PERFORMING STUDENT, TEACHER, AND TUTOR OF WRITING: NEGOTIATING IDEAS OF WRITING IN A FIRST-YEAR WRITING COURSE AND WRITING CENTER TUTORIALS

by

Jennifer Pooler Courtney

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Curriculum and Instruction

Charlotte

2009

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Lil Brannon

_____
Dr. Cy Knoblauch

_____
Dr. Tony Scott

_____
Dr. Brian Kissel

ABSTRACT

JENNIFER POOLER COURTNEY. Performing student, teacher, and tutor writing: Negotiating ideas of writing in a first-year writing course and writing center tutorials. (Under the direction of DR. LIL BRANNON)

Based upon the sociocultural theories of Vygotsky, Bakhtin, Bourdieu, Holland et al. and the work of composition scholars such as Welch, Brannon et al., and Bousquet et al., who oppose neoliberal privatization, this qualitative study explores how first-year writing classroom and writing center discourses construct student writer identity. Through case study exploration of two students, two tutors, and one composition instructor, this study investigates how the students negotiated the discourses of the classroom and the writing center in order to be/become college writers. Semistructured transcribed interviews and audio-recorded classroom observation aided by the use of field notes and writing center tutorial audio recordings and transcription were used in data collection. By using critical discourse analysis (Gee, 2005) of the interviews, tutorial sessions, and classroom meetings, this researcher describes how the students', tutors', and teacher's language construct a complex web of meanings that students must negotiate as they learn what it means to be a writer in the institution of school. Students' past histories as writers map the terrain of the tutorial and the classroom, and students often follow prior pathways, reproducing the dominant ideology. However, working to improvise and examine opportunities "outside" of the status quo can be a means to re-vision, renovate, and shift some of the "power, status, and rank" (Holland et al., 1999) found within the hegemonic structures of the corporatized university of schooling and learn alternative ways of being/becoming college writers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank several important people who have contributed to my experiences in this doctoral program and during this dissertation process. Lil Brannon, my dissertation director, advisor, mentor, colleague, and friend, has been the most influential person in my life over the past five years. I am grateful for her contributions to this work. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee: Cy Knoblauch, Tony Scott, and Brian Kissel. Your responses, questions, and assistance have helped to make this dissertation stronger and more complex.

The UNC Charlotte National Writing Project group, usually meeting via skype, has been a source of great support and encouragement. I am especially indebted to Cindy Urbanski, Tony Ianonne, and Sally Griffin for your midnight and 4am chapter readings, in-text commentary, and positive messages when I felt that I could not write another word.

I am grateful to the eight students from the English 2 course, the staff and tutors of the Writing Center, and the focal teacher of the study who opened up their writing, their histories, their minds, and their lives to me. I would especially like to highlight Hank Wallace, the English 2 teacher, who spent countless hours in coffeeshops with me discussing student writing and his experiences teaching. David Landrum's partnership in the writing center during the past five years will never be matched. I hope you move to Texas soon.

My friends have been a great help to me during this process. I would like to highlight the simply explosive and especially inspiring amounts of support I've received from Aaron, Erin, Dave Z., Ashlyn, Joe, Becky, A.J., Tony C., Paul, Lynn, Jen C.,

Barbara Ann, Mary, Bill, Libby, Katie Kate, Linda, David P., Rick, Shana, Jennifer B., Coleen, Jason, Lucy, Lacy, Jeanie, Todd, Matt, Christine, Mark, Rosemary, and David H. I'm grateful for Abe Rummage at AcuCare who kept me balanced and productive. In particular, though, I want to thank Amélie Schinck for her support during the past three years and her company on this long dissertation journey.

I would like to thank my family, Joanne, Richard, and Sean, for their thoughts of encouragement, patience, and love. I'm very grateful for your support in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

First-year writing programs and Writing Centers are common institutions in colleges and universities across the United States, and the experiences students have in these programs and centers are often similar. In the first-year writing course, students are frequently taught from a required rhetoric or composition textbook by a part-time faculty member or a novice graduate student or an untenurable Lecturer. Students encounter similar personnel in a Writing Center: graduate students who aren't quite ready for the classroom or part-timers paid by the hour. These part-time instructors, tutors, and graduate student teachers are often referred to as a causal labor force (Johnson et al., 2003; Johnson & McCarthy, 2000). It is curious how in the face of the casualization of teaching and tutoring writing, numerous studies have publicized dismal student writing skills, usually framed in terms of quantitative test scores or grade point averages (Helms, 2007a; Jones, 2001; Smolowitz, 2007a; Turner, 2006). Popular magazine articles, such as "Why Johnnie Can't Write," have indicated to the public that America's children are lagging behind the world in writing skills (Curtis, 2007; Helms, 2007a, 2007b; Smolowitz, 2007a, 2007b; Woodward, 2007). High schools, such as those near where this study takes place, have almost been closed due to poor performance on No Child Left Behind standardized tests (Curtis, 2007; Helms, 2007b; Smolowitz, 2007a), and the idea of standardizing first-year college composition courses has become a national trend,

particularly with the development of students learning outcomes by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (Law & Murphy, 1997; Ohmann, 1996).

The casualness of the labor for teaching and tutoring writing and the standardization of the writing curriculum so that "anyone" can teach it stems from the corporatized university which depends less and less on public resources for its operations and more and more on research dollars (often from the Department of Defense) and private corporate funding. While the labor of teaching is not exactly "outsourced"—meaning a situation where one company provides its services for a different company—it is treated casually. It is casual because while it may be economically efficient, it lacks security and seriousness as many teachers only have one semester's commitment (many teachers are hired even just a few days before the semester starts) and it lacks any employee benefits (Johnson et al., 2003; Johnson & McCarthy 2000). The courses associated with general education are the ones most often assigned to the lowest paid and dispensable workers. This trend is also true for most Writing Centers as tutors and Directors are often contracted out to the least experienced professionals in an English department. It is in the first-year writing program and Writing Center of the corporatized university where exploitative labor practices and corporate profit meet to narrow the possibilities of the curriculum and restrict public space within the classroom and the tutoring session. This casualness of the labor of teaching and tutoring is an effect of neoliberal privatization, the movement of the public resources into the private sector.

One issue with the labor of teaching and tutoring writing is that this labor pool is generally not considered part of the English Department faculty and are not eligible for participation in the range of activities that tenure-line faculty are privy to (CCCC, 2001;

Harris, 2000; Roemer, Schultz, & Durst, 1999). Part-time workers may have little experience teaching and tutoring writing at a college level, and many adjunct workers only hold a master's degree and rarely engage in professional development (CCCC, 2001; Harris, 2000, Roberston, 2005). Their low wages and lack of benefits, such as healthcare coverage, make them fiscally ideal in terms of corporate staffing efficiency (Bousquet, Scott, & Parascondola, 2004; Foley, 1998; Harris, 2000; Hooks, 1994; Robertson, 2005; Roemer et al., 1999). How ironic that the writing teacher and tutor who is supposedly providing students with the skills and knowledge (or capital, to use Bourdieu's representation) to succeed in the academic world is actually being marginalized by this environment.

While the standardization of the curriculum and the casualness of staffing appear in numerous studies, there is a lack of exploration of students' experiences within these writing programs. Student grades or documents may be used to support a contention, but the majority of studies do not make the students' experiences the center. This study examines students' experiences within a first-year writing program that has a casual labor force and a curriculum that appears to be voluntarily standardized by its own workers. Specifically, I examine how students navigate the discourses of the first-year writing classroom and the Writing Center. These sites are of particular interest because they can be viewed as "a microcosm of a stratified society that in turn contributes to the continuation and extension of that stratification" (Gates, 2006, p. 189). The stratified society contributes to the multiple discourses, or ideologies, presented in the classroom and the Writing Center (Grimm, 1999). The discourses of teaching and tutoring writing

are interanimated with the discourses of the university writing classroom and Writing Centers to situate the student writer in a complex globalized environment.

Globalization is a concept that refers to compression of the world and the intensification and integration of the social, economic, and political systems (or voices) linked with an American-based capitalist agenda. Capitalism, with its beliefs set down in the 17th and 18th centuries, focuses on elements of competition, business efficiency, and individual pursuit of monetary wealth (Stiglitz, 2003). De Tocqueville (1835/1989) argued that even as far back as the 1800s, America has been equated with the pursuit of wealth: “I know of no country, indeed, where the love of money has taken stronger hold of the affections of men” (p. 51).

Stiglitz (2003) explained that globalization can be viewed in both positive and negative terms; for example, many people believe that the movement has “reduced the sense of isolation felt in much of the developing world and has given many people in the developing countries access to knowledge well beyond the reach of even the wealthiest in any country a century ago” (p. 4). Still, many developing countries and their workers, including farmers and other laborers, pay the price of this reduced isolation in terms of lagging or reduced market share. As Stiglitz (2003) argued, “[w]hen foreign businesses come in they often destroy local competitors, quashing the ambitions of the small businessman who had hoped to develop homegrown industry” (p. 68).

The economic aspect of globalization is often termed neoliberal. Peet et al. (2003) explained that neoliberalism is based upon voices and beliefs “founded on right-wing, but not conservative, ideas about individual freedom, political democracy, self-regulating markets and entrepreneurship” (p. 8). Neoliberal privatization as an economic theory in

action encompasses the “deregulation of private enterprise and the privatization of previously state-run enterprises” (Peet et al., 2003, p. 8) based in economic movements, such as the outsourcing of labor and decentralization (Brannon, Cain, & Comstock, in press) and general governmental minimalist policies.

Global governing institutions that help regulate and oversee our neoliberal privatized economy, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), play an important role in supporting capitalistic-based agendas for reform in reference to “higher education”; for example, the IMF has implemented “involuntary privatization on national higher-education systems” (Bousquet et al., 2004, p. 25). Some of these IMF policies include increasing tuition costs as well as “constraints” universities must accept, such as what counts as assessment, leading to a standardization of curriculum and pedagogy (Bousquet, 2004, p. 25). Other researchers propose that neoliberalism has caused “the current crisis in academic staffing” (Foley, 1998, p. 329) within the universities. Teachers who staff university courses and Writing Centers “do not come to the classroom devoid of social and political motives and intentions” (Gates, 2006, p. 183). Globalized voices, and thus ideologies, are being enacted within the walls of the corporatized university, including this study’s specific example of Stonie University’s (a pseudonym for a southeastern university in an urban environment enrolling about 25,000 undergraduate and graduate students) first-year writing program, the writing classroom, and the Writing Center.

The first-year writing program at Stonie University oversees more than 3000 students each year through their general education writing requirement courses. In the Writing Center at Stonie (staffed by over 20 tutors) students have access to

approximately 7000 one-on-one 50-minute tutoring sessions each academic year. Students can make up to two appointments each week.

As a researcher, I am not interested in assessing the writing teacher's or tutor's pedagogy, nor do I wish to check to see if students are interpreting material in some ideal or correct form. For example, I am not interested in determining if a student interpreted an assignment correctly. Even though the "idea of teaching assumes that there are truths to be taught" (Jarvis, 1999, p. 251), I am not interested in viewing the correct implementation of a student's interpretation of a teacher's truth. Rather, I am interested in observing the different teachers' and tutors' truths enacted (or performed) in their classroom. This study is about observing a performance as opposed to evaluating a correct performance.

At Stonie University, I observed an entire semester's writing course that focuses upon academic discourse as well as observed students' writing center tutoring sessions. I provide descriptions of how students negotiated these discourses to produce student writing. The tutor in a writing center session holds an interesting position; she is not the teacher but not the student. This position allows a tutor a special insight, as she is presented with both the teacher's and student's discourses of writing instruction. This special insight is just one aspect of writing instruction performance that I examine. Because I agree with Vygotsky and Bakhtin's notions of multiple socially constructed truths and experiences, this study is not centered on providing a version of correctness. Instead, I utilized Wolcott's (1995) and Holland et al.'s (1998) philosophy of qualitatively exploring the figured world of the writing student. For this study, this figured world revolved around two spaces: the composition course (English 2) and the

writing center. I explored the many voices that make up the discourses of the writing classroom and writing center tutorials. Each voice operated within various ideologies, and the writing teacher, tutor, and student negotiated these possibilities, recognizing some discourses, ignoring others, while privileging and marginalizing various language practices. My four original research questions focused on exploring these discourses:

> Question 1: How do students represent the writing discourse(s) presented in their first-year writing courses within a writing center tutorial session?
>
> Question 2: How do tutors and students negotiate instruction within a tutorial?
>
> Question 3: How do tutors represent the tutorial to the first-year writing teacher?
>
> Question 4: How does the student make use of the tutorial within the discourses of first-year writing?

At the conclusion of the classroom and writing center tutorial observations, I added a fifth research question:

> Question 5: What ideas of writing exist in the classroom and writing center tutorial space?

I realized that the addition of this fifth question was necessary to fully unpack the first question that presumed multiple ideas of writing that made up the writing discourses presented in the students' first-year writing courses. I had to first understand how students represented the ideas of writing from the classroom before I could categorize the numerous discourses floating within the world of the first-year writing classroom and writing center tutorial space.

In an age of increasing university curriculum and pedagogical standardization pressure, especially in relation to general education courses such as first-year writing

classes, exploring how classroom and tutorial session discourses construct student writer identity is often overlooked. Bakhtin (1981) indicated that there are multiple voices and ideologies present within discourse, and Halasek (1999) explained that first-year writing courses and writing center discourse can be perceived as "interanimated ideologically and stylistically by the discourses of others" (p. 7). This interanimatedness (or to use a Bakhtinian term, multivoicedness) of this discourse is what I observed in the two spaces of the first-year writing classroom and the Writing Center at Stonie. Because I "see research as transformative in its intention" (Gates, 2006, p. 190), this research provides a space for writing teachers and administrators to begin to understand how students are situated within and against these two sites and perhaps become reflective within their own practice (Gates, 2006).

In the following chapter, I introduce the reader to the voices of Vygotsky, Bakhtin, Bourdieu, Holland et al., and scholars Brannon et al., Grimm, and Bousquet et al., who oppose neoliberal privatization, that guide the theoretical framework for this study. In addition, this chapter takes the reader into the relevant and related literature concerning composition history and philosophy, writing center history and philosophy, globalization's effects in the field of composition and writing centers, and past quantitative and qualitative research completed surrounding these sites.

.

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I explore the theoretical grounding for this study as well as provide a review of the relevant literature. The chapter concludes by discussing the overall purpose of the study.

Theoretical Framework

I use several theories and concepts as a lens to view this research topic. I begin with an epistemological foundation based on Vygotsky. Epistemic philosophies of social construction advance the notion that learning is a social activity, surrounded within varying frameworks of power dynamics. This theoretical position argues that "meaning" is constructed and formed in and through social relations. Vygotsky (1986), the social science theorist most often connected with social construction, explained that "the true direction of the development of thinking is not from the individual to the social, but from the social to the individual" (p. 36). Meanings are created from the individual's social interactions and histories, as opposed to existing outside of the social arena (Vygotsky, 1986; Woodward, 2007). The meaning becomes constructed socially and historically (Geertz, 1973).

In terms of this study, which explored the writer as he/she moved between the classroom to the tutorial session, the acts of teaching and learning were larger than the question of whether or not the teacher taught "correctly" or the student "learned" the content. I draw on Bakhtin's (1981) concepts of dialogicality, or multiple meanings,

within the discourses (or utterances) of the classroom. Both Vygotsky and Bakhtin are important to this study because I was not trying to fact check whether a student reproduced a single "correct" truth from her class or tutoring session. I dispute the idea of a single "correct" truth and rely on Vygotsky and Bakhtin to show that there are multiple means constructed within these sites of writing.

To gain a sense these students' complex meaning making within the writing classroom, I had to understand their social and historical backgrounds (history-in-person) to begin to understand how they constructed their writing identities within the classroom (Holland et al., 1998; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). I utilized interviews and classroom/tutorial observations because language for Bakhtin is in constant flux and change, shaped by the social situations surrounding the speaker and the listener; therefore, a close examination of the meanings presented through discourse can reflect an individual's multiple voices, or multivoicedness. How an individual uses language reflects the socially constructed situations surrounding the speaker and the listener; the historical, cultural, and social elements combine to create a living discourse that creates meaning. Specific situations, such as writing classrooms, call for certain discourse usage; whether one possesses the knowledge of this discourse relates to Bourdieu's notion of capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990).

Bourdieu (1990/1993) explored the poststructural notion of habitus and capital in connection with Vygotsky's and Bakhtin's theories of social construction. Bourdieu's concepts of *habitus*, capital, and field are used within the results section of this study to explain why and how participants construct their experiences. A field is a bounded system (like a classroom). *Habitus* provides that "feel for the game" because it derives

from the knowledge that we have from our prior histories—our prior encounters/understandings that we internalize and use to make sense of the world and its fields. Capital is the knowledge, or skills, needed for this "game." So if a student uses Standard American English (SAE) at home, and if her school also uses SAE, then she possesses the capital already to perform (at an advantage over her classmates who did not use SAE at home) using the rules necessary within that classroom field.

> *Habitus* assumes a political stance when viewed as:
>
> a set of dispositions that are commonly held by members of a social group. . . that bind the members together so that they can identify and communicate with each other. . . it also allows them to recognize, and be recognized by, outsiders. (Mutch, 2006, p. 163)

These dispositions assist in making up the identity of an individual; thus, the social and cultural situations surrounding an individual contribute to *habitus*. Students, teachers, and administrators draw upon their *habitus* to construct the school world, an example of a social field (Ladwig, 1994).

Holland et al.'s (1998) concepts of figured worlds build off of Bourdieu's concept of field. They explored the notions of fields along with identity as they discuss how figured worlds affect an individual's identity construction. In this study, the figured world of school the participants entered contributed to their student identities—how they performed student writer reflected their understanding of what that role means, of what their versions of student writer means. This construction is not simply cultural or constructed; it represents a combination of both forces. These figured worlds, such as the figured world of the Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) group or a classroom, have

participants who enact the narratives found and created within that world. This understanding fully participating within or approximating a full participants' social performance within a figured world's appears after much observation and experience within the figured world. For example, to teach writing is performing in the "role" of teacher, taking up a recognizable position, usually in front of the classroom, and "being in charge." According to Holland et al. (1998), this performance is created by our identity, or version of ourselves as teacher. This performance is a direct result of an individual's prior encounters, or socialization, with school, English classes, and Writing Center tutorials, and this concept relates to both teacher and student identity as performers of social roles within the classroom.

Finally, I use the macro global economic theory, neoliberal privatization in order to understand what is happening on a micro level. This global theory illustrates how larger systems affect what seems possible on local scenes. A shorthand for neoliberal privatization is the movement of public resources into the private sector. For example, in the downtown area around Stonie University, the city used tax dollars to build a highly contested downtown arena. Even though the public paid taxes for it, they still have to pay exorbitant ticket prices to use the space. The public money does not contribute to a public space. Instead, the public resources (tax dollars) went into the privatized sector. This movement of public into private happens both physically and intellectually, as in the case of Stonie, a public university whose labor practices have been impacted by neoliberal privatization.

This impact appears in the downsizing of public resources for higher education, and Stonie has moved to a corporate model which casualizes its teaching to perma-temp

laborers. The effect at Stonie and other universities like Stonie is that there is one professional tenure-track faculty member who works to oversee the hoard of non-tenure track contract laborers in order to manage the work force. One of these management tactics restricts course materials and textbooks, and non-professionalized faculty rely on those materials and texts to teach the classes. All of this reliance is based on a business model of efficiency, control, and standardization, because after all, the 3000 students who enroll need the "same sort of experience" in their writing course.

These labor practices within the university constrain and affect the teaching and learning of writing. These practices appear to constrain what it can mean to be a writing teacher, such as a writing teacher means being able to efficiently grade over 100 papers in 10 days or juggle seven classes in one semester. The writing center and classroom become narrowed as views of writing are becoming increasingly dominated by outside interests that define writing in narrow prescribed ways, and the ability to consider different options shrinks. For example, in this study, the idea of argument was defined by the textbook in one manner, and the teacher and students did not get to contribute--their experiences and understandings did not count. Ignoring this economic aspect, this larger global theory, is ignoring how big a role it plays in the construction of writing at the university—not discussing it makes this less visible. Because a part of my purpose in researching is transformative, it is important to not just be complacent with the way things are, but to make part of the figured world of the university transparent too. Several related studies share this transformative goal and make transparent the hegemonic structures within the education system.

Review of the Literature

In order to view the conversations about related studies, I provide a description of two relevant philosophical movements within the two spaces of composition programs and writing centers. In addition, I summarize related publications concerning labor and staffing issues and global economic forces impacting both spaces that contribute to my understandings of these sites of writing. Because I use these terms throughout the study, I will define the two relevant philosophical movements: Current-Traditionalism and Social Epistemic.

Current-Traditionalism

In this study, this philosophical movement most closely represents the activities and philosophy enacted in the classroom and Writing Center tutorial sessions. This philosophy had its origins in the earlier part of the 20th century. In this mindset, writing was considered the expected product of a student's knowledge of language, produced to demonstrate successful integration of skill material, such as parts of speech or rhetorical history (Berlin, 1982; Knoblauch, 1988). Little thought or worth was placed upon the process students utilized to create the essay because that activity was not easily evaluated. Substance was separated, and thus less valued, from mechanics (Bailey, 1946). For example, English writing skill was often classified as being "proficient in spelling, punctuation, and handwriting" (Martin, 1962, p. 35). Originally, writing was a task, a product that fit the dialect of the elite, produced in a positivist epistemology that was concerned about the end result.

Wendell, a Harvard composition teacher in the late 1880s, helped to design the required English A course that can be classified as an example of Current-Traditional

philosophy. According to Simmons (1995), this course is focused on the product the student produces, and the writing was formulaic and constrained (Simmons, 1995; Stewart, 1992). Process did not matter so much because writing came from a formulaic sequence beginning with words and linguistic structures and ending with an entire composition (Martin, 1962; Wendell, 1977). Good writing was elegant and stylistically clean, according to the classic pieces of literature, predominantly English literature (Wendell, 1977). Because of Harvard's prominence, the English A course and its methods were often adopted by other schools and the public (Simmons, 1995; Stewart, 1992).

Social Epistemic

The second relevant philosophy for this study is a Social Epistemic approach, developed in the late 1980s. As a researcher, I am reading the classroom and the Writing Center from this vantage point. Composition historian and researcher Berlin (1996; 1988) indicates that a social epistemic philosophy maintains that knowledge is gained via language, in social settings, and that rhetoric is political, which includes critiques of dominant culture. Berlin (1996) indicates that "social-epistemic rhetoric is the study and critique of signifying practices in their relation to subject formation within the framework of economic, social, and political conditions" (p. 77). Social epistemics stressed the need to not only study the dominant culture of power's work, but also to examine and immerse oneself in the other, primarily oppressed cultural groups who had been silenced in the past. Bizzell (as cited in Smit, 2002, p. 193) examined the "hidden curriculum" found in, at the time and currently, writing instruction. For example, one way of "proper" writing might be connected to the type of language used in a very wealthy upper-class home

environment, and a "wrong" writing type might be connected to a more oral-based tradition found in an impoverished urban environment. Heath (1984) described in *Ways with Words*, a large ethnographic study, how different cultural groups taught, viewed, and experienced writing acts. She examined different racially stratified communities to observe how writing and communication was different. There was not one unique form. Still, universities usually require one version, the academic writing style, in their first-year writing programs. The student whose family utilizes an academic writing style of language at home has a natural advantage over the child who is not surrounded by this discourse at her residence.

Many researchers have examined and made transparent the power of this narrow form of literacy instruction. Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) in *Education Under Siege* and Aronowitz in *The Knowledge Factory* (2000) explore how education functions to replicate the dominant culture. One format, or one "correct" way to write reinforces the literacy practices of those in power and works to penalize and detain those whose literacy practices do not conform. In this case, education and literacy practices reflect a sign of status and social position. Freire (1994) reflected a more social epistemic philosophy as he argued that in order to gain more purpose in writing, students should use writing to self-examine their situations and surroundings to experience awareness of their life. Shor (1987), in *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life*, argues for a critical pedagogy in literacy classrooms and provides resources for exploring how the perma-temp classroom and the corporatized university do not have to be holding grounds for students but can be a space to explore alternatives to hegemonic forces within a stratified society. One reason for Current-Traditionalism's popularity is that skills are easier to test and evaluate;

administrators and teachers can determine if a student is using a comma properly, but a nonstandard product of writing is much more subjective and difficult to evaluate quickly (Brannon et al. in press; Woodward, 2007). Social epistemic thinking represents the dominant ideology found within composition scholarship; however, it has not translated into the enactment of practice. There are several reasons for this contrast, such as ever-increasing class sizes requiring evaluation based on less subjective assessment and the labor situation.

In terms of Writing Centers, much of the composition philosophy applies because Writing Centers were developed after composition programs were created. Gere (as cited in Boquet, 1999) represented the relationship of writing centers and first-year writing as "extracurriculum of composition" (p. 466); the writing center is supplemental or subservient to the demands of composition. Most of the time, the work of the writing center is guided or grounded in the curriculum of the composition program or classroom.

Both sites had their origins as supplements, or repair factories, to the "real" English studies courses: literature. North (1984), an extremely well-known writing center historian, explained in his historical study that writing centers were first created around the 1930s; they were laboratories and repair shops for students who, according to their teachers, did not produce academic writing correctly. Many centers had (and still have) the word "lab" in their title, reflecting this repair mentality. Historically, they served as a companion to the first-year writing program; they were a place to remove deficiencies in writing. In this study, the Writing Center is a part of the English department, and over half of the students who utilized the Writing Center were in a first-year composition course.

While Jones (2001) indicated that no two Writing Centers are identical, their philosophies can be generalized into two major motivational themes: remedial laboratories connected with writing curricula or spaces connected with the exploration of the individual's unique writing process outside of curricula. The first theme provides the writing center with a "limited conception" of what it could do; the label of laboratory or clinic indicates that centers serve as sites for students who have a need for "remedial" attention (North, 1984). Some of these centers were created to address the so-called writing crisis, such as the increased enrollment of students outside of the dominant culture (Boquet, 1999). Many writing teachers and programs believe that the center is a supplement to the writing course or a writing-across-the-curriculum program; therefore, it should teach, and thus repair, what cannot be done in a classroom due to time or lack of desire by the teacher (Turner, 2006; Littleton, 2006). In these cases, the Writing Center provides a service for the teacher's classroom needs.

Turner (2006) indicated that the center should supplement the curricula of the English course at both the high school and college level because of potential increases in grade point averages, and performances on tests, and decreased writing workload/corrections for teachers. She suggested activities outside of one-on-one tutoring, including an essay exam clinic to help "students begin to make up for lost ground on tests" (Turner, 2006, p. 47). Boquet's (1999) five-year study concerning writing center history indicated that the activity at the type of centers Turner (2006) describes revolve around students waiting, passively, for the tutor's corrections on a piece of writing; for these centers, it is not a space of practice but correction (Boquet, 1999). Boquet (1999) explained that centers associated with curricula support the dominant

hegemony of what constitutes literacy. They are also agents implementing the agenda of the institution. Turner's (2006) identified benefits of this belief clearly connect the writing center's purpose to performance within the dominant culture ideology found in the politics of the prescribed curriculum and evaluation within a university writing course. Many research studies focus on this approach; they center on how the Writing Center improves a student's "correct" performance in a course.

Most quantitative studies within writing centers tend to focus on descriptive analyses of the types of students who use the center, how many sessions focus on a chosen subject matter, or linguistic examinations of power dynamics (Fisher, 1984; Linell et al., 1988; Rudolph, 1994). Researchers count the number of errors within student papers, they explore linguistic devices within tutoring sessions, or they count the numbers of linguistic speech actions, such as politeness expressions (Ferguson, 1975; Linell, 1990; Valdman, 1981; Zimin, 1981; qtd. In Thonus, 1999). Rarely do these studies engage in social or political explorations; they remain focused upon more quantitative expressions of data. Thonus (1999) treads closely to a political critique as she quantitatively measures how many times directive suggestions of dominance behavior on the part of the tutor is linked with institutional discourse dominance. Her study of 16 writing center tutorials attempts to correlate her thematized conversational tactics to institutional dominance.

While several of these studies discuss writing classrooms or writing center tutorials, explorations of the connection between these two spaces, from a student perspective, are lacking. For example, a similar study, although quantitative in nature, explores the writing center/composition connection. Jones (2001) focuses upon a study concerned with the performance of student writing in connection with increased writing

center tutorials. Jones (2001) indicates that few studies have empirically shown how and/or why student writing improves in a composition course after numerous writing center sessions. Jones (2001) addresses the connection; however, the students' voices are not represented.

While other options were (and are) available, in this study, Stonie's Writing Center tutorials reflected a notion of writing center as laboratory or repair shop. However, this notion has been challenged in the field in an attempt to disassociate Writing Centers with the university or high school curricula and assessment. Writing centers have changed their names, such as Duke University's Writing Studio, to emphasize the lack of laboratory status. North (1984) indicated that centers suffer if they are connected with curricula or assessment procedures; further, North indicated that writing centers should "help produce better writers, not better writing" (p. 438). Writing is connected to curricula and assessment; writers are connected with individual spaces and sessions that assist in writer growth and experience. Boquet (1999) suggested that this sort of writing center often creates a counter-hegemonic space, resistant to the current-traditional rhetoric often found operating in composition departments.

Neoliberal Privatization

In terms of relevant studies that also use the larger global theory of Neoliberal Privatization, I draw on the work of Brannon et al. (in press), Bousquet et al. (2004), Scott (2009), Welch (2008), and Grimm (1999). In reference to this dissertation study, these researchers greatly contributed to the analysis found within Chapters four, five, and six. These scholars speak of the influence of neoliberal privatization from different places (i.e., a first-year writing program, a Writing Center, a Research I university); however,

they illustrate how the movement of the public into privatized spaces narrows the possibilities within their specific areas of research. Brannon et al. (in press) and Scott (2009) illustrate how neoliberal practices support an increasing casualness in the labor of composition work in the name of business efficiency. Efficiency is a motivating factor for staffing changes in first-year writing programs. It is more efficient to use part-time labor within English departments and writing centers because there is no added cost, such as healthcare premiums (Robertson, 2005; hooks, 1994; Harris, 2000; Roemer et al., 1999; Foley, 1998; Bousquet et al., 2004). This contributes to a lack of professionalization within the labor force in writing programs, as discussed in Chapter four.

In terms of curriculum, Bousquet et al. (2004) indicated that the courses within the composition program reflect a "general turn in the academic-industrial complex toward vocationalism, mob training, and skills-based outcomes" (p. 3) that "universalizes" (Li, 2001, p. 275) the hegemony of the dominant culture. Because the university is being asked to model itself after the business world, newer courses, especially the second semester of English composition—which is usually based upon argumentative writing—reflect this business-minded philosophy; Bousquet et al. (2004) posed that composition may be "in league with the market forces" (p. 278) and that the market drives the curriculum and staffing choices of a department or writing center. Most universities, around the early 1990s, turned their second semester English composition courses into argument-based writing (Bousquet et al., 2004). They now have names along the lines of Writing for the Academic Community or Academic Writing. Many of these courses have standardized curricula and required textbooks. Papers in these courses often revolve around technical writing pieces and persuasive arguments and Standard

American English forms of grammar (as discussed in Chapter four); composition programs are now supposed to prepare students to write for upper-level interdisciplinary courses.

At Stonie, there is no required standard course of study for the First-year Writing Program. There are published and known goals for the courses and model syllabi (available online or hardcopy in the department's mailroom), but essentially teachers have much freedom in their course design. However, the majority of Stonie's part-time first-year writing teachers implement a current-traditional pedagogy that revolves around the same types of papers, classroom activities, out-of-context grammar instruction in Standard American English, and textbook choices. Even though there is freedom of choice (there is no textbook required to be utilized), very narrow and regimented activities and textbooks voluntarily pervade Stonie's first-year writing program. According to Ohmann (1996), writing teachers, because of their lack of knowledge about the teaching of writing, turn to "common sense"—or the business-minded preparation reflected in many first-year writing courses. While it is "voluntary," not required, it often "feels" nonetheless as though it is. Everything visible to the teacher, from the textbook that is handed to her, to the "model" syllabi that she can follow, to the conversations in the part-time workers "bull pen" office, to her prior experiences with writing instruction—all tell her that current-traditionalism is THE way to teach.

The composition course's possibilities for both students and teachers are becoming more narrowed. Welch (2008), in her text, *Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World*, explored how privatized voices remove the potential for a truly democratic classroom that is built around the critique and incorporation of a variety

of viewpoints. She used an example of healthcare discourse and how its privatized voice does not allow for alternate interpretations or movements within the discourse; patients must operate in the solitary discourse with little options for alternatives. Welch used her experience in this healthcare discourse to extend her thinking about first-year writing courses and how as the space shrinks for alternative discourses, students and teachers are left with little potential for critiquing and exploring within their classroom, as illustrated in the case studies in Chapters five and six.

These privatized influences can also be discussed in terms of the modernist perspective at the university institution. Postmodern scholar, Grimm (1999), examines what it means to have legitimate tutoring sessions in a writing center. A modernist approach might be to restrict labels of absolute "good" or "bad" sessions to one that focuses upon improving the paper directly, such as the type of sessions found in Stonie's Center that will be discussed in Chapters four, five, and six. For most of their lives, and especially after the implementation of No Child Left Behind, students have been shrouded in the "warm blanket" of common sense that supports the myth of progression and development of a correct skill/ability (Grimm, 1999, p. 38). This myth of progress indicates that the students support (knowingly or unknowingly) this modernist assumption Grimm (1999) describes: "If one believes that a particular form of discourse is 'right' or 'natural' or 'better,' the obvious conclusion is that those who depart from this form are 'wrong' and they need help to learn the 'correct' way to do things" (p. 31). For Grimm (1999), though, a postmodern approach would be to expand the session to ask questions, such as what did the student learn? A postmodern approach to legitimate tutoring sessions includes modernist ideas of "good" productive sessions, but it requires

us to “simultaneously entertain multiple point of view” to expand the sessions’ benefits beyond the idea of fixing a student’s paper of errors to increase his or her grade in a class. This approach was not enacted within Stonie’s Writing Center.

Chapter Three

The following Chapter reviews the methodology utilized within this dissertation study as well as a discussion of the analysis technique of Critical Discourse Analysis, the method of analysis utilized in the case studies.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I explore the research design for this study as well as provides an overview of participant selection, research site, data collection methods, and data analysis techniques of critical discourse analysis (CDA).

Research Design: Why Qualitative Research?

Qualitative research seeks to "listen well to others' stories and to interpret and retell the accounts" (Glesne, 2006, p. 1). It is through the listening and observing process that researchers can be present within the culture or experience the moments they are studying. My research goal was to be there in the moment with my participants' experiences and perspectives, which are socially constructed and unique according to their backgrounds (Schram, 2006). This research study describes what happens when students learned to write in (as well as for) a composition class and brought that writing for consultation in a writing center tutorial.

Case Study

This research study employed a qualitative methodology using ethnographic techniques of observation and interviews to produce case studies of two student writers. I depended upon my first four research questions to guide my observations of the students' constructions and performances of writing in these spaces.

Ethnographic-based methodology that leads to case study creation can be described as observations and interpretations of a bounded system, unit, or event to be

studied (Glesne, 2006; Merriam, 1998; Schram, 2006). Case study methodology has also been defined as “an analytic focus on an individual event, activity, episode, or other specific phenomenon” (Schram, 2006, p. 106). The main interest for case study research revolves around discovery, based upon an intensive observation of a single (or several similar units) experience (Merriam, 1998).

