



# *Inkshed*

Newsletter of the Canadian Association  
for the Study of Writing and Reading  
Volume 11, Number 1, October 1992



## **Inside *Inkshed***

Anthony Paré Ann Beer	Editorial Inkshedding	1
Jim Reither	My Turn on Textoids	3
Dawson Harms	Deferring Origin: -The Ma(r)kings of an Altered Heuristics	5
Doug Brent	Some Thoughts on the Regularization of CASWAR	7
R.L. Stanton	Introducing: -The Case of the Peer Journal Writers	9
Mary-Louise Craven Leslie Sanders Deanne Bogden Susan Drain	Call for Papers	10



.....

11.1 October 1992

*Co-Editors*

Ann Beer      Anthony Paré

McGill University  
Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing  
3700 McTavish Street, Montreal, QC, H3A 1Y2  
Fax: (514) 398-4679 – E-mail: INAP@MUSICB.McGill.CA

*Consulting Editors*

Phyllis Artiss      Neil Besner  
Memorial University      University of Winnipeg

Coralie Bryant      Wayne Lucey  
South Slave Divisional Board of Education      Assumption Catholic High School  
N.W.T.      Burlington, ON

Susan Drain      Richard M. Coe  
University of Toronto      Simon Fraser University

Lester Faigley      James A. Reither  
University of Texas      St. Thomas University

Judy Segal      Graham Smart  
University of British Columbia      Bank of Canada

Russell A. Hunt  
St. Thomas University

.....

*Inkshed* provides a forum for its subscribers to explore relationships among research, theory, and practice in language acquisition and language use. Subscribers are invited to submit informative pieces such as notices, reports, and reviews of articles, journals, books, textbooks, conferences, and workshops, as well as polemical discussions of events, issues, problems, and questions of concern to teachers in Canada interested in writing and reading theory and practice.

*Inkshed* is published five times during the academic year. The following is a schedule of submission deadlines and approximate publication dates:

15 September, for 1 October	1 February, for 15 February
15 November, for 1 December	1 April, for 15 April
Post-Conference: May - June	

The newsletter is supported financially by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing, and the Faculty of Education, McGill University, and by its subscribers. Make cheques for \$10.00 payable to Faculty of Education, McGill University.

.....

-

---

# Editorial Inkshedding

Welcome to the first *Inkshed* of 1992-93. In this issue, Jim Reither adds his voice to the ongoing discussion of "textoids," Dawson Harms begins what we hope will be a dialogue on "invention" leading up to Inkshed 10, Doug Brent offers some thoughtful comments on the structure of our community, and Ruth Stanton describes an innovative twist on the use of journals in the writing classroom. Also in this issue, Deanne Bogdan, Mary-Louise Craven, Susan Drain, and Leslie Sanders make a Call for Papers for the Inkshed 10 conference. But before you get to those pieces, we would like to draw your attention to the following concerns:

## Subscriptions

Enclosed with this issue is an *Inkshed* subscription form. We have decided to ask everyone to re-subscribe at the same time each year, and this is the time. Please photocopy the form and distribute it to interested colleagues, students, and friends.

## Publication Dates and a Call for Submissions

As you can see from the masthead, we have changed *Inkshed* deadline and publication dates and added one issue per year — a post-conference issue. However, those issues will be mighty gaunt if we don't get some contributions from Inkshedders. The masthead lists the type of submissions we welcome, and we encourage you to invent others.

## Apology and Congratulations

We apologize to Sandy Baardman for inadvertently leaving his name off "Expanding the Conversation: Inkshed's Publications," a piece in *Inkshed* 10.5 that Sandy co-authored with Stan Straw. And we would like to congratulate Dr. Baardman on the successful defence of his dissertation.

## Canadian Caucus at CCCC

Over the past few years, Canadians at the Conference on College Composition and Communication have had two opportunities to discuss issues of specifically Canadian concern: the Canadian Caucus (a Special Interest Group meeting) and the Canadian Caucus-sponsored session. Unfortunately, the proposal submitted for the latter session, although excellent, was turned down. As a result, the 1993 Canadian Caucus meeting must do double duty as a business meeting **and** an opportunity to address some of the more pressing professional concerns of our widely-dispersed community.

