding of their historical and theoretical and practical contexts, including various conceptions of the composing process and their implications; and an ability to conduct significant independent research in the most important of the rhetorical arts. The seminar [began] with lectures and intensive reading in the history and theory of rhetorical invention with emphasis on the most important modern developments. During the remainder of the course, participants [presented] papers and lectures that probe[d] fundamental features of the art and at the same time provide[d] the theoretical basis for effective undergraduate course in rhetoric (See Appendix B; Original Proposal To NEH).

On Choosing This Fellowship

INKSTER: [I applied for this particular seminar because] I had used [Young, Becker, and Pike's] Rhetoric: Discovery and Change when it first came out, and I thought it was about the smartest book I'd ever run into in my work. John Warnock, my dear friend and colleague at UW (now at Arizona), had gone to Michigan for a year as a visiting professor and had worked with Young. John encouraged me in thinking this would be an exciting and useful intellectual adventure (March 1994).

WATSON: I wanted to learn tagmemic rhetoric. While in graduate school at Iowa, indeed, I thought of taking a semester to study tagmemics with Richard at Michigan, but I hadn't done it (May 1994).

EDE: When I was a graduate student at Ohio State it wasn't possible to do formal study in composition and rhetoric; Andrea Lunsford, who arrived when I was already working on my dissertation (on Victorian nonsense: Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll), was the first person to have comp[osition] studies as an area of concentration, and she more or less cobbled that together with Ed Corbett's help. I can't recall a single course that I took as an undergrad or

graduate student (other than a TA practicum) that was related to composition studies.

I applied for the fellowship because I had by the time I applied (about three years into my first job at SUNY Brockport) firmly made the commitment to working in comp. studies, and I knew that I wasn't prepared for what I wanted to do. The fellowship looked like a splendid opportunity to have time for the kind of reading that I knew I needed to do, and also of course to work closely with others, and with Richard Young. I'd have to say that the fellowship made an incalculable difference in my ability to "re-tool." I'll always feel enormously grateful for the year and what it brought me (March 1994).

VITANZA: [My dissertation was] "The Dialectic of Perverseness in the Major Fiction of Edgar Allen Poe. . . . I wanted to switch party affiliations and this was the chance to do it. I really didn't know what to expect. But I got more than I could ever dream of getting. This event made my professional life. If you look at my CV around 1978-79, you can see the big change. I had made contacts because of this [fellowship] that I have kept til this day (March 1994).

YOUNG: ... as we developed a set of shared assumptions, concepts, vocabulary etc, and as we came to know each other and each other's interests, the plan was to relax the structure and leave more room for individuals' initiative and inquiry. This produced suggestions for visits by outside speakers (e.g. [Richard] Ohmann, [A.D.] Van Nostrand), trips (e.g. to Penn State to meet [Henry] Johnstone), bull sessions at various people's apartments, collaborative projects (e.g., as I recall Berlin and Inkster began working on a paper together that was later published, also discussions that later produced PRE/TEXT), poetry (e.g., Bassett's on grape leaves and Platonic symposiums); continuation of previous projects (e.g. Fractenberg brought with him a project on the history of dialectic that he continued to work on), etc. The seminar began as a formal lecture/discussion class and ended as a classical symposium with a lot of extra-curricular activity around it. That was part of the design in the original proposal to NEH (March 1994).

INKSTER: It was in the spring. We had gone up to State College for a special get-together at Penn State, arranged, I think by Richard with Bill Nelson's collaboration. The highlight of the day was a seminar with Henry Johnstone where he presented a paper he had in progress. During the discussion, Nelson got excited because he saw that what Johnstone was working on converged with stasis theory, which was what Nelson had decided was at the crux of rhetorical invention, and he began to hold forth energetically, ending with a question to Johnstone. Johnstone replied, "What is stasis?" On the drive back to Pittsburgh, Sam said that the most important thing he had learned that day was that Henry Johnstone didn't know what stasis was. He then went on to explain: "We're always assuming in academe that you have to master the whole territory of your discipline, and you're some kind of kind of retrograde jerk if you don't, and further, anybody who shows a hint of clay on a foot is so generally thought to be fair game for a bashing. He found it profoundly assuring and comforting that a scholar like Johnstone could say, unselfconsciously, that he didn't know what stasis

was, that this gave us all permission to go forward with our intellectual lives and take stands even though we don't know it all and never will. I would also say that this incident and the comment are illustrative of the whole year (March 1994).

WATSON: I do have one small correction, though, to what he's saying. At Penn State, I was the one, rather than Bill, who asked Henry Johnstone about stasis theory. Bob's absolutely right about our subsequent discussion. I still cite the experience, often, to students: the episode is so much truer to how intellectual work ACTUALLY gets done, than is so much of what they're expected to believe! (28 May 1994).

VITANZA: Rich brought in a lot of speakers and people to meet with us. I remember Pete Becker most of all . . . Pete the anthropologist and linguist. Richard Ohmann visited us. And many others. Also, since Rich was interviewing new people for rhetoric positions, we had a chance to listen to and visit with these people (one of which was Richard Leo Enos). (March 1994).

In the spring of 1979, several of the NEH fellows met Samuel Ijsseling at a Heidegger conference at Dusquesne University, Pittsburgh. He told us of his Philosophy and Rhetoric in Conflict (PRE/TEXT: The First Decade 1993; xvii).

YOUNG: When A.D Van Nostrand met with them [the fellows], he came away saying that I had promised him a meeting with young scholars and he found instead a pack of lions. Or a pride of lions (March 1994).

On Influencing Each Other

VITANZA: Our acts of composition are always collaborative. It is the attitudes (comic or tragic, serious or farcical) of others that always stimulate and inform composing and that should and ought to be acknowledged (Writing Histories of Rhetoric xi).

BERLIN: I want to thank a number of people who introduced me to rhetoric and in one way or another have contributed to my understanding of it: Sharon Bassett, Lisa Ede, David

Fractenberg, Bob Inkster, Charles Kneupper, Victor Vitanza, Sam Watson, Vickie Winkler, and ... Bill Nelson (Rhetoric and Reality 1987; xiii).

EDE: It seems to me that although the focus of the seminar was primarily on invention as an individual act we did in fact as a group enact a social view of invention. From the start, of course, we functioned as a seminar. But as time passed our interactions, and our support for one another, deepened. Those of us in the seminar met regularly away from campus to talk over ideas, work in progress, etc. In fact, it seems to me that during the second semester Dick agreed that we would reduce the number of seminar meetings with him so that we could meet together as an informal study group. We certainly read one another's writing, and provided all kinds of additional help. I remember borrowing many well-marked up copies of Philosophy and Rhetoric from Sam Watson, for instance. And I remember countless--and I mean countless!--discussions with Sharon Bassett, who single-handedly tried to help me learn something about philosophy (March 1994).

VITANZA: I think that collaboration was going on constantly. All that we did was talk rhetoric when we saw each other. We shared a common room with carrels. We ate lunch together. On occasion two or three of us would meet somewhere. (Not all of the members of the seminars came with spouses or were even married. Those who were with family tended, and rightly so, to divide their time.) (March 1994).

INKSTER: We ate lunch together a lot. We hung out quite a bit in the room that was reserved for us. We talked. We shared all kinds of drafts. I think "critique" isn't quite the right word for the kinds of responses. We were wonderfully supportive and gentle with each other. "Brainstorming" might be a better description of the kinds of responses we gave each other. Again, I think Richard may have had something significant if subtle to do with this in the tone he set and in his appeals to things like WJJ Gordon's Synectics (March 1994).

VITANZA: In 1978, Charles Kneupper introduced me to Richard McKeon's article on rhetoric as architechtonic productive arts. In 1978, Sharon Bassett introduced me to

Paul Feyerabend's Against Method: Outline for an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge. She first pointed out to me that the subject index included "rhetoric, 1-309." (Feyerabend's sense of humor and play and his view of sophistic rhetorics became a counterbalance to McKeon's neo-Aristotelianism....) (PRE/TEXT: The First Decade, xvi).

EDE: We were resonators for each other in that we brought diverse interests and areas of specialization to the seminar; we were interested in each other's work, and we had the luxury of large amounts of time that we could spend talking with one another, reading work in progress, etc. I think there were large questions and also general emphases that as time passed we shared; particularly important here was the sense that rhetoric provided if not the most valuable grounding for research in comp. studies, then an important one. And there was also a shared sense of mission, a sense of possibility, a sense that the questions our group was addressing were important and might make a difference to the field. But individuals also resonated more strongly with some members than with others. Sharon, Jim and Bob Inkster were particularly important for me, for instance--though I learned from everyone (March 1994).

WATSON: Collaboration happened--it always does, when in serious intellectual work is underway--but I believe we saw it as essentially adventitious to what we were "supposed" to be doing. Sharon Bassett was the earth-mother of the seminar, far and away its best-read member (including Richard Y), and its conscience; she probably saw more deeply than the rest of us the importance of collaboration, but she was also a very private person. I recall her one day saying that composition should remain a "cottage industry"; that has stuck with me, as over the years I've watched us adopt the trappings of traditional academic paraphenalia instead (17 May 1994).

INKSTER: Sharon introduced me to critical theorists I didn't know, especially continental people; Bill Nelson introduced me to stasis theory; Charles introduced me to Toulmin . . . Jim, of course, was starting on the 19th Century stuff and was excited about it and talking about it all the time, and it shows up in the Jim-Bob paper, of course . . . (March 1994).