Thus in order to collect data, I observed one first-year writing course and the students who used the writing center as a part of that course. Ultimately, I looked closely at two of these students for two assignment units, or approximately seven weeks of class. I used ethnographic techniques of interviews and observations to understand the students’ experiences within the course and the tutorial sessions. Through observations recorded in field notes, I took down classroom and tutorial conversations and descriptions and “member-checked” with the participants to verify the accuracy of the notes used in the study. I thematized the data by narrowing the material down into coded groups to provide me with pieces of language available for a CDA. This analysis technique created a space to understand the students’ experiences as reflected in their discourse.

Participants

Because my research interests and career center on first-year writing courses and writing centers, I chose to focus upon these two spaces at the site of my employment. This choice was for two reasons: convenience and the size of the site’s writing program and writing center. I asked a current English composition adjunct instructor to participate in the study. All tutors employed at the writing center during the spring of 2008 were potential participants as well; however, only two were selected because participation was based upon schedule coordination between the students and the tutor’s hours of work.

Site of Research

The study was conducted in a writing center and writing course at Stonie University, a pseudonym for a large southeastern institution that offers undergraduate and graduate programs, including master's and doctoral degrees. The university was founded in the 1940s and is located near a large urban area. Stonie University enrolled approximately 25,000 students. This urban area has one of the largest public school districts in the nation, and many of this district's students attend Stonie University. The university's enrollment continues to increase and is projected to reach 26,000 in just a few years. According to the Office of Academic Affairs (2007) website at Stonie, nearly 25% of the students lived on campus and about 90% of the students were in-state. Approximately 10% of the students were in a sorority or a fraternity and about 75% of the students were Caucasian.

The Office of Academic Affairs (2007) at Stonie indicated that there were just over 900 full-time faculty members teaching and/or researching at the university. Stonie's English Department contains several units, such as linguistics and technical writing; this study focused specifically upon the first-year writing program division and the writing center.

Selection of the Instructor

I selected my focal instructor because of his willingness to open his class to me, his background and training to teach writing, and his years of teaching at Stonie. The focal instructor is not unlike many first-year writing instructors across the country.

At the time of the study, Hank Wallace was a 26-year-old Caucasian male who had taught at the college level for a total of four years. He had taught at Stonie University

for two years as an adjunct faculty member, and prior to this, he taught English and film classes for one year at a college in Colorado. Hank earned a Bachelor's Degree in English Literature and Language from the University of Chicago in 2003 and a Master's of Fine Arts Degree in Writing from the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 2005. Hank was planning to apply for a doctoral degree, specializing in composition, to begin in the 2009-2010 academic year.

At the time of the study, Hank taught at least three courses within the first-year writing program each fall and spring semester. He also taught for other departments, such as the American Studies Department, on campus whenever possible if he was assigned fewer than four courses by the English Department. Hank had taught English 2 twice before the beginning of this study. During the entire duration of this study, Hank taught an English 1 course one night a week as well as another English 2 course another night during the week.

Selection of the Focus Students

I sat in on the writing class for two weeks at the beginning of the spring 2008 semester. After this two-week period, I spoke to the students about the study and asked all students to be participants if they so desired. Originally, eight students volunteered to participate. One student dropped out of the class during the third week of the study. I narrowed the remaining field of participants to approximately five students, based on student schedules, rapport, and convenience. From that group of five students, two were selected for detailed analysis (chapters five and six) based upon the number of times they attended the writing center tutorial sessions. These two students attended the writing center more than twice as much in comparison to the other three students.

LaToya. LaToya was a 19-year-old African American female student that had lived in both Jamaica and New Jersey. She attended a few years of school in Jamaica and then public and private school in New Jersey. Her hardworking and dedicated mother was her inspiration for both her and her two younger siblings. LaToya was interested in either being a pediatrician or a chemist. At the time of this study she was a biology major and proclaimed studying to be her largest spare-time activity. LaToya is the focus of the chapter five case study. She attended writing center sessions over eight times during the course of this study.

Steve. Steve was a 19-year old Caucasian male from an upper middle class family. He had lived most of his life in the northeast, having only recently moved to the southeast in the past two years. He described himself as the son of "two hardworking" parents with one older sister and one younger sister. Steve's father was an engineer and his mother was a stay-at-home mom. During this study, Steve attended Stonie University and lived with a roommate in university housing. His family lived within 30 minutes of the university. Steve's hobbies included playing video games with his roommates and reading; he said that he was an "avid" reader and has read since he "could basically remember." His original career plans were to become a mechanical engineer, but three months into the semester of this research study, he decided to change his major to a double major of English and criminal justice. Steve is the focus of the chapter six case study. He attended writing center sessions over 10 times during the course of this study.

Selection of the Writing Center Tutors

The tutors who worked in the writing center during the spring 2008 semester were all eligible participants for the study. During the first staff meeting of the semester, this

researcher discussed this study with them, and 10 of them volunteered to participate. She narrowed this field of 10 tutor participants based on the students selected from the writing course; six tutors who worked at the time students were able to come to the center for tutoring were selected. Out of these six eligible participants, she reported in-depth on the two tutors who worked with the two students analyzed in detail in chapters five and six.

Joanne. Joanne was a 24-year-old Caucasian female from a rural college town about two hours from Stonie. She was pursuing her Master's of English Degree at Stonie with a concentration in linguistics. She grew up on a farm and had a close relationship with her two parents and one older brother. When she was not working or taking classes, she preferred to read and "be as young as" she could stand "to be at 24." Joanne will be discussed further in chapter five as she was LaToya's tutor.

Philip. Philip was a 23-year-old Caucasian male who had recently graduated with his Bachelor's Degree in Finance. He had worked at the writing center for a year, and he was currently pursuing his Master's Degree in English. Born in the same town where Stonie was located, he was from a single-parent household and had one brother. Philip said that he does nothing with his life "but read books and write stories." Philip will be discussed further in chapter six as he was Steve's tutor.

Classroom Context

English 2 is the second-semester course within Stonie University's first-year writing program. This course is focused on argumentative writing, and its department-driven content is based on preparing students for writing in their future academic endeavors. The English 2 course for this study met twice a week from 5:00 p.m. until 6:20 p.m. There were a total of 21 students. There were two required texts: the *Diana*

Hacker Guide to Writing and *From Critical Thinking to Argument*. The syllabus (see Appendix E) indicated that class-based activities included group work, reading and reading responses, journal writing, class-wide discussions, peer-revision workshops, lecture, and informal and formal paper writing. Because this study focuses on the student writer, I provide details about the formal writing assignments.

Formal writing. The first formal writing assignment (see Appendix F for all writing assignments) asked students to choose one of the three suggested topics (or to propose their own for approval) and write two pages supporting one side of the topic without the use of outside sources. For example, one topic a student might choose was "Should Smoking be Permitted in Public Places?" The second formal writing assignment was called "The Conversation," and it required students to read one of five provided short essays on electronic reserve at Stonie's library and then create a conversation over a meal (in dialogue form) with their least favorite relative who also just happened to read the same essay. For the discussion's purposes, students were asked to converse, not debate sides. Students needed to keep the length of the paper to five to seven pages; in the case of both formal assignments; anything longer than the permitted length would not be included within the overall assessment of the paper.

Journals. In addition to the formal and informal papers, students also wrote in their journals at almost every class meeting. Students kept their journal separate from their class notes. They were asked to write to a prompt written on the board or to freewrite on a topic of their choosing. Most of these prompt responses lasted about 10 minutes. In addition, students kept their reading responses in the journal, approximately

one paragraph of text for each assignment read. The journal was collected at the end of the term for assessment.

Data Collection

Methods

Before beginning any data collection for this dissertation study, I submitted and awaited approval from the university's IRB. Data collection methods involved a combination of classroom and tutoring observations and interviews with case study participants. In addition, archival data, in the form of class papers, tutorial notes, and tutor communication with the teacher, were collected. A graphic plan of the data collection can be found in Appendix A. Approval was gained from the students (all over the age of 18), the teacher, and the writing center tutors prior to the collection of any data (See Appendix B).

Interviews. The interview was utilized to "gain in-depth knowledge from participants about particular phenomena, experiences, or sets of experiences" (deMarrais & Lapan, 2004, p. 52). In contrast to quantitative data collection, qualitative interviews are interested in capturing the experiences, language, and details presented by the person/group being interviewed. I avoided questions that required a yes/no answer and kept clear of questions that might be classified as leading the interviewee in a certain direction. Many of these questions began with "How does this appear" or "What does this look like" in a certain situation. My questions were grouped into several thematic structures: background, writer identity, writing experiences in the writing course, and writing center perceptions.

The background questions, such as “Describe your educational experiences so far in your life,” aimed to provide a social, cultural, and historical context of the participant (reflective of a Bakhtian idea of dialogicality). The writer identity questions, such as “What do you think it means to be a writer?” attended to discussions of how a participant constructed the identity of a writer. The questions concerning writing experiences in the writing course, such as “Tell me about a specific example of a writing assignment from your class,” collected information about the experiences of writing discourses in the course. The final grouping, writing center perceptions, included questions such as “How does/could the writing center connect to a first-year writing class?” to provide a participant’s thoughts concerning the multiple connections between the center and the classroom. The complete interview protocol is listed in Appendix C, with questions for the teacher, students, and tutors.

I interviewed the teacher at several points in the semester, asking questions to help me understand his perceptions of his students’ experiences within the class. These interviews were conducted formally, in a sit-down environment at a neutral place, such as a coffee shop, for approximately 45 minutes. In addition, informal interviews were conducted with him before, during, and after class. I required at least three formal interviews, one before the semester began, one during the observation times, and one after the observation times for clarity. I transcribed the interviews verbatim to assist in data analysis.

I interviewed the participating students to gain a better sense of their understanding and experiences with writing in the course as well as the approaches to writing in the writing center. I interviewed each participating student formally two times,

once before the first writing center visit and once after the observations were completed and all written work was returned to the student. These interviews lasted for approximately 15 to 30 minutes each. These interviews were conducted at a neutral spot, such as a coffee shop. Informal interviews occurred before or after class as needed; for example, I informally interviewed Steve (a student participant) three times. I also transcribed these interviews verbatim to assist in data analysis. The typed transcripts were housed on my password-protected computer at all times. The purpose of the student and teacher questions revolved around their experiences with the discourses of writing in the classroom and the writing center.

Observations. I attended English 2 (the pseudonym for the second-semester writing class) course meetings with the participating teacher during the spring 2008 semester. Each class met for one hour and 20 minutes two times a week for a total of 16 weeks. I attended all class sessions that pertained to the writing that the students did during this study. I also attended all classes from the beginning of the semester and through the first writing activity in order to determine the focal students for the study. I then shadowed those students in class and in their tutorials for a minimum of two writing assignments.

At each course meeting (one hour and 20 minutes two times a week) I attended, I digitally audio recorded and took handwritten notes during class. This recording was utilized as way to recheck the accuracy of the exact language captured in my field notes; therefore, this data was not transcribed. In addition, I took copious field notes utilizing a double-entry method. This method uses a two-column approach for note-taking, with one column used for strict observation description and one column used for immediate

observation reflection and note-taking. I kept a more in-depth reflective research journal to record observations and reflections after each session observed—I completed over 20 of these reflective pieces. The tutorial sessions (50 minutes in length) involved a similar digital audio recording and note-taking process. All digital recordings were compiled onto my single digital voice recorder, which was kept in a locked drawer at all times within my desk.

Data Analysis

Coding the Data

Textual analysis of the interview transcripts were the primary goal for data analysis. The field notes and recorded classroom observations were also analyzed and I confirmed their accuracy by asking participants for verification. Gee's (2005) method of CDA was utilized for this project. Rich and extended detail of these collected transcriptions was used to present this analysis. I grouped the transcript data into relevant themes, or categories, which continued to be represented in the data. Then, I utilized CDA to probe deeper into the language used by the participants. A sample data analysis of a transcript from one of the case study students serves as an example of this data analysis method. In this particular excerpt, I explored his discussions of himself as a writer based on interview data collected as described above. The transcript of the entire interview can be found in Appendix D.

Data Analysis of Interview

Thematic coding. After conducting the interviews, the process for data analysis began with repeated readings of the transcripts. After reading the transcripts five times sequentially, I placed them aside for two days and returned to them for four more

sequential readings. I reflected on potential themes after each reading. After the readings, I wrote out the major themes Steve mentioned, using his language to label the themes initially. I clustered the themes down to three larger codes based upon the number of references in the transcript. I transferred his original language-based themes into my own open-coded administrative categories based upon the three themes. These three themes were named: Steve as a Student, Not Getting it Done, and A Production of "This This This."

Critical Discourse Analysis. I chose this excerpt with its three themes to perform a CDA using Gee's (2005) method of thematic coding, stanza creation, and exploration. Discourse analysis examines potential meanings behind spoken or written words. A CDA is "predicated on the idea that language and discourse embody ideologies and are thus constitutive of social identities, social relations, and worldviews" (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 119). Gee (2005) explained that the analysis considers "how language, both spoken and written, enacts social and cultural perspectives and identities…how language gets recruited 'on site' to enact specific social activities and social identities" (pp. preface material, 1). When researchers utilize CDA, they provide a transcript excerpt and then break down the transcription into lines to isolate the language for a detailed exploration.

Researchers then group the lines into stanzas and name the stanza in reference to the perceived major theme of the conversation between the blocked lines (for example, I named the first stanza after the theme of Steve as a Student). Gee (2005) indicated that these blocked lines represent a "unitary topic or perspective, which appear[s]…to have been planned together" (p. 107). These line separations are not restricted to complete

grammatical sentences; they express blocks of meanings perceived by the researcher. After separating the language into stanzas, researchers are able to employ Gee's building tasks. These tasks explore in detail concepts of identity, social goods exchange, activities, political power, significance, and relationships. Researchers choose to focus on some of all of these tasks. In particular, my CDA explores Gee's building task of identity within Steve's language.

Specific chunks of language present what Gee (2005) stated as the "what" activity of the language, and the "who" (p. 22) of the language. The language Steve uses reveals his cultural and social situatedness. In Steve's case, the CDA provided a way to explore how Steve performs his writer identity, which is also wrapped up in his student identity. Gee explained that individuals use "language to get recognized as taking a certain identity or role" (p. 11), so an in-depth CDA provides researchers with the ability to question how a person negotiates the language to enact a certain identity.

Findings of the Sample Study

In this particular transcript's context, Steve discusses his feelings about writing and equates them to a feeling "more like paranoia…like if the red line pops up, it is paranoia, like oh god what did I do wrong. Go back and correct it." I asked him to say more about this idea of paranoia, and this was his response:

> When I—in kindergarten and first grade, [pause] it is fairly vivid for me. I wasn't exactly what you would call a [pause] grade A student. And my—one of the big things with writing that I have—my dad would sit me down because my biggest problem was homework, I would never get homework done, I'd wait until the last minute and I was pretty constantly in the principal's office because I didn't get

> things done, I would hide notices that I didn't get stuff done that I'd have to have signed by my parents, so my parents would get frustrated and mad at me and sit me down. I would be writing and I'd probably be writing a one page paper—'my name is Steve and I did this this this' you know basic simple words and introductory, and how I'd make a mistake or erase something my dad would get all mad at me, crumple it up and make me start over. So that and there's other situations on that I could expound on, but that is the basic idea.

To examine Steve's language in more detail, I break up his lines into three different stanzas that illustrate his construction, or lack thereof, of agency.

Stanza One: Steve as a Student

1 When I—

2 in kindergarten and first grade, [pause]

3 it is fairly vivid for me.

4 I wasn't exactly

5 what you would call a [pause]

6 grade A student.

In this stanza, Steve uses language to present his constructions of himself as a student. He uses a vivid memory, an instance of himself as a young child, that explains the kind of student that he is. His use of the word, "you," is a direct reference both to his interlocutor (this researcher) and the more generalized "you" meaning the "common sense" as in "you know"—everyone knows. Steve also knows that this interlocutor is teacher in a leadership position in a writing center, so he constructs the relationship as one with agreement. He is not, in his way of thinking about the world, the "A" student,

and certainly any professional in the field would agree. Framing his analysis in this way, with a mark of humor, also allows Steve to claim authority, or agency, over his experience while not claim to be a great writer or a knowledgeable writer. In fact, his authority comes from his lack of competence and his ability to "duck" the responsibility for being a writer, "I wasn't, what you would call, an A student." After framing his portrait of himself as a non-A student, he moves into the second section of his response, one that illustrates how his non-A behavior is how he possesses agency in his identity as a student.

Stanza Two: Not Getting it Done

7 And my—one of the big things with writing that I have—
8 my dad would sit me down
9 because my biggest problem was homework,
10 I would never get homework done,
11 I'd wait until the last minute
12 and I was pretty constantly in the principal's office
13 because I didn't get things done,
14 I would hide notices
15 that I didn't get stuff done
16 that I'd have to have signed by my parents

Steve's markers of agency appear as phrases beginning with "I," and a closer look at this heavy use of "I" illustrates his ownership in this behavior. Right away, Steve identifies his problem with writing as not getting things done. Ideas of "proper" writing and student behavior are exchanged as Steve discusses how he was socialized to view school

performance as getting things done much in the same way that a factory worker might get things done. The aim is to complete the task, not struggle with an idea. He can perform well as the slacker by avoiding the completion of his writing (his work). Three times in the transcript within five lines (Line 10: “I would never get homework done”; line 13: “I didn’t get things done”; line 15: “I didn’t get stuff done”) he identifies this behavior as one of his “biggest problems” with writing.

It is not putting words down on paper that Steve has problems with, but with the apparatus that surrounds the task. He resists the performance of writing because of where he perceives that writing is controlled. Within 10 lines, Steve uses “I” constructions in an active formation eight times. The “I” use revolves around what he did not do in terms of proper student behavior. He has agency in owning his resistance to the task of writing as he never gets homework done, he waits until the end, and he is always in the principal’s office because he does not get things done. He hides notices indicating his lack of doing, and he avoids getting his parents to sign these notices. Steve has agency in these activities as he is the actor, completing the activities and recognizing them as elements that make up his construction of his problems that he has “with writing.”

This stanza illustrates how it is important to view Steve as a student in order to understand him as a writer. He defines the writer through the idea of a student because writing is just another performance for a student, a common element of current-traditional mindsets. A student writes to “get things done.” Steve has defined himself as a “non-A” student, and he has agency in this behavior. However, Steve loses agency when he begins to discuss the specifics of his writing production in the third stanza of this excerpt.

Stanza Three: A Production of "This This This"

so my parents would get frustrated at me and mad at me
and sit me down.
I would be writing and
I'd probably be writing a one page paper—
'My name is Steve and
I did this this this'
you know basic simple words and introductory, and
how I'd make a mistake or erase something
my dad would get all mad at me
crumple it up and
make me start over.
So that
and there's other situations
that I could expound on,
but that is the basic idea.

For Steve, a writer produces material correctly in the first attempt to avoid it being appropriated by another. The assumption is that a writer does not make mistakes and is overseen by an authority figure. Steve's agency is removed in this section of his discussion; he has been moved to an object position in the sentence. Here in this position, over five times in this stanza, he becomes the object to someone else's actions, as opposed to being the actor in the activity. By losing the ability to act as a writer, Steve

becomes the victim to the authority figure who claims knowledge of the way the writing should proceed.

This stanza also illustrates a common sense idea of "proper" writing format, the five-paragraph essay. Steve, even at 19-years-old, uses the example of a five-paragraph construction to name or represent writing in line 22: "I did this this this." Three points comprise his one-page paper with almost certainly five paragraphs. Furthermore, the implication of the one-shot production screams state-testing production. Steve's past experiences taking one-shot writing tests in his 4th, 7th, and 10th grades have assisted in constructing his ideas of writing. Certainly his father's behavior assists in this construction as well.

Conclusions of the Sample Study

I argue that the effects of a privatized public education system have caused Steve, and perhaps other students like him, not to see themselves as writers. It is in the actual activity of writing that Steve claims no agency. Here he loses his power to act. The writing activity is governed by fixed rules and regulations, administered by the trainer at the time. He cannot produce in this environment, so he does not see himself as a writer. Steve's ideas of writing are reinforced in classrooms that focus on formats and formulas for writing, and Steve continues to avoid the task.

Significance of Sample Study

An in-depth exploration of Steve's language provided me with a deeper understanding of how discourse in this case is utilized to reflect and shape an individual's identity. The deliberate dissection of Steve's discourse is just a single example of how CDA can be used to comprehend a segment of a person's identity, and this was

conducted on a mere two-minute unit. Within this study, the use of CDA through the experience of numerous student, teacher, and tutor interviews and multiple classroom observations provided rich data that assisted in informing this study as well as its conclusions.

Further Presentation of Data

Chapter 4 provides the reader with an overview of the English 2 class and the writing center, the sites of writing at this study's location, using the language of the student participants.

CHAPTER 4: THE SITES OF WRITING

This chapter provides readers with a context of the three sites of writing for this study: the first-year writing program, the first-year writing classroom (English 2), and the writing center. Each description provides a context and analysis of these spaces in the university, and these illustrations will assist readers in the case study analysis sections of chapters five and six.

The First-Year Writing Program

A first-year writing program is a site within the corporatized university where exploitative labor practices and corporate profit meet to narrow the possibilities of the curriculum and restrict public space within the classroom. While Stonie is a public institution, it is illustrative of a corporatized university; for example, Stonie has just completed "branding" exercises for marketing purposes, and the university distributes the work of teaching first-year writing to cheap part-time labor and contract lecturers.

The current landscape of the first-year writing program at Stonie is far different from what it looked like in the 1970s and early 1980s. At that time, writing was taught by tenured or tenure-line faculty. The curriculum was centered on responses to literature or whatever the faculty member felt was appropriate for her course. The faculty member had agency to direct the course's content and materials.

The overarching philosophy was expressivisim, a focus on the process of the individual's journey of truth and discovery that was based squarely in composition

theory. Expressivism was a movement in response to the regimentation of current-traditionalism, which did not acknowledge the unique process of writing and instead focused on a correct display of a fixed truth in the written product with a solitary and linear presentation of process. However, many first-year writing teachers still taught in a formalistic manner found within Current-Traditional pedagogies.

In the 1980s with the Reagan Administration's presence, an increased focus on capitalism, globalization, and the United States' place in the global economy began to influence the first-year writing program. As Foley (1998) termed it, the international capitalist economy's emphasis on business-based practices began to direct choices within universities through "strategies of corporatization" (p. 329). Corporate management's way (or brand of logic) of conducting business began to penetrate the structures of higher education. Bourdieu (1993) called this infiltration a heteronomic process where rules of one field enter another; he posited that a lack of critical awareness and reflection on this process causes a loss of autonomy in the field being entered.

Because first-year writing is positioned as a general education requirement (a gatekeeping course), and so many students must take the course, it can be seen in economic terms as a drain on English department labor and profit. As enrollments grew at Stonie, so did the number of sections of first-year writing. As businesses began to increase their outsourcing of labor, English departments like Stonie's began to follow. Tenure-track faculty were needed for more privileged courses—upper division literature courses for English majors—so a solution to this labor crises was following the business-based practice of using casual labor. Bousquet et al. (2004) terms these laborers, "disposable" (p. 3) workers. These disposable workers provide a cheap and more efficient

source of labor; a department could employ four adjunct workers for the price of one tenure-line faculty member. Efficiency, and not best practice, became a priority for hiring first-year writing teachers.

These workers at Stonie, like those in countless universities across the country, are what Foley (1998) called a “reserve army” (p. 329). Frequently not composition scholars or even teachers of writing or past students of general education composition courses, they teach from recollections of how they were taught. Because of their lack of participation/involvement in conversations about composition theory, they only have their past experience as students in English from high school or middle school courses to access. And in first-year writing courses, they enact a curriculum handed down by those who “know.” The agency of the casualized composition teacher is supplanted by the agency of the curriculum of the textbook and those constructed as knowing or having authority, such as curriculum committees or administrators or even textbook companies. At the time of this study, no tenure-line faculty taught in the first year writing program, and over 50% of Stonies’s overall English department faculty is currently on a contract basis. This trend has only grown since the year 2000, as Stonie continues to experience increased dependency upon part-time disposable contract labor as enrollments grow at the school.

These disposable workers need a supervisor, or composition boss as Harris (2000) termed it, so the Writing Program Administrator (WPA) becomes the controlling agent, or manager. Composition becomes a managed entity within the managed university (Bousquet et al., 2004). In the 1990s, Stonie shifted the content for first-year writing classes to academic argumentative forms. Literature was outlawed because the tenure-

line faculty taught literature. Much like the training a factory worker receives in terms of following directions and performing her role, so does the casual disposable workers at Stonie (e.g., graduate teaching assistants, adjunct part-time teachers, non tenure-track lecturers). She receives her directions (or perhaps, more appropriately, treatment) in the form of required textbooks, mandated assignments with prescribed formulas down to each paragraphs' content (see Wood's text, *Perspectives on Argument*, 4th edition, one of the suggested texts at Stonie, on exploratory argument formats for a current example). Content is controlled. Following directions is the disposable workers' pedagogy.

This removal of agency and the shrinking of what counts as worthy for discussion in a first-year writing classroom is an effect of neoliberal privatization, the movement of the public into private spaces. Because the disposable workers are constructed and treated as not having authority in the classroom (they essentially enact a curriculum and pedagogy created by those not present in the classroom or even at times at Stonie), the focus of the class shifts to regurgitatable skills, what Brannon et al. (in press) terms objective discussions of sentence-level instruction and reproducible forms of argument. These skills, according to Brannon et al. (in press), are "divorced from the actual contexts and lived experiences of both teachers and students." These actual contexts are deemed too risky for a first-year writing classroom taught by disposable workers.

Instead of challenging this arrangement, the current landscape of the first-year writing program replicates the status quo of the dominant culture by restricting questioning, exploring, and examining the hegemonic forces within the first-year writing program. This study's instructor, Hank, who like most instructors in Stonie's writing program, was not part of the professional discussion and did not keep up with current

composition scholarship. He remained dependent upon enshrined textbook materials to teach argumentative writing. A close look at Hank's classroom for this study illustrates these larger economic forces in play.

The English 2 Classroom Narrative and Analysis

Freire (1994) described the traditional classroom as a banking model. The teacher distributes material to his passive students as deposits of knowledge. The students remain as Foucault's (1995) docile bodies taking in the one-way dispensing of correct knowledge. The teacher determines what is valuable, and knowledge is constructed as static and regurgitated back to the teacher who evaluates how close to correct the reporting is. Students are not creators or participants in knowledge making; they are only receivers.

Hank's class enacts a banking model; he is the leader, the mover of class. A description of how he begins almost every class illustrates Hank's authoritarian assumptions about teaching and learning.

The Writing Classroom at Stonie

Hank walked into the English 2 class at 4:55 p.m. His two heavy portfolio bags were banging against his khaki pants, crisscrossed over his button-up dress shirt with the sleeves rolled up, and his 6'2" frame covered the front of the rectangular room in about three strides. He effortlessly dropped his heavy bags with one hand into a heap on a chair next to the lectern, ran his hand through his light blond short hair, and focused his attention on the computer login at the front corner of the classroom. He hummed to himself, remaining at the front of the room at almost all times, taking out his grade book

and papers to return and making a few last minute marks on a paper. He looked around, spotted a student, and loudly asked him where his missing work from last class was.

This male Caucasian teacher accrues power typically afforded to men by United States culture through his commanding presence in the classroom. He enacts and makes us of the cultural markers of westernized versions of authority by placing himself at the front of the room in charge of the class. Students recognize and contribute to Hank's authority by legitimizing it, by sitting quietly, by raising their hands to speak, and by waiting to be called on. Hank's actions (entering class with materials and purpose, not chatting with students, barking orders to follow, marking papers, controlling what counts as correct) are understood by his students as legitimate actions for the leader of the class.

The students quietly filled up the desks in the room, the outer edges and the back row first, and they busied themselves with rapid text messaging, eating dinner, or just staring out one of the four tiny classroom windows. The room smelled like fast food and coffee, common ingredients for class as many students work and attend school, so they combine dinner with class. The class had nine rows of desks with five desks in each row, and the walls were bare, painted off-white, and made up of cement blocks. Most of the students were 18- or 19-years-old and White middle class; they were wearing flip flops or tennis shoes, light coats and scarves, and trendy layered shirts or button-up shirts with the collars up.

Steve and LaToya, the focal students for this research, sat near the front of the class, on the opposite side of the lectern. LaToya, in the front row, had her head down on the desk with her eyes closed, which is normal as she was tired a lot in class. She still had her jacket halfway on, fur hood hanging down her back, as she rested her cheek on her

green spiral journal that she had drawn on to decorate. Her dinner was in a Chik-fil-A bag still wrapped up under her desk with the rest of her things. Two desks behind her, Steve sat straight in his chair, hands folded in his lap, with his class materials placed under his desk, and his black and white composition journal and a pen on the top of his desk. His jacket hung behind him on the chair, and he listened to the girl next to him talk.

The teaching of grammar. At precisely 5:00 p.m. and a few seconds, Hank began his enactment of the teacher as banker. Hank's voice boomed out to call the class to order: "Okay then, you know the drill. Go ahead and copy the sentence and correct it." While the 13 students present get out paper, Hank placed a sheet of paper with one sentence on it under the document camera device, which shined the image onto the classroom screen for the entire class to see. Using the language of a military drill sergeant, Hank practices current-traditional writing practices, beginning with sentence-level concerns in hopes that students will master these skills and apply them to paragraphs and essays. He "knows what he is doing" because, as he states in his interviews, this was how English was taught to him in high school.

His focus on surface correctness, a common element of current-traditional teaching (Berlin, 1987) takes up much of Hank's time in the classroom. Prior to this class, Hank spent two full class days lecturing about common sentence-level issues, about three hours out of 45 total semester hours of class time. In addition to these days of lecturing, Hank devotes a quarter of each day's class (over about three-quarters of the days met during the semester) to Daily Oral Language (DOL) activities. Adding in the 20 minutes for the DOL activities results in 400 minutes of total grammar instruction time

out of a total of 2,700 minutes of class time during the semester, or roughly 15% of instruction time.

For the DOL activity, Hank used sentences from students' papers. As he began the work, several students throw out corrections varying from comma placement to Hank-described "classic, classic, spell-check errors" to the removal of "totally pointless" words, such as "very." When the class got quiet, he prodded with questions like, "What do we think about that agreement thing?" He warned the students to pay attention to these errors because they "just might find their own sentences up on the board." He told them that this is important to learn. A student says, "I'm confused. This is so stupid. Fucking forget it." He looked down at his desk, and several students snickered. Hank ignored the outburst. When no one else contributed any corrections, and Hank agreed that they were finished, he asked the class to "put their names on the paper and pass them to the front."

This DOL assignment, which is repeated (albeit with different sentences) class after class, is required to be checked in for attendance, so students were required to participate and submit their work. Hank asks students for their corrections to the DOL sample, and there is one correct repair he is waiting for students to provide. Until they provide it, the activity continues. Students' own writing (that is not eligible for a future life via revision) is used as samples for the DOL, so they are publicly humiliated as markers of bad writers if they do not fix their work. This kind of regimentation is what Grimm (1999) discussed as the modernist preoccupation with erasing differences. The students are expected to correct the writing uniformly and to submerge their interpretations and language practices to Edited American English standardizations.

While some might say this is like a grammar-in-context activity since Hank is using the students' own writing, the activity itself has no space for writer development. The sentence-level emphasis implies error, not writers' choice. There is no discussion about why the student made the "error" that she did; there is only one right or wrong way to create a sentence. This technique is not used to further the writing experience as Hank does not use the writing for re-visioning activities. Contrary to what Weaver (1996) or Noden (1999) might have suggested in terms of teaching grammar in context, this activity illustrates that Hank believes that this isolated repetition via DOL will get the students to write right in the context of their own writing. Hank continued this out-of-context approach with the class' next activity, the timed journal writing.

Timed writing. It was 5:25 p.m., and Hank continued his role as banker with the next item on his agenda, timed writing. He collected the sentence activity while the students got their journals out. Hank stacked the collected papers next to his grade book on the lectern, turned the computer off, picked up the chalk, and wrote a journal prompt on the board: "Is the mind different from the brain?" In true banker form, Hank dispensed the topic to his waiting receivers. Hank pointed to the clock on the wall and told the students to write for six to eight minutes on his topic. As the students quietly bent over the journals, pens scribbling, Hank whistled and flipped through the sentence activities to mark who was present. He glanced at the clock several times to monitor time. When finished marking attendance, he folded the sheets in half, walked across the front of the class, tossed them in the trashcan, looked at his watch, and tapping the face of his watch, announced to the class, "30 seconds left."

After 30 seconds, whether the students were finished producing or not, he told the class to share any points they wrote about. Steve volunteered first and said, “The brain is the organ, the mind is the consciousness.” LaToya said, “The mind is what we perceive we think and the brain is what we actually think.” Two other students read a sentence from what they wrote. There was no conversation, only recitation. Hank nodded at the students who read and moved on to cover some reminders about the attendance policy and pending due dates of assignments. The clock read 5:46 p.m.

In Hank’s class, “correct” writing gets a large chunk of instructional time. In an interesting shift, we see Hank move from a current-traditional-based DOL activity to journal writing in class. This activity is a common element in social-epistemic and expressivist-based classrooms that make space for informal writings that are not required to look like five-paragraph essays (although many of Steve and LaToya’s journal entries were in five-paragraph format). On the first day of class, Hank told his students that the journal is used for writing practice to help them become better writers, an activity he adopted from his high school English courses. Brannon et al. (2008) discussed the idea of a journal (or daybook) as a place for writing as a means of thinking, a messy junk drawer that provides space for thinking about ideas that can be developed, shared, saved, or abandoned.

However, Brannon et al.’s (2008) philosophy does require that the journal be connected to other writings students are doing in order to be a space for thinking. In Hank’s class, students are asked to answer a timed in-class prompt that does not relate to further writings; instead, it is writing meant to fill up pages and count as work produced—counted as a “completion grade” according to the syllabus. The journal

writing also serves another purpose. It keeps the workers (students) quiet and on a task while the supervisor (Hank) is able to get his own work done; he marks attendance. Given his workload of four classes (a common workload for many part-time teachers), this ability to multitask decreases his out-of-class homework. The journal writing, then, is a classroom management device to control the classroom as students perform the correct role by keeping quiet and producing their timed writing before the next activity, discussion.

Recite and regurgitate. The discussion activity highlights dispensing and regurgitation via the authority of the textbook, a common feature in banking-model classrooms. Hank told the students to take out their notebooks, and they resumed last class's discussion about argument. He asked them, "What is the purpose of an argument class?" A student replied, "The purpose of an argument class is to make you a better arguer." Another student said, "It can help you understand a concept better." Hank asked how being a better arguer and understanding concepts leads to the skill of arguing better. Several students contributed answers: LaToya said, "You don't sound stupid." Steve said it shows you "how to argue in a more formal environment." None of these responses from the students got more than a nod from Hank, and nothing is written on the board or recorded in any student notebooks.