The agenda for the CCCC Canadian Caucus has traditionally been the responsibility of the *Inkshed* editor, so we are asking for suggestions. What should we discuss? One topic must certainly be the proposal for the 1994 Canadian Caucus-sponsored session. If you have ideas for other topics, please let us know, and we will publish an agenda in the February newsletter.

Also, if you are presenting at CCCC in San Diego, let us know the time and title of your presentation and we will publish that information in the same issue.

## **Steering Committee Update**

As many of you will remember from last year's newsletters, a Steering Committee has been exploring how to regularize Inkshed/CASWAR's curiously "formless" organization in terms of a constitution. This goal has become necessary for legal and financial reasons, and because of a widespread desire to protect or enhance democratic processes within the group. The Committee's work continues, and in an upcoming newsletter or a separate mailing you will be asked to read, and vote on, a draft constitution based on the discussion so far.

In this issue is Doug Brent's contribution to the conversation. Doug is responding to the Committee's Progress Report (*Inkshed* 10.1), to Stan Straw and Sandy Baardman's proposal for a publication group (*Inkshed* 10.5) and to the lengthy discussion of the issues at the 1992 Inkshed Conference in Banff. (Also in *Inkshed* 10.5).

### **More perspectives on the constitution are urgently needed!**

Write to the newsletter editors or to any Committee Member to add your voice. Put forward whatever questions or suggestions you may have.

The new Committee consists of the following people (some overlap from last year, some "new blood"):

Sandy Baardman  
Susan Drain  
Jacqueline Howse  
Jim Reither  
Wendy Strachan  
Stan Straw  
Alayne Sullivan  
Ann Beer

Susan, Stan, and Sandy are serving as joint coordinators of the Committee. If you wish to contact the Committee, Susan's address is:

Dept. of English  
Victoria University  
73 Queen's Park Cr.  
Toronto, ON  
M5S 1K7

Ann has stepped down as coordinator but continues as a committee member. She would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who has participated in the process so far and given their time and energy so generously. Barbara Powell and Catherine Taylor have had to step down because of other pressing commitments.

**Ann Beer**  
**Anthony Paré**

---

# My Turn on Textoids

Even if it's wrong, Russ Hunt's notion of the textoid (see *Inkshed* 10.1 and 10.5) nags us into examining the ways texts and textbooks are used in our classrooms. As I understand the notion, a textoid is a text that has never had a social-dialogic function or that has been wrenched from its context so that its social-dialogic functions have been eradicated. An obvious example of a textoid is the sentence or paragraph written for grammar and usage handbooks, sentences and paragraphs whose *raison d'être* is to illustrate dangling participles or topic sentences or some such stuff. By extension, a textoid is produced in a context that does not allow for a kind of whole-language, social-dialogic function. One obvious example is the text teachers all too often ask students to write as term papers, a text whose sole or primary function is to provide data teachers can use to come up with grades. Students appropriately respond to such assignments and purposes by writing not to say something to someone about something, but, instead, merely to satisfy the course requirement and get the grade. Another obvious example, unfortunately, are texts written as textbooks -- virtually all of which are written and used abstractively, to lay out the body of knowledge that is (wrongly) thought to constitute a given field. And, in any case, textbooks don't really speak to other texts; textbooks speak to students. And sometimes the text originated as an utterance in a conversation but its dialogic function has been eradicated or ignored. One example is the conversationally-embedded article published in a journal that is then republished in a reader to illustrate the form and content of a genre or "rhetorical mode."

As others in this discussion have suggested, the problem with this notion of the textoid is that "textoidness" is not something that inheres in texts themselves. We cannot point to a text and say, "This is, always has been, and always will be a textoid," because there is no such thing as a text that exists outside of some social-dialogic context. Such a thing would be something other than a text. That's true of sentences written solely to illustrate dangling participles, of paragraphs written solely to demonstrate topic sentences, of term papers written solely to get grades, of textbooks written solely to teach what is known in a field, and of articles that gain a second life by being published in *The Bedford Reader* solely to show students what a descriptive essay looks like and talks about.