EDE: I have a few especially powerful memories of times with Sharon Bassett. I still remember, for instance, how once during a walk from Sharon's apartment to I turned to her in frustration and exclaimed "Just tell me which is bigger, Sharon, phenomenology or hermeneutics?" (If this doesn't make sense, I'd been attempting to understand their relationship and could only formulate my effort in this crude way). I still remember the generous, warm, funny way Sharon responded. Another memory of Sharon: We read . . . Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics in our study group. I know no German and had literally read almost no philosophy before then. So I didn't know that in German important words like "Dasein" [being] are capitalized. I read the entire volume (and I mean the entire volume) thinking that "Dasein" referred to a person. I still remember calling Sharon and saying "Just tell me who in the hell is this Dasein person that Gadamer keeps talking about." And I remember the warmth and humor and gentleness of Sharon's response, which began something like this: "Oh, I guess that perhaps you've not studied German or read much German literature or philosophy." You can easily imagine, I'm sure, how easily someone might have put me down, made me afraid of ever revealing my ignorance. Sharon, like most

others in the seminar, always responded gently, thoughtfully, supportively (March 1994).

WATSON: Collaboration, as I say, felt adventitious, at least to me. The seminar would have been a richer experience, had that been otherwise. I recall lots of dreaded days, dozing purposelessly over dusty tomes, that I might have better spent if they had been more thoroughly informed by on-going conversation among us. That's what I see now; I can't claim to have seen it then (17 May 1994).

On Splinter Groups

VITANZA: Splinter groups formed too. The theory group met once a week or every other week (October 1993). It was actually the sub-seminar that [influenced me]...the post-structuralist stuff. I know a lot about the literature of composition studies and I can and do teach the literature on it occasionally, but what I mostly do is respond to it via post structuralist and cultural critique. So . . .you see it is a tale of two seminars: *the* seminar and the subseminar (March 1994).

INKSTER: I'm sure you've heard about the "Pittsburgh Society of Rhetoric and Philosophy" that formed as a kind of counterbalance to the seminar itself. I'm not sure who the prime mover(s) was/were in starting this group. The central people were Sharon, Victor, Charles (I think) and David ("The Ayatolla Fractenberg" Sharon dubbed him affectionately). Sam, Jim, and Lisa were active discussants too. I was there for most--maybe all--of the meetings. The Pittsburgh Societe pour Rhetorique et Philosophe! (March 1994).

VITANZA: We read Derrida, Walter Benjamin, Foucault (early), Feyerabend...really a mixed crew...mostly Derrida at the time (21 June 1994).

On PRE/TEXT

ALMAGNO: PRE/TEXT: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Rhetoric, later becoming PRE/TEXT: the Journal of Rhetorical Theory, edited by Victor Vitanza, is one of the projects closely associated with the 1978-79 fellowship. The journal, now in its fourteenth year of publication, spawned a "standing special interest group" meeting

annually (1981-1993) at CCCC. In addition, PRE/TEXT: The First Decade, a collection of 10 reprinted articles, was published in 1993. And the journal's most current manifestation is PTc, the PRE/TEXT Conversation, an electronic discussion group on the Internet, moderated by Victor Vitanza and James Sosnoski at Miami University-Ohio.

WATSON: From the beginning, PRE/TEXT was Victor's baby. I recall a few preliminary, brainstorming discussions, over beer, of how it would be important to have a new KIND of journal, one which would be genuinely exploratory, tentative, "pre-textual," as it were. . . . Victor's tenacity is what made that fly; I wasn't aware of anyone else having the kind of commitment to it, necessary for it, actually to come into being (17 May 1994).

VITANZA: In the Spring of 1979, I talked with the NEH fellows about the possibility of a journal, and talked with others who visited CMU and others at the University of Pittsburgh. . . . When the NEH seminar came to an end and we all packed up to go our separate ways, I announced that I was going to start a journal. The response was "Yes,

that a good idea." After all, who would or could believe what would eventually happen? At most, it was suggested by someone, that this "journal" might be a simple mimeographed newsletter to be circulated among the NEH Fellows and their friends (PRE/TEXT: The First Decade xvii).

EDE: Here's what I recall about PRE/TEXT; I'll be curious to see how it meshes with others' memories. I remember P/T evolving gradually out of our group's shared frustration with the limited scope of articles then appearing in CCC. I remember someone exclaiming in frustration "but how can you say anything important, really explore an idea, in ten pages." . . . And then I remember Victor and Charles especially talking about it (and I recall, too, that Richard wasn't particularly encouraging), but it seems to me that Victor and Charles were already at the forefront, with Jim, Bob, and Sam perhaps being most involved after that (March 1994).

VITANZA: When I was ready to start [it], (I was already at home); I wrote to everyone [the NEH fellows] and they agreed to join in. From there on I pretty much tried to include them in making decisions, but after a while some of

them never responded to my letters or some wanted the journal to go in directions that I had no interest in. The people with whom I spoke the most were Sam Watson and Sharon Bassett. Both of them played a part in one or the other of the first two volumes: Sharon wrote two articles; Sam guest-edited the second volume on Polanyi (March 1994).

INKSTER: My memory is that Victor came to the seminar with the idea already in his head. Others, especially Sharon, picked upon the idea and energized him. Charles, of course, was a crucial figure too. I remember that by the time the year was over, Victor was going full-speed on the project, and Sam's special issue on Polanyi was already underway as a future project. I remember that for some reason, I was the one who told Richard about Victor's plan to start the journal and to name it PRE/TEXT, and I remember Richard's eyebrows jumping when I told him the name (March 1994).

BERLIN: When V.V. founded P/T in 1980, rhetoric figured in popular discourse only as the contrary of truth (indeed, as today) and in university departments as the devalorized

opposite of literary texts (English), of empirical investigation (communication), and of the pursuit of rational truth (philosophy). P/T was of course a part of the general activity that accompanied the displacement of these invidious oppositions, and, more important, it has a role in the continuous effort to disrupt and displace them. And this, I would argue, is the future of P/T . . . as it has been its past (PRE/TEXT: The First Decade xxv).

EDE: Though Victor and Charles were the most important in developing the idea of P/T, or so I remember, I'd have to say that the closeness and energy and intensity we developed as a group played an important role that similar emotional factors have played in Andrea Lunsford's and my work. It's not enough to have the idea; taking the step from idea to actually trying to carry it out can be very difficult. Having the support of people you value makes all the difference, makes it more possible to take risks (March 1994).

PRE/TEXT: Volume 1, Numbers 1-2: EDITOR: Victor Vitanza; ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Sharon Bassett. ADVISORY BOARD: James Berlin, Steve Carr, Lisa Ede, David Fractenberg, Robert

Inkster, Charles Kneupper, William F. Nelson, Samuel Watson, Jr., and Victoria Winkler.

VITANZA: In the fall of 1979, after returning to Eastern Illinois University, I designed a brochure announcing the new journal and had it printed. It was distributed by members of the editorial board at the 1980 College Composition and Communication Conference. We got 150 subscribers. Individual subscriptions were $6.00; institutions, $8.00. P/T was in business, but could not pay the bills. And the bills have to be paid (PRE/TEXT: The First Decade xvii).

BERLIN: P/T . . . creates a clash that cuts across all affiliations, collecting the entire range of differences and generating a battle of all against all. This fracas is saved from sheer nihilism, furthermore, in revealing and creating new alliances and disalliances, however temporary, opening up new possibilities for a richer, more complex discourse. . . . PRE/TEXT is a forum where we can all get together to disagree, establishing relationships, as V.V. and I have done, on mutual and heartfelt disrespect (PRE/TEXT: The First Decade xxvii & xxvi)

INKSTER: I was not a central player in PRE/TEXT, and within a couple of years Victor had kicked a bunch of us off. I remember he kicked me, David, and Vickie off in the same letter. I suppose all this demonstrates that in spite of the friendship and conviviality, there really was not a monolithic orthodoxy among us (March 1994).

VITANZA: After a while I think that we just got in trouble with each other. So it goes. Sharon began to lose interest in rhetoric and composition and so we parted; Sam and I just did not always get along, though we constantly talked and did things for each other. . . . When I took a position at UTA, we eventually hired Kneupper and I appointed him associate editor to replace Bassett. This pissed off some people. Again, Charles and I did not necessarily get along very well, so I would of course listen to his advice and just go do what I wanted to do with "MY" journal.

At first, people really didn't think much of the journal, but when it came out they really began to see its value and the impact that it might have and then they wanted to get active. . . . I just had to do as I thought.

After all, I held the copyright and it was my small business registered with the IRS. So it goes. After Kneupper died, I asked Jim B. to be associate editor. We worked fine together on the journal. He was supportive and said that I was the "antichrist." He was not going to bother with me.

After I start PRE/TEXT, I started a special interest group associated with CCCC. It was called "Forum for Rhetoric as an Inter-disciplinary Study." I invited Sam Watson to speak on Michael Polanyi and Rhetoric at CCCC in Dallas, 1981. I continued this forum until 1994. One other important session that we had was on revisionary rhetoric (Atlanta, 1987), which really got things going. You see, it was not only the journal but also this forum that allowed me to introduce new ways of thinking to the C's (March 1994).

On the Flower/Hayes Study

ALMAGNO: One of the professional activities closely associated with the 1978-79 fellowship was Linda Flower and John Hayes' use of the fellowship participants as their expert writers for a study concerning cognition, discovery,

and writing ("The Cognition of Discovery," 1980). In this study, Flower and Hayes studied the protocols of both novice and expert writers. Because Flower and Hayes were literally down the hall at CMU from the NEH fellowship participants, Flower and Hayes asked the fellows to be the expert writers. Their prompt was to "write about your job for the readers of Seventeen magazine, 13-14 year old girls," and they were "asked to compose out loud into a tape recorder as he or she worked" (Flower/Hayes 1980, 23-24).