Hank asked them to take out their textbook and tell him how the book describes the categories of argument. The same core participating students regurgitated the information back to him, word-for-word from the chapter: persuasion, argument, and dispute. Hank praised, nodded, and affirmed the answers as correct and wrote their answers on the board under the headers: persuasion, argument, and dispute. In typical

banking-model fashion, these listed categories and their presence on the board (in contrast to their prior contributions about argument) are perceived as important because many of the students copy down in their notebooks what Hank writes on the board. If the answer matches the textbook's definition, it gets written on the board and shown value by Hank. The students recognize this position of value and copy the information. As the clock approaches 6:15 p.m., the students began to shuffle their belongings into their bags and pull on their coats. Hank's voice, louder than the packing noise, told them that their homework was to watch television commercials, looking for the types of appeals within them and being prepared to talk about them in class next week. He told the students to have a good night as they filed out, turned on their cell phones, and tossed out their Chick-fil-A bags and Starbucks cups into the trashcan at the door.

Hank's banking-inspired discussion is emblematic of how the textbook has the authority, the correct answer, the preferred objective presentation, and the right approach; the students' contributions are not rewarded in the same manner as the regurgitated textbook answers. The very questions concerning argument that Hank asks come from the textbook's headers and content. Hank asks students to perform in discussion "according to the textbook" or "how the book" responds. The authority of the textbook as knowledge, as opposed to Hank or his students having potential knowledge, is another feature of Hank's course, a common element of a first-year writing classroom with a privatized curriculum.

The privatized curriculum, as represented here by the textbook, has center stage and presence on the board in the classroom space, and the personal (or alternative) responses students (or Hank) give do not receive the same treatment. The right answer is

the textbook's answer. The dominance of the textbook squeezes out the potential space for students' (and Hank's) understandings of argument. The textbook directs the gaze of the classroom; it tells both the students and the teacher what writing is. One reason for this dominance is the modernist perspective of objectivity and the need for neutrality. Brannon et al. (in press) explores the concept of objectivity and the commodified role of the teacher and student:

> One consequence of privatization that teachers of writing must face is increasing pressure to create classroom spaces that 'privatize' all signs of their agency as co-creators (along with students) of knowledge and learning. Instead, teachers are represented as 'objective' (or in other words, commodified) delivery systems for the 'neutral' receptacles that are students. Privatization demands that our choices, our perspectives, and our experiences be erased so as not to 'bias' the more 'objective' authoritative voices presented within textbooks, media, and program curricula. Such curricula emphasize forms, mechanics and grammar as neutral 'skills' and 'tools' for students to acquire.

Because the teacher is expected to be objective and neutral, the writing teacher is expected to deliver the curriculum (the product), via an objective textbook, that squashes the potential space for co-creating new and other knowledge for both students and teacher. This curriculum matches the banking approach to class as the students (and teacher) are not imagined as having relevant information—instead in this case, it is a one-way direction from the textbook (the boss) to the class (the workers).

Globalization's influences via a modernist university perspective can also be observed in the second site of writing in this study, the writing center. First I discuss how

the writing center can be a site of modernist preoccupations. Then I profile two narratives of tutoring at the writing center, one for Steve and one for LaToya, to provide examples of how their ideas of what it means to be a writer are constructed within this space and the interaction with their writing center tutors, Philip and Joanne.

Modernist Ideas of Writing

A common modernist perception of the writing center presents the space as a place that helps the Other become more like Us. One way the Other becomes more like Us is through a prevailing literacy practice based on an autonomous model with a goal of assimilation or as Spring (2004) said, deculturalization. According to Grimm (1999), the autonomous model of literacy is represented as "culturally neutral, individually acquired, context-free skill" (p. 30) and was used as a marker of literacy, worthy of value in the Western culture. These are the skills Hank's class emphasizes through DOL and paper production. This perspective comes from the modernist belief in individual responsibility and meritocracy, and it is presented as neutral and objective; skills attainable through hard work.

Grimm (1999) also reminded us that writing centers can be "normalizing agents" (p. xvii) that continue the modernist agenda of making the Other more like Us. In this case, the tutors are the authorities that dispense the knowledge to the passive Others, the students, to help them gain the skills and written appearance to merge seamlessly into the university. The writing center, then, requires similar banking model-based classroom rules; there is an authoritative source who knows and dispenses, and the students passively receive the wisdom of their tutors. In a modernist writing center, like Hank's modernist-based privatized classroom, the student is not constructed as having any

knowledge to contribute, and the tutoring session is one-way in its dispensation of brilliance.

Within the context of Stonie's writing center, new tutors like Philip and Joanne arrive fairly steeped in traditional modernist views of individual responsibility and meritocracy. Grimm (1999) indicated that these modernist concepts are based in the westernized focus on the individual's duty to better herself through autonomous hard work that provides onlookers (or evaluators) with a means to ignore inequity and their own implications in that inequity. With this mindset, the student is easily at fault because she did not study enough as opposed to her potentially being silenced within a system that privileges some over others. Even if a writing center does not subscribe to a modernist philosophy, it takes much more than a few months (or even years) of working in a center to change a tutor's view of the enterprise of teaching writing. Most tutors have been apprenticed in the modernist institution because of their 16 years (or more) of experience as a student. Exploring Steve and LaToya's experiences in their writing center sessions illustrates Grimm's (1999) theories in action.

The Writing Center for Steve

The glass door to the writing center's large suite was heavy; most of the time it required two hands to get it open, and it would hit the entering person as it shut. The writing center was housed on the same floor as, but not within, the English department. This building also was the campus center for academic support services; besides the writing center, students could also find disability services and the university learning center (tutoring for other subjects besides writing, such as math). This placement of the writing center with support services (common at many universities) helps contribute to

the representation of the writing center as a service station for students who need help, reinforcing the banking idea of passive receivers who journey to the tutors to get help with academic literacy practices.

All of the writing center sessions started at the top of the hour, and at nearly 11:00 a.m. on a Monday as Steve entered, the center was busy and noisy, and the waiting room's two purple couches and office chairs were full of students waiting to be fetched by their tutor and whisked back to where the tutoring occurred in a different room. Movement is dictated by the tutor, and the student must wait on the tutor's action. Some of the students were wearing headphones and typing frantically on their laptops, while others looked nervous as they clutched their papers with remnants of their teachers' comments (e.g., "run don't walk to the writing center [sic]") scrawled across the pages. One student sat quietly at the edge of her seat, sipping on a mocha cappuccino from the coffee shop on the lower level of the building. Two students from the same class were talking animatedly, comparing the grades on their papers.

There were some students there on referral, which was a contract-based system between the student, the teacher, and the writing center. This system required students to attend writing center session, and their teachers often factored their writing center attendance (which tutors report to the teacher) into a course grade. Here the student was required to attend because her performance in class was deemed insufficient, so the weekly referral appointment was supposed to fix this performance. This system contributes to the representation of the center as a service entity for students to follow their professor's directions to do extra work to get a correct performance by the end of the semester.

Steve walked up to the reception desk, a large, old, chipped wooden structure with a computer and a phone, staffed by at least one or two work study students who took his information to check him in on the paper schedule. He quietly announced his name, looking down at his shoes. Much like a doctor's office, students need to make an appointment to see a specialist. The work study student smiled at him and nodded as she checked his name on the schedule. The phone rang repeatedly as work study students greeted callers ("Thank you for calling the Writing Center, this is Erika. How can I help you?) and made appointments. There were three other private inner offices in this front waiting area, and phone conversations and laughter echoed out of these busy inner offices and combined with the general noise of this small front area. Steve and his full backpack leaned against the white cement wall with its purple trim. He waited silently, amongst the other students, for the clock to read 11:00 a.m., the time of his appointment with his specialist.

Meet your tutor. At 11:00 a.m. promptly, multiple tutors—the experts—almost magically appeared in the waiting room to call out the names of the students they were going to work with for the next 50 minutes. Most of the tutors were dressed in casual clothes—jeans and t-shirts—with wild hair; all but two of them are students after all. Steve's tutor, Philip, sauntered up the hall a few minutes after 11:00 a.m. in a ripped t-shirt and jeans. He was covered in tattoos and had unique facial hair. His iPod headphones hung off his neck. Steve had worked with Philip for several sessions, so he knew this was a normal look for Philip. He retrieved Steve by motioning for Steve to follow him down a long narrow hallway, passing a conference room and a kitchen area to the tutoring space, an area big enough to hold 10 computer-based workstations along with

three computer-less tables, with a wall full of windows and some bookcases sporting a mixture of fake and live plants along with multiple shelves of books. There were writing handbooks and reference materials, such as APA handbooks, and there were no non-reference or textbook-type books present. This choice of visible books reinforces and inscribes the autonomous literacy model—only official, correct, standardized English writing materials have a place in the writing center. It is business only, and the space is set up for one-on-one consulting, a mini-version of a classroom with straight-backed formal office chairs and desks.

Many of the workstations were separated by a single, multiple-colored cubicle wall, but they remained essentially open to the room. There was also another private inner office in this area, with a small shaded window that enabled the person inside the office to look out into the tutoring space or to listen, unseen, to the workers in the center, much like a factory boss. A door to the outer hallway was here as well, so students did not have to walk back through the narrow hallway to the front waiting room to leave the center.

By the time Philip and Steve arrived at the tutoring space, some of the other tutoring sessions had begun, and students and tutors were sitting close together, huddled over a paper in between them. Voices of students reading their own papers filled the room, along with questions tutors ask, such as “What do you want to work on today?” This is a common opening question, heralded by many tutoring textbooks and manuals as being non-directive and student-centered. However, according to Grimm (1999), this approach is guided by notions of individual responsibility, a modernist preoccupation. The student, in this case, is required to know upfront and identify goals of a session. The

tutor will not do work for someone else, so it is the job of the student to arrive prepared. This also indicates a linear idea of progress, another modernist preoccupation. The student and the tutor set a goal, and much like a business meeting, they go about attaining it, having made progress by making their goal. However, they have perhaps missed out on the potential of what might have occurred without a scripted focus that governs a session's content.

During sessions, tutors reached for APA and grammar manuals from the stack of reference or textbooks at each station. Some students pulled up class web pages on their laptops to further illustrate their assignment's requirements and contexts. The writing center is swarming with writing governed by classroom curricula; the class's paper directs the conversations, motivating the student to get a better grade in a class or meeting a professor's requirement to "run" to the writing center. Steve's session was no exception. Philip and Steve sat down at one of the tutoring stations with a computer, the one farthest from the doors, and Steve flung his backpack onto the floor next to his chair on wheels and pulled out a few sheets of paper and a pen in expectation of recording his tutor's wisdom. Philip leaned back in his chair, stretched his tattooed arms over his head and asked Steve, "Hey dude, what did you bring to work on today?"

Answer my questions. In response to Philip's traditional opening question, Steve said he brought work for his second paper for his English 2 class, so they settled down to focus their attention on the assignment. Steve slid his paper across the desk to Philip, took out a pen, and perched over his blank loose-leaf paper, but Philip ignored the paper, turned his face away from the desk, folded his hands in his lap, and looked Steve directly in the eyes. He told Steve, "Man, you know I don't write on papers." This is another

common directive in writing center literature that Grimm (1999) associated with modernist ideas of individual responsibility. In this case, Philip refuses to co-create with Steve on a piece of writing because Steve must complete that activity on his own, the solitary writer. To co-create would be to perhaps to plagiarize (Steve claiming Philip's words) in a modernist interpretation on the act of writing with individual responsibility.

After rebuking Steve for his actions, Philip asked Steve to describe the assignment in his own words first. Steve fumbled around, looking at the assignment sheet and mumbling about the requirements Hank placed upon the paper, like page length or source usage. Steve said that this paper was about a fictional conversation he was supposed to have over dinner with one of his relatives. The conversation was supposed to be about an essay the participants had read; in this case, the essay is by Orwell, and Steve had picked his father as the other participant at the dinner table. Steve indicated he chose the Orwell piece because he had already read it in high school.

After Philip gained a sense of the requirements, he asked Steve to talk through his plans for finishing the rest of the paper, asking questions to clarify the content, like "Why would you say that?" or "What do you mean by differences of opinion in abstract versus literal terms?" Steve attempted to answer each of Philip's questions, taking notes or pointing to places in the paper with his finger. Steve asked no questions but instead remained as a passive receiver of information. Philip asked Steve to take him on a tour of his paper to get a sense of the content. Steve pulled the paper in front of him and pointed at each paragraph, summarizing its content. They talked about how to punctuate dialogue correctly but not why one follows the conventions. Over their talk, the talk and occasional laughter of six other tutoring sessions going on immediately next to them in

the tutoring center grows ever louder. Steve looked around in annoyance at some of the loud talkers and the occasional cell phone blaring out a funky dance tune.

After 30 minutes, Steve softly said he would like to go back to his apartment to work in the quiet. Philip suggested making an appointment for the next day at a time when the writing center was less crowded to review what Steve produced, based on Philip's comments. They began to pack up the tutoring station area. Steve shoved his unmarked paper back in his full backpack and shuffled up the narrow hallway behind Philip past the conference room and the inner offices to the front waiting area with one hand in his pocket. They decided to make another appointment for the next day, and they continued to chat idly as the work study student set up his next appointment. She gave Steve an appointment reminder card, much like a reminder card from a dentist's office. Steve waved at Philip and walked out of the center, the glass door hitting him on his backpack as he departed. Steve walked past the disability services office and the sign for the academic tutoring office one floor up as he exited the building into the cool winter air, headed to his apartment to continue to work on his draft over lunch.

The Writing Center for LaToya

The other focal student of the study, LaToya, had a session at a radically different setting in the writing center. Stonie's writing center offered over 200 sessions a week in an attempt to service traditional and nontraditional students, many who are required to attend, so there were sessions late at night and on the weekends. LaToya walked into the writing center a few minutes before 7:00 p.m. on a Tuesday, the time of her tutoring session. It was late, but it is the only appointment that is open at such short notice; she had made the appointment a few hours before and it fit into her work and class schedule.

She stood in what reminded her of a doctor's office waiting room, unsure of what to do. There was no one at the reception desk; there was no one on any of the purple couches or chairs in the room, and all the doors to the inner offices she could see were closed. She peered down a narrow hall that seemed to lead to a large room that had lights on, but she was not sure if she was allowed back there. A man in a suit wearing a Bluetooth in his ear and carrying a briefcase while clutching a few pieces of paper with typed text on them opened the heavy door and entered the center. At Stonie, nontraditional students were common; the university was near a large banking and executive community who frequently returned to school for additional degrees. The two students, both working and attending school, looked at each other, not knowing what to do. A sign on the reception desk said, "Ring bell for service." Wincing in anticipation, LaToya watched as he tapped the bell, and DING, it rang out.

We are short-staffed. LaToya heard footsteps coming, and a woman with dark hair in a t-shirt and jeans appeared, looking a bit flustered. "Yes?" she asked. The man in the suit said, "I have an appointment at 7." LaToya said meekly, "Me too." The tutor walked behind the reception area's large wooden desk, made some notes on a large paper sheet, and said, "Your tutors will be up here in a minute to get you. Have a seat and relax on the couch. We only have two people working on Tuesday nights." Most of the writing center tutors were required by their graduate teaching assistant contract to work 20 hours per week, but the late night shifts were rarely first choices. The phone rang, but the dark-haired woman waved her hand at it and ignored it, mumbling something about voicemail. LaToya sank down onto one of the purple couches and leaned her head back onto the

edge of the couch; she had not slept much the night before and dozed off immediately. The woman walked quickly back down the narrow hall out of sight.

Working girls. A few minutes later, LaToya was woken up when she heard her name spoken by her tutor, a slender, tall girl with long, straight brown hair who said her name was Joanne. She stuck her hand out to LaToya, who shook it as she struggled up off the squishy couch and grabbed her backpack with the other hand. The man in the suit still waited for his tutor. Much like Steve's experience, LaToya was led back into the tutoring space, past the conference room and inner offices. It was dark outside, so the wall of windows reflected the harsh florescent lighting overhead. The girl who met her at the front desk was sitting in front of a computer screen with her iPod on, her back to them, typing furiously on a word document. No one else was in the room; it made the tutoring room look enormous in its emptiness.

LaToya and Joanne went to a space divided by two cubicle walls, which almost made a private little room of its own within the tutoring room. LaToya smiled at the sight of a vase full of fake, bright yellow flowers that was sitting on the top shelf of a bookcase next to reference texts and a box of tissues. Joanne sat in front of the computer and LaToya sat next to her. Once seated, LaToya pulled out her paper and the accompanying assignment sheet and her textbook. She pushed all these documents in front of Joanne who slid them back towards the middle of them. Like Philip, Joanne is enacting a hands-off philosophy of avoiding appropriation of a student's work because for Joanne, it is LaToya's responsibility. LaToya heard the other tutor sigh loudly, push her chair back, and leave the room to get the man in the suit. She heard the tutor greet him, and then LaToya also heard the tutor lock the front door of the center.

The Hank-approved tutor. Joanne turned her chair towards LaToya and asked her to talk about the class she was in, who the teacher was, and what she brought to work on that evening. LaToya pulled out her syllabus and pointed to Hank's name on the page. She then pushed the assignment sheet toward Joanne, telling her that she brought in her paper for Joanne to edit and look over to be sure it was right for the assignment. This request is common in writing centers as historically, writing centers had been labs, created to supplement weak writers in composition classes. They are usually called labs or clinics, and this repair-shop stereotype still remains, often reinforced by teachers who tell students to get their work edited at the writing center before submission. Some teachers at Stonie will not accept work before a student goes to the writing center first. LaToya leaned back in her chair and continued to tell Joanne that she wanted to be sure that she was doing the paper right so that she would get a good grade in the class. She said she needed to get a good grade. Joanne nodded at LaToya, told her that she did not edit papers in the writing center, and asked her to explain the assignment in her own words.

LaToya looked down at the assignment sheet for assistance and explained that she was supposed to pick between two topics and write without the use of outside sources about why she agreed or disagreed with one of the topics. "It's right here," she said, "on the assignment sheet." Many students equate writing to production and following directions, so LaToya is presenting a popular thought, "Why is her interpretation needed?" A common result of the banking method is that the student is constructed as not having knowledge to contribute, so LaToya would not have a need to explain in her own words; the assignment sheet is the authority and only voice on the topic.

LaToya's topic was smoking in public places, and she explained to Joanne that her three supporting reasons were related to health concerns, politeness, and space issues as to why it should not be allowed in public places. Her organizational scheme, a common choice for first-year writing students especially, reflects the five-paragraph format, and this is often the only idea of writing students have at this point. Joanne probed further with her questions, asking LaToya what she thought about the paper. She asked LaToya about the process she went through to produce this draft. LaToya said she just needed to know if she were doing it right but that she did it in one sitting yesterday in her dorm room. This single-shot process is another common practice seen in the writing center, reinforced by the testing establishment's timed writing prompts that portray writing as a one-shot production. As they continued the session, it became quiet in the tutoring center—the other session was just producing clicking noises on the keyboard. LaToya whispered her responses to Joanne's questions.

Joanne asked LaToya to read the paper aloud, and Joanne listened to her quiet voice and read along silently with her. They discussed several sentence-level issues, including changes from Black English Vernacular (BEV) to Standard American English (SAE). There were no discussions about why she should make the changes, only that they were represented as errors that need to be fixed. Joanne indicated that LaToya seemed to have covered the requirements of the assignment. LaToya appeared satisfied with this pronouncement and said, "Okay, I guess I'll make another appointment later on when the next paper comes up." Joanne asked if there is anything else she would like to discuss, any other work for a different class, or any preliminary thinking she had done on other work in the class, but LaToya said that this was all she needed, and she packed up her

materials. She adjusted her backpack on her back and walked out the deserted building with most of its lights now off at 8:00 p.m.

Make Us "Right"

For the writing center, the purpose of the autonomous literacy model is to be a provider of neutral skills to help deficit students (Others) maneuver in the institution, illustrating Grimm's (1999) description of a "modernist narrative of education as progressive and liberating" (p. 12). This is a noble idea; the provider is a savior to students like LaToya, who is labeled as deficit in writing because she is not as skilled as her tutor (or her teacher). As the narrative highlights, LaToya uses the word "right" multiple times and is focused on being "correct." Her perceived idea of the writing center's purpose is to use the writing center (and her tutor) to help her get closer to right by becoming assimilated through the corrections that are administered by her tutor. LaToya is becoming inscribed through the discipline enacted through her trainer, the tutor.

The writing center is a service station for deficit writers who must, through meritocracy and individual responsibility, journey towards what Freire (1994) called an "adaptation (assimilation, aborption)" to the dominant culture's so-called autonomous literacy model (as cited in Halasek, 1999, p. 172). This adaptation plays out over and over again as students learn to silence and erase their differences to become colonized. Halasek (1999) informed us that the "master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (p. 173), and so the cycle continues. Instead of challenging "the discourse to adapt to students" (Halasek, 1999, p. 174), students are asked to adapt and be responsible for figuring out how to erase their differences.

Grimm (1999) indicated that writing centers, first-year writing classrooms, tutors, teachers, and students all can become players of the blame game. She said the "blaming mechanism is deeply connected to the modernist belief in individual responsibility (p. 11). Many common writing center practices, taught during new tutor training and illustrated in the narratives, such as not writing on the paper or not editing, illustrate this modernist focus. Within this mindset, it is easy to place responsibility outside ourselves, and blame becomes a common reaction "because it protects us from examining our own implications in a problem" (p. 11). Here tutors are taught to place blame on students when they wait too long to attend a session or when they do not have enough work completed, and then tutor comments may reflect a need to work harder, or longer, to get the writing "right." Students are asked to return for another session after doing more work.

Instead of a "successful" tutoring session focusing on critiquing the autonomous literacy model, or confronting it by putting it in play as a viable topic, talk focuses on working harder to get the writing "right" according to the professor's requirements. The reason talk focuses on the "right" is because in the modernist university, the writing center is a space for repairs, for service. The space within a tutoring session becomes focused on a "right" production, as in LaToya's example, within an autonomous model, and as the narrative examples show, the space lacks critique or "questioning of academic pretensions" and narrows us to "monocultural views" (Grimm, 1999, p. 11). And while tutors, like Philip, may listen to complaining about the system (or model), they still direct discussion to "right" performance as opposed to exploring the "why" behind a "right" performance. Philip does not question the why because it is not part of his job. The job

(or work) of a tutor in a modernist university is not to question but to help and provide service.

This lack of engagement with the power of hegemonic elements, such as autonomous literacy models, puts the job (or work) of the tutor into what Kohl described as a secret contract with the university. According to Kohl, we become secretly contracted with the institution when we do not make visible the hegemonic motivations behind policies, curriculum, or even notions of "correct" writing. By remaining quiet, and thus becoming the institution's partner, we engage with the institution in a perverse secret contract that allows students to continue to remain blissfully ignorant of the politics behind power structures that continue to dominate and control.

Writing center directors who uncritically advance the institution's hegemonic elements engage as well in this secret contract. Tutors are trained to respond in ways illustrated in these narratives. Sessions focus on transmitting "right" writing. There is no exploring of "why" a student might need to write "right." Because there is little negotiation during sessions on the purposes behind these occasions for writing, these tutors take up uncritically hegemonic practices and become agents of the disciplining institution.

Further Chapters

Chapters five and six use case study methodology to explore how the two focal students, LaToya and Steve, negotiate the different ideas of writing presented within these contextualized sites of writing: the first-year writing classroom and the Writing Center. Critical Discourse Analysis (Gee 2005) will be used to explore and identify how

LaToya and Steve use language to construct their identities as writers (and students) within these sites.

CHAPTER 5: LATOYA: I MUST WRITE RIGHT

Latoya, a 19-year-old freshman originally from Jamaica, has to navigate the rhetorical demands of the college writing classroom and the Writing Center at Stonie University. Outside of the world of school at Stonie, LaToya's personal interests included poetry, drawing, and a fierce devotion to her family. She loved her younger brother and sister, but LaToya had an especially deep commitment to her mother. Her mother called LaToya "her right hand." LaToya's mother brought the family from Jamaica to New Jersey so that they could have "equal rights as Americans." She said that her mother has done so "much for her children" and LaToya wanted to one day be able "to give back to her like she's given to me."

LaToya had a passion for social justice, and in high school, she, along with the larger majority of African American students, participated in a protest to resist the school's tracking practices that segregated minority students into "low" level or regular classes where their White counterparts were in honors or college-bound classes. LaToya wanted to be in the college-bound classes because she wanted to continue her education. Doing well in school was important for LaToya, as her family valued education as the means for social advancement. With her family's input, she settled on science as a major with the choice of medicine (pediatrics) or chemistry as a career path. She chose to come to Stonie because it was close to home and her family thought the university would be "it" for her.

A Closer Look at LaToya as a Writer

Looking at LaToya's discussions of writing illustrates what it means to be a writer at the two sites of writing at Stonie. In our first interview (see Appendix G), I talked with her about herself and how she represents the ideas of writing both in English 2 as well as past experiences in school. These discussions highlight ideologies working within her representations of writing and the teaching of writing. The discussions also illustrate how LaToya constructs what it means to be a student and to be a writer. I asked LaToya, "What does it mean to be a writer?" to listen to how she presents this identity. Here was the conversation:

> LaToya: To be a writer is to successfully get your thoughts expressed on paper. But in a structured and organized way. And have it be interesting so the reader wants to read it. I think that if you can have your reader to ask questions, like questions of interest, it is cool it shows that you—what you wrote was really effective.
>
> JPC: Would you ever say that you were a writer?
>
> LaToya: No. I don't like English, but I think it is only because of my experiences in high school, but not exactly.

A closer examination of LaToya's language reveals what being a writer means to LaToya. Using Gee's critical discourse analysis, I have broken the above excerpt from her interview into an 11-line stanza.

Stanza One: What is a Successful Writer?

1 To be a writer is to successfully get your thoughts expressed on paper.

2 But in a structured and organized way.

3 And have it be interesting so the reader wants to read it.

4 I think that if you can have your reader to ask questions,

5 like questions of interest,

6 it is cool

7 it shows that you—

8 what you wrote was really effective."

[JPC: "Would you ever say that you were a writer?"]

9 No. I don't like English,

10 but I think it is only because of my experiences in high school,

11 but not exactly.

Throughout this stanza, LaToya represents what it means to be a writer, a construct which excludes LaToya. She begins explaining what a writer is without situating herself within the discourse. In lines 1-3 she doesn't use the pronoun "I," but rather moves to the generic "you." Within the stanza she places herself outside her understandings of what a writer is and thereby presents no version of herself as meeting her own writerly qualities. She does not place herself in the position of subject or object within her construction.

The experience of being a writer ("get your thoughts" on the page and be "structured…organized" and "interesting") is represented through LaToya's language as tasks and qualities of appearance—it has to look right. It is a formalist rendering of

writing as opposed to a constructivist understanding that allows the student to have agency in her rhetorical choices. In response to the question, “What does it mean to be a writer,” LaToya gives her understanding of the term, writer. In line 1, she indicates that a writer is someone who “get[s] thoughts” on paper in particular ways. So the writer for LaToya is a producer of “structured and organized” material on the page. Writing is about “thoughts expressed on paper” and what the reader wants is “successful” or “structured and organized.” Writing (and ultimately being a writer) is a performance to be completed by someone, not LaToya in this case, and originating for a purpose predetermined by an unnamed reader.

LaToya makes it clear to her interlocuter that she has an understanding of what writing is supposed to be like at school in comparison to her own personal views of writing. She does this by speaking in two different registers—a register of the textbook that she presumes her interlocuter, a writing teacher, will agree with (“successfully get your thoughts expressed”) and a register of a 19-year-old college student (“it is cool”). In her former register, she states back an answer—objectively, like a fact from a textbook—without her as a subject to personalize it, as if this concept of “writer” can be recited back (e.g., line 1: “to be a writer is” X.).

In line 4, she shifts to a personal register that reflects her 19-year-old college student voice as she tells us that it would be “cool” if a reader would ask questions of interest. LaToya’s use of “cool” establishes a relationship with the interviewer by drawing attention to her position as a student. When cool is juxtaposed to the textbook register of her prior statement, LaToya performs the role of knowledgeable student by bringing her student identity into relationship with her knowledge of writing (albeit as an

outsider). She simultaneously performs a contradictory move by both hedging her best by saying “I think,” understood as a tentative marker, and declaring what she knows (“I think”). However, at line 8, she interrupts her thinking in the 19-year-old college student register and returns to textbook register concerning what counts as effective written work, again stating through this register change that she does not find herself within this description of a writer. This attitude is confirmed in lines 10-12 when she indicates she is not a writer by her own admission. She privileges textbookish language and formalist descriptions of writing (successful, structured, organized).

Only twice in the excerpt does she place herself in the subject, or actor, position in a clause. The first time is when she breaks out of her textbook register to briefly talk about what was “cool” in terms of a response from a reader (lines 4-6), but this position is quickly censored by a return to an objective person-less register in line 8. Her second actor moment occurs in line 10 when she indicates she is not a writer and provides reasons why (lines 10-12: she doesn’t “like English” because of her “high school” experiences “but not exactly”). At first she ascribes the reason she does not like English to her “high school” experiences, but the following clause, “but not exactly” reverses what she just said. Not only do high school experiences explain why LaToya does not like English, but she also attributes it to something else not named.

For LaToya, a writer’s identity is linked to performance and the discipline of English, and she is not a writer—a writer is not something a person is, but rather something a person does. There is little potential for agency here, only passive disciplined production of product. Doing is what LaToya associates with writing and being a student, and this representation of writing limits potential for student agency

because the work is governed by someone else. Her conception of writer/writing as "doing" is brought into the first-year writing class and the writing center. This conception is also consistent with LaToya's understanding of what doing well in school entails: doing well on tests, getting into college-bound classes, and making good grades. The writer-as-doer conception is reinforced in her English 2 classroom and remains impermeable in the writing center.

LaToya's Writing in English 2: Doing School

The writing, or artifacts, from the figured world of the English 2 classroom provide evidence of how LaToya performed writing. These documents illustrate how LaToya understands the discourses of the first-year writing course, and they show how she maneuvers within the course's requirements. The writing in LaToya's English 2 course included several formal essay assignments as well as in-class and out-of-class journal assignments (see Appendix E for the syllabus descriptions). The final version of her first paper (assignment found in Appendix F and the outline is in Appendix K), six paragraphs long, enacts a typical "five-paragraph structure."

This five-paragraph structure is a formalist construct of writing that generally has five paragraphs total. The opening paragraph has an attention-getting statement and a thesis statement with three points. Each point then corresponds to a body paragraph, and then the essay wraps up with a concluding paragraph that includes no new information but repeats the three points and the thesis statement. Often paragraphs must contain five sentences and sentences should contain a certain number of words. Students simply place information into the required spaces. There are modifications, including the adding in of

counterarguments or the stretching of points across several paragraphs; however, the overall structure of the three-pronged thesis is usually retained.

This formulaic (and outmoded) style of writing asks students to compose within a format, as opposed to allowing the work of forming to be completed without the constraints of a format. Connors (1990) indicated that working within a format requires the creation of artificial discourse structures and further points out that even in 1953, Kitzhaber had already claimed that these formats:

> represent an unrealistic view of the writing process, a view that assumes writing is done by formula and in a social vacuum. They turn the attention of both teacher and student toward an academic exercise instead of toward a meaningful act of communication in a social context. (as cited in Brannon et al., 2008, p. 16)

Yet still this formulaic approach to writing continues. For LaToya, who already categories writing as "doing," this production of writing that is predetermined in form only serves to reinforce this agent-less performance notion of writer identity. Writing continues to be an "academic exercise" that is divorced from meaning and is only about the production line. The effects of adopting this performance identity of writer lead her to produce a five-paragraph structured essay for the first paper due in Hank's course.

Looking at her outline first (in Appendix K), she has presented at this stage a seven-paragraph sketch of her paper that includes three major arguments with an introduction and closing paragraph. Her first paragraph provides a strategy for the attention getting statement and a thesis statement. The next paragraphs are labeled with terms such as "my first argument" and "counterargument," which name the purpose and

content of each paragraph, culminating in three arguments, two counterarguments, and a concluding section that restates the thesis.

In her movement from the outline to the final version of the paper, she transfers the same structure. In the opening paragraph of her paper, she states her thesis ("In my opinion, I think that cigarette smoking should not be allowed in public places because of its harmful effects it can have on another person"). Then she moves onto her main points to support her thesis that smoking should not be allowed in public places and then finishes up with a conclusion. One of her main points is extended across two paragraphs, but it is still a traditional "five-paragraph structure" that has three main points, an introduction, and a conclusion. She includes two counterarguments, reflective of typical content advice from argument textbooks. Her teacher rewards this performance in his typed end comment on the paper (typical for the responses she received on her assignments in the course, including general length of response and even opening comments, "Nice work here") that lacks many specific references to her work but instead could be a rubber-stamped commentary, applicable to just about any student's work in the course:

> LaToya,
>
> Nice work here. The essay meets the requirements throughout, and you do a nice job of emphasizing your points and observations.
>
> You write with a very clear voice, and that is definitely a positive point. My impression, though, is that your rhetoric comes across a bit harsh at times, and maybe a bit over-accusatory when talking about smokers and their behavior.

> While this is not necessarily negative, it is something that is worth being aware of since it will influence your reader's perception of you and your credibility.
>
> As to mechanics, there are a number of issues that warrant a bit of attention. The primary point is sentence punctuation, and there's [sic] a few spots where run-ons cause a bit of a distraction. This can be solved with more practice and revision techniques focused on the specific issue, all of which we will continue to discuss as the semester proceeds.
>
> Overall, a nice essay. Given your strong writing voice, I think the next assignment will be very enjoyable.

The commentary LaToya receives casts the writing in the English 2 course as person-less, responded to with a rubber-stamp one-size-fits-all commentary that illustrates how well LaToya can match a desired product—his product. The lack of text-specific commentary is common for current-traditional classrooms like Hank's that do not make space for students to develop their own ideas (Sommers, 1982; Straub, 1996). As Sommers (1982) indicated, this type of response takes students' attention "away from their own purposes in writing" (p. 149) and instead focuses attention upon the teacher's purposes. LaToya produces work for Hank (for a grade) by following his directions, or his purposes. She has been disciplined (she receives her performance evaluations in his end comments) that this performance, which she practices and can replicate, is what she is supposed to do.

LaToya's formal paper writing is not that uncommon in first-year writing; many students produce a five-paragraph-type paper because this format is reinforced through the writing students do and teachers assign in preparation for essay tests, classes, and

yearly assessments. LaToya performs writing in this format because it is what she knows, and it fits within the requirements of the assignment. Doing well in school is a value she has, and she would rather retake a course than perform lower than a C. She has plans of becoming a chemist or a pediatrician, so she knows that she needs high grades to meet this career goal.

The idea of "doing" school can be seen as helpful in moving LaToya towards her career aspirations. However, in order to reach these goals, she has to bracket off her "otherness" to conform to the discourse practices of academic writing and the dialect preferences of her teacher, i.e., Standard Written English. She also silences herself by subordinating her purposes for writing. Her desire to make the grade causes her to narrow her vision for what writing can be. The first-year writing program, the English 2 course, and the writing center (as argued later) also through the discourse practices they privilege sustain LaToya's narrow vision. Ironically, this same value system that underpinned the tracking practices in LaToya's high school about which she protested, underpin the sanctioned discourse practices of her classroom. Yes this similarity is invisible to LaToya.

The language practices within her first-year writing course are steeped with what Bourdieu (1993) named "symbolic violence." This concept can be seen as a de-culturalization of the student that de-values what is not within the dominant culture. It also removes student agency by treating the student as an object in the figured world of school. In the classroom, these violent practices include such actions as valuing one dialect for all writing occasions (SAE dialect) and a lack of student choice within writing, such as the removal of student-directed topic choices, format requirements for written

products, and content direction. This violence removes agency within writing and transforms writing classes into replication machines that train students to follow orders and to not question the teacher's (or trainer's or boss's) orders. These practices are not seen by LaToya in the way the tracking practices in high school were because she has internalized a powerful cultural trope: the bootstrap narrative.