What matters is what people do with texts. On the one hand, we can deal with them, in and out of school, as if they were textoids. That often happens to texts read and written by students in writing and other courses. (The vast majority of textbooks, it seems to me, invite readers to treat them as textoids, by presenting their content as a finished body of knowledge that is no longer under the stress of challenge, modification, and addition. That's why Russ can rightly say that textbooks are texts "used as sources or repositories of 'The Truth' in situations where The Truth is institutionally pre-determined...." [*Inkshed* 10.1: 8].) On the other hand, we can deal with texts in ways that acknowledge their situatedness, their indebtedness, their tentativeness, their instrumentalness, their answerability. Patrick Dias and his McGill cohorts (Ann Beer, Jane Ledwell-Brown, Anthony Paré, and Carolyn Pittenger) have gone a long way toward doing just that with their textbook, *Writing for Ourselves/Writing for Others* (Nelson Canada, 1992). Douglas Vipond has found a number of ways to do that, even with the most textbooky and textoidy kinds of psychology textbooks. And I think I've found ways to do that in courses I teach in rhetoric and language as symbolic action, by asking students not to study and master what's in assigned texts but to use what's in those texts to help them find ways to talk, write, and think about how language shapes their worlds, their realities (my idea is that texts are dialogic not just with other texts but with all language-mediated reality [which may well be all there is]).

Still, I can't help agreeing with Russ about the principle he's trying to get at in his use of the term textoid. As I understand things, by their very nature texts must be seen as situated, contextualized,

question-able, tentative, rhetorical, "hesitant, exploratory or risky" (Hunt 8), "provocative, written in response to other texts and in anticipation of response" (9). We have to see, and we have to allow our students to see, "the literature of a field as a conversation and the author as one speaker among others" (9).

Which is why I want to resist, or at least modify, Pat Dias's suggestion that "some or even most texts ought to be read in common" (*Inkshed* 10.4: 2). Pat observes "that the first thing we want to do after we've read a book (of some significance, however defined) is to find someone else who has read the same book." This is indeed a "powerful justification" for asking students to engage in "collaborative discussion of common texts" (2). Knowing differently from the ways others know about the same thing is one of the most powerful motives I know for engaging in discourse. But who decides which common texts? On what basis? What is the message about texts and discourse, teaching and learning, when it is teachers who choose texts for common reading and discussion, for the students' own good?

There's another powerful motive for engaging in the sorts of text-initiated discourse we're talking about here, one that's easily as powerful as the one Pat identifies. That motive is knowing things others do not know -- in particular, knowing about a text that others do not know about and believing that that text is relevant, significant, of use in dealing with a shared problem or issue. So it seems to me that while Pat Dias tells one side of the story of our motives for discourse, Russ Hunt tells an important (and generally lost, ignored, eradicated) other side of that story of motives. What I see is the possibility that the desire to recommend a book or article to someone else occurs just as often, and just as vitally, as the need to seek out someone else who has read the same text; and this observation is a "powerful justification" for asking students to undertake the kinds of collaborative inquiry that Russ alludes to when he concludes his little piece in *Inkshed* 10.1. One immediate benefit of the approach Russ recommends is that students can feel a far greater sense of "ownership" of texts they find and recommend to others than they can of texts teachers assign for them to read.

In the end, surely, what matters is how students understand texts and their uses and functions. My sense is that, in school, texts are most often treated as if they were textoids -- as stand-alone entities, things, artifacts, containers, repositories of information and truth -- so that the "wonderful essay by Annie Dillard...go[es] dead between the covers of an anthology" (Kay Stewart, *Inkshed* 10.4:1), because it's treated not as an utterance in an ongoing conversation but as an example of, say, "the descriptive essay." In such a situation, the students' job is to learn what the text has to teach them about such things as form and content. The situation is only too rarely set so that students learn to see (as Inkshedders came to see at *Inkshed* II, in Edmonton, in 1985) that texts are always both product and process.

My plea here is for more careful, deliberate attention to the reading and writing situations in which we place our students. We can, by our actions, appear to textoidize their reading and writing, or we can allow situations to develop in which their reading and writing are fundamentally dialogic. The second alternative is more fun. More important, it tells the truth about reading and writing. We need to develop (and tell each other about) ways to use texts that allow students to know reading and writing as deeply embedded, situated activities. Texts cannot be otherwise. But texts can be understood as otherwise, and we can't let that happen.

**Jim Reither**  
Department of English  
St. Thomas University

---

# Deferring Origin:

## The Ma(r)kings of an Altered Heuristics

- What do we (actually/supposedly) know about writerly invention?
- What epistemological constructs are privileged in the popular process-oriented discourse of invention?
- How might alternative inventions, occasioned by a critical **re**-reading of invention's text, be conceptualized and configured?