Not all fellowship members participated; the Flower and Hayes work, however, went on to become significant not only for its topic, but also for the protocol analysis (see Flower and Hayes 1980 & 1981 and Cooper and Holtzman 1983).

EDE: I didn't participate in the Flower/Hayes study--our participation was optional, though I'd have to say that inevitable we all felt, or at least I felt, some pressure to participate. Why didn't I participate? Frankly because I didn't feel very much like an "expert writer," and also the whole process of protocol research felt unnatural and intimidating. I want to be clear that I think this says more about me, about who I was then and how I felt at the

time, than about either Linda or her and Hayes' project (March 1994).

YOUNG: As I recall, I did not even know the participants were working with Flower and Hayes until after they had begun. . . . I suspect that it was a good experience for the ones who did participate (March 1994).

INKSTER: I was immensely impressed with the little bit that I knew about their work, and I thought it would be an opportunity to learn more and make some good connections with them. So I volunteered. Unfortunately, they were less impressed with me. I can say that my work never appeared in any of their reports among the samples of expert writers! It was a weird experience for me. For one thing, I had just hurt my back and was really crippled. For another, I had just lost my job back in Wyoming, having been on a grant project that lost its funding. The NEH seminar was, from a practical and financial point of view, a strange stopgap for me personally.

Then came along Flower and Hayes and asked me to write

about . . . MY JOB! . . . My protocol, as I recall, consisted mostly of complaining about how uncomfortable I was and mumbling about my work in the seminar. You can, I guess, see the problem one has with invention when one is supposed to write about a job one hasn't got. Furthermore, I was too embarrassed to tell anybody the truth. Then they called me back to do another protocol. I went thinking maybe I could redeem myself on a second topic. And what did they want? A revision of the first draft. Someday maybe I'll tell Linda about the confounding variable in that research project (March 1994).

WATSON: Yes, I did participate, and in fact it was my protocol that seems to have figured most prominently in their subsequently published research. . . . There was the original writing session, then, a week or so later, one in which I was given back my original draft and asked to revise it. . . . . Several years later, Linda mentioned to me at a convention once, "We're still analyzing the hell out of your protocol."

Out of the original protocol experience I thought of writing an article, which I really wish I had done: "As the Subject Sees It" would have been my reflections as a

drafter of that original magazine article. I'd have talked about the process in terms that made the most sense to me--those, broadly, of classical rhetoric. I felt then (and still do) that those ancient terms map rather neatly onto the cognitive psych. terms of the F/H [sic] model; to have said so publicly and at some depth, might have helped the discipline avoid some of the logomachies that swirled about the F/H [sic] work for the next decade.

Even at the time, members of the seminar were raising questions about protocol methodology. As I recall (and I could be wrong on this) the objections voiced were pretty much more to the methodology's pretensions to a "scientific" status presuming some sort of certainty and completeness, rather than to the a-situational and individualistic (rather than collaborative) character of the writing which the setting constrained us to do (17 May 1994).

VITANZA: I participated in the project. One day, Linda came to the seminar and explained their project, told us everything from soup to nuts and asked for volunteers. Some people were leery, but I thought I could learn

something from this. And boy I did. Linda and John Hayes met with us 2 - 3 times. (e.g. we were interested in how they were going to interpret the protocols. We began to see problems immediately!) We (about 6 -7 of us) gave 2 protocols each. We had numerous discussions with Linda at parties and in the hallway. She showed us drafts of the papers that she was writing and that would later become famous. We made suggestions, but I do not think that many were taken to heart. My general impression is that most of us did not care for the whole thing at all. I eventually wrote against their work. I think that Jim and I both very publicly parted company with Linda. She today does not really talk much to us (March 1994).

On Doing Panels & Papers Together

EDE: I wrote a somewhat ... general paper on audience that I presented at the CCCC on a panel with Richard, Charles---and I can't recall the third person. I think it was either Jim or Victor, but I'm not quite sure (March 1994).

VITANZA: [The list of papers read and written with the fellowship members includes:

"Evaluation and Tagmemics," read at Conference on English Education, Pittsburgh, 16-18 March 1979. (with Sam Watson, Lisa Ede, Sharon Bassett, and perhaps 1 or 2 others).

"A Tagmemic Organizational Heuristic for the Whole Composition" read at The Conference on College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis, 5 - 7 April 1979. (Dick Young selected 3 of us to present papers for CCCC that we had written the first semester. with Lisa Ede and Charles Kneupper--all papers were on invention. Mine was eventually published in CCC.)

"The Texas Armadillo: From Underground Peace Symbol to Texas Brags" read at Popular Culture Association Meeting, Pittsburgh, 1979. (This was a hoot. The PC was in town so we decided to read papers. I think about 7 of us read, and not on the seminar topics.)

"Teaching Tagmemic Invention and Organization," read at Eastern Communication Association Meeting, Philadelphia, 1-3 May 1979. (This was Co-authored with Vicki Winkler. She delivered it; I did not go. Afterwards we tried to get it published in a speech journal. Almost made it but our

example was from literature and they wanted something from speech. We never rewrote it.)

"Towards a Pluralistic Analysis of Discourse Beyond the Paragraph," Learning to Write (Canadian Council of Teacher's of English), Ottawa, 1979 May 8 -14. (This was my second paper for the seminar. And this was an unbelievable conference. people from all over the English-speaking world were reading papers. I met an incredible number of people. What I remember most of all was Janice Lauer taking me by the arm and introducing me to everyone. The other thing that I remember about this conference was the drive there and back with Sam Watson. We had incredible conversations.) (March 1994).

WATSON: Some years later, at an MLA convention, Victor and I were scurrying through hallways looking for a particular session. Victor was six feet in front, as we ended up in the kitchen. He turned and with an exasperated look said, "Sam, I thought you knew where we were going." I told him, "Victor, some people lead from behind. But I've just discovered this about you: you follow from in front." And I think there's truth to that (17 May 1994).

INKSTER: David and I presented papers on the same panel at the 1979 Wyoming Conference, and I chaired a session on Burke at the same conference where Lisa, David, and Sharon gave papers. As I recall, the Wyoming Conference was my idea. Sam and I presented papers together at the 1991 International Polanyi Centennial Conference at Kent State and at the 1992 CCCC.

Have I said that Richard explicitly encouraged us to work collaboratively? He did. That's why I ventured to ask Jim, who had spoken at one of our first meetings about wanting to do a project looking at the epistemology of the current-traditional paradigm, if I could join him on the venture (March 1994).

ALMAGNO: The project to which Inkster just referred became "Current-Traditional Rhetoric: Paradigm & Practice" published by Freshmen English News (1980). The piece has become affectionately known as the "Jim-Bob" essay.

INKSTER: It is probably worth saying that while it was the Jim-Bob paper, its very name, and the familiarity it suggests, shows the affection and ownership the whole group had on it. When Jim and I were working on the Jim-Bob

paper, Sam gave us more useful leads than everyone else combined. . . . Everyone read it; "brainstormed" it for us, and was hugely supportive of it. Sam got Louise Phelps, who was then working on her dissertation at Case Western (Sam was and is amazing. In his quiet way, he makes so much happen, and he knows everybody. I'm not sure how he knew Louise Phelps even back then) to come to one of the sessions where we talked formally about the paper, and I think her dissertation is the first place where it got cited even before it was published (March 1994).

On Current-Traditional Rhetoric

ALMAGNO: Richard Young's extensive work on invention, specifically tagmemic invention, was a central reason that so many of the members applied to this particular fellowship. And I've heard from a number of group members that the 1978-79 fellowship participants had been called The 10 Disciples, presumably of Richard Young and tagmemics.

YOUNG: Well, I never thought of our relationship as being that sort [as disciples]. I thought we grew rather quickly into something more like colleagues and friends. Tagmemic invention was only one of the arts of invention considered in the Seminar. I tried to allow space for different theories, partly because we don't understand what something is unless we understand what it isn't. And that requires comparison and contrast (March 1994).

WATSON: Well, I left knowing very little more of tagmemics than when we began. I really had hoped for immersion in the nine-cell matrix, at least, but Richard always seemed reluctant to go beyond a cursory lecture or so on it (17 May 1994).

In Memoriam: On Jim, Charles, and Bill

EDE: Oh, this is a hard one. Some of the things that are most important to me about Jim, Bill, and Charles I'm not sure that i want to share in a public forum. But I can say a few things. One perspective that Charles brought to our seminar was his grounding in speech communication (a grounding Charles shared with Bill and David, of course).

I think our discussions were enormously richer because we had such multiple groundings and perspectives. I remember Charles' wonderful sense of humor, the way he would tease us for our "Englishy" ways. Victor, I'm sure, will have many more stories of Charles. And I have so many powerful, warm memories of Jim that I hardly know how to begin. Jim's intellectual passion was linked to an irreverence (an irreverence that he regularly turned on himself, as much as on others) and wit that were remarkable. And Jim was enormously kind (March 1994).

WATSON: I didn't know Charles as well as I did Bill or Jim. I'd read an article by Bill on invention and brought a great deal of respect for him. In the South, we'd say he was a fun-loving good old boy, as was Jim in his way.

I think Bill lay awake at night thinking up Polack jokes to tell Jim the next day. . . . Once we were having a pot-luck supper at Richard's house. I'd brought a quart of barbeque meat hash from home. I was on the other side of the house as folks were going through the line; heard Bill's loud voice: "Sam, come here, QUICK." I ran over to hear Bill smugly announce, "I want you to see how a Polack stacks his barbeque." Sure enough, Jim had a pile of rice on top of his meat hash (17 May 1994).

INKSTER: They were such fine people. What's most important for me at this point is what a wonderful father and husband Jim was (to hell with all that professional stuff). (March 1994).