The narrative is attributed to the Horatio Alger myth, made popular in the late 1800s through over 100 books portraying poor, down-on-their-luck characters who through perseverance and hard work (and good morals) attain success. These characters illustrate the myth of the American dream to model that anyone can rise from adversity. However, the reality is that Alger's characters are the exception, and while a few may move ahead, the majority actually falls further behind. The bootstrap narrative is powerful in American culture because it places all the responsibility for economic success on the individual. This narrative reinforces the act of "doing" whatever is necessary to continue on the path, such as LaToya's career path. Within this narrative, it does not matter if a person has a "natural" advantage or not, it only matters if she works hard. In fact, the more obstacles a person overcomes, the more prized her achievement becomes.

This narrative masks the basic injustice of distribution of social goods into the hands of the few, leaving others to struggle for what is left over. Inequity is not something visible because blame for inequity can be attributed to the individual. Elements of systemic racism, such as the dominance of a White upper middle class dialect in English classes and the de-valuing of any other dialects of English, are easy to overlook. Instead of noting the inequity, students are just asked to work harder, go to get

a tutor, drop the course, or just be content to receive lower grades. And the students are blamed if they do not succeed. The systemic racism is painted as "just the way things are." There is no space for questioning or challenging because the bootstrap trope becomes the narrative to live by. It is about performing. As evidenced by her interview data that highlights working hard for success, LaToya does not see the English 2 classroom (and the writing center) as sites of systemic racism. Instead these sites can quietly support and replicate language practices that close off the potential for LaToya to gain agency through her writing. Students are not constructed as equal and valuable contributors to a classroom; the teacher has the power and retains it through pedagogical authority, or the "right to impose" (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 13) legitimacy on the student's performance.

There is more to this, however, than just teacher-imposed legitimacy by Hank. The university itself actually controls and represents the values and purposes of writing. This control continues to perpetuate the idea that school is about following directions that someone else (usually outside the classroom) decides should be followed. Scott (2009), in his text, *Dangerous Writing: Understanding the Political Economy of Composition*, explores the commodification of higher education that presents (sells and validates) education as an "instructional delivery system" where LaToya is the "targeted consumer" (p. 109) of this system. The symbolic violence disguises itself through a narrowing of possibility that emphasizes following so-called "objective" direction and closing off student choice and purposes in writing. Scott (2009) indicates that "the creation of a space from which students might gain more critical and more strategic understandings of writing and themselves is discouraged by the everyday material processes of work and

production in many of today's postsecondary institutions" (p. 110). For LaToya, this translates into doing the work placed in front of her (by Hank, by the goals required in the first-year writing program, by the goals required/imposed by the university's values and critiques of the purposes of writing at the institution, and by the larger cultural narratives). LaToya internalizes this writer-as-doer to perform and believes that if she follows directions and produces the "right" work, she will overcome adversity through hard work and reach "success."

LaToya's journal entry about her first paper clearly summarizes her performance identity of writer-as-doer. She subordinates her purposes of writing to produce what she believes her teacher wants, based upon "his" guidelines. In her entry, she equates writing to following guidelines and turning work in time, work that was corrected by her writing center tutor:

> I was actually proud of my rough draft. I'm not saying it was good but I got it done on time. I actually followed the guidelines of my outline (something I never do). My papers always turn out to be completely different from my outlines. I feel that I had enough examples from life experience to support my thesis. Also, having a tutor helped me; she basically pointed out little mistakes that I missed. I am pretty confident about my paper.

Good writing for LaToya is work that was submitted "on time" and followed "guidelines." It also benefits from the removal of "little mistakes." In the case of the formal paper and her thinking about it, LaToya writes/values what Hank imposes (he chooses topics, formats, audiences) and what Hank confirms as legitimate (i.e. follow guidelines and correct grammar). And as Hank tells us in his interviews (see Appendix J),

he imposes assignments based upon his perceived understandings of how the first-year writing program constructs and "impose[s]" legitimacy on writing in English 2. He also imposes assignments based on similar prior understandings of what was considered legitimate from his experiences as a high school student. Writing legitimacy in this case is about getting it right, turning it in on time, and meeting the requirements. There is one way to write "right," and LaToya does not have any say in what "right" is. Her motivations to succeed and "be right" fit nicely within her construct of "doing" school in English 2. Her need to be "right" factors into her ideas of what a writing center is for and how it can be used.

"His" Assignments in the Writing Center

The final site of writing, the writing center, plays a role in LaToya's construction of writing (and being a student) at Stonie as she pursues her preparation for attaining a Bachelor of Science degree. Having a B.S. degree for LaToya means more than just knowledge of science; it also translates into economic success and pleasing her family. In *The Knowledge Factory,* Aronowitz (2000) saw the pursuit of higher education as not only the attainment of knowledge but more importantly the socialization into a set of dispositions that the B.S. degree "signifies." Those dispositions are those most desirable by employers who demand that prospective employees "can tolerate boredom and knows how to follow rules" (p. 10). Aronowitz indicated that these dispositions may be "the most important lesson in postsecondary education" (p. 10) because they are the desirable qualities for docile-bodied employees. LaToya's interviews and classroom activities illustrate that she is internalizing those dispositions because she knows that she needs a degree to reach her career goals, or as Aronowitz would say, "to play the job game" and

add to the university's mission of producing and distributing "human capital" (pp. 10-11). So LaToya plugs away at her work in Hank's class, trying to follow "his" rules, or "guidelines" as she likes to call them, and she tolerates seat time in class to "do" school and get a grade that is good enough to send her on her way. School is about discipline and following orders.

LaToya uses and views the writing center tutorials much in the same way. While much possibility can exist in the writing center tutorial, including opening up ideas of writing beyond "doing" school, LaToya represents the writing center in her journal and her interviews as a place to go to get her writing fixed up to or within the teacher's standards. In her first interview (see Appendix G), she indicated that her mother told her to go to get a writing tutor when she went to college:

> I didn't get good grades on any of my writing, and that was a discouragement to me. I didn't feel anyone was trying to help me do better at my writing. So my mom said to get a tutor when I came out here.

Writing centers are places for LaToya to receive help to "do better" at her writing. Therefore, LaToya focused much of the talk with her tutor, Joanne, around questions of correctness and Joanne's expertise as an evaluator of correctness. LaToya's views, exemplified in her journal excerpt, indicated that the tutor was helpful in repairing the "little mistakes" (what was not "right") in her writing.

This focus on correctness reduces Joanne's role as a tutor to a final stop on the production line for an inspection before the product is sent off out of the factory. A three-minute segment from a tutoring session between LaToya and Joanne highlights this emphasis on "right" performance; this session excerpt is typical of their sessions as

LaToya's emphasis on correctness was repeated in every session between the two. Tutoring sessions for LaToya did not venture into discussions of LaToya as a writer or explore the "why" behind writing instruction at the university; there was no place for this distraction on the assembly line.

A "Right" Production-Line Tutoring Session

1 LaToya: I'm not sure I'm doing it right.

2 Joanne: Okay, let me see the assignment.

[pause while Joanne reads it]

3 Joanne: Okay, I understand the assignment.

4 LaToya: I brought an outline that I did since last time.

5 Joanne: Well you can make paragraphs out of that outline.

6 LaToya: Let me show you my outline.

7 Joanne: What is the function of the first paragraph?

8 LaToya: Hank says it is to set up the scene. There are a lot of guidelines.

[They read the piece out loud, both murmuring the words at the same time.]

9 LaToya: Is this sentence right? [points to a sentence]

[Joanne reads the sentence out loud.]

10 Joanne: It sounds right.

11 LaToya: I just want it to be right.

Within three minutes, LaToya says "right" three times (line 1 "I'm not sure I'm doing it right"; line 9, "Is this sentence right"; line 11, "I just want it to be right"), illustrating her focus on doing her work for class right. And Joanne confirms this by inspecting the work and then indicating and judging that it is "right" in line 10: "It sounds right." For LaToya,

she does not concern herself with what she wants as a writer; instead, she tells us that her purpose in writing the assignment is in line 11, “to be right.” This implies that the writing is judged outside of her (by the teacher and confirmed by the tutor), and the aim is to follow the rules correctly.

LaToya’s language shows her lack of agency as she discusses her purposes for writing. In line 8, LaToya responds to Joanne’s question about the purpose of her first paragraph as: “Hank says it is to set up the scene. There are a lot of guidelines.” LaToya decreases her agency in this activity by placing Hank in the subject position of the statement; the activity belongs to Hank, and she is an object to his control. She produces a first paragraph that does what Hank wishes, and by doing so she subordinates her choices for what she imagines what Hank would like in the first paragraph. Rather than a dialogic relationship between a writer’s purpose and a reader’s needs, what LaToya is doing is subordinating her own purposes trying to construct the idealized text that is in Hank’s imagination.

LaToya in the Privatized Classroom, Writing Center, and First-Year Writing Program

LaToya’s experience in her English 2 course and the writing center tutorials illustrate that her writerly identity is about towing the line and following orders objectively. This notion of following orders is part of the modernist narrative of education that prepares students for the corporate life. LaToya’s experiences in class and the writing center illustrate that she associates “right” performance with progression towards her goal of becoming a pediatrician or chemist in her immigrant family’s pursuit of the American dream and “equal rights as Americans.”

Her classroom teacher conditions her to see that seat time and idealized products make for a good grade, which results in promotion. Her writing center tutor reinforces LaToya's correctness by responding to her questions as opposed to placing this need for correctness on the table for inquiry. And much of the composition and writing center literature supports this approach; the role of the teacher and tutor is to help the Other become more like Us (Grimm, 1999).

Grimm's (1999) discussion of the autonomous model of literacy (see chapter 4) and how it governs much literacy work and purpose, also illustrates what Hank, Joanne, and LaToya have internalized and reflected in their work together. The purpose of the English 2 course and writing center (and first-year writing program) grooms students to perform within such constraints as the autonomous model of literacy so they can be sent "out to the real world" to fulfill education's purpose of replicating the status quo (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). And while this for some may seem like a noble goal, and professes to be "culturally neutral and individually acquired" (Grimm, 1999, p. 30) through hard work, it devalues and strips students of their cultural identities and their abilities to question or to construct alternative worlds.

The normalizing and standardizing curriculum remains unquestioned within writing programs because marginalized part-time teachers and contract-based tutors do not necessarily see this as part of their role in the writing class. And it remains quiet and unseen as writing programs, teachers, tutors, and students rarely find it placed on the table for inquiry. Students like LaToya who have felt its impact can still easily fall in line, "tolerate boredom," and "follow rules" (Aronowitz, 2000, p. 10). Even as LaToya tries to move ahead she is at risk of failure. Even if she is rewarded, nothing is being done to

change the cultural standardizations that marginalize based on gender, class, or ethnicity within the figured worlds she is trying to enter. Even as she narrows her language and her possibilities and ideas to fit into the prefabricated forms, she still is at risk for failure.

Within the figured world of the English 2 classroom and the writing center (and the first-year writing program), it is not just that LaToya is learning to write to please her teacher, but that this moment is illustrative of the larger forces of LaToya learning to obey and please privatized forces within her first-year writing course. These forces constrict the potential of the public space of the classroom by restricting ideas to textbook canned answers, by controlling writing through formats, by rewarding "right" writing, and by implementing out-of-context grammar instruction that enforces SAE dialect and creates a privatized classroom and writing center. It encourages students to remain as objects within a system that is presented as unchangeable. And the writing program that oversees and partners with and through the writing teacher and the writing center tutor will continue to churn out product ("Nice work here" and "It sounds right.") for the boss.

Over the 15 weeks studied her, LaToya did quietly fall in line within the constraints and training of her modernistic privatized English 2 classroom and writing center. Her focus was on being a good student, pleasing her mother, and moving ahead in her career. And the writing program allowed her to meet with that success, though the long-term outcomes of this strategy remain unclear. Over the same 15-week term, she began to realize that she had to change her major from pre-med to chemistry because she was having difficulty in her science classes. When LaToya has difficulty, she drops the course and tries again another term, so instead of progressing, she was moving backwards because she was not meeting with the same success in her science courses that she was in

her English classes. She knew it might take her three or more tries to get a C or better in the pre-med courses. LaToya's "success" in her first-year writing course did not translate into "success" or adaptability in the larger university.

In chapter 6, LaToya's classmate Steve also navigates the spaces of the English 2 classroom, the first-year writing program, and writing center, and his negotiations within these sites result in a different engagement with these forces.

CHAPTER 6: STEVE: FROM THE EXACTNESS OF THE ENGINEER TO FREEDOM WRITER

Steve, a 19-year old freshman originally from Connecticut, navigates the first-year writing class and the writing center and illustrates what it means to be a writer at Stonie. He was an only child from a two-parent household who moved to the wealthy suburbs around Stonie a few years ago. Steve's father was an engineer and helped to guide his son into choosing engineering for a major upon entry to Stonie. His mother worked as a teacher for several years. His upper middle class home closely mirrored the activities found at school, and there was much parental involvement in Steve's education when he was growing up. For example, the only programs he was permitted to watch were programs like the Discovery Channel or *Sesame Street* when he was younger, and there was specific time set aside for homework, monitored by his father. Indeed, if Steve's homework was not correct on the first try, his father would "crumple it up" and make him start over (see the sample CDA in chapter 3 for more of Steve's discussion of this experience). A traditional view of correctness was expected on his first attempt, and SAE dialect was utilized at all times in his home.

Steve characterized his high school experiences in the suburbs around Stonie as intensely focused on testing and overall "easy" to get through. Even though school may have come easily for Steve, he was frequently in "trouble" and classified himself in his first interview as "a trouble student." This constant-trouble-status transferred into low

grades and frequent disciplinary actions, causing Steve to go to Stonie because, according to him, he did not have any other choices.

Steve's case study illustrates how the writing program (the first-year course and the writing center) both enables and constrains the possibilities for Steve as a writer. When he entered the university, he had a very narrow view of what writing was. In fact, when I asked him at the beginning of the study (see Appendix H for the entire transcript) if he considered himself as a writer, he replied, "Only when I'm writing something." In this interview, Steve explained that he does not take on the identity of a writer unless he is producing "something" that his teacher came "up with," presumably for a grade. It is only in the act of producing the right text on the page that he assumed the label of a writer. At the beginning of the study, a writer, for Steve, was about correct production, as given by his teacher, as opposed to other activities, such as learning, thinking, developing, or abandoning ideas.

Towards the end of the study, Steve had changed his major, was actively writing short stories and journal entries under the tutelage of his writing center tutor Philip, and called himself a "creative writer" (see Appendix I for entire transcript). These actions indicate a potential shift in his view of what writing could be. Steve has added to his view of writing; it is about doing school, but it is also about potential freedom that allows him to think about his life. These conflicting views of writing are what make Steve an interesting case to study. Writing for Steve is performing, but it is also about composing his purposes and needs/uses for writing.

Steve the Recycling Center

In order to understand Steve's thinking about writers and writing, I asked him at the end of the study to describe himself as a writer using a metaphor. This metaphor is critical to understanding Steve's ideas of writing as it presents his representations and interpretations of the activity of writing as well as what a writer means to him. The metaphor captures his underlying perspectives about writing and being a student. Unlike LaToya, Steve, by the end of the study, constructed writing as a bit more than just a performance of "doing" school, so analyzing Steve's experiences as a writer at Stonie illustrates the possible potential for broadening the ideas of writing within the institution of school. Steve's metaphor of being a writer is "a recycling center":

> I find myself as just a recycling center. I took all the garbage and shit that everyone has thrown at me my entire life and turn it into something that could be useful. It is better than going to a psychiatrist just being able to make fun of what happened in my past, being able to make it as a joke takes the pressure off what it really was, how hurtful it was looking back on it, and I think being in the major and being able to have a lot more freedom with writing and stuff I will be going to college and having the freedom to have the time to really think about who I am and all that and going back to an engineering major would be like taking a step backwards and letting going of that freedom I received. I'd rather go forward and think more and be able to go back to my self-psychiatry.

A closer examination of Steve's language and choice of metaphor reveals how Steve represents himself and his purposes as a writer. Using Gee's CDA, I break the above excerpt from his interview into three stanzas.

Stanza One: I'm Finding Myself

1 I find myself as just a recycling center.

2 I took all the garbage and shit

3 that everyone has thrown at me my entire life

4 and turn it into something that could be useful.

Beginning in line 1, Steve is doing the action in the sentence, the action he names as "find[ing]." He is the agent here, the one with the power, the participant that indicates a role that the verb in the clause names. He is using present tense, so that means he is currently doing the action of finding. In response to the question of using a metaphor to describe himself, it is significant that the emphasis of the sentence is on the word "find" as opposed to "recycling center." The "recycling center" is the so-called answer to the metaphor question, but it is placed at the end of the sentence. Gee (2005) indicated that "what goes first in a sentence creates a perspective from which everything else in the clause is viewed," a "launching point" (p. 188) of meaning and interpretation. Steve could have replied, "I am a recycling center" or even "I am just a recycling center," but instead he inserts "I find myself" before the metaphor, indicating that he feels this reference to finding is important, more important than perhaps even the answer, "recycling center." While he is still engaging in a question/answer format with this interlocutor asking the question and Steve answering, he inserts this journey reference with him as the participant who is going to find something. Finding requires looking, and Steve is telling his interlocutor that his writer's identity (as viewed through his metaphor) is a process of journeying; he speaks with authority in charge of finding himself.

This activity of finding has value for Steve; its location in the sentence indicates that he has given "find[ing]" a high status placement in his thinking about himself as a writer (and potentially as a student). Steve switches from a position of power ("I find myself") and lowers or de-values his response by inserting "just" before his answer, placing this answer at a position of subordination. Using "just" removes the power in the statement; he could have said, "I find myself as a recycling center" which is a stronger declarative statement. Using "just" makes it possible for there to be exceptions. This shift is a movement in register from a position of authority to a position of inferiority.

Steve could have stopped in line 1 as this response ("I find myself as just a recycling center") does answer this interlocutor's question. However, he chooses to elaborate on this metaphor. In line 2, "I took all the garbage and shit," Steve uses past tense to illustrate a prior attitude/experience from his past, and he places himself again in the actor/participant placement in the clause that does the event of taking the "garbage and shit." His use of the word, "took" indicates that he is a receiver of the "garbage and shit" that an unnamed thing passed to him. He's owning (or has agency) in the receipt of the "garbage and shit." This is less passive than if he had framed it using "get," or "give" instead of "took." Regardless, his construction says that he is actively illustrating an activity that presumably, he does not have/do anymore; otherwise he would have used a present tense marker.

Steve's use of informal language, "garbage and shit," is a shift from the formality used in the first sentence. Here Steve uses curse words in front of this interlocutor, a woman older than he who teaches the subject material he is studying. This lack of formality combined with his active construction of "I took" creates an informal register

that reflects a lack of respect for traditional authority figures and settings. By using curse words, especially just a few seconds into his response to this interlocuter, potentially indicates a challenge to traditional authority.

In line 3, "that everyone has thrown at me my entire life," continues Steve's elaboration on his metaphor. This section of the clause is passive—he received what was thrown. This clause replaces Steve as the participant with "everyone" as the agent of the clause. "[E]veryone" is doing the action of throwing the prior line's "garbage and shit" at Steve during his entire lifetime. The action of the sentence, "thrown," is a violent action that implies again that Steve has to catch, or take" what was delivered at him. His passivity is a contrast to his active present-tense presentation of the first line ("I find myself"); however in line 4, he returns to this active construction.

Lines 3 and 4 are connected with "and," meaning that both clauses on either side of "and" are "co-equal" according to Gee (p. 190); the material in both are equally important pieces of information, as one bit of data is not subordinated to the other. Steve could have negated what was "thrown" at him in line 3 by using a conjunction like "but" that would reverse what followed; however, the use of the conjunction "and" means that the "thrown" clause of line 3 is as important as the upcoming clause in line 4. Line 4 shifts tense again as Steve indicates his current role/activity, "turn it into something that could be useful," is one of transformation and movement. Here Steve returns to present tense, "turn," and although this clause has an implied subject ("I"), it reflects Steve's movement from passive object to subject of the "turn[ing]" activity. The actor in the transformative "turn" is Steve, not the people who threw "garbage and shit" at him. No longer is he passively receiving what someone else has decided to throw at him, but now

he is going to transform this bad “garbage and shit” into “something” of his choosing. Presumably, this “something” has potential to be positive because Steve says that this “something” “could be useful.” This use of the conditional (“could be”) suggests a tentativeness—this “could be” useful. Useful is positioned here in opposition to “garbage and shit,” implying a transformation from the negative “shit” to something opposite, the good “useful.” If useful is in opposition to “shit,” “useful” has been marked as non-“shit[ty],” meaning Steve places value on “useful.”

Returning to Steve’s metaphor of a recycling center, which takes undesired items of “garbage” (i.e., used, dirty, worn, discarded bottles, cans, paper) and transforms them onsite into something new, something useful again (i.e., new bottles, cans, and paper) that have a new life after the transformation, illustrates Steve’s views of writing and himself. In terms of writing, the prior material, the “garbage and shit” is turned into a potentially useful end product.

Stanza Two: Make a Joke

5 It is better than going to a psychiatrist
6 just being able to make fun of what happened in my past,
7 being able to make it as a joke
8 takes the pressure off what it really was,
9 how hurtful it was looking back on it,

Going into stanza two, Steve indicates that the transformation idea of stanza one is more desirable (line 5: “better than”) than how he described his “past.” In line 5, Steve compares “going to a psychiatrist” versus “it.” He uses “it” to refer back to line 2-4’s descriptions of taking what was thrown at him and turning it into “something” potentially

"useful." This transformative "recycling center" metaphor is being compared to "going to a psychiatrist." It is not clear in his language if he actually went to a psychiatrist in the "past" or if he is using the cliché of going to a psychiatrist, implying that his "past" was "hurtful" enough to warrant a psychiatrist. His simple sentence answer in line 1 has now turned into an elaboration on his "past" in stanza two. The activity in line 2-5 is not just responding to the metaphor question, but now it is extended to thinking about what he names in lines 5-6, dealing with "what happened in my past." His writerly identity metaphor is extended to something better than psychiatry (whatever version he means) of his "past."

Steve's "recycling center" transforms through humor (line 6: "make fun"; line 7 "make it a joke,"). His changing of the "garbage and shit" occurs through changing what was "hurtful" into a "joke." He turns what was undesirable ("garbage and shit") into something more desirable, humor. This change makes Steve able to remove "the pressure" of his "hurtful" experiences in the past. Steve is doing this transformation in the present, as his use of present tense in line 8 ("takes") indicates that the "pressure" has been removed. This stanza places the transformation as the subject of the actions. Steve does not use "I" in this stanza, placing the idea of the "recycling center" in the actor position. The transformational process, and not necessarily Steve, is what makes his "past" experiences less hurtful.

Stanza Three: Thinking About Who I Am

10 and I think being in the major and
11 being able to have a lot more freedom with writing and stuff
12 I will be going to college and having the freedom
13 to have the time to really think about who I am and all that
14 and going back to an engineering major
15 would be like taking a step backwards
16 and letting go of that freedom I received.
17 I'd rather go forward and think more
18 and be able to go back to my self-psychiatry.

In stanza three, Steve talks about "being in the major" in line 10. As mentioned earlier, Steve changed his major during the study from engineering to English/criminal justice, so this reference to "being in the major" is the English/criminal justice major. Unlike the second stanza, this stanza uses "I" five times, starting with the beginning of the first clause in line 10 that indicates Steve is sharing his ponderings ("I think") about what it will be like to be "in the major." Steve could have said he is/was an English major or that he has English for a major, but instead he says he is "in" the major. This "in" use implies that he is inside the major, enveloped by the major. He has not adopted it as a part of his identity; he does not say he is an English major but instead that he is "in the major." This distinction is significant because this is a passive construction; he does not have agency in being a major but is instead an object to the major.

This object position continues in the line 11 as he says that he will be able to have freedom ("being able to have a lot more freedom"). The construction of "being able"

implies being permitted or allowed, as if he is “being able” to have seconds at the dinner table. Someone or something considers Steve to have the ability to be able to do something. He also uses “being able” twice in stanza two (lines 6 and 7) as he discusses what he will be able to do as he goes through this transformation into the recycling center. He is placing himself in an object position as he is considered by someone or something outside him. He does not say he has a lot more freedom but that he is “being able” to have the freedom, as if he will be granted permission to have the freedom.

He uses the word, “freedom,” three times in the stanza, giving it importance through repetition in his thinking about “being in the major.” His relationship to the word can be characterized as one of possession (line 11: “have a lot more freedom”; line 12: “having the freedom”; and line 16, “freedom I received”). Freedom is an external commodity that one possesses, or has, or receives, as opposed to something internal. He is not freedom or does not feel freedom, but he has it. It is not a part of him, a part of his identity, but just something outside of him that he “has” or “received.” Being “in the major,” covered within it, also gives him “freedom.”

However, most curious in this stanza is his use of the phrase in line 12, “I will be going to college.” This delineates his thinking between his past, “going back to an engineering major,” and his present, “being in the major” (implying English major). At this point in the study, Steve has been at college for the almost two entire semesters, yet he explains his shift to an English major as “will be going to college.” His use of “I” means that he is the actor of the sentence, completing the event of “going to college.” The use of a future tense (“will be going”) implies he has not yet gone to college, but Steve has already been in college for several months. This change in major has discounted his

college experiences so far, enough so that Steve indicates that he has not yet been to college. “Being in the major” and “the freedom with writing and stuff” equates to “going to college,” and indicates that he has not yet had such freedom and envelopment in his prior major, engineering. “Going” means that he is in the process and that it has not happened.

This activity of “will be going to college” and “having the freedom to have the time,” gives Steve freedom, time, and thinking, something that Steve has not had. This construction reflects how transformative this major change has been for Steve. Not only does he indicate that he is a transformer, a “recycling center” in line 1, but that his entire life is being recycled so that he can start anew by “going” to college again and moving “forward” by having the ability provided to him (“being able to”) to think and return to his self-psychiatry.” He has presented two versions of school, one of “in the major” that is connected to newness (“will be going to college”), thinking, and freedom, and one of “back to an engineering major” that is backwards and opposite to thinking and freedom. This representation of the latter version of school, the “engineering major,” is also revealed in the artifacts from Steve’s English 2 course.

Steve’s Time in English 2

Once at Stonie, Steve enrolled in English 1, a course by his definition that was “a reintroduction to English, what you’d expect college students to be able to write. It was very introductory….we didn’t do much writing, it was mostly journal writing.” Steve’s constructions of English 1 writing equate to formal writing, and he does not label journal writing as writing. This attitude is transferred into his discussions of English 2 writing.

When Steve talked about writing in English 2, he refers to the formal papers. He never utilized the journal writing as examples that he could pull from to respond to questions during interviews about himself as a writer. As discussed in chapter 4, Hank's class wrote in the journal daily, yet Steve makes no references to this apparently valued activity in his interview discussions of writing in English 2. In an excerpt from his class journal, he muses on the journal's purpose in class, and I replicated his capitalizations as well as any crossouts in his own writing (using the strikethrough feature in Microsoft Word):

> The journal was more of a sidenote, semester long responsibility. While it wasn't useless it wasn't ~~all~~ exactly engaging for me. The prompts did get my 'writing juices' flowing and on a few occasions did give me ideas on some of my papers. Though for the most part it ~~did~~ was more of a ~~blo~~ ancillary assignment of ~~that~~ which I was not able to give much attention to outside of class. In all honestly its Homework importance to me is sealed some where between nightly math problems and bi-daily worksheets.

Steve does his journal like any other homework assignment that should get completed, and for the "most part" it was a production of work as opposed to the "few occasions" that the journal writing contributed to his "ideas on some" of the papers in class. The journal writing either serves as homework for the class's requirements, or it serves the classroom's formal paper assignment purposes. There is no reference to the journal's purposes outside of the classroom.

Steve characterizes the writing in English 2 as "doing." For example, in three interviews, Steve uses the word, "doing," 18 times to describe the act of writing. He is

"doing" writing, much like someone would do a task, like "doing" laundry or "doing" the dishes. The teacher is responsible for creating, and the student is responsible for the "doing." In this case, Steve "does" the journal and categorizes it with worksheets and nightly math problems as mindless skill drill busy work. Steve expands on this "doing" idea by explaining at the beginning of the study what writing for him the engineering major should look like:

> …we actually have a book, *How to Write Like an Engineer*, very formal very focused….you want to give a good impression of yourself through your writing, no noise, no wordy language, just very efficient language.

As an engineering major at the start of the study, Steve talks about the importance of being able to write properly: "I recognize that writing is very important and you should really know how you can use it" (See Appendix H for the entire transcript). For Steve, writing is used like a tool; it is "efficient" with "no noise," and it is something that can be done and "used."

At the conclusion of the first interview of the study, Steve told me that he already had his writing style "established" and did not indicate that he needed anything beyond finding the "occasional fix" that his writing might need in terms of grammar. Here Steve indicates that he already possesses a writing style that works; he has the knowledge, or capital, of "efficient" writing that allows him to perform well on writing assignments. Steve is in an English 2 class where he can already perform, and these class activities validate his prior memories of what writing looks like and how to do it. He can already "do" the class, and the figured world of the English 2 classroom (and the first-year writing program) continues to support his current-traditional notion of writing.

A sample paragraph from Steve's first English 2 paper illustrates his performance of writer in this space. While chapter 3 describes this assignment, the entire assignment sheet can be found in Appendix F. Steve's MLA-formatted, two-page, outside source-less paper responded to one of the two provided topics, "Should smoking be regulated in public places?" The following is paragraph one of Steve's paper titled, "Assignment #1: Smoking in Public":

> Smoking has been a large part of American culture since the first pilgrims; movie stars, music artists, and various celebrities up until the nineties all smoked. Nowadays even though the tobacco companies are no longer able to advertise nearly as much as they used to, it is still considered by some, popular to smoke. So why is it that what seems like a majority of people are up in arms about smoking in public, and the only things a person sees on the TV are ads advising against smoking, and how someone can stop? Simply put smoking is unhealthy, not only for the person who smokes them, but for the people around them also. Smoking both first and second hand is named as one of the leading causes of cancer and death in the US; whether we like it or not smoking in a public place is unhealthy to everyone in the vicinity of the smoke, and should be regulated.

Steve's teacher responded to this piece of writing and describes this paper as:

> Steve:
>
> A very nice essay for this assignment. Organization and structuring are solid as to standards, and you easily meet all of the requirements. You're obviously very comfortable with this kind of writing, and your paragraph organization shows it.

Steve received a grade of 64 out of 75 possible points for the paper, losing 11 points to grammar errors, one point off for each instance of a marked error by Hank. Aside from grammar errors, his organization, structure, content, and assignment following are perfect according to Hank's rubric, and Hank indicates that Steve's paragraph organization is what exhibits Steve's comfort level with "this kind of writing."

This kind of writing is the typical academic essay, and Steve's prior experiences with this writing in high school can be seen in the moves he makes even in this excerpt, his first paragraph. Traditional performances of the academic essay call for elements such as the thesis statement, a forecasting statement, and the all-to-familiar hook sentence that is supposed to grab a reader's attention and bring them into the paper. Here Steve presents his hook by presenting us with the context of the smoking controversy, presumably something we American citizens can all connect to. Steve then moves to a rhetorical question, a common strategy used to produce connection and interest in the reader, and then the movement to the thesis statement proclaiming that smoking is unhealthy for the smoker and those around the smoker. The final sentence of the paragraph is a forecaster, indicating to the reader what she might find next in the paper.

Some of the elements not present in this paragraph are personal connections to the topic; instead, the material is presented in an objective, historically factual manner. He displays the facts. As readers, we see no reason why the writer chose the topic. In addition, we see the traditional lack of "I' use by the writer, a common element in the discourse of academic writing, the removal of the personal and all signs of the personal to present a clean and objective argument for readers. The reader can have an opinion, but the writer needs to be personally removed from the argument, otherwise Steve might be

perceived as ranting. He only uses this sign of the personal, "I," as examples, or evidence for his objective thesis statement (and probably because his teacher forbid him to use those non-biased outside sources in the assignment sheet).

This paragraph then lacks any connection to the topic, any explanations of why the topic is important for Steve. And really why would it be important personally to him? He did not have a choice in the topic, so he just has to objectively perform for Hank to show that he can produce the right writing for this assignment. Steve receives confirmation from Hank that this type of performance, this objective, self-less representation of writing, is "nice" and conforms to "standards," so this course continues to value the type of writing Steve can "do" well and has "done" well. All he needs to do in English 2 is continue to perform within this type of writing that he is comfortable doing. And Hank's role as judger of writing continues to construct the current-traditional performance of teacher as judger/evaluator who dispenses a grade on the final product. Others outside of this evaluation experience are not necessary.

Hank's commentary indicates that Steve has the more regimented writing style "down." When Steve is called upon to produce college writing he knows and already possesses the rules of that particular performance because this kind of writing calls on the writer to fill in, an activity Steve has "done" for years at both home and at school. This requirement puts him at an advantage at doing school writing; he has had prior school experiences that allow him to possess this writerly identity, in a form especially praised by his English 2 writing teacher.

Bourdieu and Passeron's (1990) discussion of capital helps to explain Steve's ability to perform with ease within the figured world of the English 2 course. Capital is

described as the necessary skills, knowledge, or equipment needed to perform within a social situation (Bourdieu, 1993). Because Steve's home and school discourse practices are similar, his home and school capital are similar. He has an advantage over other students whose home and school discourse practices are dissimilar because Steve already possesses the skills to write for the corporatized university. The English 2 course, then, functions to keep privileged language practices in place, rewarding those students who conform with high grades. It is not that Steve is learning these practices; rather he is being rewarded for following directions and performing within the limited restrictions placed on him. English 2 becomes a legitimized way of sorting those students with language capital from those without.

A major element of the modernistic idea of literacy involves the use of writing as a display. Steve's language about writing reflects writing as a tool, a device that contributes to people's "impression" of the writer as presenting the correct response. It is a means of presenting "right" writing to the world. Writing is something that is used by writers to advance themselves and display their skills or knowledge. Current-traditional representations of the purposes or uses for writing reflect writing in a similar manner, focused on surface correctness and a presentation of the "Truth" that the writer rearticulates back to readers. Writing is a form of presentation, not a place for thinking, not a place for messiness, not a place for not "right" writing.

Classroom "Stuff" and Classmates

In an excerpt from an interview during the middle of the study, Steve discussed how useless many of the classroom activities are for him, especially since he already knows what he is doing and his classmates clearly do not. His teacher's response to his

paper affirms his ability to perform properly. In his interviews, Steve described the English 2 class activities as extraneous for him, including examples of how he does not use many of the activities in his English 2 class, including "outlines and prewriting exercises and stuff like that" (see Appendix H for the entire transcript). As seen in the English 2 syllabus's discussion section (see Appendix E), these types of activities are expected to happen frequently; they have significance for Hank's course. This researcher's field notes indicate that over one-half of the days the class met (15 days), the class worked on something that Steve might feel he did not need. A look at Steve's language as he explores the English 2 classroom activities illustrates Steve's representations of uselessness as well as his thoughts on his classmates and peer "editing." I have numbered the lines for ease of reference.

1 I'm not one to really rely on outlines and prewriting exercises and stuff like that. I
2 don't know if you noticed, I really didn't borrow from the peer editing because I
3 don't really like handing over my paper to someone else and I'm not really a
4 judgmental person, but when it comes to people like going over my essay, I tend
5 to prefer what I write because a lot of times to me it seems like it's really taking
6 away from my paper what other people put on there, and the only time that I
7 really peer edit is with people I know, I trust, people I know will give me good
8 input—close friends, people I—like I have a friend in college who has been on
9 the dean's list and he's fairly efficient at grading papers, and he's one of the kind
10 of friends that will kindof make jokes, like jokingly degrade you and make fun of
11 you and stuff, so it is people like that, people who aren't afraid to criticize me or
12 make fun of me because you know they have more freedom to grade it as opposed

13 to people who are trying to protect me.

This excerpt represents a moment in the figured world of Steve's English 2 classroom as well as close description of the role of the capable peer reviewer (or "peer edit[or]") and this editor's relationship to the writer. In line 1, Steve classifies classroom activities as something to "rely on." This construction, "rely on" implies a need for help, as one relies on training wheels or an instruction manual to do an activity. Steve does not need the assistance—he can stand without reliance on "outlines," prewriting exercise," and unnamed other "stuff" in his English 2 course.

He then moves into a discussion of peer review, which he names as "peer editing." Steve defines this in two ways: in his English 2 class it means "handing over" his work "to someone else" to go "over" his essay, but outside the class with people Steve "know[s]" and "trust[s]," peer editing is to "give" him "good input." The purpose of editing is different depending upon his editors. In English 2, he explains that it is "handing over" work, with Steve doing the action, but outside English 2, peer editing is more passive with Steve receiving ("give") the "input" from others. The non-English 2 people "have more freedom to grade" Steve's work because these people can "degrade" and "make fun" of him. The others, not directly named at the end of the excerpt, "tak[e] away from" his paper and don't "degrade" but rather "protect." For Steve, feedback on his writing is valuable when it encompasses degradation and subordination (lines 9-11: "degrade" or "make fun" of). And his classmates and perhaps his teacher do not fit into this representation of peer editing, so for Steve, there is no need to "rely on" it.

Good feedback also comes from trustworthy sources, like his friend discussed in line 8 who is on the "dean's list" and who is "efficient at grading papers." Here Steve

represents feedback as evaluation, or "grading." This presentation removes Steve's agency. In lines 1-7, Steve uses "I" to represent his active position in his descriptions of what he doesn't "rely on" and why he does not need peer review in class. Beginning in line 8, he discusses an example of who would be considered a trustworthy editor ("a friend in college"), there is no "I" reference, no position of Steve as an actor in his sentences. He is an object to his "grad[er]" evaluator.

Steve does not value his classmates' contributions, nor does he need to "rely on" his English 2 class activities. He de-values his classmates by indicating in line 3 and 4 that he is not "judgmental" and then contracts this statement by placing a "but" after the statement: "I'm not really a judgmental person, *but* when it comes to people like going over my essay I tend to prefer what I write." He believes his work is superior. By using "but" after declaring his non-judgmentalness, he negates his claim of being "not judgmental." He does not use his classmates' feedback because his work is preferable. Since he indicates that peer editing is about getting "good input"; his classmates' responses do not fit within his own purposes and representations of peer editing. Therefore, the peer editing activity in class is superfluous for him; he does not need it. Steve already has the capital to know how to do examples of school activity like peer review, and English 2 is just more doing of what he "already knows."

While his classroom experiences confirm what Steve already knows, Steve's experiences in the writing center open him up to activities and categories of writing that he had not presented prior to this semester's experiences or even at the beginning of this study. Steve attributes many of his changes during the study to his work with his tutor, Philip. These experiences encompass his change in major and his recycling center

metaphor of transformation and future tense use of “will be going to college.” His representations and discussions of the work he does in the Writing Center sets Steve slightly apart from LaToya’s representations of writing at Stonie in chapter five.

Steve, Philip, and the Writing Center

In this section, I provide Steve’s representations of the writing center at Stonie as well as the work he did as a student at the Center. These descriptions stretch from the start of the study to the end of the study, and taking a tour of them is illustrative of his understandings of writing and being a student at Stonie. Steve’s language surrounding the work of the Writing Center suggests an adjustment to his original understandings of writing and being a writer; this adjustment exists outside of the English 2 classroom, and Steve connects this alteration to his Writing Center experiences, specifically with his tutor, Philip. Steve is still an object to the limited possibilities existing within the globalized institution of Stonie, but his work in the Writing Center does show more possibilities than his work in the English 2 classroom.

At the very beginning of the study, in his first interview, Steve talked about his impressions of writers, a writing center, and a writing center’s purposes. I have numbered the lines for ease of reference.

JPC: What do you think a writer is?

Steve: A writer can be anyone who writes a memo to another person in a very loose sense of the word, or a person writing in a journal, or a student writing a paper for a class, or writing a book for other people to read.

JPC: Do you think of yourself as a writer?

Steve: When I’m writing.

JPC: Okay. What do you think a writing center is for?

Steve: Just to go over your writing style, how you can improve it, to work towards your strengths.

JPC: What do you think going to the writing center during this study is going to do to your experience in this class?

Steve: I've really established my writing style—it could help some. My future really isn't in writing. I'm going for mechanical engineering. I guess various errors that I repeat I could probably fix that, but other than that not much.

For Steve, a writer is someone who produces writing. Steve reflects this production view by indicating that he doesn't view himself as a writer unless he is "writing." A writer only encompasses the activity of writing, as opposed to other activities, such as thinking, responding, or reading. In lines 2-4, Steve elaborates further on this statement by saying that writers produce documents for others, including memos, journals, papers for class, and books for others to read. Writers display material for others. Writing centers are cast as places for help in developing a style to display materials for others.

At this stage in the study, Steve indicated that he had never stepped foot into a writing center, so his writing center descriptions are his guesses of what it would be. He presents the purposes of a writing center in line 8 as a service center that "goes over" writing to work on improving the "strengths" of "your writing style." Steve explains writing center purposes without a reference to him (line 8 and 9: "your writing style," "your writing," "your strengths"), further distancing himself from the writing center. It is obvious from his descriptions that not only has he not been to a writing center, as he does not draw on any past histories, but also that he is not a part of what a writing center does.

In line 12, he defines his writing as fixed and unchanging ("I've really established my writing style"), so a writing center cannot do more than just "help some" on an already established style. This "help" for him is conceived as repairing "various errors" that he repeats, but not much else. Steve doesn't see a need to reflect or change his writing style; he indicates that since the style is "established," the center is only about supplementing through error correction. As the English 2 section indicates above, Steve is comfortable and successful with his "doing school" mode of writing, so if a writing center is about working on "your writing style," he does not see a need for this in his realm of writing; he can do school already. He indicates that he is going into engineering, and he believes that there is not much writing that needs to be done for that field; his future "isn't in writing" at this point. Writing centers, according to Steve's explorations here, are for students who have "futures" in writing and who need help with their writing style because they have weaknesses in writing.

At the end of the study, Steve still presents writing as displaying an idea, a performance; however, he also adds to what else writing could be. He expresses writing differently at times. Instead of writing being only about "doing" school, writing becomes defined in two ways for Steve: "writing to display an idea" and "writing to give your ideas." Again, I will number lines for ease of reference.

1 "When you are writing just to display an idea, the content is really just factual, but
2 if you are writing to give your ideas, like what I'm doing here like Philip says, I
3 have to write for myself and in each situation it kind of changes, content wise.
4 Like if I'm writing a news article, it is really what is happening, it is not really my
5 opinion or it shouldn't be my opinion but if it is just personal writing like this or

6 writing for a class, the content obviously has to be developed towards what I
7 would think or whatever I'm writing about.

After working in the center with Philip for a semester, Steve broadens his idea of writing center by presenting the work of the writing center as a place to work on "your ideas." In line 2, Steve defines writing "to give your ideas" as something he does "here" in the writing center with Philip, and it equates to writing "for myself." For Steve, "giv[ing]" an idea is different from "display[ing]" an idea. He splits these two occasions of writing by using a "but" in line 1 to indicate a separation. Because he uses "but," he reverses the first part of the sentence in line 1 and 2 ("when you are writing just to display an idea") in exchange for the second part this sentence ("if you are writing to give your ideas"). He does not say that he did this writing for himself prior to being "here" in the center. His former construction of writing center work implied that the writing was fixed, and that he did not have a "future" in writing. At the end of the study, he equates a type of writing to "writing for myself," meaning that he could use writing for his own purposes. In his recycling center metaphor of himself, he equates writing to being something he can use to "think" about himself. Steve is existing within the separation of personal ("for myself") and academic ("content is really factual"), but he has added another idea of writing to his original characterization of just academic "doing" school.

This other idea of writing is located in the writing center (line 2: "what I'm doing here like Philip says" and line 5: "personal writing like this"). The broadening of Steve's potential purposes or ideas of writing is reflected in his discussions of his work in the center with Philip. Listening to Steve talk about some of the activities he completed with Philip, such as revision and examining writing as larger than just grammar and spelling,

helps to make his constructions of his broadening process visible. The lines have been numbered for ease of reference.

1 Steve: Before now I hadn't really revised drafts—probably just spelling or little
2 things caught in peer review. I really hadn't gone back and worked through the
3 ideas of the paper, I hadn't revised—like the, for example with this paper, me and
4 Philip had gone over, really it was just back and forth and there was nothing in
5 between….So I would never really do that before, but in this class almost all of
6 my papers I had gone back and revised the ideas and restructured it more than just
7 going over spell check and grammar check and punctuation check. I think a good
8 paper relies on those types of revisions, going back and seeing what you have
9 done with your ideas, more than just structure and grammar.

In Steve's prior constructions of a writing center's purpose, discussed at the start of this section, he had indicated that he might use the center for help repairing small errors he made in his writing. Here at the end of the study, he discusses the concept of revision of drafts and how "before now," he had not revised and "worked through" ideas in his paper. He names Philip in line 3 as an example of this current revision activity, and using "before now" in line 1 and line 5"s "never really do that before," Steve indicates that this is a new activity for him. Steve identifies these revision elements as part of a "good paper" in line 7 and 8, indicating that his past work on papers perhaps did not lead to "good paper[s]." Writing encompasses more than just structure and grammar and "good" writing means going back and really re-working the ideas of a paper. While it is not clear exactly how Steve decided to construct this broader idea of writing, his language at the

end of the study indicates that writing, the activity of writing, and the purposes of writing are different (larger, more encompassing) than they were at the start of the study.

The Writing Center Possibilities?

It would be so simple to say that the writing center has changed Steve's ideas of writing. Tutors could be praised for adding to a student's understandings of writing, the method used in the session could be formalized and marketed through journal articles and tutor software for all writing centers to emulate, and this dissertation case study could end in a problem/solution format that is hailed as a legitimate format through countless composition textbooks. But it is not that simple. At first glance, it appears that Steve has transformed himself and added to his ideas of writing and is on his way to composition theory nirvana. In reality, Steve has slightly increased his exposure of what writing can be and do for him (using writing to think about himself), but he still operates as an object, lacking much agency, within the [modernistic] university's corporatized framework that supports the supremacy of so-called "academic" writing.

Steve's representations of his English 2 classroom and the writing center reveal that he believes he has adopted two ideas of writing: academic ("writing to display ideas") and personal ("writing for myself"). Steve expresses the idea of personal to mean writing about his individual self-contained truths ("for myself") as opposed to other meanings of personal, such as personal meaning individual agency. The "personal" in Steve's case is closely linked to his renegade tutor, Philip. The expressivist bohemian male writer, in search of personal truth on the metaphorical pond at Walden, is similar to his tutor's lifestyle. Originally Steve chose his major due to his dominating father's influence. Now after one term in the writing center, Steve is choosing his path after his

dominating tutor's influence. Steve shows signs of his adoration for his tutor's path by emulating his tutor's facial hair, using his tutor's favorite curse words (see the recycling center metaphor excerpt that contains curse words commonly used by Philip; Philip had been reprimanded multiple times during the study's semester for loudly using curse words, like "shit" or "fuck," during sessions), keeping a personal journal for Philip's suggested daily writing practice, registering for the courses Philip suggests, changing majors like Philip advised in multiple tutoring sessions, and dressing in a similar fashion.

While Steve may have the outward markings of the bohemian male writer, he does not have the conceptual understandings of what it means. He constructs his identity as this type of writer who uses writing to "think," yet he has not represented the act of writing as thinking; he still performs his "doing" school. He uses writing to think outside of school, where the conceptual understandings of the expressivist tradition would have him also using writing to "think" in school. Personal can mean personal connections to writing, engagement with a subject matter that has relevance to the author. This dissertation is personal even though it is a classic example of "academic" writing. Personal is a sign of an author's agency with her material, regardless of whether it is in or out of school.

However, "doing" school at the corporatized institution is about performing and "displaying" ideas. These narrow possibilities of writing at school are an effect of the globalized institution. Writing is not a means of learning but a means of proving one can display "correct" ideas properly according to an idealized product in an evaluator's mind. Grimm (1999) indicated a modernist idea of literacy is more about learning "the discourses we need in order to be accepted in certain groups" (p. xvi). So while Steve

says he is using writing to "think" about himself, he is still holding firm to and performing for the modernist idea of writing to "display" ideas properly in the "correct" discourse for his work in school, and his agency within these ideas are controlled and limited by other forces, such as textbook determined formats and first-year writing program goals.

Writing centers are often cast as powerful entities that perform the "institutional function of erasing differences" by being "normalizing agents" (Grimm, 1999, p. xvii). Even though Steve's tutor, Philip, may be advocating an idea of writing as "thinking" and contradictory to the modernist idea of performing "correct" displays, Philip does act as a normalizing agent because this idea of writing exists outside of school. Steve may be adopting an idea of writing as "thinking," but he keeps this separated from his school "performances." Steve is attempting to adopt a broader writer identity by emulating the identity of his tutor, but he is still clinging to writing as performing, writer as object. Steve continues the separation of personal and academic because ultimately, personal has no place for Steve in academic writing. He conforms to the "institution's expectations" (Grimm, 1999, p. 29) of academia that places the student in an object position.

Still, it is important that Steve has added to his constructions of writing during the short course of the study. Here is where there is potential, a way to think about how writing is constructed at the university. This is a significant step in even seeing that writing could be more than just a school assignment—that it has an existence and purpose outside of school. Steve represents writing as something that could be more than just a five-paragraph format that displays ideas that are appropriate for the class assignment. This seems key as even just this small re-thinking of writing indicates possibility within

the globalized university. Chapter 7 will continue this exploration of writing and being a writer within the institution of school.

While I would like to report that Steve has been continuing his work with his tutor while I wrote this dissertation, Steve has not been seen in the writing center since he abruptly stopped attending appointments with his tutor two months after the conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

Positionality…is inextricably linked to power, status, and rank" (Holland et al., 1998, p. 271).

In my inbox recently, I received an e-mail from a textbook company that was offering a two-day seminar (in Miami, FL) for the low price of $325. According to the e-mail, the seminar was marketed as a means for teachers and WPAs to increase "efficiency" and "quality" of their "Freshman Composition" courses by producing amazing "gains" in learning and retention. "Remarkable results" would come about through "course redesign" based on the approach in the textbook produced by the company. This program was also marketed as being cost effective. This e-mail had a large distribution list, no doubt going to part-time/full-time adjunct faculty and tenure-track faculty inboxes around the country.

The language of these offers represents the teaching of writing in business terms: efficiency, quality, gains/losses, and cost analyses. This business logic connects well with the corporate university which has casualized its teaching in the lower division and which operates its other programs in large part over the student credit hours generated through the labor of the part-timers. The teacher surely needs to be "efficient" when she is grading over 100 student papers weekly. But the concept of efficiency is much larger than that of the teacher. "Efficiency" and "productivity" and "gains in retention" are code for the corporatized logic that underpins the enterprise we call first-year writing.

Reflective practice grounded in explorations of composition theory would not/could not appear in prepackaged, teacher-proof course redesign workshops in Miami. A true praxis, a practice based on ongoing theoretical reflection, would require a professionalized teaching force.

The crises in staffing first-year writing courses (as discussed in chapter 2 and 4) has contributed to the standardization of the first-year writing course as exemplified in the two-day seminar's redesign based on a standardized textbook. Standardization also makes the administration of the writing program manageable. At Stonie, the WPA experiences a 33% yearly turnover of the part-time labor force. The composition "boss,"—WPA—often with the best of intentions, limits the possibilities of textbooks that can be ordered for the class (often because the bookstores need to know the order before there is even an instructor to teach the class) but also to insure some semblance of "order" and "consistency" in the instruction. This standardization in terms of required composition textbooks, course goals, and syllabi content restrictions and assignment guidelines creates the illusion that there is one "correct" way to teach and that the teachers had better deliver the program and not question it.

This illusion, sometimes enforced through teaching portfolios or classroom observations, decrease a "worker's" agency within a classroom. She runs her classroom, like Hank did, with a prepackaged curriculum, a one-size-fits-all approach to a generalized first-year writing classroom and its students. She is, like Hank, not considered part of her home department, so she is often relegated to a crowded office that houses all adjunct faculty (if there is one), she does not receive invitations to department events, and even her own university structure recognizes her as a contract worker, not

labeled as faculty; she is not a professional—she is a "worker." The corporatized university, the casualization of teaching and the control of practice by the corporate private sector (i.e., textbook-based curricula or business practices of efficient staffing and standardization) is a an effect of neoliberal privatization, the increasing movement of public resources into the private sector brought about through global capitalism. This narrowing of public space, where ideas can be generated and contested, is what controls the first year writing curriculum and what limits teaching and learning.

The case studies of LaToya and Steve are instances of how the corporatized university's labor practices manage to restrict the teaching and learning of student writers. These two writers are precariously situated, restricted, and constrained by the discourse practices of first-year writing at Stonie. Both students dutifully came to class for an entire semester, wrote essays assigned by the teacher, and did as they were told. They tried to approximate the idealized product that the teacher "wanted." LaToya made a B in the course and Steve made an A. Each student attended his/her tutoring sessions promptly at the scheduled time, complete with material to work on during the allotted 50 minutes. They responded to their tutors' questions and did any homework the tutor asked of them. At the start of the term, each student had clear career goals that they expressed in interviews and during class: medicine or chemistry for LaToya and engineering for Steve.

They looked like they were "doing" school well: attend class, produce papers, please the teacher, work towards your career, go the extra mile by attending their Writing Center sessions outside of class. They did everything the teacher (and society) asked of them as students, producing the best graded documents for class in a well behaved

manner, but their writing class and writing center sessions (and first-year writing course goals) were not about becoming a writer, capable of handling most rhetorical situations. Nor was it about helping students to become "their own agents for social change…[or] creators of democratic culture" (Shor, 1987, p. 48). Instead, students learned how to follow directions, behave by being obedient to authority figures, fix papers of grammatical "errors," and figure out how to produce "right" writing by filling out formats with conventional wisdom. These "learning outcomes" for students are a result of the prescribed curricula and textbook-valued answers, implemented by a perma-temp laborer, Hank, working for his composition boss. These demands of "right" production and output are well-practiced activities for LaToya and Steve, based on their past experiences in the public schools.

Both students indicated that the English 2 class (and the English 1 before it) did not ask them to do anything they had not already done in prior writing classes or the "13,000 hours" (Shor, 1987, p. 33) they had already spent in school before college. English 2's existence became a "holding place" (Shor, 1987, p. 9) for these students, a way of delaying their academic progress by having them spend weeks doing something they already knew how to do. Shor (1987) equated this holding place to a "warehouse instead of a learning center" (p. 9) as its function is to restrict people's freedoms and time. This "warehouse" for students meant that writing was "doing" what the teacher asked, restricting choice, and producing material that proved the student could "display" ideas "correctly" and in the proper format for the teacher. Writing did not encompass opportunities for expanding thinking, pondering ideas, or abandoning ideas. Writing did not encompass choice on the student's part, aside from choosing a topic the teacher listed

as potential subjects. Students did not write for different purposes to multiple audiences about a variety of topics. They did not experience moments of situating themselves within differing rhetorical situations; the graded formal writing was presented in one major way: the 1000-word college essay, double-spaced, MLA format, completed by the solitary writer. Writing was (and is) a socializing experience, but in Hank's class, students were conditioned to take their "place in an established order" (Shor, 1987, p. 2) that teaches students (workers) to obey and not question. For LaToya and Steve, they learned that they were not going to reach their goals.

What they did learn was to follow directions, show up to class (work) on time and produce documents with few or no errors. This view is often how employers describe their ideal employee, one who obeys directions, punches in on time, and produces "correct" outputs. Hank's rationale for his pedagogy is to prepare students for the world of work, so his class emphasis on fill-in-the-blank writing appears to be giving students desirable skills to be "successful." In fact, Hank (and the Writing Center and Writing Program) could be seen as doing students a noble service, providing a space that emphasized the type of personal skills expected by employers. Hank was "helping" because he was insisting on the behaviors that students may even need. And departments across campus would agree, saying such things as students had better show up for class and their writing needs to be "clean" (no grammatical errors). On Stonie's campus, many faculty will fail a paper if there are too many grammatical errors. The problem, however, in this case is that Hank (and many other teachers, administrators, and bosses) does not teach the students grammar at all. He teaches prescribed rules out of context taken from

mistakes that the students make. And he penalizes students who do not already speak the standard dialect.

Grammar is not clearly right/wrong; it is rhetorically and socially situated. Joseph Williams' article, "The Phenomenology of Error," demonstrates this point. Williams intentionally wrote an academic published essay, in the most highly ranked rhetoric and composition journal, making over 100 grammatical "errors," that the reader does not notice. In fact, he does not mention these errors until the end of the piece in order draw the reader's attention to them. His essay highlights how, if a reader is not looking for error, she does not see it. The unspoken social expectation of a published article is that the author has control over the writing. Published articles, especially in the field of composition, are socially constructed as being authoritative, part of which means not having errors; therefore, the readers of Williams' essay do not see the errors in the way they might in a student paper, which is generally constructed as having "errors" that need to be identified (circled in red) and penalized. For LaToya and Steve this meant that grammar is not choice but arbitrary rules that favor one dialect over another. This sociality of error is not explored in most writing programs, and it was not at Stonie. The rules that the students were to internalize favored those students whose home dialect was closest to Edited American English. And it marked and slowed those whose dialects differed. There was not much grammatical teaching happening in the classroom. This focus on error was not just a feature of the classroom, the writing center also "supported" the writing program as a means of writing "correctly" and following the format prescribed in the assignment to achieve "success."

The idea of "success" is deceptive for LaToya, Steve, and other students like them. While each of these students is being rewarded for filling in the blanks, they have not developed rhetorical sophistication or ways of using writing to form or think about complex ideas. Rather these students persist in believing that writing and learning is about being an object and giving back what the teacher "wants." Students then end up blaming themselves and their teachers blame their students for not being smart enough or committed enough. If the students do well, then the program accepts responsibility for preparing them well. But in the two cases here, neither student was "successful" academically. In LaToya's case, she indicated that if she does not do well in a course, she drops it before the grade can make it to her transcript. Already as a first-year student, she had already dropped many courses. She did not learn about how to address whatever is causing her to perform "incorrectly"; instead, she avoids and changes her major to chemistry because it might be "easier." Within one year she has dropped an entire semester behind, and at this writing, she is considering dropping out of school entirely. Her family, none of whom went to college and some who did not finish high school, is not much help to her, other than to tell her to get a tutor (who helps to reinforce the "right" writing idea).

Steve too is very good at giving back what the teacher wants, so good that his teacher indicated that he had it "down," but like LaToya, writing for him is *only* giving back. Steve is lost at the university and tries to find himself, as his recycling center CDA indicates; he moved from one overbearing figure of his father to an overbearing figure of a tutor during the study. He also changed from a math/science major, engineering, to a language/literature major, English. He is moving without direction. While on the surface

he may have appeared to be a good student, who was making good grades, Steve eventually dropped out of school. The writing program marked both of these students as successful; both students received above average grades. Yet what the writing program and writing center did was narrow the possibilities of growth and learning for these students. What counted as writing and what was perceived as valuable was restricted by the teacher and the tutor, by the WPA boss and textbook company, by the corporate university and its labor practices.

What becomes apparent from this study is that the corporatized university's practices work to decrease agency amongst its workers: first-year composition teachers, students, and bosses (WPAs). Developing and encouraging agency on the part of students, teachers, and writing programs is a way to provide an alternative to the "way things are." Many researchers, such as Welch, Brannon et al., Grimm, Bousquet et al., and Scott have already made these corporatized university's practices transparent and have written about ways to challenge the way things are from their vantage points. In *Dangerous Writing*, Scott (2009), a WPA himself discusses the precarious position of the WPA who is a middle manager "tasked with maintaining viable writing programs on skeletal budgets with overwhelmingly contingent faculties….whose real status is much closer to retail workers than to vested professionals" (p. 184). The composition teachers, or "workers," are "not entrusted with" agency within their positions in the classroom (p. 184). Scott (2009) references Bousquet, who indicated that much WPA literature could be characterized as pragmatic, as the weary WPA must simply accept the inevitability of the status quo within the institution and must cope rather than resist or stir up trouble within the existing power structures.

Instead of advocating for a silent coping strategy, Scott suggests naming "the contradictions and inadequacies in our programs, scholarship, and pedagogy—to keep pushing the issues to the forefront" (p. 186). As Knoblauch and Brannon (1993) indicated, representation, or naming is a powerful force; there is power in deciding "who gets to do the naming, what motives are involved, what consequences follow, what possibilities for alternative naming have been forgotten, or gone unrecognized, or been ignored, hidden, or suppressed" (p. 3). The power of agency residing behind representing "our programs, scholarship, and pedagogy" makes the complexities more transparent. Scott indicates that the "power of literacy and learning is far more likely to come about when we conceive of our identities and the identities of our institutions as dynamic, constantly evolving, and subject to being rewritten" (p. 190).

Understanding that institutions evolve and can be re-written even in the face of hegemonic institutional pressures can give teachers, tutors, and WPAs some agency if they engage in critical reflection about teaching and tutoring. A part of this critical reflection within the first-year writing program and the writing center involves examining and contesting the labor situation. The current labor practices within first-year writing and the writing center sustain the status quo's system of standardization, and composition faculty, students, tutors, and bosses must work to demand a professionalization of these communities of practice. Until the "workers" within the writing program and the writing center become professionalized, the current practices, based on business logic, will continue.

Professionalization does not require tenure and published scholarship on the part of all participants, especially in the face of the current staffing situation. For example, a

professional community within a writing center (directors, tutors, work study students) can be fostered through much discussion and immersion into writing center research combined with the agency of the lived experience of tutoring. Writing centers and first-year writing programs frequently house the most inexperienced students, workers, and directors within a university. Most of the 2009-2010 writing center director job postings on the MLA joblist were for non-tenure track year-by-year contract positions, and many of these required an M.A. degree only. At Stonie's writing center, all but one tutor is new each year, there is a lack of training, experience, and desire as many tutors are graduate students who have never tutored before and believe tutoring is about fixing writing into Edited American English. In the writing program, six to eight (usually inexperienced) graduate assistants teach three courses each year. Graduate and undergraduate students can be professionalized into a community of practice, but this professionalization will only happen if these sites are not subjected to continued high turnover rate of "workers."

Since the center and the writing program are often cast as a support services for the rest of the university, the least experienced "workers," often those on contract basis or without tenure, are the supporters, cast as repair agents rather than professionals in the field who can contribute to the ongoing study within composition and writing centers. In order to re-vision what the writing program and writing center can be, these labor practices need to be questioned, and both sites need to become professionalized to be recast in a form outside of a rotating service station model, otherwise both sites will become dead ends that reinforce the corporatized university's views of writing.

A second part of critical reflection about teaching requires a collaborative effort across grade levels to re-imagine the teaching of writing. The writing problems at Stonie

are not uniquely Stonie's; they extend across universities and into K-12 schools. All writing professionals, therefore, need to work collaboratively across grade levels. Organizations, such as the National Writing Project (NWP), a K-university partnership, provide an image of the possibility of teachers collaboratively teaching other teachers about the teaching of writing that are grounded in current composition and education research and theory. The NWP also engages teachers in inquiry to critically examine notions of what works and what does not. The NWP creates agency for teachers in their own classroom and her school community as the actors within the system making the choices and re-visioning what is best for students. They know because they live in a system that does not work well because it attempts to control teaching "from the *outside*" (Shor, 1987, p. viii). In the NWP, teachers have more options to speak back to the administration (and those outside the classroom or the school) because this re-visioning is based upon published research and lived experience. Teachers have more authority to explain the why behind their classroom pedagogy.

Local sites that house writing program can focus professional development, such as brown bag and orientation sessions, not just on pragmatic logistics but as moments where teaching practices can be examined and researched. WPAs can offer opportunities to reflect on those values that seem "outside" the traditional histories of writing instruction. For example, a WPA can conduct workshops that do not provide "how-to" scripts but that instead illustrate multiple understandings/approaches to writing instruction that make transparent how narrow current-traditional ideas of writing can be. Because so many part-time faculty members are not aware that their traditional pedagogy may or may not be based on research or scholarship (they are, in many cases, following a

textbook that their boss gave them), creating a forum to make the "why" behind their classroom practices visible can provide a way to re-envision what success in their first-year writing classrooms can be. Shor's (1987) text, *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life*, is an excellent place to start this re-visioning as it provides a theoretical basis for the included practical classroom-based descriptions to help teachers reflect on their classroom activities and their teaching philosophies. Welch's (2008) text, *Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World*, would also assist in provoking rich discussion about teaching within the corporatized university and finding ways to both make visible and work through the hegemonic forces of the institution.

Future research studies can focus on re-visioning by continuing to explore how students negotiate what it means to be a writer. Some potential directions for study include providing thick descriptions taught by professionalized writing teachers. A study that follows students who placed out of the first-year writing requirement and who only have their high school experiences may provide insightful contributions as well. In addition, with the growing interest in WAC/WID programs, centering a study on thick and rich descriptions of students in WAC/WID courses may help to represent the student's experiences as writers across different disciplines. Within the writing center, directors can illustrate (during new tutor training, staff meetings, and writing center publications) how tutoring often re-inscribes narrow forms of literacy but has the potential for opening up and expanding the discourse practices of students who enter. Like in the first-year writing program, it would be helpful to look at what happens to students who have a professionalized writing center. A re-visioned professionalized

center can be a space of awareness as student and teacher experiences collide in the contact zone (Pratt, 1999) of a tutoring session.

The Holland et al. (1998) comment at the start of this chapter illustrates how positionality within figured worlds is related to “power, status, and rank” (p. 271). According to Bourdieu and Passeron (1990), if education is about reproduction of the status quo, and unquestioning disciplined well-behaved “workers” are easy to dominate, then critical thinkers, rebellious collective “workers,” and questioning citizens endanger the status quo and will threaten the corporate university. We cannot, however, let the power of others lessen our resolve. The results of this dissertation study are dismal because the participants are positioned as holding little “power, status, and rank” within the figured world of school. Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) suggested that one way to re-envision within the figured world of the corporatized university is to be “specific [about] what we as a community want education to be” (p. 19) and to work collectively toward that vision. This communal specification will bring agency to the sites of writing for teachers, students, and WPAs and will suggest “constructive alternatives” (p. 19) which should over time themselves be examined so that they do not become reified. Working together to examine opportunities outside of the status quo is a means to re-vision and change the “power, status, and rank” found within the hegemonic structures of the corporatized university.

REFERENCES

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning*. Boston: Beacon.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1985). Education under siege: The conservative, liberal and radical debate over schooling. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Bailey, J. O. (1946). Harvard, Yale, Princeton required English. *South Atlantic Bulletin, 11*(4), 6-8. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Ed. M. Holquist Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Bartholomae, D. (2000). Composition, 1900-2000. *PMLA, 115*(7), 1950-1954.

Bergeron, S. (2001). Political economy discourses of globalization and feminist politics. *Signs, 26*(4), 983-1006. Retrieved September 22, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Berlin, J. A. (1982). Contemporary composition: The major pedagogical theories. *College English, 44*, 765-777.

Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality*: *Writing instruction in American college, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bizzell, P. (1988). Arguing about literacy. *College English, 50*, 141-153.

Booth, K. M. (1998). National mother, global whore, and transnational femocrats: The politics of AIDS and the construction of women at the World Health Organization. *Feminist Studies, 24*(1), 115-139.

Boquet, E. H. (1999). "Our little secret": A history of writing centers, pre- to post-open admissions. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(3), 463-482.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question*. London: Sage. (Original work published 1990).

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* London: Sage.

Bousquet, M., Scott, T., & Parascondola, L. (2004). *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers: Writing instruction in the managed university*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Brannon, L., Cain, M. A., & Comstock, M. (in press). *Breathing space: Composing public places for writing and teaching*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook/Heinemann.

Bridwell-Bowles, L. (2006). Freedom, form, function. In *Views from the Center: The CCCC Chairs' Addresses 1977-2005*, D. Roen (ed.). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 267-281.

CCCC Committee on Part-Time/Adjunct Issues. (2001). Report on the coalition on the academic workforce/CCCC survey of faculty in freestanding writing programs for fall 1999. *College Composition and Communication, 53*(2), 336-348.

Clark, I. L. (1993). Portfolio evaluation, collaboration, and writing centers. *College Composition and Communication, 44*(4), 515-524.

Codd, J. (2005, May). Teachers as 'managed professionals' in the global education industry: The New Zealand Experience. *Educational Review*, *57*(2), 193-206. Retrieved November 2006, from Academic Search Premier database.

Connors, R. J. (1990). Overwork/Underpay: Labor and status of composition teachers since 1880. *Rhetoric review, 9*(1), 108-126. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Curtis, M. C. (2007, June 30). Scores, as always, leave us unsatisfied. *The Charlotte Observer*, 1B.

deMarrais, K. B., & Lapan, S. D. (2004). Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence.

de Tocqueville, A. (1989). *Democracy in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. (Original work published 1835)

Elbow, P. (1991). Reflections on academic discourse: How it relates to freshmen and colleagues. *College English, 53*(2), 135-155.

Ferguson, C. A. (1975). Toward a characterization of English foreigner talk. *Anthropological Linguistics, 17*, 1-14.

Fisher, S. (1984). Institutional authority and the structure of discourse. *Discourse Processes, 7*, 201-224.

Foley, B. (1998). "Lepers in the Acropolis": Liberalism, capitalism, and the crisis in academic labor. *Contemporary Literature, 39*(2), 317-335. Retrieved September 22, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Knopf.

Freeman, C. (2001). Is local: Global as feminine: Masculine? Rethinking the gender of globalization. *Signs, 26*(4), 1007-1037. Retrieved September 7, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gans, H. J. (1972). The positive functions of poverty. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78*(2), 275-289. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Gates, P. (2000). A study of the structure of the professional orientation of two teachers of mathematics: A sociological approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nottingham University, London.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1973). *Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture*. In *The Interpretation of cultures,* C. Geertz (Ed.), 3-30. New York: Basic Books.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* Boston: Pearson.

Grimm, N. (1999). *Good intentions: Writing center work for postmodern times.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Hairston, M. (2006). Breaking our bonds and reaffirming our connections. In *Views from the Center: The CCCC Chairs' Addresses 1977-2005,* D. Roen (ed.). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 132-144.

Halasek, K. (1999). *A pedagogy of possibility: Bakhtinian perspectives on composition studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Harrington, S. et al. (2001). WPA outcomes statement for First-Year Composition. *College English, 63*(3), 321-325.

Harris, J. (2000). Meet the new boss, same as the old boss: Class consciousness in composition. *College Composition and Communication, 52*(1), 43-68.