VITANZA: Jim had the biggest impact [on the rhetoric and composition community]; no doubt about it. This probably does not need to be explained. Bill had done everything he was going to do before the seminar. His life was falling apart. He drove to Illinois once to visit. He called me a few times after that and things were really going down hill (March 1994).

Charles started the Rhetoric Society of America Conference and published three sets of papers read at the conference (March 1994). When Charles got the idea of having a conference, he wrote to and met with the board of directors of the society, and told them that he wanted to put on a conference. They of course said yes. Look at what Charles has turned that yes into ("For Charles" 5).

YOUNG: They were all remarkable intelligent, amiable, and decent people who were committed to rhetoric and the scholarly life. Clearly, they had already made a substantial mark in the discipline before they died. No one can say what they would have done had they lived. But I suspect it would have been grand (March 1994).

Last Thoughts On the Fellowship

VITANZA: I learned so much from everyone in the group. They freely gave me information, titles to books, insights into them, what journal articles were important, etc. Young obviously did the same. What I learned in that collaborative spirit would have taken me a decade to find out on my own. These people knew exactly what had to be read and what not to bother with (March 1994).

EDE: My most vivid memories of the seminar are memories of the informal times that those of us in the seminar spent together. Even when we were relaxing, socializing, there was an intellectual energy and intensity that was palpable; there was also a real sense of caring for and enjoying being with one another (March 1994).

VITANZA: [I remember] the final meeting. Rich asked what we were going to be concerned about in the future. When it was my time, I said that I was going to be concerned with the nature of asking questions. By that I meant get suspicious about questions (March 1994).

WATSON: At the end of the year I remember something of a last discussion session. I'd found my own application by then. . . . I'd re-read it; as people talked about where they'd gotten to, I recall thinking (though, I hope, not saying, that, as a group, we were ending about where my own thinking had begun. (sorry to sound so damned condescending, Stephanie, but that's a vivid memory for me.) (17 May 1994).

INKSTER: It is absolutely no exaggeration to say that the Pittsburgh year was the high-water mark of my intellectual life. I was so excited, so constantly living with the sense that I was on the edge of wonderful discoveries and integrations, so full of the personal and intellectual fellowship for the entire year, so full of the sense that I was a part of a group of people who were making a difference in the world (March 1994).

EDE: It seems clear to me that the NEH seminar played a central role in the development of my career. Without the time to read, think, and write that that year afforded, I might never have become an active scholar. (In the years before the seminar I had published only a few short pieces.) The connections with people like Jim, Sharon, Victor, Charles, Bob, Sam, and others were important not so much because they resulted in specific publications, networking, etc. (I'd have to say that my connections with women in the profession, most notably of course with Andrea Lunsford, have been more important in that regard.) But they helped give me a sense of professional identity that enabled me to feel that I might hope to have some place in the field (March 1994).

WATSON: My most vivid memory is the closing of a session just before lunch one day. Various participants were musing about just how wonderful our rhetorical theory was. Richard said, "Yes, but if we can't solve the dissemination problem, [that is, getting theory to inform pedagogical practice] then the best theory in the world isn't going to do anybody any good." People started to rise for lunch,

but I asked them to sit for another moment to hear me say this: "It may not be true of a theory in any other field, but if what we're talking about is a rhetorical theory, and we can't solve the dissemination problem, then we don't have much of a theory, now do we?" Then we went to lunch and I was able to digest mine, which I wouldn't have been, if I hadn't gotten that said.

Surely no one recalls that little incident but me. For me, it served to crystallize my attitudes toward the seminar as a whole. Though I had walked in with the most theoretical background among the participants, I spent the year becoming increasingly sensitive to the potential vapidities of theory, increasingly suspicious of any theory which is divorced from practice or uninformed by practice. I still hold that suspicion on grounds that are both theoretical and practical.

When I came home from from Pittsburgh, my first action was to direct the first summer institute of our site of the National Writing Project, whose prime presumption is that teachers know things. I said at the time that (A) Writing Project work is about as far as it's possible to get from the orientation of the NEH seminar, and (B) therefore the seminar had given me the best possible orientation for beginning a Writing Project site (17 May 1994).

On Today's Work and Interests

EDE: Well, right now I'm doing work in several related areas. The research that most draws me is work in feminist and critical theory. I've found these discourses to be powerful ways of thinking through, with, and against current problems in composition studies. I'm at the early stages of what may turn out to be a book-length study of the relationship of theory and practice in composition studies. I'm hoping that this study can participate in the movement toward disciplinary self-reflection and critique evident in recent years in the field. I continue as well to work with Andrea Lunsford on issues growing out of our research on collaborative writing, particularly issues involving intellectual property. And--interestingly given its grounding in the NEH seminar--Andrea and I are also working on a sort of "ten years later" reflection on our audience addressed / audience invoked essay (March 1994).

VITANZA: But first, what have I done besides publish stuff?:

a) started a journal in the field

b) designed an undergraduate and graduate (PhD) curriculum in rhetoric, composition, and critical theory. And directed it for 6 years (at UTA).

c) organized and directed 3 national conferences

d) made a lot of good friends

e) remarried and got happy and we had Roman!!

(I spend most of my time at home playing at my work and playing with Ro.)

I am still questioning questions. I am finishing up my big, heavy, yet lightful interests in historiography (I'm just about finished with Negation, Subjectivity, and the History of Rhetoric) and will go on to the sequel Negation, Subjectivity, and Composition Studies. I am well into a monograph on Canonicity and Rape Narratives in the History of Rhetoric. I have co-started an electronic discussion group entitled "The PRE-TEXT Conversation." I have tons of articles to write. I am getting more and more interested in virtual rhetorics (March 1994).

WATSON: A. How might I learn to teach freshman composition really well?

B. How might the institutional values of a university be shifted, such that it becomes a place "safe" for writing?

C. What are the relationships between writing that clearly is "personal" and writing which is appropriate and useful within a particular discourse community, for instance an academic one?

D. What varying purposes might writing appropriately serve, through the undergraduate years; in what ways could those purposes best build upon one another?

E. What varying sets of relationships are possible between texts of various sorts and the varying contexts within which texts are read?

F. (Really an extension or restatement of E) How might we generate a theory of texts/contexts, rooted in Kenneth Burke's understanding of "form" as "the arousal and satisfaction of expectations"? (17 May 1994)

INKSTER: Polanyi still has me in his grasp. I think he has so much to say to us as we try to negotiate between "Romantic" and "social constructionist" rhetoric and figure out where we really stand ethically and epistemologically with each other and with our institutions. I'm interested

in faculty development, assessment, workplace literacy, literature of the American West, the relevance of the English major in the 21st century.... I'm not sure if that's the order. And I'm also interested in high school basketball, both on behalf of my own 10th grade son and on behalf of Christopher and Dan Berlin (March 1994).

Chapter 4

IMPLICATIONS OF A SOCIAL NETWORK HISTORY

In chapter two I showed that histories of composition studies have been limited to textual evidence concerning the field's development. In contrast, chapter four, which uses evidence from the fellowship history in chapter three, indicates that social network histories offer information once unavailable from composition's traditional histories. The history of Richard Young's fellowship includes information on the formation of social networks, on the professional retraining of the fellowship's members, and on the ways in which the group produced knowledge directly affecting the field.

Because academic preparation for teaching composition was scarce in the 1970s, graduate students and faculty members teaching both literature and writing courses looked to professional organizations and endowments to fund directed study opportunities. The NEH, a significant partner in retraining English department faculty, sponsored conferences, meetings, workshops, and speakers.

Although other annual events like Janice Lauer's "Rhetoric Seminar: Current Theories of Teaching Composition" also assisted faculty in professional retraining, the NEH funded innumerable projects until the mid 1980s; Richard Young's "Rhetorical Invention" seminar is just one example.

As faculty, who were trained primarily in literature, joined the rhetoric and composition movement, many were delighted in the social and communal flavor of the small group. Charles Moran's professional autobiography, "A Life in the Profession," suggests just this. He writes, [we are a] "social crew: not for us the monastic years in the library carrel" (160). Unlike literature scholars who make their reputations via individual scholarship, composition faculty are known for their collaborative professional endeavors. And for the first time, composition historians are able to write a history of the field that captures the social dimension of our professional work. What follows, then, is an analysis of the social network history in chapter three which, I will demonstrate, reveals previously unavailable information concerning composition's evolution as a discipline.

Developing a Social Network & Training Scholars

The structure of the 1978-79 fellowship run by Richard Young left the members time to work together over the nine months. This collective education led to the formation of an intellectual and social network of scholars. Richard Young writes:

> . . . as we developed a set of shared assumption, concepts, vocabulary etc, and as we came to know each other's interests, the plan was to relax the structure and leave more room for individual inquiry. (March 1994)

The shared assumptions, concepts, and vocabulary did develop through the group's common intellectual pursuits and interests. Furthermore, Ede mentions this indirectly when she indicates that the group asked Young to reduce the number of seminar meetings in the second half of the fellowship so that they could meet together more often (March 1994). Gathering formally and informally became the participants' first step in the formation of the social network.

Informal professional activity significantly contributed to the development of the fellowship's social network. For example, members read drafts of each other's work and made recommendations for revision; Inkster talks about this in terms of "brainstorming." In addition to responding to drafts, the group recommended readings to each other as areas of further investigation. Vitanza, for example, mentions Kneupper and Bassett introducing him to McKean and Feyerabend, respectively; Ede offers the long example of her work on Gadamer with Bassett; Inkster mentions that Kneupper introduced him to Toulmin, and that he asked Watson to sit on his dissertation committee because Watson had also written a dissertation on Polanyi.