Hassan, W. S. (2000). World literature in the age of globalization: Reflections on an anthology. *College English, 63*(1), 38-47.

Hatlen, B. (1988). Michel Foucault and the discourse[s] of English. *College English, 50*(7), 786-801.

Heath, S. B. (1984). *Ways with words.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Helms, A. D. (2007a, November 15). Fair to feature school's rebirth. *The Charlotte Observer*, 3B.

Helms, A. D. (2007b, November 16). Scores spur celebration, but show little progress. *The Charlotte Observer*, 5B.

Herndl, C. G. (1993). Teaching discourse and reproducing culture: A critique of research and pedagogy in professional and non-academic writing. *College Composition and Communication, 44*(3), 349-363.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Jr., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Horner, B. (2000). Traditions and professionalization: Reconceiving work in Composition. *College Composition and Communication, 51*(3), 366-398.

Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication, 53*(4), 594-630.

Hutchings, C. (2006). Reaching students: Lessons from a writing centre. *Higher Education Research and Development, 25*(3), 247-261.

Imam, S. R. (2005). English as a global language and the question of nation building education in Bangladesh. *Comparative Education, 41*(4), 471-486.

Institute for Policy Studies (2001). *New CEO/Worker Pay Gap Study*. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from http://www.ips-dc.org/projects/execexcess2001.htm

Jarvis, P. (1999). Global trends in lifelong learning and the response of the universities. *Comparative Education, 35*(2), 249-257.

Jay, P. (2001). Beyond discipline? Globalization and the future of English. *PMLA, 116*(1), 32-47. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Johnson, B., & McCarthy T. (Summer 2000). Casual labor and the future of the academy. *Thought and Action*, 107-120.

Johnson, B., et al. (2003). *Steal this university: The rise of the corporate university and the acdemic labor movement*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, C. (2001). The relationship between writing centers and improvement in writing ability: An assessment of the literature. *Education, 122*(1), 3- 20.

Kamberelis, G. & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). *Qualitative inquiry: Approaches to language and literacy research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Knoblauch, C. H., & Brannon, L. (1993). *Critical teaching and the idea of literacy.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Knoblauch, C. H. (1988). Rhetorical constructions: Dialogue and commitment. *College English, 50,* 125-140.

Knoblauch, C. H., & Brannon, L. (1984). *Rhetorical traditions and the teaching of writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Ladwig, J. G. (1994). For whom this reform?: Outlining educational policy as a social field. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 15*(3), 341-363.

Lauer, J. M. (1995). The feminization of rhetoric and composition studies? *Rhetoric Review, 13*(2), 276-286.

Law, J. & Murphy, C. (1997). Formative assessment and the paradigms of writing center practice *Clearing House, 71*, 106-108.

Li, D. L. (2001). Introduction: Globalization and the humanities. *Comparative Literature, 53*(4), 275-282. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Linell, P. (1990). The power of dialogue dynamics. In *The Dynamics of Dialogue*, I. Markova and K. Foppa, eds. New York: Springer.

Linell, P. et al. (1988). Interactional dominance in dyadic communication: A presentation of initiative-response analysis. *Linguistics, 26*, 415-442.

Littleton, C. E. (2006, November/December). Creating connections between secondary and college writing centers. *The Clearing House*, 77-78.

Livingston, R. E. (2001). Glocal knowledges: Agency and place in literary studies. *PMLA, 116*(1), 145-157. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Logan, S. W. (2006). Changing missions, shifting positions, and breaking silences. In *Views from the Center: The CCCC Chairs' Addresses 1977-2005*, D. Roen (ed.). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 418-429.

Luke, A. (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early literacy training. *Linguistics and Education, 4*, 107-129.

Martin, H. (1962). Freshman composition: Harvard beginnings. *College Composition and Communication, 13*(3), 35-36.

Martin, R. (1997). Academic labor: An introduction. *Social Text, 51*, 1-8. Retrieved September 22, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, R. E. (1994). Composing English Studies: Towards a social history of the discipline. *College Composition and Communication, 45*(2), 164-179.

Mutch, C. A. (2006). Adapting Bourdieu's field theory to explain decision-making processes in educational policy. In *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*, V. A. Anfara, Jr. & N. T. Mertz, eds. London: Sage.

Noden, H. (1999). *Image grammar: Using grammatical structures to teach writing.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

North, S. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English, 46*(5), 433-446.

Ohmann, R. (1996). *English in America: A radical view of the profession.* London: Wesleyan University Press.

Paul, J. L. (2005). *Introduction to the philosophies of research and criticism in education and the Social Sciences*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Peet, R., et al. (2003). *Unholy Trinity: The IMF, World Bank and WTO*. New York: Zed Books.

Perlman, L. (1986). The context of classroom writing. *College English, 48*(5), 471-479.

Pratt, M.L. (1999) Arts of the Contact Zones. in Bartholomae, D. and Petroksky, A (eds.) Ways of Reading. New York, US: Bedford/St. Martin.

Robertson, . L. (2005). Re-imagining and rescripting the future of education: Global knowledge economy discourses and the challenge to education systems. *Comparative Education, 41*(2), 151-170.

Roemer, M., Schultz, L. M., & Durst, R. K. (1999). Reframing the great debate on first-year writing. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(3), 377-392.

Rudolph, D. E. (1994). Construction an apprenticeship with discourse strategies: Professor-graduate student interactions. *Language in society, 23*, 199-230.

Schram, T. H. (2006). *Conceptualizing and proposing qualitative research: Mindwork for fieldwork in education and the social sciences.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Scott, T. (2009). *Dangerous writing: Understanding the political economy of composition.* Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 2009.

Shor, I. (1987). Critical teaching and everyday life. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Simmons, S. C. (1995). Constructing writers: Barrett Wendell's pedagogy at Harvard. *College Composition and Communication, 46*(3), 327-352.

Smit, D. (2002). Curriculum design for first-year writing programs. In *The Allyn and Bacon sourcebook for writing program administrators*, I. Ward & W. J. Carpenter (Eds.). New York: Longman, 185-206.

Smolowitz, P. (2007a, August 18). CMS middle schools face unpleasant choices. *The Charlotte Observer*, 1A.

Smolowitz, P. (2007b, October 24). CMS likely to rate schools to help with comparisons. *The Charlotte Observer,* 3B.

Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 148-156.

Spring, J. (2004). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Stewart, D. C. (1992). Harvard's influence on English Studies: Perceptions from three universities in the early Twentieth Century. *College Composition and Communication, 43*(4), 455-471.

Stiglitz, J. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: Norton.

Straub, R. (1996). The concept of control in teacher response: Definng the varieties of "directive" and "facilitative" commentary. *College Composition and Communication, 47*(2), 223-251.

Thonus, T. (1999). Dominance in academic writing tutorials: Gender, language proficiency, and the offering of suggestions. *Discourse Society, 10*, 225-248.

Torres, C. A. (2002, November). The state, privatization and educational policy: A critique of neo-liberalism in Latin America and some ethical and political implications. *Comparative Education, 38*(4), 365-385.

Turner, M. (2006, November/December). Writing centers: Being proactive in the education crisis. *The Clearing House*, 45-49.

United Nations. (2006). *United Nations World Institute for development economics research of the United Nations University*. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from http://www.wider.unu.edu

Valdman, A. (1981). Sociolinguistic aspects of foreigner talk. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *28*, 41-52.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching Grammar in Context*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Welch, N. (2008). *Living Room: Teaching public writing in a privatized world.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Wendell, B. (1977). *Literature, society, and politics: Selected essays, edited by Robert T. Self.* St. Paul, MN: John Colet Press.

Wilson, M. (2006). Rethinking rubrics in writing assessment. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Wolcott, H. F. (1995). *The art of fieldwork.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Woodward, S. (2007). Conceptualizing and enacting writing: How teachers of writing construct identity and practice within a complex figured world of school. Unpublished Dissertation, Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Zimin, S. (1981). Sex and politeness: Factors in first-and second-language use. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 27*, 35-58.

APPENDIX A: STUDY TIMELINE

Before Study	Interview Teacher for a. Teacher's philosophy b. Plan for class c. Clarity of assignments d. History of teacher and views about writing		
Weeks 1&2	Class Observations for context, selection of focal students	Interviews with focal students: a. views of writing b. views of first-year writing experiences thus far c. history as a writer Interviews with tutor(s) a. Teaching philosophy b. Tutorial philosophy	
Weeks 3, 4, 5	Assignment 1: Class Observation	Tutorials for each focal student (one or two tutorial(s) per student	Copy tutor notes, tutor emails, and student papers
Weeks 5, 6, 7	Assignment 2: Class Observation	Tutorials for each focal student (one or two tutorials per student)	Copy tutor notes, tutor emails, and student papers
Weeks 8, 9	Follow-up interview with teacher a. how he perceived the class b. his view of focal students and their needs c. his view of the tutorials' effects on student performance	Follow-up interviews: Tutors: perception of students and tutorials Students: perception of tutorials, class session, and writing performance	

APPENDIX B: IRB LETTER OF CONSENT FORMS

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
9201 University City Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28223

Informed Consent Form
(for the Teacher)

Project Title and Purpose:

Performances of Writing Discourses in a First-Year Writing Course and Writing Center Tutorials will be a qualitative study involving one first-year writing course, its teacher, up to five of its students, and two writing center tutors. This study will examine how these students experience the performance of different discourses in the classroom and writing center space. I will be conducting tape-recorded interviews and observations, and collecting archival data in the form of student papers, tutor email-based tutorial session reports to the teacher, and tutor notes from writing center sessions in order to investigate how students experience writing discourses within the first-year writing classroom and the writing center.

Investigator:

This study will be conducted by Jennifer P. Courtney, B.A.; M.A. and PhD Candidate. The responsible faculty member is Dr. Lil Brannon in the Department of Arts and Sciences.

Eligibility:

You have been selected to participate in this study because you are a first-year writing teacher at this institution. Your participation in this study would cease if you terminated your employment at this school and/or moved to another school.

Overall Description of Participation:

Case study methodology will be used in this study, so you will be asked to participate in interviews and observations. Initial interviews with the teacher will be conducted in the beginning of January 2008. Classroom and tutorial session observations will begin in January 2008 and will officially end May 2008. Final interviews with the teacher will be conducted between March and May of 2008. All interviews and observations will be

tape-recorded. Archival data in the form of student writing, tutor emails, and tutor notes may also be collected upon consent of the students.

Length of Participation:

Initial interviews will be conducted in January 2008. Classroom and tutoring session observations will begin in January 2008 and will officially end May 2008. Final interviews with the teacher will be conducted between March and May of 2008. Each interview will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour. Observations will last the entire length of a traditional class period or tutoring session. One initial interview will be conducted before observations begin, and at least two follow-up interviews will be conducted.

Volunteer Statement:

You are a volunteer. The decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. If you decide to be in the study, you may stop at any time. You will not be treated any differently if you decide not to participate in the study or if you stop once you have started.

Confidentiality Statement:

Any information about your participation, including your identity, is completely confidential. The following steps will be taken to ensure this confidentiality:

1) You will choose a pseudonym, first and last name, that will be used in all transcripts and publications.
2) In any publication of the research results, your school's identity will be masked.
3) All tapes will be labeled with your pseudonym.
4) Only people directly involved with analysis of the data will have access to the tapes and transcripts.
5) Upon request you will be sent an electronic copy of your transcripts for review. You will have the opportunity to remove all or parts of the interview transcripts from the data.

Statement of Fair Treatment and Respect:

UNC Charlotte wants to make sure that you are treated in a fair and respectful manner. Contact the university's Research Compliance Office (704-687-3309) if you have questions about how you are treated as a study participant. If you have any questions about the actual project or study, please contact Ms. Jennifer P. Courtney at (704.687.4226; jpooler@uncc.edu) or Dr. Lil Brannon (704.687.3220; lbrannon@.uncc.edu).

Approval Date:

This form was approved for use on *XX/XX/XXXX* for use for one year.

Participant Consent *(for participants who are at least 18 years of age)*

I have read the information in this consent form. I have had the chance to ask questions about this study, and those questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I am at least 18 years of age, and I agree to participate in this research project. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form after it has been signed by me and the principal investigator of this research study.

_____ _____
Participant Name (PRINT) DATE

_____
Participant Signature

_____ _____
Investigator Signature DATE

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
9201 University City Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28223

Informed Consent Form
(for Students)

Project Title and Purpose:

Performances of Writing Discourses in a First-Year Writing Course and Writing Center Tutorials will be a qualitative study involving one first-year writing course, its teacher, up to five of its students, and two writing center tutors. This study will examine how these students experience the performance of different discourses in the classroom and writing center space. I will be conducting tape-recorded interviews and observations, and collecting archival data in the form of student papers, tutor email-based tutorial session reports to the teacher, and tutor notes from writing center sessions in order to investigate how students experience writing discourses within the first-year writing classroom and the writing center.

Investigator:

This study will be conducted by Jennifer P. Courtney, B.A.; M.A. and PhD Candidate. The responsible faculty member is Dr. Lil Brannon in the Department of Arts and Sciences.

Eligibility:

You have been selected to participate in this study because you are a student in the teacher participant's classrooms in which this study is focused. Your participation in this study would cease if you were no longer in this teacher's class.

Overall Description of Participation:

Case study methodology will be used in this study, so you will be asked to participate in interviews and observations. Initial interviews with students will be conducted at the end of January or beginning of February 2008. Classroom and tutorial session observations will begin in January 2008 and will officially end May 2008. Final interviews with students will be conducted between March and May of 2008. All interviews and observations will be tape-recorded. Archival data in the form of student writing, tutor emails, and tutor notes may also be collected upon consent of the students.

Length of Participation:

Initial interviews will be conducted in late January or early February 2008. Classroom and tutoring session observations will begin in January 2008 and will officially end May 2008. Final interviews with students will be conducted between March and May of 2008. Each interview will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour. Observations will last the entire length of a traditional class period or tutoring session. At least one follow-up interviews will be conducted.

Volunteer Statement:

You are a volunteer. The decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. If you decide to be in the study, you may stop at any time. You will not be treated any differently if you decide not to participate in the study or if you stop once you have started.

Confidentiality Statement:

Any information about your participation, including your identity, is completely confidential. The following steps will be taken to ensure this confidentiality:

1) You will choose a pseudonym, first and last name, that will be used in all transcripts and publications.
2) In any publication of the research results, your school's identity will be masked.
3) All tapes will be labeled with your pseudonym.
4) Only people directly involved with analysis of the data will have access to the tapes and transcripts.
5) Upon request you will be sent an electronic copy of your transcripts for review. You will have the opportunity to remove all or parts of the interview transcripts from the data.

Statement of Fair Treatment and Respect:

UNC Charlotte wants to make sure that you are treated in a fair and respectful manner. Contact the university's Research Compliance Office (704-687-3309) if you have questions about how you are treated as a study participant. If you have any questions about the actual project or study, please contact Ms. Jennifer P. Courtney at (704.687.4226; jpooler@uncc.edu) or Dr. Lil Brannon (704.687.3220; lbrannon@.uncc.edu).

Approval Date:

This form was approved for use on XX/XX/XXXX for use for one year.

Participant Consent *(for participants who are at least 18 years of age)*

I have read the information in this consent form. I have had the chance to ask questions about this study, and those questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I am at least 18 years of age, and I agree to participate in this research project. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form after it has been signed by me and the principal investigator of this research study.

_____ _____
Participant Name (PRINT) DATE

_____
Participant Signature

_____ _____
Investigator Signature DATE

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
9201 University City Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28223

Informed Consent Form
(for Tutors)

Project Title and Purpose:

Performances of Writing Discourses in a First-Year Writing Course and Writing Center Tutorials will be a qualitative study involving one first-year writing course, its teacher, up to five of its students, and two writing center tutors. This study will examine how these students experience the performance of different discourses in the classroom and writing center space. I will be conducting tape-recorded interviews and observations, and collecting archival data in the form of student papers, tutor email-based tutorial session reports to the teacher, and tutor notes from writing center sessions in order to investigate how students experience writing discourses within the first-year writing classroom and the writing center.

Investigator:

This study will be conducted by Jennifer P. Courtney, B.A.; M.A. and PhD Candidate. The responsible faculty member is Dr. Lil Brannon in the Department of Arts and Sciences.

Eligibility:

You have been selected to participate in this study because you are a tutor in the writing center in which this study is focused. Your participation in this study would cease if you were no longer a tutor at this center.

Overall Description of Participation:

Case study methodology will be used in this study, so you will be asked to participate in interviews and observations. Initial interviews with tutors will be conducted at the end of January or beginning of February 2008. Classroom and tutorial session observations will begin in January 2008 and will officially end May 2008. Final interviews with tutors will be conducted between March and May of 2008. All interviews and observations will be tape-recorded. Archival data in the form of student writing, tutor emails, and tutor notes may also be collected upon consent of the students.

Length of Participation:

Initial interviews will be conducted in late January or early February 2008. Classroom and tutoring session observations will begin in January 2008 and will officially end May 2008. Final interviews with tutors will be conducted between March and May of 2008. Each interview will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour. Observations will last the entire length of a traditional class period or tutoring session. At least one follow-up interview will be conducted.

Volunteer Statement:

You are a volunteer. The decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. If you decide to be in the study, you may stop at any time. You will not be treated any differently if you decide not to participate in the study or if you stop once you have started.

Confidentiality Statement:

Any information about your participation, including your identity, is completely confidential. The following steps will be taken to ensure this confidentiality:

1) You will choose a pseudonym, first and last name, that will be used in all transcripts and publications.
2) In any publication of the research results, your school's identity will be masked.
3) All tapes will be labeled with your pseudonym.
4) Only people directly involved with analysis of the data will have access to the tapes and transcripts.
5) Upon request you will be sent an electronic copy of your transcripts for review. You will have the opportunity to remove all or parts of the interview transcripts from the data.

Statement of Fair Treatment and Respect:

UNC Charlotte wants to make sure that you are treated in a fair and respectful manner. Contact the university's Research Compliance Office (704-687-3309) if you have questions about how you are treated as a study participant. If you have any questions about the actual project or study, please contact Ms. Jennifer P. Courtney at (704.687.4226; jpooler@uncc.edu) or Dr. Lil Brannon (704.687.3220; lbrannon@.uncc.edu).

Approval Date:

This form was approved for use on XX/XX/XXXX for use for one year.

Participant Consent *(for participants who are at least 18 years of age)*

I have read the information in this consent form. I have had the chance to ask questions about this study, and those questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I am at least 18 years of age, and I agree to participate in this research project. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form after it has been signed by me and the principal investigator of this research study.

_____ _____

Participant Name (PRINT) DATE

_____

Participant Signature

_____ _____

Investigator Signature DATE

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Teacher Questions

Tell me a bit about yourself…where are you from?

Describe your educational experiences so far in your life.

Describe your teaching experiences so far in your life.

What do you think good student writing looks like? Why?

What do you think bad student writing looks like? Why?

What do you think it means to be a writer?

What kinds of writing are you asking students to work on in your English 1102 class?

Tell me about a specific example of a writing assignment from your class.

Tell me about how you feel about this assignment.

What do you think a writing center is for?

Where does this idea of a writing center come from?

How does/could the writing center connect to a first-year writing class?

Student Questions

Tell me a bit about yourself…where are you from?

Describe your educational experiences so far in your life.

What type of writing have you done before?

What do you think good student writing looks like? Why?

What do you think bad student writing looks like? Why?

What do you think it means to be a writer?

What kinds of writing are you working on in your English 1102 class?

Tell me about a specific example of a writing assignment from your class.

Tell me about how you feel about this assignment.

What do you think a writing center is for?

Where does this idea of a writing center come from?

Tell me about an experience in the writing center during a tutoring session.

How did the writing center tutorial relate to your writing for class?

Tutor Questions

Tell me a bit about yourself…where are you from?

Describe your educational experiences so far in your life.

What type of writing have you done before?

What do you think good student writing looks like? Why?

What do you think bad student writing looks like? Why?

What do you think it means to be a writer?

What type of writing assignments do you typically see from first-year writing students?

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE CDA TRANSCRIPT

Transcription

JPC: okay it is March 11 and we are here with Charlie (Steve) looking over his Paper One.

S: kindof one of the first things you notice is that I misspelled Rob's name, and he made a big thing about that in class, one of the things that you know, that I see going through this is format. Just like one or two comma splices, like these here and extra space between the title, I'm always thrown off by things like double spacing and how to arrange that. And a couple things like what the assignment pertained to, like I'm known to a lot of people as a well of useless knowledge. Like whatever, I'll remember certain things, not necessarily useful, so I put some facts in here that a lot of people may not know, but I know well enough and it is believable enough that people might take it for common sense, and he had marked down that it is a little close to needing citation. And one of the—another thing I noticed—commas and semi-colons, like I know how to use them but not necessarily in context to what I'm writing. [pause]

JPC: say more about that

S: like right here, the sentence would be, "to this day there hasn't been one proven positive effect to health from smoking tobacco in fact all there seems to be in both magazines and tv are more ads and more and more facts against it." And part of where I had trouble was where he corrected me was where it says, "health from smoking tobacco" I had put a semi colon after tobacco and he had corrected it as "smoking tobacco in fact COMMA all there seems to be…" and that is one of the things he was trying to teach us about, punctuation use and

JPC: how does what happens in class with examples of this is how you use this particular punctuation, how is that translating into your own writing?

S: well [big pause]

JPC: or does it?

S: it seems like almost every English class starts off with you know the basics, like where you use different words, when they are used, and different punctuations and where you would use them, and it is like at that moment, I feel like I know it, and then I'll go to write my paper and it is just like a complete brain shut down as to where to put this and how I should use it. And I always find myself going back and trying to find—because it, it's—you can go into class and take notes on how to use things, but it is different when you try to use them in context of what you are trying to write. [pause] because you don't punctuate your thoughts. It's only when you put them down on paper and when formatting.

JPC: Hmmm.

S: And really most of my points were taken off from just punctuation and stuff. Looking at the breakdown of points here, all the points I lost were from grammar and mechanical format categories. There are things like word agreement, and like here, one of the more humorous things he took as a more humorous thing I just. And one of the things he just thought I should have done was to expand on an idea which I would have but time constraints and just wanted to get the paper done, really because it is not a really long paper.

JPC: yes it was short

S: it had like a three page limit on it. Like two to three pages. And I had, because I tend to, my ideas tend to run away on me, and had I expanded on many of the ideas that I wanted to put in the paper, my paper probably would have ended up as an eight-page thesis paper on the subject.

JPC: I saw in one of the tutoring sessions that you had something to the effect of if you had written without limit, it would have been much longer.

S: it is hard for me to spend too much time on one thing without starting to make mistakes. But at the same time, I like to work on things like this at one time.

JPC: Like one sitting? One chunk of time?

S: I mean not just sit down and plug away at it for six hours, I mean like sit down, work on it for an hour or two and take a break, another hour or two, and come back to it. Take half a day to work on it.

JPC: okay.

S: he has here that my peer editing—do you want anything from that?

JPC: whatever you want

S: can we go over his end?

JPC: sure you can take a read through it and digest it and tell me what you get out of that.

S: he's just basically saying that this that he is going over one of his bigger corrections that I should have expanded more in my important ideas, like my observations. I had made a point about what I learned from health class and body worlds where you always get a shock factor of seeing the black pocked lung—I don't know what they call it at body worlds, like you see a normal lung and then a shriveled little thing they call a lunch, that is only from five years of smoking, so he said I should have kind of expanded on that and another point I had made about the hypocracy of environmentalists and how their

whole bohemian attitude of I smoke is kindof hypocritical to their aim to save the environment, because it may not be on the same scale but they are doing the same thing to their fellow people that humanity is doing to the environment. He said it is in no way limited, but my paper would have been a lot better had I expanded on those ideas.

JPC: but you said you were feeling kindof constrained--

S: yes—I could have written separate essays on those two points alone. But—I'm not one to really rely on outlines and prewriting exercises and stuff like that. I don't know if you noticed, I really didn't borrow from the peer editing because I don't really like handing over my paper to someone else and I'm not really a judgmental person, but when it comes to people like going over my essay, I tend to prefer what I write because a lot of times to me it seems like it's really taking away from my paper what other people put on there, and the only time that I really peer edit is with people I know, I trust, people I know will give me good input—close friends, people I—like I have a friend in college who has been on the dean's list and he's fairly efficient at grading papers, and he's one of the kind of friends that will kindof make jokes, like jokingly degrade you and make fun of you and stuff, so it is people like that, people who aren't afraid to criticize me or make fun of me because you know they have more freedom to grade it as opposed to people who are trying to protect me.

JPC: Hmmm. You said I remember hearing in one of the tutoring sessions that a lot of the peer commentary was more stylistic even, which is very personal—a personal thing as well.

S: with my writing, not necessarily like I've got an obsession about my writing, it is more like paranoia, like I'll write a sentence, read a couple sentences before it and see how it fits. And I don't wait until the end of the paper to edit, it's kindof like an in-process thing. Where like if the red line pops up, it is paranoia, like oh god what did I do wrong. Go back and correct it.

JPC: where do you think that comes from?

S: [pause]

JPC: is that something you can recall?

S: yeah. [pause] When I—in kindergarten and first grade, [pause] it is fairly vivid for me. I wasn't exactly what you would call a [pause] grade A student. And my—one of the big things was writing that I had, and this really goes all the way up to third grade but it is just kindof one of the things that sticks with you—those two years [big pause]

JPC: yes, they do. It sticks with you more than recent things.

S: and one of the things with writing, not necessarily what I was writing but writing the words and penmanship and stuff like that, my dad would sit because my biggest problem

was homework, I would never get homework done, I'd wait until the last minute and I was pretty constantly in the principal's office because I didn't get things done, I would hide notices that I didn't get stuff done that I'd have to have signed by my parents, so my parents would get frustrated and mad at me and sit me down. I would be writing and I'd probably be writing a one page paper---"my name is Steve and I did this this this" you know basic simple words and introductory, and how I'd make a mistake or erase something my dad would get all mad at me, crumple it up and make me start over. So that and there's other situations on that I could expound on, but that is the basic idea.

JPC: so perfect at first.

S: just wanting to go back, always make sure it is correct, just like that innate programmed fear in the back of my mind that my dad was going to reach out from nowhere and delete the file and make me start over.

JPC: I can see how that would do it. [big pause] What do you think Hank wants you to get out of his commentary to take to your next paper?

S: well, I think he really put that in the last paragraph of his response, he really wants, if I have ideas that I see as important, I shouldn't feel limited by it I should write them out and then be concerned with my page limitations—content limitations.

JPC: ooo. That is in direct contrast to how you've been approaching writing.

S: well I've been told that before, like my senior English teacher she made us write eight pages and then cut it down to six. And this was over a like two month process of writing this paper, I put all this time and effort into it and you think you have a really good eight page paper and all of sudden she is like limit it to six. You have to go through your entire paper and basically do it over because for me it was like doing it over because a lot of my writing was due to the fact that it was eight pages, so I had to take out entire paragraphs, rewrite paragraphs so everything fit together. I could do that in this paper because it is a bigger paper, this next one, because obviously there is more time to plan it out and stuff so—it will be a little more easier for me to do that.

JPC: I've asked hank this as well, but who is this piece of writing for?

S: well obviously it is for Hank, but—are you taking about this paper [paper one] or the next one?

JPC: this paper

S: [pause]

JPC: When you wrote this, what were you writing for?

S: really for me because it is my opinion because it is an opinion based essay, so while I was doing the assignment for Hank and most of it is for him as it is his assignment for his class, it is my opinion it is really for me to express my opinion on the subject.

JPC: let's talk about the response in general. Pull back from this class and let's just think about you as a writer in general. What would be your ideal way of getting a response from someone about your paper? You talked about your friends in the past, but how would that person present his or her response? Is it a written piece, is a tour of your paper, overall themes? What would be ideal for you?

S: you mean handing your paper over to someone?

JPC: like if I gave you the first three chapters of my dissertation, and I said, I want to hear what your response is to this. Like I have an idea how you could share with me your response. I've got certain things that work better than others, like, a pen and you've gone through every page and just corrected punctuation, that would do nothing for me.

S: What is best for me is what I do. Not necessarily first person, but like say I'm online and I see that my friend is online. I'd say, hey, can you look over this paper for me and they'll read it and just have a one-on-one discussion about it, what they thought the problems were in the paper and well I can really take—there's real value in what he said. I will be able to put more content into the next paper and work with this, where if someone just corrects my paper and says do this, this is wrong and this is wrong. What works best for me is just sitting down with someone and as most of my friends live over 1000 miles away from me, then it is hard because I can't drive up there for one paper. But I do talk to them online, and I'll type with them online.

JPC: I was trying to ask some of the same questions I asked him as he was reading through your paper. Yep. That is it.

APPENDIX E: CLASS SYLLABI

English 2: Writing in the Academic Community

"Words don't deserve that kind of malarkey. They're innocent, neutral, precise, standing for this, describing that, meaning the other, so if you look after them you can build bridges across incomprehension and chaos. But when they get their corners knocked off, they're no good any more…So [that] everything [you build] is jerry built. It's rubbish. An intelligent child could push it over. I don't think writers are sacred, but words are. They deserve respect. If you get the right ones in the right order, you can nudge the world a little or make a poem which children will speak for you when you're dead."

-Tom Stoppard, from *The Real Thing* (1982)

Syllabus: This syllabus contains a tremendous amount of information regarding the nature of the class, contact information, procedures and policies, and scheduling of readings and assignments. Please look it over and make sure all aspects are clear. Please keep it somewhere safe so you won't lose it!

Course Goals: Welcome to English 1102. As in 1101, the purpose of this course is to develop (and refine) your ability to write at the college level. The specific focus of this class is the argumentative essay and the ability to perform critical analysis. Our goal is to reach a level of critical literacy, which is defined as the ability to write fluently, to engage with important issues, to work with appropriate materials and resources, to understand chosen issues from multiple perspectives, and to advance a position that is reflective in quality. Over the course of the semester we will have a number of goals, including the following: 1) to recognize and respond to academic rhetorical situations through argument, 2) to be able to read and evaluate written arguments, including your own, 3) to be able to evaluate the credibility of sources (academic and popular, primary, text based, and electronic) used as evidence in an argument, and 4) to articulate several perspectives that surround an issue.

Course Methods: "Critical Literacy" is the primary goal of this course; simply put, our goal is to think critically, read critically, and write critically. To accomplish this, we will explore different strategies to analyze and understand texts, visuals, and issues from multiple perspectives or positions. From there, we will expand our analysis to the entire rhetorical situation surrounding issues and topics in order to grasp the whole picture and not just one point of view. We will cover approaches and techniques for examining issues and use them on various examples and units throughout the semester.

The important element of writing critically, then, is to express clearly and effectively our analytical thought. The best way to improve and refine your writing is, simply, to write, or "learn by doing." As such, this course is designed to incorporate elements of a writing workshop, meaning we will spend nearly every class period writing or talking about writing. Mechanical aptitude is important, as are stylistic considerations, so we will spend some of our time refining those qualities. Mechanics, then, will constitute a portion of your grade on each assignment. As our focus is argument and critical analysis, there will be a good amount of discussion as well. Participation in discussion and workshop will

constitute a percentage of your final grade as will daily assignments. We will also practice writing and monitor our progress as writers in a writing journal.

"Let me explain to you one of the key elements involved in the writing process. Because it may seem outwardly that the pen and the paper and the chair play a large role. But they're all somewhat incidental to the actual using of the brain."

-Jerry Seinfeld, from *Seinfeld* TV episode "The Cheever Letters" (1992)

Required Texts:

-Sylvan Barnet and Hugo Bedau, *From Critical Thinking to Argument (2nd Edition)* (Bedford/St. Martin's 2008)

-Diana Hacker, *A Writer's Reference (6th Edition)* (Bedford/St. Martin's 2007)
Note: The "Hacker" available at the bookstore for this class should be packaged with a Webster Pocket Dictionary. The dictionary is not required, but heartily recommended.

-There are several secondary texts available from the electronic reserves through the Library and on the Blackboard site for this class. Electronic texts are available through the Library's website: http://library.uncc.edu/reserves/, and Blackboard can be accessed through 49er Express, at http://www.express.uncc.edu/, or directly, at http://ncvista.blackboard.com/webct/.

Other Required Materials:

-One (1) Mead Composition book or spiral notebook set aside as a writing journal (no binders)

-One (1) Portfolio Folder w/Pockets (Mead, 5-Star, etc) for major essay materials (we'll re-use)

Requirements and Grading: (percentages are approximate)

There are 1000 points available, distributed as follows:

1) Participation in Discussions and Workshops: In a class of this nature, daily participation is essential for everyone's success. (150 points/15% of final grade)

2) The Writing Journal: All students will keep a journal to record their personal progress as writers. The journal will be graded on a completion basis, not on content. (150 points/15% of final grade)

3) Three Essays: Details will be in press. (300 points/35% of final grade)
Note: Essay grades will include multiple drafts and revisions.

4) Final Essay: Details will be in press. (200 points/20% of final grade)

5) Various other assignments (in and out of class): (150points/15% of final grade)
Note: all out-of-class assignments MUST be typed unless otherwise noted.

Grade Scale: (1000 points available)
A = 900+ points (90% and above)
B = 800-899 points (80%-89%)
C = 700-799 points (70%-79%)
D = 600-699 points (60%-69%)
F = 599 points or below (0%-59%)

"It had at this time become my custom, -and it is still my custom, though of late I have become a little lenient with myself, -to write with my watch before me, and to require from myself 250 words every quarter of an hour. I have found that 250 words have been as in press as regularly as my watch went."

-Anthony Trollope, from *An Autobiography* (1883)

Policies, Procedures, etc:

Attendance policy-As has already been noted, daily participation is essential to the success of all students. Attendance, therefore, is obviously critical. Please attend class, bring work, and participate in discussions and workshops. Failure to attend or bring assignments will prevent you from passing the class.

-You will be allowed 4 absences for personal use. Subsequent absences will count against your grade. For each absence after 4, you will lose half a letter grade up to 10 absences, where you will receive an automatic failing grade. (Each absence after 5 = -50 points)

-There are no excused/unexcused absences. You have 4 absences. The only exceptions to this rule are school excused absences (athletics, school sponsored competitions, etc) and emergency situations (family, medical, etc) lasting longer than 2 weeks. For school related absences, please provide documentation. For emergencies, please get in touch with me as soon as possible.

-If for any reason you are late, it is YOUR responsibility to inform me, at the end of class, that you were present. If you do NOT, you risk being marked absent. DO NOT FORGET TO DO THIS!

Weather, class cancellations, etc: Classes can and will only be cancelled by University decree or extraordinary circumstances. I will not cancel class because of inclement weather unless the University closes as a result, and if class for any reason will not be meeting, I will do my best to inform you in advance.

Late Assignments: Assignments that are turned in late can cause problems for the entire class, as we will often workshop or build upon each assignment during class. Obviously, it is difficult to workshop an assignment if that assignment has not been completed. All assignments are due on the designated date IN CLASS, ON PAPER. After class is over, assignments can be turned in by the end of the next day (i.e., papers due Monday can be turned it until the end of the day on Tuesday) with a 50% deduction from the grade. Assignments due on a Friday must be turned in by the end of the day. If you turn in an assignment late, you will forfeit any participation/workshop grade assessed on the due-date. I will not accept assignments turned in after the 1 day late period. If you will not be

able to turn in an assignment on time, it is your responsibility to get the assignment in early or arrange for an extension in advance. Extensions will ONLY be granted in advance of the due date, barring extreme circumstances. Day to day assignments that are not listed on the schedule are still required. Should you miss class, smaller assignments are still due when indicated in class, and it is your responsibility to complete them on time.

Email: Since assignments are due in class, I will not accept emailed documents or any software containing an electronic file (that includes cell phones and personal data assistants) for completion of an assignment except in the advent of an emergency of some kind. If you will be in a situation where there is no other option but email, please speak with me in advance.

Completion Grades: Some assignments, like journal entries, are graded on a completion basis. Completion, however, entails completion of the assignment and an indication of positive effort. To receive a completion grade, therefore, you must fulfill the guidelines of the assignment (for instance, a sheet of lined paper with your name and the phrase "This is my assignment" will not be sufficient to fulfill the requirements of a page long assignment).

"How well I would write if I were not here!"

-Italo Calvino, from *If on a winter's night a traveler* (1979)

Plagiarism and Academic Integrity: Since the goal of this class is to improve your thinking and writing skills, all work must reflect your own ability. As such, ALL assignments and essays must be completed by you, in your own words. Any text from other writers and/or other sources must be properly attributed and documented. Anything used word for word must be enclosed in quotes and cited properly, and anything paraphrased must still be attributed by citation. Any action to the contrary, or any other action constituting dishonesty in this regard, could result in plagiarism, which can lead to serious consequences including failure of the assignment, failure of the class, and possible suspension and expulsion. Refer to the attached section on Academic Misconduct, the Student Handbook, UNCC website, or ask myself or other faculty member for further details or answers to other questions. If there is ANY doubt or question, ASK SOMEONE AND BE CAREFULL!

Assignments and Reading:

Essay Assignments: Every major essay assignment will have a comprehensive assignment sheet listing all relevant due dates and required materials. Most essays will require process materials such as pre-writing tools and rough drafts, all of which must be included with the final draft in your folder. Make sure you receive (and READ!) the assignment sheet for every essay.

Essay Topics: The topic of each essay will be included on the assignment sheet passed out when the paper is assigned. Many essays will include an option for a unique topic of

your choice. If this option is available, one procedural point remains constant regardless of the assignment: any topic of your choice MUST be approved by me by a specified date. Furthermore, evidence of topic approval must be IN WRITING and attached to the final draft. Any papers written on unapproved topics WILL NOT BE GRADED. There are no exceptions to this policy. Check each assignment sheet for details.

Journals: Your journal must be kept in a spiral bound or composition notebook of some kind. Binders, report covers, stacks of loose leaf paper, etc are all unacceptable. Label and date each entry CLEARLY for grading purposes (if I have to spend more than 5 seconds trying to figure out which entry I'm looking at, you won't get credit!). Journal entries will cover a variety of topics, but I will only grade your completion and effort. I will not grade organization, grammar, mechanics, or handwriting (though it's best if you write legibly!).

Reading Responses in the Journal: All reading assignments (unless otherwise noted) include a reading response in your journal. Please label and date the entry clearly (e.g. Chapter 1, Feb. 31) since I will need to locate it in your journal.
You have two options as to the form your entry may take:

1) Write a well-developed paragraph, at least one half page in length, responding to issues raised in the text.
2) Complete a 3-2-1 itemized response:
   3 things, ideas, points, etc from the text that you find interesting or that you learned
   2 discussion questions you have regarding parts of the text
   1 idea you feel will help you with your writing

APPENDIX F: CLASS ASSIGNMENT SHEETS

Essay Assignment #1: Opinion/Persuasive Essay

Due: Thursday, February 7th

Format: 2-3 pages, 12pt font, double spaced, 1" margins

Assignment:

Prepare an opinion based, persuasive essay addressing one of the following topics:

1) Support or refute this statement: "My one vote in an election isn't going to change anything."
2) Cigarette smoking should/should not be allowed in public places.
3) Write your own topic and submit it to me for approval by Tuesday, January 29th. *Papers written on unapproved topics WILL NOT BE GRADED!

Requirements:

1) A fairly detailed outline, including a tentative thesis statement, to be completed by **Thursday, Jan. 31st**.
2) A rough draft, to be completed by **Tuesday, February 5th**. On the 5th we will workshop and revise your rough drafts. You will be allowed to keep the revised copy to work from, but you must include it with your final draft.
3) A final draft of the paper, due **Thursday, February 7th**.

Pointers:

- Make a Traditional argument, that is, make a claim and support it. You must take and argue a specific position, present your position in a clear thesis statement, and maintain that position throughout the essay. Assume your audience is neutral/undecided. Your goal for this paper is to sway your audience to your point of view.
- If you choose your own topic, please keep in mind that this is a short essay which does not necessarily lend itself well to broad, difficult issues.
- This is a strictly persuasive essay, based on your views and ideas. As such, DO NOT integrate outside information and sources! You should not cite statistics, studies, etc. or any information outside common knowledge.
- Try to be as in-depth as possible with your argument and supporting reasoning. Remember that "Because I said so!" doesn't hold a lot of water!

Essay Assignment 2: The Conversation

Format: MLA Paper format, 3-5 pages

Due: Thursday, March 20th

Your second essay assignment requires a close reading and understanding of an argumentative text and the ability to engage with the author's ideas in written form. You will select one of the available essays and engage with the ideas in the form of a conversation. The scenario will unfold as follows:

- You have just finished reading your chosen article and are about to sit down for dinner when your least favorite relative drops by unexpectedly and invites him or herself to join you. During dinner, your relative brings up the article, which he or she has just finished reading as well. The discussion that ensues should form the bulk of your essay and present a clear understanding of the ideas covered in the essay.

Guidelines:

- Your conversation must be in dialogue form (we will discuss some ways to present this) and should feature two distinct voices (yours and your relative's). You may include other characters (friends, other family members, etc.), but the main focus should be on the exchange of ideas between the two main characters.
- The conversation should form the bulk of the paper. Don't spend 3 pages setting the scene!
- This is a conversation, not a debate or dispute. Your views will most likely differ, but there is no "winner" of your discussion or "agree to disagree" impasse.
- You have an enormous amount of creative leeway in this essay, but information and ideas from your primary source MUST be cited using proper MLA citations. Paraphrase is preferable to direct quotation, but quotes are acceptable in small numbers. Remember that a majority of this paper should focus on your engagement with the text. The conversation portion is NOT a summary!
- Do not bring in additional sources. Focus only on the primary text. Since there will only be one source, you do not need a works cited page. THIS APPLIES TO THIS ASSIGNMENT ONLY!
- The paper format must be MLA standard. The body of the essay (the actual text) may deviate slightly depending on the chosen presentation of the dialogue, but the margins, page numbering, header, spacing, and all other elements must be consistent with MLA standard (see the MLA section of your Hacker for details).

Requirements and Deadlines:

1) For **Tuesday, March 11th:** an **OBJECTIVE SUMMARY** of your chosen article, 1 page max. The summary is NOT included in your final page count, but must be included in your folder with the final draft.

2) For **Thursday, March 13th:** a **TYPED OUTLINE** which includes major talking points for each main character. (Keep in mind this is not an outline for each SIDE, but rather points of emphasis. There should be some overlap, as this is a conversation! Format and presentation of the outline are up to you.)

3) For **Tuesday, March 18th:** a **ROUGH DRAFT** of your conversation, ready to workshop.

4) For **Thursday, March 20th**: the **FINAL DRAFT**, 3-5 pages, in your folder with all previous process material.

Essay Assignment 2: The Conversation (Part 2)
Reading list and instructions

You may use any of the following texts as a basis for your 2nd essay assignment. If you are familiar with one or more of them, I STRONGLY encourage you to use a NEW text, one you are not familiar with!

While you only need a single text for your essay, you must read all of them and complete a journal reading response (as per the syllabus) for each.

Here are your selections:

"Goodbye to All That" by Joan Didion
"The Turning Point of My Life" by Mark Twain
"Shooting an Elephant" by George Orwell
"Against Interpretation" by Susan Sontag
"Repeat After Me" by David Sedaris

Texts are available through the library's electronic reserve page: http://library.uncc.edu/reserves/ Again, please read ALL OF THEM and complete a reading response before making your selection!

APPENDIX G: INITIAL INTERVIEW WITH LATOYA

JPC: so it is jan 31st and we are here with LaToya for her first student interview. We'll start off with an easy question, why don't you tell me a little bit about yourself, your background, your age, where you've lived, your family…

L: well, I'm from Ne ow Jersey, first of all, and I go to college down here. A lot of people ask me, why do I go to college down here and it is because my uncle, he moved down here from California, and I came to visit last year and so I checked out the colleges around the area and this is it. And then both my parents are Jamaican, so we lived in Jamica at some point, and that is why I got skipped. What else?

JPC: do you have any brothers or sisters?

L: I have a brother and a sister and they are both younger than me, so they look up to me for a lot of things. And I'm my mother's right hand. My mother is my inspiration.

JPC: why is she your inspiration? Tell me about her.

L: because, the stuff that she has been through, it inspires me to keep on growing and live for her, I want to be able to give back to her like she's given to me, because I feel like she has done so much for her children. Being that she did come up her so we could have equal rights as Americans.

JPC: what do you do in your spare time?

L: well, that varies from watching tv, hanging out with my friends, I study a lot because I am a science major, so I'm probably changing from biology to chemistry. Chemistry is a bit more easier I think, and the internet is a big thing. I'd say just hanging out with my friends.

JPC: what do you want to do when you get out of college?

L: I'm concentrating on pre-med, I want to be a pediatrician, but that is kindof changing a little bit because I went to do a job shadow with a doctor back home, and he showed me a lot of behind scenes stuff, not the actual in the office setting, he was showing me what they do on the computers and then how you are supposed to write reports and I'm supposed to be doing a summer program in the summer and they will take you into the place where they hang the bodies, and even though I do want to become a doctor, I don't think I'm physically ready for it yet, so I still need to feel out my options because if I'm not physically ready for it, I shouldn't. so that's where chemistry comes in. I'm in chemistry now, and I decided it is much easier than biology. I had to withdraw from biology first semester and I think I'll probably be—try to become a chemist.

JPC: okay, well you kindof started to go in this direction. Can you tell me about your educational experiences so far? Anything that you want…like a memory, likes, dislikes, whatever pops into your mind.

L: I love school. It is really weird, but my mom says that I'm the only person she knows that actually wants to go to school. When I was younger, I was like I have to be at school. Elementary school I graduated as a valedictorian, that's when I went through all my different schools. I lived in about eight different cities, and elementary school I went through so much and then the last year when I actually graduated, even though I wasn't there that long—that was really cool. And then I went to a catholic school for middle school. That was different. My mom said it was to help shape my—she said it was to, needed me to have my manners enforced. I didn't thing—I thought her thoughts of what a catholic school should be, it wasn't what it was. Catholic schools to me, being that I've been in a public school, a catholic school, they do stuff behind, they do stuff behind the scenes, and a public school do it out front. It is like fake. It is hard to explain. It is like the students, everyone is fake. And it just gives this idea that catholic schools are prim and proper but htye are not. And then high school I moved to a different area, again and I went to a public high school and the city I live in now, it is like to me it is like diverse and it feels like since I have lived through a lot of different cities, I know different aspects. I have lived with all white people, all black people, I lived in the Caribbean, and it seems like it is just unity of all one. It is kind of cool and I liked it a lot and my high school had a lot of different activities for me and I joined a lot of stuff, so that was cool. I did sports, a lot of them. Now I'm here and I'm majoring in biology but I withdrew from the class because I wasn't getting the grades that I wanted to and I wanted to pass it with an A or a B seeing that it is my major, but if I had stayed in it I would have gotten a C, and I didn't want that on my transcript, so I just withdrew from it. And then I got As and Bs on the rest of my transcripts. I am going to do biology next semester and then I think I'm going to do summer classes probably at a university in my area in Jersey.

JPC: when you were in school did you ever have to take any state writing tests?

L: I had to take a lot of tests actually. As far as writing, I never did prompts because I did the catholic school for middle school and they usually have the prompts for lower grades. Everybody, like when I was in 9th grade, I think we had a writing prompt to do to move onto the 10th grade, like part of the 9th grade assessment. I don't remember what it was. Everybody, like the teachers were crazy about the prompt. In catholic school, it is slower. They are more about teaching you the religion and teaching you about how to do certain things the right way, and I think their work is just—it lacks a lot of different things. Public schools have a lot more to offer, so when they told me about picture prompts, and we are so tired of picture prompts, because they did it all in middle school, I didn't know what they were talking about, so my first picture prompt was probably like 9th grade.

JPC: do you remember how they talked about writing. Did they give you suggestions about what it should look like?

L: in 9th grade? Um, well in 9th grade my English teacher, she wasn't—she didn't really explain that much, I didn't think she was really that good, and the way she had us do a lot of them, lots of work. She put us into groups, but it was like big groups and then like I was in all honors for all my classes, and it was some of the same people and some of them seemed like different—they would make, I don't know how to say it, they make—like the whites, when we were put in groups, they would have the minorities do most of the work, and I didn't think that was right, and I tried to bring it to her attention, and it was like they felt that since they were already in honors they didn't need to do any of the work, and they already had it out there. That was kindof how my high school was, like whoever was in honors most of us, placement tests, I got in from placement tests, but some of the people's parents were in the system and so they would get into it and it went like that. And then she left on a pregnant leave, so she wasn't really like—I don't think she was a great teacher. I've had really bad experiences with my English teachers in high school. The problem was we had a walk out at my school in my 11th grade year. I participated in it…I asked my mom if I should do it or not, and she said if you feel strong about it. It was about that and other different things we had going on at our school. The thing was that the African-Americans at our school were dwelling on the fact that these people, the white people were in honors. They were in honors but they, I didn't think they thought we lived up to the expectations. They wanted a change. I think they should have worked on—like it was separated onto levels. If you are all honors, you can stay in it all four years. The people in level three were mostly black, and the people in level four were mostly white. And then level two was all black. The issue at my school was that level 2 wasn't really—they wanted to get rid of the levels because level 2 wasn't encouraged to go to college. They said you can't even do this, so you can't do college. They don't give you a lot of material to do. They just sit there and don't do anything, it is usually only about five people. Then level 3 classes are loud and they don't cooperate, and it is really wrong how they have it set up, and I hope it is better now, and I got to experience level 3 in my senior year becaue I was put in that class because I had a schedule conflict and I was supposed to have a math, but you don't have to have a math if you had three years of math, but I wanted to have a math anyway, so I got put into the math class and they moved me into a different drama class, and the drama class was really disruptive and I didn't like being in there because the teacher was making us do work based on their behavior. I didn't feel like I should be punished. So, I switched into a different English class, and in this English class, it was level 3 and that was because there was no level 4 open, so my level gotmoved down just because of that change, and it shouldn't have happened. When you are in certain levels, your GPA is raised towards that level and it kind of cheated me out. The class that I was in, the English teacher treated it like it was college—they way she taught it, she wanted to show us rigor and challenge, but she wasn't showing us that the right way. She gave everybody a 64% on their paper, and she wouldn't put any comments on the paper, she wouldn't do anything, so we didn't know how to make our papers better. I went out and got a tutor, she was really good and she helped me with my writing, and I gave my English teacher the paper the tutor helped me revise, and the English teacher kept it at a 64%. She messed a lot of people up. She failed a lot of seniors and she didn't have any heart in it. She just said when everyone else is graduating, I'll see you in summer school. It was heartless. Last semester I had a lot of As on my English papers, and my mom told me to go show it to her. I went, and I did that.

She was like, only my good students—and I was like, whatever. She was hard. She was ridiculous. When I went back to her she said that I don't know what to do with these kids, they don't want to work anymore. They don't care that I threaten them. I told her that she needed to get rid of her ways—that is not how you teach a class. Her classes, she talked the whole time about nothing and she'd give us an assignment about something. Are you serious? You didn't go over any of this. You didn't show us any fundamentals that we should all know. I felt cheated because I shouldn't have been in that class, it was only because it was everybody—all the classes were filled up and they couldn't give me any better options, so first of all, they moved me a level down and then they put me in this horrible class. It was a nightmare. I had everything going for me, and I had all As, and in her class I had a C. in her class I had a C. so it really messed me up and I was mad.

JPC: you sort of talked about this a little, but what is a good piece of writing to you?

L: a good piece of writing, like what do you mean?

JPC: like if your teacher gave you—not the one you just talked about—but say Rob gives you a paper back and says, LaToya, this is a good paper. What would you expect the qualities of the paper to be?

L: the content? Um, well, in the papers that I write, I make sure that I put my experience in it, or I will begin my first paragraph with a scenario or a statement saying, you know, like if I was talking about freedom or security, I would say something like, most airport—you know something that starts off [pause]

JPC: a story?

L: yeah for him something like that, and then I'd say what the thesis statement is, and like in my body paragraph I'd put like one idea, like what we talked about in class today, and then I'd try to support that idea with a lot of different examples, basically link it back to my thesis statement and in the closing I would end it with another scenario and something from my—well no, in the body paragraphs I'd have life experiences and then in the intro and closing there would be two different scenarios to help cover the whole issue.

JPC: if conversely, Rob handed it back and said this is a bad piece of writing, what do you think that would—what would be wrong with it?

L: well, grammar, sentence structure, and organization. If you have really bad—if your thoughts are all over the place because I've had problems with organizing my papers and making sure that different ideas I'd run them onto each other, so I think it would be a big part of that. And you have to make sure that everything goes into transition. If you mention something don't' mention it like three paragraphs later as a different type of topic.

JPC: have you—what kind of writing have you done? Have you done personal writings,

like do you have a journal, do you do school writings, what kind of writing have you done?

L: well, I do poetry when I'm down, when I try to express—not exactly express myself, just if I don't feel like talking to somebody I'll just write poetry or draw, so that helps me to—I don't know why, it just helps. I don't try for publishing. I had my—I had one poem published, but other than that last semester I wrote a memoir, last semester we basically worked on our, not critical thinking, we just basically worked on different things like we did the profile of a place, and that was profiling and memoirs. And then that was—the memoir that I did was about my life in Jamaica, so that was kinda cool.

JPC: what do you expect to write in this class?

L: arguments. Long research papers. Yuk I hate those.

JPC: well, we are sitting in the writing center. Have you even been to the writing center?

L: I had all intentions to actually. I said to myself because I was told that my writing was poor, most of my high school, I didn't get good grades on any of my writing, and that was a discouragment to me, So my mom said to get a tutor when I came out here. So I asked my English teacher what can I do, because he works in the writing center, Professor Jeannot?

JPC: oh yes yes

L: so he told me to come over here and ask for a personal tutor, you know the one you get…

JPC: a referral?

L: yeah. So I came over here, got the slip, had him fill it out, but I never came back. I meant to do it, but then he said my writing is really good, and he wrote on the paper, the memoir, he said he didn't know what was going through the teacher's mind—he didn't want to judge a teacher, but he didn't know what was going through their mind because it was really good. And I think teachers like that—I know some of the people in my class didn't want to go to college because of the teacher said so much stuff—it is just like why would you say that? It doesn't make sense to me.

JPC: I'm glad to hear that he really enjoyed your writing and it sounds like you enjoyed writing for that class.

L: yeah. It helped because it showed me what my strengths and weaknesses were but it showed me strengths I never knew I had because I didn't think I could write at all. And then my mom say my work and said it was better. I don't know if it is because I came to college, but it is better than it used to be, and I have found myself when I applied for emerging leaders, I did the whole application myself including the essay and I usually get

help with the essay because—so I just decided to give it a shot and I did it and got accepted. I was like cool!

JPC: my last question is what does it mean to you to be a writer.

L: to be a writer is to successfully get your thoughts expressed on paper. But in a structured and organized way. And have it be interesting so the reader wants to read it. I think that if you can have your reader to ask questions, like questions of interest, it is cool it shows that you—what you wrote was really effective.

JPC: would you ever say that you were a writer?

L: No. I don't like English, but I think it is only because of my experiences in high school, but not exactly.

APPENDIX H: INITIAL INTERVIEW WITH STEVE

(1/21/08 Panera Bread: 12:30)

JPC: So it is Jan 21st, with Steve at Panera, 12:30. We'll start with an easy one. Tell me about yourself, where you are from, how you came to be a student here at Stonie University

S: I was originally born and raised in Connecticut, grew up in southern Connecticut until I was about 8.5 and then _____ Connecticut where I lived until I moved to North Carolina 2.5 years ago. I went to the first two years of high school at _____ high school in South____ Connecticut, then I moved to North Carolina and spent my junior and senior year at Lake Norman High School. Honestly, I basically came to Stonie University because it was my only choice.

JPC: What is your family background like? Do you have any brothers and sisters?

S: I'm a middle child in between two sisters, middle class family, hard working parents

JPC: You've kindof told me a little bit about your educational experience so far with high school and stuff….did you do a lot of educational work at home? Did you find yourself doing a lot of homework, did you do it at school, was there a lot of like reading or educational TV or…

S: I've always read ever since I could basically remember, I remember being in show and tell, bringing in books and reading them to the class. Up until about my sophomore or junior year of high school I was really a trouble student. I was always the kid that the teacher would have the parents come in and say he has potential he just isn't doing the work. Then it just, I don't know, kindof hit me one day I just started becoming a straight A student, but because of my background, that's why I had to come to Stonie.

JPC: What do you like to do when you're not doing homework or working?

S: I don't work. I sit on my computer, talk to some of my old friends, play video games with my roommates, that sort of thing…

JPC: What type of writing have you done before?

S: all different types, I've written thesis papers, research papers, short stories for English classes, different genres…

JPC: would you say most of the writing was connected to school?

S: yes

JPC: so you were doing it in response to an assignment or prompt

S: yes

JPC: What do you think good student writing looks like and why?

S: it is really kindof hard to say, but I guess good writing basically follows the prompt closely, relatively good grammar, it shows that they've done proofreading with another person or just by themselves.

JPC: where do you think your idea of that equaling good writing comes from?

S: I guess just standards from other people that have been passed down, what a person learns from prior teachers.

JPC: And how about bad writing? Bad student writing, what does that look like?

S: bad student writing is just people who just write to put stuff down on paper. Just to get the print on the grade, don't really put much effort into it, don't really care much attention to grammar and punctuation, who don't take the time to correct the mistakes they've made.

JPC: did you have to do any state tests while you were here, or did you skip that since you were here towards the end of high school?

S: no, I've done the EOC…

JPC: tell me a little bit about that, what that was like for you….because I haven't taught K-12 here in North Carolina, so I just am very interested in how students come to experience that too

S: I mean, I come from a high school that was like top 15,000 in the United States, I'm not bragging or anything—it had its faults—but coming down to North Carolina where they are having trouble with their schools, seeing them just use standardized testing as just an excuse to not evaluate their students, and seeing how much control it is taking away from the teachers and administrators…I don't know, I just didn't like it too much.

JPC: So what would happen in a classroom when it was getting close to test time?

S: it was basically just the teachers after they had done their own thing just trying to go over what they had been expected to teach for the EOCs.

JPC: what did most of the writing look like when the teachers would have the students practice the prompts, the different prompts for the test?

S: just stuff they came up with, sometimes the prompts were from various books or

magazines, writing magazines, or just prompts from other teachers that they'd come up with over the years.

JPC: were you encouraged to respond in any way you wanted, or were you asked to form the writing in a certain way…did the writing need to look a certain way?

S: yeah, there's, uh, I was introduced to the MLA formatting coming down here, just formatting stuff, but usually the content is your realm, depending upon the genre, obviously with a research paper you have to follow a certain format, you have to state your sources, but usually stuff like creative writing could be whatever.

JPC: so tell me about this research paper, the format, you said you had to kindof follow a format and certain guidelines…talk a little bit more about that.

S: it was my senior year teacher, for the love of me I just can't remember her name, even though it was last year. She was a great teacher, very strict about her writing, I've heard students say they'd used her for a reference at UNC Chapel Hill and their advisors look at the reference saying, oh, you've had this teacher? She's done tons of references and is a high level reference there. This was our final paper. It was only six pages but she made us write 12 pages and cut it down to six because you'd obviously have in the future to limit what you wrote. It was tough. We had to find a European piece of writing, preferably in English and we had to research various references in the book, what other people had written about it, other papers people had written about it, we had to go through annotated bibliographies, we had to do it her way, we had to write it on notecards, we had to write to the very end of the notecard…we couldn't just write various words, we had to write what type of, you know whether it was a quote or summary or paraphrase, and we pretty much did this throughout the entire semester.

JPC: What was the type of response you'd get back from this teacher about your writing? For example, did she write on the paper, did she give you a note…how did you find out about how she thought about your paper?

S: I'm not sure how many students she had, she was an AP and Honors English teacher—I don't know how she did it but she would write at every little mistake…she would write two or three sentences on that paper based on that mistake, and at the end of the draft that you turned in she would always have like a medium sized paragraph saying the mistakes that you made, how you can improve it, if you wanted you could turn it in you could see her.

JPC: so you said earlier that you thought she was strict.

S: strict but fair

JPC: okay, can you give me an example of strict but fair?

S: she was conservative in the way she ran things, you did not swear in her class, you did

not bring food or drinks into her class, she was friendly, you could talk to her about things, she was always smiling in class unless she was unhappy with something someone was doing, she was an approachable person, it was not like she was very standoffish, she was like a high-level English teacher you'd have in college, an English Professor.

JPC: Did you take 1101 here?

S: yes.

JPC: tell me about that class

S: it was kindof you know a re-introduction to English, what you'd expect college students to be able to write. It was very introductory.

JPC: was it easy for you after this class you had before?

S: yes

JPC: what things did you write about?

S: we didn't do much writing, it was mostly journal writing. We had to research a song that we found that had some characteristics in it we found unique. We had to research violence in music, what we thought about that…small stuff like that.

JPC: what kind of writing do you think you'll be doing in this class we are in now?

S: well

JPC: what do you expect going into it?

S: he's told us that we are going to be doing prompts and various other pieces and prompts that he'll come up with.

JPC: if I asked you to tell me what you thought a writer was, if I said tell me what you think a writer is, what are some things that come to mind?

S: a writer can be anyone who writes a memo to another person in a very loose sense of the word, or a person writing in a journal, or a student writing a paper for a class, or writing a book for other people to read.

JPC: do you think of yourself as a writer?

S: when I'm writing

JPC: when you're writing, okay. My last couple questions concern a writing center. Have you ever been to a writing center?

S: no

JPC: okay. What do you think a writing center is for?

S: just to go over your writing style, how you can improve it, to work towards your strengths.

JPC: what do you think going to the writing center during this study is going to do to your experience in this class?

S: I've really established my writing style—it could help some. My future really isn't in writing. I'm going for mechanical engineering. I guess various errors that I repeat I could probably fix that, but other than that not much.

JPC: what kind of writing do you know is required in your mechanical engineering field?

S: we actually have a book, *How to Write like an Engineer*, very formal, very focused…you want to give a good impression of yourself through your writing, no noise, no wordy language, just very efficient language.

JPC: a lot of students when I've taught first-year writing, a lot of engineers who are in my class say, I don't need this class, I don't need to write in Engineering.

S: people I've talked to, Engineers in particular, depending upon where you go and what you get into, writing can be very important. My neighbor who was a CEO of JIG lifts—they do the forklifts and all that—I was talking to him because he was a mechanical engineer before he got into that—I was talking to him about taking English for two years and how when you get into the upper echelons, especially where he was, in Engineering companies, it is very important to know what you are saying, how you say it, if there is one thing, if it is a couple words off, it could be taken as pretentious and that is not what you want in business, especially as an engineer, so I recognize that writing is very important and you should really know how you can use it.

JPC: okay…do you have any questions for me?

S: no offense, but none right now.

JPC: we'll probably have some later. This is an easy interview because we don't have any writing to talk about or reflect on from the course, so it was the easy one.

APPENDIX I: FINAL INTERVIEW WITH STEVE

JPC: okay so it is May 7th and we are here with Steve for his final closing interview. So first question for you is to describe how the writing you did in this class was similar to or different from writing you've done in prior English classes.

S: well I think we mentioned it yesterday and I don't know if it is just Hank but we did have a lot more freedom or at least the chance to have more freedom with our writing because in high school and even last semester our teachers were—well last semester was different than high school—it was less stringent and you could write more, but there is still that kindof rubric that you have to go by. With this, there was no set rubric that says 10 points for this, 10 points for this--

JPC: so in that case you really structured your writing on rubric that was given to you at first

S: and with this you were just given a prompt to write with Hank.

JPC: so high school you would be—the assignment would be given to you and you would actually have a checklist idea of what they were looking for?

S: pretty much. I did have one teacher in my sophomore year in high school and in hindsight I realize how much he went out of his way to help me and I didn't realize it until I started going into the writing workshop and he would pull me off to the side and talk to me about stuff when I told him that I was moving down here at the end of the semester he gave me this nice big bright brown bag of books he kept lying around the office. For the most part though, yeah you were given a rubric and (2:09) my last semester of high school English was just beating it into your head, if this isn't right you get so many points taken off. That was the first time I was introduced to MLA and she came out and threatened the class that she does not mind the paperwork to—she was a good teacher mind you—but she didn't mind the paperwork to fill out for plagiarism and she would take it to the Dean of Students. It was just that kindof strictness and then you go to college and you have the freedom to write however you want as long as it grammatically and chemically correct.

JPC: so how would Hank's rubrics speak to the rubrics you have had in the past, if you were to compare them.

S: it would be a difference between the exactness of an engineer as compared to the freedom of a writer.

JPC: the next question is thinking of response to your writing from Hank. Think about the responses you've received from him because he really gave you three types of response, formal response: he would write on the paper, he would give a written commentary on

the entire paper and then he had also had a rubric gradesheet that he used. So think about those and tell me about your thoughts on those.

S: I think his rubrics were almost, and in all four of the papers, kindof spoke chronologically to my progression through the writing and how I really came into my own with writing this semester. Comments like, this is good, you can do better—it seems as if you had more time you couldv'e done this, you progressed with this, keep going with this and then moving onto this is really good there is only a little bit wrong but overall it is a really good paper and it shows how I'm finding my own with my writing, just kindof time line of that.

JPC: I'm still finding myself drifting back to what you said about the teacher giving the rubric at the same time as the assignment. and I'm wondering if you can talk about your writing process when you are given the rubric before you begin to write the paper (5:10).

S: well you are not really thinking about how much you want to write. You are really writing to what the teacher wants you to write. I think listening to them talk a lot of them were so used—the talk from yesterday—they were used to oh, this is all we've known to write and we don't know if there is anything outside of that. I mean, I'm one of the odd ducks where I can read a book and I can continue to read it not just because someone told me to read it but because I want to read it. I've been reading for a while and I sometimes contribute that to the idea that I know what writing is and it is not just the five paragraph, have you thesis, include your three subjects in the body paragraphs and conclude that part of the thesis in the body paragraphs and conclude with a different version of your thesis.

JPC: [I talk about Peter Elbow's Rigid Rules article] how did class discussion affect you and did it or didn't it show up in any of your papers?

S: to a point, more of when we talked about argument and when we wrote about it, just having that conversation—no offense to anyone else in the class but what they said didn't get me thinking about much. Everyone kept saying argument is just a fight between two people but I was thinking further ahead to what else it might be. And really a lot of my writing is what else can I do with this? How can I take this in an opposite direction?

JPC: it sure could be taught as an argument between two sides…in fact there are many 1102 classes out there where the entire semester is like that.

S; I just kindof get frustrated with instead of just sitting and thinking, okay, what is this, a lot of people just spew stuff out like a shot blast and I'll hit with at least one of these things. Lia is a good friend of mine, my best friend is her boyfriend, but she likes to talk.

JPC: yes. I remember her talking about keeping the class moving.

S: yes.

JPC: {I drink} class discussion is very hard for many teachers because it is a releasing of control.

S: plus with such a low introductory class not a lot of people want to get involved.

JPC: many will avoid discussion and just go with lecture or solid writing the entire time period. Discussion is scary for many teachers because of a lack of control—it is hard to bring it back.

S: I think Hank really constructed his personality well with the class where he doesn't necessarily come out and yell because if you do that once you'll lose the class forever. You'll never get them back, but he has that personality where he'll participate with the off-topic for a little bit and then he'll push it back to what he was saying. A lot of strict teachers will lose the class in the first day by doing that. I think maybe they can't relate to the students. With our class, you had the back corner behind me—I'm not making any assumptions [pause]

JPC: frat guys?

S: yeah. [laughs]. I have another word, but that one is nicer. And then the front of the class was where most of the discussion happened, me—well, I didn't really discuss that much—I kindof sat back and watched everyone else talk.

JPC: Nikita talked a lot

S: she was (12:03) northwest of me. And then other guy you are working with--

JPC: John

S: yeah he was cool and then there was the corner by you—I am horrible with names, especially with people I don't talk to much.

JPC: Mary and Jennifer

S: they sat in the back of the class. I am a much more reserved person. I'd rather sit back and listen to what people have to say so I think a lot of the topics during discussion, especially when you are trying to get to know a person and get a feel for the class, I just like to sit back and listen, especially if it is a debate or something because you know the people who just jump right into the debate usually lose themselves. I just sit back and wait for the first person to talk and figure out where they are going with that and figure out if I have anything to add to that or if I can add to that because sometimes when you get a really good idea going on, the conversation moves on. (13:37)

JPC: yes it skims on the surface instead of going further into a point.

S: yes

JPC: okay. We've talked about this before…what is good writing at the university?

S: it is hard to say what that is because every teacher has a different expectation of the students, and unless the university decides to make the mistake of having a university-wide rubric for every class which would negate the English major in this university but because that is kindof why I went over to English—everything else that I was looking at as a major was too narrow-minded. There is this—you know it goes back to me moving down here and discovering the testing—there is a term—I don't know, the standardized testing. I had never once in elementary school or once in high school had standardized testing, you fail a class you fail a semester if you don't pass the test, even if you have an A+. it goes back to that—why? The question of why. Then going from that to a university and trying to get into an engineering major you have to do it this way, you have to be exact—there is no going beyond these guidelines. You have to fit within these guidelines even if you think it is better to go beyond them. It is very rigid. When I told one of my engineering friends that I was going into a different major, he found this amazing group of jokes about engineers and I thought, a lot of times there are stereotypes, but all the ones about the engineers are true. Not all, but the anal retentiveness, the lack of personality towards other people.

JPC: it sounds like they breed that into you with the way that it is taught.

S: I see my dad and he is just like that. He is—he had to be like that because he had to pretty much raise his family because his dad left. He is anal retentive and exact and if you are not doing it this way, you are doing it wrong. If you are not prepared to do it the right way the first time, you may as well not do it at all. (17:17) in certain jobs you have to have that mentality and having that I don't want to be like my dad mentality—I want to be a different person so I'm not going that way. So I'm just seeing this super professional career in front of me where I'm sitting at a desk all day and I just think I don't want to do this. I'm going into English having the ability to think open mindedly—even like criminal justice, I'd be going into, but there is more left to interpretation than just, this is the equation you have to use, this is the program you have to use.

JPC: it removes the need for thinking.

S: Yes!

JPC: you strike me as a thoughtful person, a thinker, someone who is introspective—not socially inept or anything—you are just a thinker. We're glad to have you over here in English—we like thinkers!

S: you'll have to share me with the criminal justice department--

JPC: that is okay—we'll share. [laughter]

S: I was talking with Philip—there is a lot you can do with these two majors. That is the other thing. Yeah, a mechanical engineer is a jack of all trades in the engineering

community. But still, with a mechanical engineering major, that is all I have. With this, I can become a lawyer, a federal agent, a US marshall, an investigator. I just have the personality that even if it is just something out there where I have to find out how it works. That is why I'm drawn to gadgets and cars. I want to know what it is, what others think about it, why it works. That interests me. [he talks about Dirty Harry movies] I don't want to only do one thing the rest of my life.