In addition to the individual textual recommendations, a splinter group also supported the formation of the participant's intellectual and social network. Vitanza and Inkster both mention "The Pittsburgh Societe pour Rhetorique et Philosophe;" this splinter group formed to read and discuss the implications of post-structuralist theorists such as Benjamin, Foucault, and Derrida, who were just coming to American attention.

These concrete examples of members of the fellowship challenging each other intellectually support the belief that rhetoric and composition faculty reject the stereotypes of the atomistic inventors, alone in a library carrel. But more importantly, this information concerning the professionalization of composition's practitioners is new to histories of the field. Traditional histories focusing on published (and polished) intellectual products, or what Connors has called the artifacts of composition studies, have no mechanism to include a history of the field and its practitioners in the process of developing ideas and information. Social network histories, however, are concerned with both the evolution of the field and the the products produced.

In addition to capturing for posterity the textual influences on the fellowship participants, social network histories also welcome discussions of the interpersonal influences on the network's members. Classtime and mealtime were equal opportunities for the group to spark each other's intellectual curiosity and abilities. Ede remembers it this way: "We had the luxury of large amounts of time that we could spend with one another, reading works in progress, etc. . . . And there was also a shared sense

of mission, a sense of possibility, a sense that the questions our group was addressing were important and might make a difference to the field. . . . I learned from everyone". And Inkster and Vitanza both mention shared meals that were another excuse for continuing discussions of rhetoric.

Other influences from real people in the participants' lives included introductions to the first-generation composition scholars. Vitanza, for instance, talks about a literal introduction to the field's professionals. He recalls Janice Lauer taking him by the hand and actually introducing him to colleagues. In addition to personal introductions, speakers who visited or were visited by the group (Johnstone, Ohmann, and Ijsseling, for example) also strengthened the developing social network and affected the participants' professional training. Inkster and Watson speak to this in their recollections of the meeting with Johnstone. The stasis theory story and its "permission" not to master every part of composition and rhetoric studies indicates that the fellowship participants understood the nature of academic posturing and were reassured by the central figures in the field who could admit that they were fluent in only specific elements of the field.

The above recollections concerning interpersonal networking and support are significant because they demonstrate how social network histories can trace intricate webs of interaction between composition professionals. Unlike histories that traditionally privilege information concerning scholars as if they existed in social vacuums, social network histories indicate the ways that first and second generation scholars mingled and shared knowledge important to composition studies.

Producing Knowledge

Testimony supporting the existence of the social network among the fellowship participants includes a traceable path of shared intellectual activities. The network influenced the professionalization of the members who were retooling their professional interests to include rhetoric and composition studies, and the network began to generate knowledge and information that would directly affect the field of rhetoric and composition. What's traditional, here, is the focus on the visible, public end-product. What social network histories do well,

however, is incorporate the private process leading to the public products. For example, social network histories can include decisions, feelings, and emotions in ways that traditional histories cannot. Two examples in the history of 1978-79 fellowship stand out; they are the origins of PRE/TEXT and the Flower/Hayes study.

PRE/TEXT, a project with roots leading to the 1978-79 fellowship, represents a tangible marker of composition studies' burgeoning professionalism. And while the social network history of the fellowship re-presents the origin of the journal, it does so in such a way as to include multiple stories surrounding the journal's inception. In contrast to the tidy taxonomy that Connor's presents in his article on journal development, the social network history's polylogue on specific topics of investigation offers material not synthesized in order to locate a common denominator; difference, in social network histories, has not been ameliorated. Instead, difference and dissonance indicate the flavor and compromises of professional products. In other words, the multiple responses to PRE/TEXT as a topic of historical inquiry indicate the growing pains that the field as endured.

Reasons offered concerning the necessity of PRE/TEXT are as varied as the stories of the journal's origins. Ede, for example, mentions the frustrations that scholars had with space limitations in other journals; the group seemed to feel a need for a location that could publish sustained projects; Berlin, however, offers PRE/TEXT as a journal with ideological differences from the already established composition journals such as College Composition and Communication. The richness of the reasons for establishing a journal, in this particular case, do not fit into any compartmentalized taxonomy. Ede remembers PRE/TEXT "evolving gradually out of the group's shared frustration" with existing journals. Inkster remembers Victor coming to the seminar with the journal in mind; he also says that by the fellowship's end, Vitanza was "going full-speed" on the project. Vitanza, however, says that he wrote to everyone after the fellowship and told them of his plans. Again, what's important here is the process behind PRE/TEXT's publication, and only social network histories, which include the behind-the-scenes information on projects can trace the multiple reasons for a journal's development.

Yet another project linked to the 1978-79 fellowship is the Linda Flower and John Hayes article "Cognition and Discovery" which introduces composition studies to a discussion of cognitive reading strategies. Although Flower and Hayes did mention in the article that the expert writers are the 1978-79 fellowship participants, this link seems to have been forgotten. The social network history of the fellowship, however, reclaims their participation and gives new voice to the subjects.

Despite claiming that the writers were the fellowship members, not all participated. Ede says she didn't participate because she "didn't feel very much like an expert writer." And Inkster, who was involved in the project, tells of his bad experience with it. He admits that Flower and Hayes were not impressed with his protocols because he had to talk about a job he had just lost, unbeknownst to Flower and Hayes. And Vitanza eventually "wrote against their work. . . . and publicly parted company with Linda" [Flower].

Traditional histories of composition studies will mark the Flower/Hayes work as a milestone in the history of the field. These histories will focus on the product, the study and claims made in the published articles; however,

social network histories now offer a reason and a vehicle by which to include the subjects' memories and recollections. What's new about this topic is the incorporation of the private responses and tribulations of the subjects involved in the study. Again, the textual products of the field can finally be connected to the private processes of the persons participating.

Interpersonal Relationships

An emphasis on social networks in the history of composition studies affords an opportunity to examine the interpersonal relationships of the network's participants, an area previously unexamined by traditional histories. In their responses, the 1978-79 fellowship members hint at, suggest, and demonstrate their varied interpersonal relationships. This offers histories of the field not only a new set of dynamics affecting composition's development, but it also indicates a movement away from a reliance on textual evidence as a the sole indication of change and activity in composition studies.

Social network histories offer a space to articulate the importance of relationships between the field's professionals. One such example can be found in Ede's extensive comments on her intellectual assistance from Bassett. Another example comes from the loving thoughts offered by the fellowship members in remembrance of their deceased colleagues. Phrases such as "wonderful sense of humor," "respect," "intellectual passion," "fine people," and "remarkably intelligent" pepper the section on Berlin, Kneupper, and Nelson. Still other personal comments, especially by Inkster about Jim Berlin's sons, are precisely the spirit of the fellowship.

The personal, which has been previously unsaid (unsayable) in traditional histories, makes its way into social network histories through a new space for narratives that address personal conflicts. Never before has a history given voice to the interpersonal relationships of its professionals. Vitanza, for example, writes freely about his perceptions of other members of the fellowship while other members address changes in Richard Young's life during the year-long fellowship. In addition, Inkster talks about the effect of losing his job and his back problems on his work in the fellowship.

The collection of private information coupled with acknowledgments of public activities, such as giving papers and publishing together, adds flavor to social network histories. This coupling also identifies ways in which the field developed from more than textual artifacts. What's important in these histories, therefore, is the testimony concerning the effect that scholars have on each other's lives and careers. This is significant in that composition professionals have claimed to be a social group, yet little evidence has been available in the histories of the field to substantiate the claim. With the mix of private and public information, social network histories will now be able to trace the effects of the interpersonal relationships behind the field's artifacts.

Surprises

One of the delightful experiences with social network histories is the discovery of a previously untold tidbit or refinding a forgotten component of composition history. Learning that Charles Kneupper was responsible for beginning the Rhetoric Society of America (RSA) Conference was one such moment for me. In "For Charles," a tribute to

Kneupper presented at the 1992 RSA meeting shortly after Kneupper's death, Vitanza told the story of Kneupper's vision for the conference. Today, we can only imagine what other projects Knuepper had in store for the field.

Another surprise in the 1978-79 fellowship's history came not from an over-abundance of professional activities but from the fellowship participant's failure to take up the study of tagmemics. Most fellowship members identified Richard Young and his research on the application of tagmemics to the writing process as their central motive for application to this particular fellowship. However, in the history of the fellowship the respondents spoke very little about tagmemics. Only Watson, who had begun his career in rhetoric and composition studies, alluded to the fact that Young hadn't pushed the envelope any more than what Watson had already heard in other lectures. And in spite of being called the "Ten Disciples," the participants seem quite the opposite. The only exceptions were Bob Inkster, who delivered a presentation "Particles, Waves, and Paradigms" in 1979, and Charles Kneupper, whose "Revising the Tagmemic Heuristic" appeared in College Composition and Communication in 1980. No one else publicly took up the work of their mentor.

Stories like these represent the social foundations of the field; they are pictures of the field in process, becoming what we see today. Therefore, they are the most often excluded from composition histories because traditional histories trace only the textual evidence, the finished products, of the field. Social network histories, in contrast, present interpersonal relationships which affect the field's development.

Conclusion

Despite new methods to represent the histories of social networks within composition studies, professional educational opportunities leading to the development of such networks have been all but eliminated since the mid 1980s. At one time professional journals ran numerous ads beckoning teachers to apply for NEH funded programs; today, however, the ads have disappeared because NEH funding has nearly ceased. And when questioned about the conspicuous disappearance of these support services, an NEH representative told me that The Endowment ran these events because few graduate programs in English granted extensive study in rhetoric and composition, and with the current

proliferation of programs granting degrees in the area, the NEH sees no reason to duplicate this work (Couturier 1993). This comment is ironic, however, in light of the fact that the NEH continues to fund programs in literature.

Composition professionals seem to enjoy a challenge. When funds for professional enhancement programs disappeared, composition professionals embraced a new technology. Via the Internet, the worldwide linking of computers, scholars find ways to meet, virtually face-to-face, and to do the kind of work begun in the 1978-79 fellowship. As the consummate social creatures, composition professionals have immediately discovered the benefits of electronic conferences such as H-Rhetor: The History of Rhetoric, Purtopoi: Rhetoric, Language, and Professional Writing, MBU-L: Megabyte University, and WHIRL-L: History of Women's History in Rhetoric and Language. These lists are dedicated to the transmission of rhetoric and composition information, and they also offer a place for scholars to network.

Begun in the 1990s, electronic discussion groups now offer opportunities for professional training similar to the NEH funded conference, fellowships, and workshops. List subscribers discuss the current issues in composition

studies or topics of their choosing with graduate students as well as name-recognizable scholars. And from these lists, social networks of composition professionals are forming.

The networks that have already developed produce extensive work in the field of computers and composition, for example, and the Alliance For Computers and Writing is supporting the efforts of the national network of scholars to write a history of the evolution of computers' use in classrooms teaching writing. These histories are loosely organized right now, yet in some ways they replicate components integral to social network histories. Personal recollections of the field's early days and photo montages have become the rage in this historical project.

Groups within composition studies are beginning to see the need for histories to do more than place events on a timeline, and social network histories, such as the one presented in this dissertation, are accepting the challenge. It may not be until after the turn of the century that someone writes a history of scholars meeting and forming social networks via the Internet, but until then, this history of the 1978-79 NEH fellowship, offers a vocabulary with which to discuss previously invisible

networks of scholars. Furthermore, it offers one way to discuss the relationship between these networks and discipline development.

Social network histories offer space to include personal narratives and discussions of interpersonal relationships of the field's professionals; they also incorporate recollections of the private processes behind the the field's polished textual artifacts, which, for too long, have constituted one of the only areas of historical examination. As writing instruction changed its orientation from product to process, so too should the histories of the field. Historians must keep in mind more than composition's current manifestation, but historians need to recognize how we have reached this point. Social network histories will assist in the identification of factors and discussions supporting crucial decisions in the field.

ENDNOTES

[1]Conference attendance is never a sure thing, despite registration. Sharon Bassett, David Fractenberg, and Victoria (Winkler) Mikelonis were not attending. Robert Inkster was home with the flu, and in February 1994, Jim Berlin died unexpectedly. Victor Vitanza took his friend's death hard and decided not to attend CCCC. And while Richard Young did attend CCCC, he found talking about Jim very difficult. Consequently, the gathering idea was abandoned.

I did, however, get to meet Sam Watson, who graciously sought me out, and I attended Lisa Ede's presentation which she delivered with Andrea Lunsford.

[2]Not all the participants who committed to helping with the project have done so; Sharon Bassett, David Fractenberg, and Victoria (Winkler) Mikelonis haven't participated. And despite never having responded to my questions, Jim Berlin has "participated" in the conversation based on his published material.

[3]NEH Summer Seminars directly affected Rhetoric and Composition studies. Beginning in 1973 and once numbering more than 100 per year, the seminars focused on either literature or rhetoric and composition. An advertisement in the February 1980 CCC, for example, indicates that the NEH offered 120 summer seminars that year, six of which were dedicated to composition and rhetoric. According to Edith Couturier of the NEH's Division of Fellowships and Seminars, the NEH now organizes less than 50 summer seminars per year, with rhetoric and composition totally excluded from the offerings.

When asked why the NEH no longer sponsors rhetoric and composition fellowships, as they continue to do with literature, Couturier said that she believed that interest was waning on the part of rhetoric and composition faculty to direct these fellowships (the same senior faculty were proposing fellowship topics each year), and that graduate schools were doing the work that the fellowship had done to train former literature faculty to "retool" as rhetoric and composition faculty (Couturier 1993). This last suggestion is ironic especially in light of the fact that colleges and universities continue to grant degrees in literature while the NEH continues to sponsor fellowships and summer seminars for literature faculty.

[4]Richard Young has developed a significant number of projects based on NEH grants. These include:

SUMMER SEMINARS:

1977: "Rhetoric: Modern Developments in the Art of Invention." University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. ($44,184)

1978: "Teaching Writing: Theories and Practice." Carnegie-Mellon University.

1979: "Rhetoric: Modern Developments in the Art of Invention." Carnegie-Mellon University.

1981: "Rhetoric: Modern Developments in the Art of Invention." Carnegie-Mellon University. ($52,954).

1983: "Rhetoric: Modern Developments in the Art of Invention." Carnegie-Mellon University. ($61,215)

FELLOWSHIPS:

1978-79 AY: "Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process." Carnegie-Mellon University. ($25,000)

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS: Round 1--General Information

Sent to: Lisa Ede <edel@ccmail.orst.edu>
Bob Inkster <rinkster@tigger.stcloud.msus.edu>
Victor Vitanza <d266engl@utarlg.uta.edu>
Sam Watson <fen00sdw@unccvm.uncc.edu>
David Fractenberg SUNY-New Paltz
Sharon Bassett California State U-Los Angeles
Victoria Mikelonis U of Minnesota, St Paul

Last semester I contacted each of you individually and received confirmation concerning your participation in the oral history portion of my dissertation. Since that time, unexpected delays, especially by the tragic death of Jim Berlin, have slowed the progress of this section. Now, more than ever, it's critical that I complete this project. I would, however, first like to express my condolences to each of you, especially to Victor, upon the loss of your friend and colleague. I hope that this oral history stands as a small tribute to the work that you as a group began in the 1978-79 fellowship.

Specifically, I am interested in discovering how your collaborative efforts (both formal or informal) have affected the discipline of rhetoric and composition. In other words, how did the fellowship setting affect the work that you generated in and after the seminar? In some cases, like Jim's histories and Victor's early Pre/Text issues, your names are listed as integral parts of the projects. I am searching for other specific examples of ways that the discipline developed from collaborative activity, projects, and/or the generation/ fine-tuning of ideas and theories.

In order to accomplish this, I have provided you with a series of questions allowing me to gather a variety of background and seminar related information. Feel free to relate all memories, even if the prompts seem not to have called for them. I need historical information--general facts, names, places, dates (?), events, happenings, etc. as well

as recollections and memories. Your responses will collectively tell the story of the 78-79 fellowship with Richard Young as well as demonstrate how social sites like your fellowship year affect the emerging discipline. Writing this history is exciting, and I look forward to your continued support of the project. I see a deadline for responses around CCCC next month; answer as many of the questions as you can in detail initially. You may either respond via e-mail or snail mail. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me either at work <salm4314@uriacc.uri.edu> or at home--401-942-7524. And, finally, thank you for the time that you're taking to assist me in this project.

FELLOWSHIP DATA

1. The focus of the 78-79 seminar was "Rhetorical Invention and the Composing Process." Did the group see (to use Karen Burke LeFevre's phrase) "invention as a social act"? In other words, in what ways did the group work together--collaborate, advise, support, critique each other's intellectual development(s)?

2. In addition to class time, how did the proximity of your living arrangements influence or prompt collaboration? Did collaboration occur from both formal and informal meetings or conversations?

3. In the Rhetoric and Reality acknowledgments Jim names each of you individually as having "introduced [him] to rhetoric and in one way or another hav[ing] contributed to [his] study of it." LeFevre uses the word "resonators" to indicate the persons who "nourish and sustain the inventor as well as the invention." How were you resonators (or can we find another term) for each other's developing knowledge of rhetorical and composition theory?

4. Each of you had a position in the early issues of Pre/Text; what do you remember about the journal's early seeds? How did the idea develop?--did it spring from Victor's head alone or

was the idea fine-tuned by the group in any formal or informal conversations? (How) would you articulate this as an example of collaborative invention from your fellowship?

5. Did smaller discussion or study groups develop among you? How soon into the seminar did it/they develop? who were the players? what was the role of the splinter group(s) either on its/their own or in relation to the larger seminar?

6. In addition to your regular seminar work, you were also the Flower/Hayes 10 expert writers for their articulation of a cognitive theory of writing. Did you participate? Why or why not? Was participation optional? What do you remember about that situation? How long did your work for them last? Any particular memories of this event that you'd like to share?

PERSONAL DATA

1. Was your dissertation area literature or rhetoric and composition? Topic?

2. Why did you apply for this particular NEH fellowship?

3. What were your expectations for the fellowship? were they met? in what ways?

4. If you were a literature PhD, how did this fellowship affect your "re-tooling" to rhetoric and composition.

OR

If you were a rhetoric and composition PhD, how did this fellowship confirm/affirm your choice?

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Did you have formal seminars with syllabi and required readings? How often did you meet formally? Do you recall any of the readings? Were these pieces new to you? How did these readings (or the seminar overall) affect your pedagogy ?

2. What projects did you develop to fulfill NEH requirements?

3. What's your most vivid memory of the seminar? why? how does it color your memories of those nine months?

4. How did the seminar influence your scholarly focus, intellectual interests, or your career?

5. Did you appear on any conference panels together? Which? When? Topic? How did this collaboration come about?

6. Did you compose or publish together? what? when published? How did this collaboration come about?

7. In memoriam: what wouldyou like people to know about the ways that Jim, Bill, and Charles affected the field. Any anecdotes or stories that otherwise are unknown to the rhetoric and composition community would be helpful.