JPC: why don't you give me your metaphor for yourself as a writing student in this class.

S: I took this one from the Philip school of vocabulary.

JPC: good—another chapter header for me?

S: me not necessarily with that class in particular but with writing in general, (21:16) I kindof took this from a couple things in general—I'll explain it after—I took it from a couple comedians—but

JPC: you are going to drop the F bomb on me, aren't you? [they laugh]

S: no, I'm going to drop a different bomb. I find myself as just a recycling center. I took all the garbage and shit that everyone has thrown at me my entire life and turn it into something that could be useful. It is better than going to a psychiatrist just being able to make fun of what happened in my past, being able to make it as a joke takes the pressure off what it really was, how hurtful it was looking back on it, and I think being in the major and being able to have a lot more freedom with writing and stuff I will be going to college and having the freedom to have the time to really think about who I am and all that and going back to an engineering major would be like taking a step backwards and letting going of that freedom I received. I'd rather go forward and think more and be able to go back to my self-psychiatry.

JPC: i think more students should live on campus

S: that is the biggest problem on campus (24:22) either a lot of students live around the campus and it would be smart for them to live on campus. And too many of them live with their parents. Or they live too far away—like an hour away. The people from dysfunctional families can live life easier because they know when the shit is going to hit the fan. And they know when to step aside. It is the people babied by their moms and dads, they don't know what dysfunction is, to a certain extent, and when the shit hits the fan, they don't know when to step aside and they just get the full face full. They don't know how to react to that. When the world ends, all the functional people are going to be running around like chickens with their heads cut off, and the dysfunctional people are going to be thinking, hey, no one is watching the Lexus dealership. If you don't know what life is and what it is like to fail, you are not going to be able to know how to fail when you get out of college. Even if you are living away from home and you are living in an apartment, people don't know what it is like to live with limited amentities. They have just moved from one comfort zone to another comfort zone sans parents.

[we talk about the dorms in college]

JPC: you've talked already about your experience in the writing center and how it affected your writing as a student. I thought we could end by having you take me to a moment in one wc session and tell me about it and why it stands out to you.

S: well I never really sat down in depth with anyone about my writing—never continually to the other point where the other person knows what you are thinking about with your writing. Talking to Philip—im not good at remembering specifics—like a singularizing moment, but just having someone say, you know, I've never really met many people that have this idea of writing this early on in their college career and just how having him say how you think and what you know about what you are doing with it, i look at things as a whole experience. I look at different things from different sessions, but…

JPC: so it was different than in the past with a teacher sitting down?

S: yeah. A teacher has anywhere from 40 to 50 students, college up to a 1000. But here in the WC, the tutor only has about a half dozen people. It gets more personal.

JPC: he thinks very highly of you. I've never heard him speak about any student this entire year as he does about you. He is very impressed with the writing you do.

S: I tell people what I told my friends when they asked why I change majors that apparently I have this amazing grasp on the English language. It is a culmination of different things, and realizing with Philip saying that and stuff, and that praise, looking back on why, looking back on my mom reading to me every night when I was younger, I mean reading—I'd go to show and tell at pre-school showing Dr. Seuss books when everyone else was like, you can read? Wow. Placing value on being able to read, going back to my cousin in first grade when he was held back because of his reading level—not being malicious about it, he was mean to me—he would bully me and then he couldn't read like I could. And I remember high school and other people saying you read? How can you do that? Comeing from a semi-disfunctional family and understanding the perspective that comes from with emotional writing, and people can't really realize that without a comibination of certain things.

APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW WITH HANK WALLACE

JPC: Hello, it is December, 2007…This is JPC, here with Hank Wallace, our pseudonym for a teacher participating in JPC's dissertation study. Today we are going to ask Hank a few questions [giggles again]…is this recording? [laughter] Okay, what do you think good student writing looks like and why?

HW: okay, well, there is a number of ways I look at this, especially at the freshman level. Good student writing, and I have and will probably continue to take a little flak for this, but I do view mechanical accuracy as important, um, the reason for that is I find so often that students are, or at least have been encouraged to stress, oh what is it, asked more or less to write rather than write well, and I don't think there is anything inherently wrong with that, but it maybe leads to is this feeling that as long as I indicate or hint at what I mean, that will be sufficient, my content will be my intent and not my actual content. I say to my students all the time say what you mean, don't qualify yourself into oblivion, come out and be direct and effective with the argumentation. I stress the sentence as the most important part of writing because a accurate sentence, not necessarily just mechanically, but an accurate sentence which states what it is meant to state as opposed to a sentence that hints at what the author's intent is, I think is far more effective as a means of communication, both academically and the rest of the world of course. So, a piece of good student writing is of course a majority mostly mechanically accurate, a type here and there or misplaced comma is no big deal, but as long as they are formulating sentences, that is what is important. Beyond that, paragraph structure I think is important as well as the essay structure that we teach is good solid ground work, but to me, I enjoy a sort of direct style of composition that nevertheless makes use of vivid description and so on, but so long as my students are saying exactly what they mean, directly and clearly, I think that is probably the most important element of a good student paper.

JPC: Where do you think your ideas of good student writing came from?

HW: Well, it's a real mixed bag. Mostly my writing style developed very much from the teachings that I had in high school, from a high school English teacher who was you know very much about the same things that I'm about, relative mechanical accuracy, directness, clearly stating ideas and clearly explaining them and leading your reader along as effectively as possible. In college, I didn't have as much writing instruction, I mean I don't want to sound like I'm blowing my own horn or anything, but I was writing at a fairly decent level when I got into college. And so that sort of allowed me to develop my writing the way I was attempting to do something and organize things well in college as sort of an extension of practice as opposed to additional instruction. And then interestingly when towards the latter stages of college when I was looking at graduate school I was actually leaning more towards creative writing, um, than analytical writing, so I was doing a lot of playwriting and screenwriting and in graduate school as well that was my focus, and writing dialogue was one of my creative strengths. But, I found the sort of formulaic elements of playwriting and screenwriting to be more in tune with the sort of organizational aspects of composition than I had initially expected, and I think that

many people expect them to be so I found myself writing screen direction that was very effective, very clear very forward, not necessarily very flashy but direct and that sort of led me into that sort of rediscovery of the emphasis on the direct sentence, the direct paragraph as I got into the early stages of my teaching.

JPC: I'm assuming that if I were to ask you about bad student writing that it would be the opposite of what you've said?

HW: Yeah, I think the bad writing, it is unintentionally misleading is what I'd term it best. So often I will have sentences in student papers that say something entirely different than what they were intended to say. And you know while I do stress mechanical accuracy, the importance to me is the directness of content, if you've structured a sentence that is misleading or that basically says something other than what it ought to say and it was meant to say, I think that of course leads to misunderstanding which detracts from the quality of the student writing and what they were trying to accomplish. And if they are unintentionally sort of sabotoshing what they are trying to accomplish in the first place, it is very difficult I think to produce a solid essay at any level, especially at the student level. So, I feel that if a sentence says something other than what it is supposed to say, what it was meant to say, that is probably the most basic element of bad writing. Or unsatisfactory writing I guess may be more accurate for pedagogical sense of things. Oftentimes it is not so much that they don't know what they are trying to say but that they can't or haven't been able to structure it the way they want.

JPC: why do you think they haven't been able to structure it like you want?

HW: well, I think there are a number of reasons for it. And here I am beating the same dead horse again, but…

JPC: you've taught a lot of students

HW: the mechanical accuracy is huge. I don't care about comma conventions that much, I'm not a stickler for minute rules, the ones I am a stickler for are the ones that transform the meaning. If you misplace a comma it can in some cases in most cases transform the meaning of the sentence into something else entirely. And as much as I am in support of getting students to write as much as possible, I do have them do a daily journal entry because I want them to be thinking and writing and transferring their thoughts into writing, somewhere along the way I think a lot of this comes down to revision. I think revision is probably one of the more difficult aspects of writing process for many students, understandably so of course, but somewhere along the line you've got to be able to transform a sort of raw data from your mind into something that says what you want it to say and some of the trouble there is the disconnect between what you have in your head and what you've written on the page. So I tell my students this all the time, once you've written something down it takes on a very sort of odd relationship to you in that it is something very intimate because it is the content of your mind, it's your thoughts, but it is also something extremely alien because it is no longer the content of your mind, it's text on the page, which has to stand by itself, and so I think in the, it is not the

transferring of the information so much as the refining of it afterwards, so the revision is a big part of it. We write, I can't claim to be perfect and I never would, we all make mistakes when we are drafting, I mean we all write sentences that don't say what we want them to mean, and so I think the trouble then is not so much we can't or my students can't get their thoughts down on a sheet of paper but they can't sort of wrangle it or wrestle it into a form that conveys their meaning the way they want it to. Which is why I put a fairly large amount of emphasis on reading and revising sentence by sentence. Taking sentences out of their context in order to revise them. Everyday in class I start with an example sentence on the overhead and we tear it apart. You take one sentence out of context it is easier to correct so I encourage them to go to the back of their paper, read the last sentence and make sure it is fine read the sentence before that and then progress backwards through the paper in order to make sure that every sentence states what it is supposed to state, so I guess the sort of very round about answer there is that it is a question of attaining and maintaining accuracy and thought and accuracy of statement in the sentence.

JPC: do you think students have a lot of practice with revision by the time they get to you?

HW: you know, I don't think so, and I don't know if that is the case, obviously I haven't spent time teaching at the high school or middle school level, but more often than not, and I certainly was guilty of this and at times still am, revision is proofreading, and proofreading to the extent of okay someone marked that this was a misspelled word, this is supposed to be a comma here, um, and so some of the minor sort of mechanical details get focused on while the content of the sentence is not necessarily paid any attention. Which I think is unfortunate, and I don't know where that comes from, I can't state with any authority what kind of experience they are getting at different levels and at different classes, but there is also a great desire, and this is part of the odd relationship between writer and what they've written, there is this desire to once it is down on the page to be done with it, to be finished with it, to not look at it to not think about it anymore, and I certainly have been guilty of that a few times, in my life, in my writing life, so I can understand it, and that is a difficult thing to get past, I think, but it is sort of repetition oftentimes the best way I've found to break that habit. That is a hard question. Part of me wants to say in my most frustrated sense in the middle of a stack of papers that I'm grading that obviously they have never been asked to revise ever in their lives, but I know that is not true, so I think it, you know obviously every student learns differently and every student is going to internalize differently, so depending on their experience and their own approach to it, I mean I've had students that are very good writers, if they revise just a little more closely or I've got students who revise very heavily and don't have quite the natural knack for it, so it is interesting mixture of aptitude and then training I think, but ultimately I would say that maybe revision is not stressed enough from what I've seen, and I think a lot of that is, is, despite how much it is stressed or not stressed, it is not something that is terribly glamorous to do, and that is probably a big part of why they don't really get into it that much, which I can understand of course because it is not that much fun.

JPC: well you are sort of attacking my next question which according to you, what do you think it means to be a writer?

HW: [laughter] oy! Ack! Oy! Um! Well somewhat ironically I always have my students write a paragraph about what is writing at the beginning of the semester…

JPC: oh good, so you get to do it now…

HW: obviously it is one of those assignments that I would absolutely hate to be assigned because I don't like answering those questions, um, what it means to be a writer is difficult because everyone is a writer and we are required to be, more so now I think than ever, for all the students that have told me that writing is dead or dying because of the internet, I usually respond that it is the exact opposite that is true, there's more writing available, more writing being done arguably than before, so to be a writer is to be a communicator, to be someone that can obviously, all the clichés, express yourself and convey your ideas and define yourself the way you want to. The mantra has always been as long as I can remember, get your voice heard, you know get your voice out there so people can hear you, and there's more ways to do that now more than ever, but I have to wonder, if being a writer and being a confident writer, I don't want to say competent or want to say good necessarily, but being confident in what you write and how you write it I think is very important because if you just throw something up online nowadays and it is difficult to understand mechanically and accurate and maybe doesn't say what you want it to say, you haven't added much, if anything maybe you've taken a little bit away from some people who don't really know what you're saying. So to me being a writer is being confident in your ability to say what you mean in any form, online, in academic work, at in the workplace, wherever you are asked to communicate in writing, which I think is going, is more important now than it has been ever.

JPC: would you say you are a writer?

HW: well, sort of by default I would have to say yes, I've always been uncomfortable characterizing myself as a writer because to this day, writer carries a connotation of someone who focuses souly on their writing,[pause] and I don't necessarily, [pause] there again [chuckle], it is sort of interesting that despite all the time I spent working on creative writing and studying it how I've at times tried to distance myself from that sort of mystic or from that sort of stigma when in reality I spend all my time thinking and talking about writing, so I guess that does make me a writer sort of by default, but I think that mostly we are all writers now because we have to be. You know, more people are literate, more people are able to communicate in writing, for better or worse depending on how well they are able to do it now than ever before, and I think this makes us all in a way writers.

JPC: let's talk a little bit more about the specifics of your class…

HW: okay

JPC: what kinds of writing are you asking your students to work on in your 1102 class?

HW: in my 1102 class, well, I'm sort of, I've been redesigning it a little bit but my focus has always been to first and foremost be able to read and understand argument in all its forms and what it is trying to accomplish what is being said and what the intent and content is. And so my focus there, I always have a fairly bulky exploratory essay assignment where students are asked to analyze texts but also the entire, of course as we are asked to teach, the entire rhetorical situation.

JPC: so asked to teach by the department?

HW: well, encouraged to cover

JPC: okay

HW: you know part of it is the critical literacy thing, and that is important to read and understand and be able to respond to what you've read, so when I assign an exploratory essay there is no, [pause] I never allow them to use their own personal opinion or view on the matter, they have to research at least three positions on the issue, give me a background and examination in that regards, and a lot of times I will have students who have never considered an opposing viewpoint, much less a third viewpoint or have never even considered the issue outside of their own position, and I find that to be sort of a universal thing, interestingly enough, which again, nowadays is kind of hard to get away from, so the encouragement there is to look at the issue not to look at your side of the issue because I think a lot of times when students are asked to write about an issue they are asked to, okay, defend your views on this issue, which is an important skill, but critical literacy calls for being able to understand the whole thing, and that is what I want them to do. From that, I like to sort of progress to a, obviously the research position paper is a mainstay and that is an important one being able to research the issue, look into it and back up what you have to say with something more than because I said so which is exactly what I tell them to do. I'm considering throwing in a couple of new assignments that I haven't done before, but the goal ultimately is to read, understand and be able to explain and react or respond and more now than previously that is going to be the major focus, and I am going to introduce a lot of elements of visual arguments as well, we are going to be looking at some film clips, discussing the issues they pertain to and so on, so, in sort of a midst of a redesign or overhaul but that is the big one, read, understand, and respond if you want to put it that way, I guess.

JPC: so a little switching of gears, what do you think a writing center is for?

HW: a writing center!

JPC: this is generalizing

HW: generalizing

JPC: you can talk about ours in particular or you can

HW: well I'm not going to necessarily point any fingers

JPC: I don't know if you know anybody in there [laughter]

HW: well a writing center to me is, well a lot of people view it as someone to proofread their paper, and that is definetly not the case. I think a writing center is you know again there is so many terms to throw out, I could say tutor, or something along those lines, and I'm not sure all those connotations really apply but a writing center is a resource, I mean, a lot of times writing centers are called writing resource centers for obvious reasons because it is another set of eyes if you will. One of my big stresses when I look at revision is not that it is proofreading but that you are reworking that you are reimagining that you are rewriting that you've created the structure, the sort of outward hazy appearance of what will eventually be an essay, and the only way to bring it into focus is to get as many eyes looking at it as you can, not to check for commas and spelling though those are important very important in my opinion but that you can when you are doing your own revision step outside yourself in a way and be able to view it as a reader might and to have another reader. I do a lot of peer review in class, that is the majority of the workshop is other students looking at their papers, the goal is to make sure that what you're trying to say and communicate is being understood, not understood or interpreted eventually by getting what you mean but that you can read a paper and understand what the writer is trying to say. And I think one of the great things about something like the writing center and peer review is wonderful and all the workshops we do are great, but the experience available from that particular set of eyes is always going to be tremendously helpful to a student writer so there's always the risk in peer review sometimes of the blind leading the blind which I think is an overly negative view of it, but nevertheless if student doesn't feel all that comfortable with their own writing, even if they think they feel comfortable looking at someone else's writing, that may not be the case. And I don't want to again make it sound like I know what I'm doing and they don't because that is not always the case. I do know what I'm doing most of the time but if they only have one experienced set of eyes looking at their paper during a workshop and that one set of experienced eyes is mine, that's not as much as they need. I think that the more eyes looking at something the easier it is to see, if you will, to sound horribly cheesy and clichéd, but nevertheless, so the sort of intense one on one tutoring is great too because when someone looks at a paper, sees something and understands what is there, what needs to be there, what could be there, what shouldn't be there, and so on, it is a lot easier to share that in person especially if they really know what they are looking for. That is one of the reasons I do so much conferencing because 20 minutes one-on-one is going to be worth two or three class periods of me talking to the whole class. And so the more trained sets of eyes look at something the easier it is to see, I guess.

JPC: where does your notion of the writing center as a resource, as another set of eyes, where does that come from?

HW: well, the experience I've had working with writing centers have pretty much been universally positive. In that both of the institutions that I've worked at, the tutors there were first and foremost about making the paper function the way it is supposed to, and that's not indicating that somehow it is dysfunctional but that the student has a goal, something they want to say and the goal of the writing center tutor is to help them say it or to point them in directions where they can fix it to the point…I hate to use terminology like fixing because it is often tweaking and refining more than fixing…getting to the point where they are saying what they want to say and what they need to be saying not something that they don't mean and so it has been a pretty positive experience thus far and the students that I can actually get to go to the writing center usually come away with a pretty positive report. Unfortunately, a lot of times these students that could use the extra set of eyes the most are not the ones who are getting those sets of eyes, but that is neither here nor there.

JPC: well how does or could the writing center connect to a first-year writing class such as yours?

HW: well, to me it's I feel sometimes like I don't like to lecture, I try not to, but even in a class of 22 students, which is a blessing [laughter] that we cap it at 22, I have worked with 28 to 30 students and that is just so many, because in a composition class you can get lost, even in a classroom of 22 people or 18 people, I mean we are not talking about a 300-person chemistry lecture, but I am sure that it feels like that at times. Because I am standing at the front of the room, a lot of times, leading a discussion or going over material, and if they don't feel like there is a connection, I do a lot of small group work to try to combat this as much as I can, but I have an hour and fifteen minutes every couple of days, but I think that the feeling of getting lost in the 300-person lecture class is very similar to getting lost in even a small composition class if you are not feeling or seeing the connection between what we are talking about or discussing, what we are even looking at example wise and your own writing because a lot of students don't make that connection that's one of the reasons revision is difficult, I mean I still don't make that connection it's a very difficult thing to get into your head, that a bad example on the board is more related to you than maybe you want to admit, maybe that is part of it, because once you put something down on the page it's not just the content of your thoughts anymore its something on a page. It's so easy to look at the examples that I bring in and find the issues to sort of see that it is not saying what it needs to be saying but when we look at our own sentences it is very difficult, very different. So I mean it would be even more of a problem if it was a 30-35 person class, but even at 22 like I said, you can get lost, you can feel isolated. I can't sit there and talk to each student one-on-one individually for an hour and fifteen minutes twice a week, I would love to, because it is about their writing, and students come in with this idea that they need to do what I'm looking for that they need to write the paper that I want them to write, whereas I just want them to be able to write well, I want them to be able to express themselves and say things, so I think that having an opportunity to meet with someone one-on-one is absolutely critical; I do it as much as I can but if I have three sections, I have 66 students, if I have four sections, I have 88, all of whom I would love to spend an hour with twice a week if I could but I can't so what is great to me about the way I approach things is

getting that opportunity, getting that extra set of eyes, that's a phrase I'm going to stick to for the rest of my life probably is absolutely essential. I think it can work really well with a class like mine because when a student feels lost, feels like they are not sure, what they are saying and how it applies to them, obviously it is my job to do that as best I can, but when they have another person telling them one-on-one, face-to-face, here's some of the issues let's talk about them, I think that is essential because it sort of grounds them a little bit when maybe they don't have the opportunity or don't feel that they can or should approach me because I'm assigning a grade. I think that is an interesting relationship as well.

Follow up on background: Jan 2007

JPC: Okay…Tell me a bit about yourself, where are you from?

HW: Well my name is Hank Wallace…I grew up in Western Colorado, my high school was public, but I had, most of the people I went to college with went to private high schools, but despite the relatively low funding of the district I was in, I had some pretty fantastic teachers who really believed in what they were doing. So I mean all the clichés of course, that I had an inspirational English teacher when I was in high school, which I actually did, and English writing turned out to be the thing I was best at, I enjoyed science, for all my life I had wanted to go into some sort of science field, even when I was in college I was thinking about doubling in English and Physics, which would have been kindof interesting. I've had quantum physics and higher energy physics, which I found particularly fascinating and poetic. It was appealing but ultimately I didn't want to go through all the Newtonian physics, so I didn't. So I graduated as an honors student in high school and enrolled at the University of Chicago and graduate high school in 1999. I enrolled at the university of Chicago in the fall of 1999 and didn't declare a major immediately, but I went into English pretty quickly. I toyed with ideas of doubling in both English and History but ended up sticking with just English. My primary interests were sort of broad and numerous. We weren't asked to pick a specialization as an undergrad, so I ended up doing a bunch of different things. Interestingly I wasn't particularly interested in British Lit, which was the primary focus of the majority of the coursework, so a lot of my requirements I ended up meeting with film classes and early modern classes, particularly early modern English utopias and early 20th C. silent films were my biggest interests. In college my BA project involved studying silent films, specifically Charlie Chaplin, as a sort of lens for a utopian philosophy and literature. It was an interesting project but a difficult one that I never really fully followed up the way I wanted to.

JPC: Maybe you could also speak a little about your family's educational experiences, for example, were you the first person in your family to go to college?

HW: I was not, both of my parents went to college. My father grew up in Denver and started at the University of Colorado. Unfortunatly he had some differing ideas on what he wanted to be doing at the time, and the university asked him not to return for his second year, he is fond of the saying that in 1969 if you didn't have a plan for your life,

the Federal government surely did. His draft never came up and he ended up going into the National Guard for a few years before returning to college at the University of Colorado Boulder and earned a double major with a degree in History and Political Science. My mother grew up in South California, Southern California, and went to the University of California Riverside in what I believe was Business Management, that was her focus. They ended up in Colorado, which is where I grew up, my little sister, little by which I mean two years younger studied at Davidson, was army ROTC, studied political science and is currently looking to get into law school when she is finished with her army commitment.

JPC: Did you ever do any writing at home?

HW: yeah, quite a bit. I started with probably a lot of the insane bad pre-adolescent and teen poetry that we all did, but I wasn't too bad at it. There were a few instances in high school that I had small [inaudible], which were poetic only in that there was a rhyme here and there. I was in the high school publications. I tried my hand at short stories, but I didn't really get into a more focused creative writing aspect until I was in college. My academic writing however was fairly strong in high school, which was a benefit.

JPC: Why do you think it was strong?

HW: You know honestly, a lot of it I think came from reading. We started reading in my house when I was very young, very early, and all through elementary school I was a voracious reader, and was constantly being recognized by my teachers for how much I read and the level of reading that I was doing and the various kinds of reading—lots of different genres lots of different levels---I was reading several grade ahead of where I was supposed to be for a long time. By the time I started writing, that dedicated writing idea late in elementary and middle school, I had a fairly good idea of what it was supposed to look like.

JPC: You said you read a lot, was that a kindof norm in your house? Did everybody read?

HW: Yes. My father to this day reads probably for an hour before he goes to sleep every night. Everything from non-fiction to—he prefers non-fiction, his major was history and political science, so reads non-fiction as well as fiction. My mother reads as well, and as soon as I was able to read I was reading a lot. My parents, of course, read to me when I was younger, before I started reading, and actually some of the trickle down effect of that was that my younger sister, two years younger than myself, was reading at I believe a first or second grade level when she started kindergarten, mostly through the sort of classic sibling confrontational, if I was able to read she wanted to be able to read too, so reading was always a big deal in my family.

JPC: Tell me how you would describe the dialect at your home.

HW: Dialect….well of course no one actually thinks they are speaking a dialect.

JPC: were you, did you use a lot of formal language, was it more relaxed, were you corrected if you used…

HW: well I was asked by my parents…well my parents weren't strict about it but we were expected to speak not formally necessarily but politely, and I think a lot of my spoken diction came from reading an awful lot. I remember in sixth or seventh grade tearing through a series of Howard Pyle King Arthur books. Obviously that is turn of the century British practically, so it was very, um

JPC: easy reading for a youngster?

HW: yeah! So that had a tremendous impact on how I spoke and how I wrote. That is the most specific example of what I wrote. We were asked to be polite, and to be respectable, respectful to each other and to our parents. There was not a lot of slang, or offensive language.

JPC: Can you tell me a positive and a negative moment from your prior educational experience.

HW: Positive moments—you want the whole thing?

JPC: Just a snippet…take me to a positive moment in your educational experience.

HW: Geez—well, there's actually been quite a few positive moments; however, my proudest moment, and this is of course slightly ego driven. I was part of the honors English program when I was in 10th grade in high school, and we had a very, oh what is the best word for this, a very driven and very intensive instructor for that class. Her class was sort of known for being extremely difficult and demanding. Part of this was in the spring semester when we were asked to write a series of short papers, two to three pages in length, I believe eight or nine of them over the course of the semester, once every two weeks or so, and the goal of the entire unit was to produce a perfect paper, quote unquote.

JPC: she said perfect?

HW: uh huh. The mechanically perfect and content perfect. So the goal then was for each paper, 100 points, was that you had to have a mechanically perfect paper that could also fulfill all the requirements for content—the perfect paper. We had something like eight chances to do it, and of my class of 30, I was the first to accomplish that on the third or fourth try. I was very proud of that because it gave me a lot of confidence, obviously, in my writing ability. So that was a very positive moment for me. Negative experience—I could complain about individual classes at college, but most of those were core curriculum, like biology and such, but I think the most telling and you know what I think still influences me somewhat when I got into education, is my particular dislike for standardized testing. When I was younger I—there were numerous—well, one major gifted and talented program all throughout elementary and middle school which I was not asked to participate in until I was in 8th grade which of course was the last year it was

available, primarily because my standardized testing scores, particularly in math were not what they could be, but an analysis of those tests showed that I was not getting the answers wrong, I just was not completing them quick enough to get all of the answers. So I completed something like 50% of the questions, got them all right, but didn't complete the rest of the test and as such was scoring low and was not asked to participate in the advanced enrichment classes. To me that in sort of retrospect, that is sort of a negative moment. I have a feeling that despite having some of the best grades in my grade level, not being asked to participate in something like that was sort of a negative to me, not necessarily of my education in general but a negative aspect of the system, which has sort of been extended from what I can tell in the years since that, since the 80s.

JPC: Just a follow up, you classified your English class as difficult and demanding.

HW: Right.

JPC: Can you explain a little more about what difficult and demanding is?

HW: Well, we were held to a fairly high standard. I mean the idea for the entire second half of the course, the second semester, was that we were asked to essentially write the perfect English essay, mechanically perfect, and exhaustive in content in terms of analysis of literature and so on. So there was a lot involved. It was extremely difficult to do well, the instructor was very demanding in the sense that she asked a lot of you and expected a lot of you. Standards were very high, her grading was very strict. So we went into it—it was not, it had the reputation around the entire high school as the most difficult class that the high school offered. Large workload, all of it fairly complex in depth, a lot of the kinds of work that you would expect from an honors program that would advance what I and my classmates would experience.

JPC: Okay. Moving into the idea of your teaching now, before I ask you to tell me about the specifics about your teaching, would you classify yourself as difficult and demanding?

HW: [laughter] I think in some respects yes, I mean it is not even very difficult for myself to look at my curriculums and my own syllabi as having influences of some of the difficult courses that I took in high school and college. I don't have a perfect paper type assignment, but that sort of structure is what I've instituted. A lot of my courses I look for mechanical accuracy not for the sake of being accurate but for the sake of effectiveness. And I ask a lot of my students in that respect. A lot of my assignments are shorter assignments, two to three or four pages, focusing on being as direct and efficient but also as effective as possible in a short amount of time, which is sort of the backbone of all the papers I really sort of cut my teeth on when I was learning to write. A lot of that was in high school, some of that was in college as well. So the level that I felt I was writing at in early college is sort of the ultimate goal of the freshman composition classes I teach, keeping in my that I'm not going to be so married to that idea that I will turn a blind eye to my students. Obviously the goal of my classes is to improve their writing as much as they possibly can in the course of a semester. So in many respects I do feel that I am

very demanding, but I don't think that I'm particularly difficult, however. I differentiate the two in that I ask a lot of my students, I ask them to work hard in their writing to improve over the course of the semester. My grading is geared toward improvement, in a lot of respects. A lot of my grading policies involve completion grades for assignments or journal entries and so on, so if they essentially show up and do the work, they don't have to worry about not passing the class. They will pass my class. I make them work hard for Bs and As. I want them to not only produce good papers but improve their papers over the course of the semester and I found that being demanding but also understanding has been very effective in seeing a lot of improvement in students who may not have otherwise improved. I had several students over the course of the year who've improved from doing C or D level work to producing A level papers by the end of the semester. Of course that makes me feel very good and it also, the way my class is set up, let's them write their way into an A, which is nice.

JPC: Just go ahead and tell me the logistics of what classes you've taught, how long you've been teaching, where you've taught, that type thing…

HW: my teaching really sort of started when I was in graduate school at the School of the Arts in Chicago from '03 to '05. My degree is a Master of Fine Arts in Writing, and primarily in creative writing, focused on playwriting and screen writing, and I also did a fair amount of prose, but we were encouraged to look at things in an interdisciplinary manner, so I spent a lot of time in the film department as well, as I had studied quite a bit of it in college. So what ended up happening was I got a TA position in screen writing class in the spring of my first year, and from there I went on to TA two more classes, both of them in film production which was something of a departure from what I had done previously. Often times, in fact the rule was that you were not allowed to TA in a department more than once in order to keep the positions open. But I established sort of a rapport with a professor that I was working with, he was one of the more experimental film makers who worked primarily with hand manipulation of film and optical printing, which not a lot of other people were working on. Most people were at some point going into digital video, and so I had a really good handle on all of the equipment and what we had to do, etc., etc., and so I TA'ed his image making course and his optical printing course in consectutive semesters during my second year of graduate school. So that was sort of my first experience with being in any sort of instructional capacity, and it was sort of ironically a situation where I was working with film production, showing kids how to fill or feed film into an optical printer rather than write, but that sort of peaked my interest in teaching. I always thought that it would be something I'd do along with my writing, and then as I was sort of looking around for more graduate work, my plan was that I'd pursue a PhD, and it still is, and I was given the opportunity to do a guest lecture for a course my former BA presecptor was teaching at the University of Chicago in the spring of '05. I had written my BA project on Charlie Chaplin's modern times, and he was teaching that particular film maker's course, and so he asked me to come in and teach for a day when he was doing the film. It was a—I went and it was primarily a discussion based course as most classes in Chicago are and were, but I found it to be absolutely invigorating. It was a decent discussion, most people had a handle on what was going on in the film, and I walked out of there with a spring in my step and realized

that this really was what I wanted to be doing. The following fall I started my work as an adjunct at Mesa State College at my hometown. I taught three sections of remedial writing, which was certainly baptism by fire to put it lightly. It was trying, it was difficult, it was a college with open enrollment with a number of students from all sorts of different backgrounds. Hard-working students who never had the opportunity to learn how to write, students who hadn't learned how to write, non-traditional students who had worked in mining for 30 or 40 years who had been injured and had to go back to school to learn how to use computers, essentially. So that was—I learned an awful lot in my first semester teaching, simply because I had to. It was a very very positive experience and I came out of it feeling pretty good about myself as an instructor because I had a lot of students who improved significantly. It also gave me an opportunity to realize that I needed to figure a few things out, and I'd be able to design my classes for the spring in a different way. I essentially came in two or three weeks before the semester, as a lot of adjuncts do, and there was no common curriculum, so I designed my first three classes with about two weeks to spare with a book that had been assigned for me which was a critical thinking text not a writing text, which made things a little more interesting. From there I moved on in the spring to a couple sections of freshman composition, which were fantastic. I actually had a few conversations with my high school English teacher about teaching mechanics and accuracy in writing and took a lot of her ideas and approaches into my freshman writing course. So a lot of what I had learned to do when I was in high school and in college I was then beginning to teach. So a lot of the same systems, and I felt great about my spring work at Mesa, and two of the best classes I've ever had, with again a very diverse group of students. I had accelerated high school seniors who were 17 years old, I had traditional college freshman, I had non-traditional students who were returning from military service, and I also had non-traditional students in their 40s and 50s, so it was a fantastic mix of students. The rapport was exhilarating because I had views on life from four or five different people in the group which was amazing. Then I had an opportunity to come to Stonie in the fall of '06, where I picked up three sections of argumentative writing and one section of freshman composition. The argumentative writing was not a class I had taught before, and so it was the third consecutive semester where I picked up a new kind of class that I had to essentially design myself. Which actually went fairly well, I adapted to it fairly easily and look forward to that in the spring. In '07 I had again two sections of the argumentative writing and one section of the freshman composition and then fall of '07 I had three freshman composition courses and then a brand new once again class, a literature course called literature and culture where we examined the influence and impact of literature on culture. I chose to focus on satire particularly as a way to examine literature's impact and commentary on society.

JPC: What would you guess is the total number of students you've taught? Just a guess…

HW: over 400.

APPENDIX K: LATOYA'S OUTLINE

Cigarette smoking should not be allowed in public places

1st paragraph:

Introduction- A brief scenario on a case where there is a person smoking in a public place and from there I will go straight into my thesis. In my opinion, I think that cigarette smoking should not be allowed in public places because of its harmful effects it can have on another person. I will end the introduction with another brief scenario.

2nd paragraph:

My first argument-I know that smoking is an addiction and people who smoke feel the necessity to do it any where but they need to take other people into consideration. After stating this general idea I will list examples of why I feel this way. Once again, I will be ending this paragraph with a scenario.

3rd paragraph:

A counterargument-Based on what I have written in the first paragraph, I will now tell it from a smoker's point of view. I will list their reasons for being able to smoke anywhere they please. Somewhere in this paragraph, I will use my grandmother as an example.

4th paragraph:

My second argument-Sometimes smoking can have a bad influence on others and make them want to try it. Basically, it's promoting bad habits. Even though parents may have told their children the dangers of smoking, they will still be curious if they see a lot of people doing it. I will then just support my ideas with examples from daily life.

5th paragraph:

My last argument-Public places also accounts for the media. When I mentioned that children will be curious, teenagers and adults will also feel the same way by how smoking is portrayed in the media. Different things in the media will make smoking look good, like it's the everyday way of life. You will see this in movies, on TV shows, and you can hear it in the music. I will definitely include a few scenarios within this paragraph.

6th paragraph:

Another counterargument-I'm not sure if I want to include this just yet. I will list what someone who smokes would have to say about them being a bad influence. Mainly, I will focus on how they defend themselves and say that nobody should be imitating them.

Last paragraph:

Closing-I will wrap it up and restate my thesis statement. Then, I will mention a personal life experience and probably someone else's experiences.