8. The most interesting part of my thesis, for me anyway, is the discovery of the way that the work begun 14 years ago has influenced directions of and discussions within composiiton studies today. So, to bring these varied questions up to 1994, briefly tell me what's interesting you today, or as Sam wrote to me "what questions do you find yourself thinking about NOW"?

Professor Young,

Last semester I contacted you and the participants of your 1978-79 fellowship held at CMU. Everyone has agreed to participate in the conversations to be included in my dissertation. Despite the delay and the untimely death of Jim Berlin, I am finally going forward with this phase of the project.

Below are 12 questions concerning the fellowship (a different set of questions has already been sent to the former fellows). The questions may require extended answers, so feel free to answer them in any order, with as much detail as you think necessary. You can send you answers to me via e-mail or snail mail anytime before CCCC next month.

Thank you in advance for your contribution to this project.

The central focus of this dissertation is on the collaboration among the fellowship participants. I'm trying to discover how the discipline of rhetoric and composition has developed from collaborative work as it has developed from work generated by individual scholars.

INVENTION

1. how did the topic of invention affect the structure of the work within the fellowship.

2. what kinds of projects or assignments generated "invention"?

3. was invention ever collaborative? in other words, did the theories of invention presented in the fellowship affect the kinds of invention that the fellows used among themselves? for example, I know that Sharon was very influential in Victor's early articulations of PRE/TEXT. Can you comment on this or offer any other concrete examples of collaboration affecting the work of the fellows even after the fellowship ended?

4. In what ways did the form or topic of the fellowship itself lead to the development of these 10 fellows as leaders in the rhetoric and composition "movement"?

THE FELLOWSHIP ITSELF

5. What were your goals for the fellowship? Were they met despite the fact that you were beginning a new phase of your career with a move to CMU?

6. In what ways do you think that your 1978-79 fellowship affected the development of rhetoric and composition as we know it today?

7. What do you see as the direct results of the fellowship on the rhetoric and composition as a discrete discipline?

THE FELLOWSHIP PARTICIPANTS

8. What do you remember about the fellows specifically. How did they work together? I understand that their dexterity with rhetorical theory was at very different levels, but could you see them growing and developing?

9. Rumor has it that the fellowship participants were known as "The 10 Disciples" ostensibly of you and tagmemic invention. What's your reaction to this characterization?

10. Did Linda Flower and John Hayes need your permission to use the fellowship participants as their "expert" writers? How did you feel about their use as subjects for the protocol analysis?

11. In memoriam: what would you like people to know about the ways that Jim Berlin, Bill Nelson, and Charles Kneupper affected the field. Any anecdotes or stories that otherwise may not be known to the rhetoric and composition community would be particularly helpful.

MISCELLANEOUS

12. what do you think is the NEH's rationale for no longer sponsoring fellowships in rhetoric and composition?

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
DIVISION OF FELLOWSHIPS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506
(202) 382-5827

OMB 128-R0033

FELLOWSHIPS IN RESIDENCE FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

FACE SHEET

3. AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL (Name, Title, Address, Zip Code)
Charles G. Overberger
Vice President for Research
The University of Michigan
4080 Administration Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

1. SEMINAR DIRECTOR (Name, Address, Zip Code)
Richard E. Young
Department of Humanities
College of Engineering
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
TELEPHONE: (313) 764-1425/764-1420

4. TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED
$25,000

5. PAYEE (Check to be made payable to)
The Regents of The University of Michigan
Check to be mailed to
Name J.F. Brinkerhoff
Title V.Pres.& Chief Financial Officer
Address 3014 Administration Building
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

2. INSTITUTION (Name, Address, Zip Code)
The University of Michigan
260 Research Administration Bldg.
Attn: L.D. Beatty
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

6. INCLUSIVE DATES OF GRANT

From	Month	Day	Year	Through	Month	Day	Year
	October	1	1977		August	31	1979

7. SEMINAR TITLE
RHETORICAL INVENTION AND THE COMPOSING PROCESS

8. BRIEF DESCRIPTION
The seminar has three basic goals: an understanding of four modern methods of invention (classical invention, Burke's dramatistic method, Rohman's prewriting, and Pike's tagmanic discovery procedure); an understanding of their historical, theoretical and practical contexts, including various conceptions of the composing process and their implications; and an ability to conduct significant independent research in the most important of the rhetorical arts. The seminar will begin with lectures and intensive reading in the history and theory of rhetorical invention, with emphasis on the most important modern developments. During the remainder of the course, participants will present papers and lectures that probe fundamental features of the art and at the same time provide the theoretical basis for effective undergraduate courses in rhetoric.

Agreement: It is understood and agreed that any funds granted as a result of this request are to be used for the purposes set forth herein. Furthermore, the undersigned agree, as to any grant awarded, to abide by the relevant National Endowment for the Humanities policies as prescribed.

Signature of Seminar Director

Richard E. Young

Richard E. Young

Signature of Authorizing Official

Charles G. Overberger
Vice President for Research

Bibliography

Aley, Shelley. "Doing What Pupils Are Least Able to Do for Themselves: Alexander Bain and the Teaching of Rhetoric." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Nashville, TN., March 1994.

Allen, R.R. "The Rhetoric of John F. Genung." Speech Teacher 12 (1963): 238 - 41.

Applebee, Arthur N. Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History. Urbana, IL: National Council Teachers of English, 1974.

Bartholomae, David. "Freshman English, Composition, and CCCC." College Composition and Communication 40.1 (February 1989): 38 - 50.

Bassett, Sharon. Personal Conversation. 10 October 1993.

Berkenkotter, Carol, Thomas N. Huckin, and John Ackerman. "Social Context and Socially Constructed Texts: The Initiation of a Graduate Student Into a Writing Research Community." Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities. Eds. Charles Bazerman and James Paradis. University of Wisconsin Press, 1991. 191 - 215.

Berlin, James A. "John Genung and Contemporary Composition Theory: The Triumph of the Eighteenth Century." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 11 (Spring 1981): 74 - 84.

---. "Postmodernism, Politics, and Histories of Rhetoric." Pre/Text 11.3-4 (1990): 169 - 87.

---. "Revisionary History: The Dialectical Method." Pre/Text 8.1-2 (1987): 47 - 61.

---. Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

---. "Richard Whately and Current-Traditional Rhetoric." College English 42.1 (September 1980): 10 - 17.

---. "Writing Instruction in School and College English, 1890-1985." Murphy 1990: 183 - 220.

---. Writing Instruction in Nineteeth-Century American Colleges. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

--- and Robert Inkster. "Current Traditional Rhetoric: Paradigm and Practice." Freshman English News 8.3 (Winter 1980): 1 - 4 & 13 - 14.

Bevilacqua, Vincent. "Campbell, Priestley, and Common Sense." Southern Speech Journal 30 (1964): 79 - 97.

Bird, Nancy K. "The Conference on College Composition and

Communication: A Historical Study of Its Continuing Education and Professionalization Activities, 1949 - 1975." Diss. Virginia Polytechnic, 1977.

Bledstein, Burton. The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America. New York: Norton & Co., 1976.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models." College English 34.5 (February 1973): 634 - 43.

---. "Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind." College English 46.7 (November 1984): 635 - 52.

---. A Short Course in Writing. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, 1972.

Bullock, Richard, and John Trimbur, eds. The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1991.

Campbell, JoAnn. "Controlling Voices: The Legacy of English A at Radcliffe College, 1883-1917." College Composition and Communication 43.4 (December 1992): 472 - 485.

Chapman, David W. and Gary Tate. "A Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition." Rhetoric

Review 5.2 (Spring 1987): 124 - 186.

Connors, Robert. "Journals in Composition." College English 46.4 (April 1984): 348 - 365.

---, ed. Selected Essays of Edward P.J. Corbett. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1989.

---. "Textbooks and the Evolution of the Discipline." College Composition and Communication 37.2 (May 1986): 178 - 194.

---. "Writing the History of Our Discipline." Lindemann & Tate 1991, 49 - 71.

Cooper, Marilyn and Michael Holzman. "Talking about Protocols." College Composition and Communication 34.3 (October 1983): 284 - 293.

Corbett, Edward P.J.. "Hugh Blair: A Study of His Rhetorical Theory." Diss. Loyola. 1956.

---. "Hugh Blair's Three (?) Critical Dissertations." Notes & Queries NSl (November 1954): 478 - 80.

---. "Hugh Blair as Analyzer of English Prose Style." College Composition and Communication 9.2 (May 1958): 98 - 103.

---."John Locke's Contributions to Rhetoric." College Composition and Communication 32.4 (December 1981): 423 - 433.

Couturier, Edith. Personal Interview. 11 August 1993.

Crowley, Sharon. "The Evolution of Invention in Current-Traditional Rhetoric: 1850-1970." Rhetoric Review 3.2 (January 1985): 146 - 162.

Douglas, Wallace. "Barrett Wendell and the Contradictions of Composition." Arizona English Bulletin 16.2 (1974): 182 - 90.

Ede, Lisa. Personal Interview. 2 March 1994.

Ehninger, Douglas. "Campbell, Blair, and Whately: Old Friends in a New Light." Western Speech Journal 28 (1955): 169 - 82.

---."Campbell, Blair, amd Whately Revisited." Southern Speech Journal 28 (1963): 169 - 82.

---. "George Campbell and the Revolution in Inventional Theory." Southern Speech Journal 15 (1950): 270 - 76.

Elbow, Peter What is English? New York: Modern Language Association, 1990.

Emig, Janet. "The Relationship Between Thought and Language Implicit in Some Early American Rhetoric and Composition Texts." The Web of Meaning. Eds. Dixie Goswamie and Maureen Butler. NJ: Boynton/Cook: 1983. 3 - 43.

Ettlich, E. E. "John F. Genung and the Nineteenth Century

Definition of Rhetoric." Central States Speech Journal 17 (1966): 283 - 88.

Fishman, Stephen M.. "Explicating Our Tacit Tradition: John Dewey and Composition Studies." College Composition and Communication 44.3 (October 1993): 315 - 330.

Flower, Linda and John Hayes. The Cognition of Discovery: Defining a Rhetorical Problem." College Composition and Communication 31.1 (February 1980): 21 - 32.

---. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." College Composition and Communication 32.4 (December 1981): 365 - 387.

Gebhardt, Richard. "Teamwork and Feedback: Broadening the Base of Collaborative Writing." College English 42.1 (September 1980): 69- 74.

Gerber, John. "CCCC Facts--1956." College Composition and Communication (October 1956): 117 - 20.

---. "The Conference on College Composition and Communictaion." College Composition and Communication (March 1950): 12.

---. "Three Year History of the CCCC." College Composition and Communication (October 1952): 17 - 18.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. Into The Field: Sites of Composition Studies. New York: Modern Language Association, 1993.

---. "Kitchen Tables and Rented Room: The Extracurriculum of Composition." College Composition and Communication 45.1 (February 1994): 75-92.

---.Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implications. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

Gluck, Sherna and Daphne Patai, eds. Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History. New York and London: Routledge, 1991.

Graff, Gerald. Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Halloran, S, Michael. "From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing In America to 1900." Murphy 1990: 151 - 182.

Harkin, Patricia and John Schilb. Contending With Words. New York: Modern Language Association, 1991.

Heath, Shirley Brice. Ways With Words: Language, Life and Work in the Communities and Classrooms. Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hook, J.N. A Long Way Together: A Personal View of NCTE's First Sixty-Seven Years. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1979.

Hurmence, Belinda, ed. Before Freedom, When I Just Can

Remember: Twenty-Seven Oral Histories of Former South Carolina Slaves. Winston-Salem, NC: J.F. Blair, 1989.

Inkster, Robert. "Particles, Waves, and Paradigms: Can Physics Humanize Composition Instruction." Presented Wyoming Conference on English, 1979.

---. Personal Interview. March 1994.

Jarratt, Susan. "Speaking to the Past: Feminist Historiography in Rhetoric." PRE/TEXT 11.3-4 (1990): 189 - 209.

---. Toward A Sophistic Historiography." PRE/TEXT 8.1 (1987): 9 - 26.

Johnson, Nan. "Three Nineteenth Century Rhetoricians: The Humanist Alternative to Rhetoric as Skills Management." Murphy, 1982: 105 - 117.

Joliffe, David A. "The Moral Subject in Composition: A Conceptual Framework and the Case of Harvard, 1865 - 1900." College English 51.2 (February 1989): 163 - 73.

Kirch, Gesa, and Patricia A. Sullivan. Methods and Methodology in Composition Research. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992.

Kitzhaber, Albert. Rhetoric in American College,

1850-1900. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Kneupper, Charles. "Revising the Tagmemic Heuristic: Theoretical and Pedagogical Considerations." College Composition and Communication 31.2 (May 1980): 160 - 167.

---. Rhetoric and Ideology: Compositions and Criticisms of Power. Arlington, Texas: Rhetoric Society of America, 1989.

Lanham, Richard A. The Electronic Word: Democracy, Technology, and The Arts. Chicago & London:

Landow, George. Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley, LA, London: University of California Press, 1977.

Lauer, Janice. "Composition Studies: Dappled Disciplines." Rhetoric Review 3.1 (September 1994): 20 - 29.

---. Personal Interview. 12 November 1993.

--- and J. William Asher. Composition Research: Empirical Designs. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Lefevre, Karen Burke. Invention as a Social Act.

Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

Lincoln, Yvonna A. and Egon G. Guba. Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1985.

Lindemann, Erika and Gary Tate. An Introduction To Composition Studies. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Lunsford, Andrea. "Alexander Bain's Contributions to Discourse Theory." College English 44.3 (March 1982): 290 - 300.

--- and Lisa Ede. "Rhetoric in a New Key: Women and Collaboration." Rhetoric Review 8.2 (Spring 1990): 234 - 241.

---. Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaboration. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.

Malone, Anne Righton. "Women are Not Theoretical Footnotes: Reclaiming our Heroines." Presented at Conference on College Composition and Communication Nashville, TN. March 1994.

Mann, Nancy D., compiler. "Directory of Women's Oral History Projects and Collections." Frontiers 7.1

(1983): 114 - 121.

Mathis, Stephen C. "The Womb of the Future: John F. Genung and The Foundations of Current-Traditional Rhetoric." Thesis. University of Rhode Island. 1991.

Miller, Richard E. "Composing English Studies: Towards a Social History of the Discipline." College Composition and Communication 45.2 (May 1994): 164 - 179.

Miller, Susan. Rescuing the Subject: A Critical Introduction to Rhetoric and the Writer. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.

---.Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Moran, Charles. "A Life in the Profession." Lindemann & Tate 1990, 160 - 82.

Murphy, James J., ed. The Rhetorical Tradition and Modern Writing. New York: Modern Language Association, 1982.

---.A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1990.

Nelms, Gerald. "The Case for Oral Evidence in Composition Historiography." Written Communication 9.3 (July 1992): 356 - 384.

---. "The History Approach to Composition Studies: Edward P.J. Corbett and Janet Emig." Diss. The Ohio State U., 1990.

Newkirk, Thomas. Barrett Wendell and the Birth of Freshman Composition." Presented at Conference on College Composition and Communication. Chicago, IL. March 1990.

---. "Barrett Wendell's Theory of Discourse." Rhetoric Review 10 (1991): 20 - 30.

Nietz, John. The Evolution of American Secondary School Textbooks. Rutland, VT: Tuttle, 1966.

---. Old Textbooks. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.

North, Stephen. The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1987.

Octalog. "The Politics of Historiography." Rhetoric Review 7.1 (Fall 1988): 5 - 49.

Ohmann, Richard. English in America: A Radical View of the Profession. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Olson, Gary and Irene Gale, eds. (Inter)views: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Rhetoric and Literacy. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Parker, William Riley. "Where Do English Departments Come From." College English 28.5 (February 1967): 339 - 351.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. Composition as a Human Science: Contributions to the Self-Understanding of a Discipline. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Portelli, Allesandro. The Death of Luigi Portelli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.

Powledge, Fred. Free At Last?: The Civil Rights Movement and the People Who Made It. New York: HarperPerennial, 1991.

Reid, Paul E. "The Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory." Western Speech 24 (1960): 83 - 88.

---. "Francis Child: The Fourth Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory." Quarterly Journal of Speech 55 (1969): 268 - 75.

Reid, Ronald F. "The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, 1806-1904: A Case Study of Changing Concepts of Rhetoric and Pedagogy." Quarterly Journal of Speech 45 (October 1959): 239 - 57.

Reither, James A. and Douglas Vipond. "Writing as Collaboration." College English 51.8 (December 1989): 855 - 67.

Rodgers, Paul C. Jr. "Alexander Bain and the Rise of the Organic Paragraph." Quarterly Journal of Speech 51 (1965): 399 - 408.

Roen, Duane H., and Robert K. Mittan. "Collaborative Scholarship in Composition: Some Issues." Gesa Kirsch and Patricia Sullivan, eds: 287 - 313.

Russell, David R. Writing in Academic Disciplines, 1870-1990. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Schilb, John. "Future Historiographies of Rhetoric and the Present Age of Anxiety." Vitanza [1994]: 128 - 38.

Schultz, Lucille M. "Elaborating Our History: A Look at Mid-19th Century First Books of Composition." College Composition and Communication 45.1 (February 1994): 10 - 30.

Self, Robert T. Barrett Wendell. Boston: Twayne, 1975.

Shaughnessy, Mina. Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Stewart, Donald. "The Barnyard Goose, History, and Fred

Newton Scott." English Journal 1978: 14 - 17.

---. "Composition Textbooks and the Assault On Tradition." College Composition and Communication 29.2 (May 1978): 171 - 76.

---. "Harvard's Influence on English Studies: Perceptions from Three Universities in the Early Twentieth Century." College Composition and Communication 43.4 (December 1992): 455 - 71.

---. "Rediscovering Fred Newton Scott." College English 40 (1978): 539 - 47.

---. "Some Facts Worth Knowing About the Origins of Freshman Composition." CEA Critic 44.4 (May 1982): 2 - 11.

---. "The Status of Composition and Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1880-1902: An MLA Perspective." College English 47.7 (November 1985): 734 - 46.

---. "Two Model Teachers and the Harvardization of English Departments." Murphy 1982: 118 - 29.

Thompson, Paul. The Voice of the Past. 2nd ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Trimbur, John. "Writing Instruction and the Politics of Professionalization. Unpublished paper.

Tuman, Myron. "From Astor Place to Kenyon Road: The NCTE

and the Origins of English Studies." College English 48.4 (April 1986): 339 - 49.

Vansina, Jan. Oral Tradition as History. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Vitanza, Victor. "For Charles." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 22.3. (Summer 1992): 1- 5.

---. Personal Interviews. 10/2/93; 3/94.

---,ed. Pre/Text: The First Decade. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993.

---, ed. Writing Histories of Rhetoric. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Watson, Samuel. Personal Interviews. 5/17/1994; 5/28/94.

Woods, William F. "Composition Textbooks and Pedagogical Theory, 1960 - 1980. College English 43.4 (April 1981): 393 - 409.

---. "The Reform Tradition in Nineteenth Century Composition Teaching." Written Communication 2.4 (Oct. 1985): 377 - 390.

Young, Richard. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1978: 29 - 47.

---. Personal Interview. March 1994.