Grappling with questions regarding scriptive or literate invention can serve as a significant point of departure in gaining a critical understanding of the myths and biases which inhabit, and inhibit, orthodoxies in writing-composition studies. Inquiry into the current process-oriented **conceptualization** and (necessary) **representation** of invention can open up the pedagogical text for critical scrutiny as well as an urgently needed re-configuration.

As the writing process movement has gained its current status as the new orthodoxy in writing studies, invention has again achieved the kind of central status that it once held in classical rhetoric. Although it often goes by an assumed name - - creativity, discovery, meaning-making - - invention continues to function as a kind of compelling mystery at the centre of creative activity .

In spite of process pedagogy's confident assertions regarding a better understanding of invention, invention proves to be a rather slippery and disruptive force in the discourse. Rather than serving process pedagogy's desire for a unified and constructive schematics, invention becomes a confounding "occurrence," an anti-presence, simulacrum, a (free) signifier (among signifiers) ... continually frustrating attempts at pedagogical appropriation.

In taking a kind of "second look" at invention, in un-packing or un-packaging process pedagogy's (marketable?) product, what becomes increasingly apparent is "invention's" own **invention** - - at the deft hands of the paradigmatic innovators.

Admittedly, a post-structural (deconstructive) inquiry wills a view of things as textual (if nothing else). Thus, it is the discourse employed in process pedagogy's writing of invention which is "bound" to both conceal and reveal the epistemological and ontological assumptions by/within/out of which invention is constituted.

As invention emerges out of confused and disparate historical contexts - - as rhetorical mimesis or romantic inspiration - - it continues to prompt varied speculation and manipulation regarding originality, and the nature of author-ity. Invention's **dissemination** is particularly evident in contemporary writing dogma's deeply rifted discourse: two fundamentally conflictual and untenable orientations define and direct the epistemological and scriptive gestures which **are** process pedagogy; although "expressivist" and "technicist" orientations share a basic **constructivist** bias, they can not agree in their assumptions regarding writer, text, and the writing process.

An expressivist perspective holds to and reflects a quasi-romanticized bias towards literate act and artefact - - privileging individual memory, response, and experience. An expressivist conception of invention resembles a (quasi-) mystical sense of **discovery** or inspiration - - private, spontaneous, and magical. Ex **nihilo**.

## Deferring Origin: The Ma(r)kings of an Altered Heuristics

---

Much of Donald Murray's writing of invention has represented an expressivist style of thinking, for example. Murray has emphasized the writers' necessarily passive role in the writing process: if he or she is receptive (enough), the idea will "attach itself to the writer" Murray says (1986, p. 38). The *idea* takes on a life of its own; it seems to "take hold" of the writer and the writing (p. 39).

This is invention as "Incubation" -- as Britton would have it -- where ideas develop on their own as the writer remains patient and attentive. Thus Murray encourages writers to "try not to consciously think about what they are going to write" (1986, p. 38); they should let writing happen according to "its own resonance" (p. 43). It will be obvious when "writing is near" (p. 41).

Murray's discourse desires an Ideal Invention, an immutable creative *presence*, as a basis for understanding and identifying original writing. Here inventive gesture is characterized by mystery, spontaneity, and unpredictability.

A technician bias, after Linda Flower's work, for example, reflects a more systematic and scientific approach. Emerging from a mix of cognitive psychology, systems theory, and classical rhetoric, the technician invention privileges writer control, strategizing, and predictability. It is invention resembling rhetorical *production*, in many ways.

Flower's controlled and systematic approach to writing research itself reflects a technician view of what invention is or should be. Her concept of invention is characterized by complexity and recursiveness, essentially involving the control of writerly plans and textual revision.

Seen as objectifiable, invention is the responsibility of the writer -- already a "very busy switchboard operator" (Flower and Hayes, 1980, p. 33). Since, in Flower's view, "good writers have plans and strategies" (p. 50), invention becomes a strategic maneuvering on the writer's part in the effort to "solve" the "rhetorical problem."

Evidently views of invention vary significantly within process pedagogy's purview. Given that Murray's and Flower's texts continue to influence and inform current writing pedagogy, it is not surprising that invention *itself* remains problematic -- indeterminate and polysemous.

What becomes increasingly apparent, in the "search for invention," is that invention confounds the discourse which claims to have identified it. Pedagogical discourse would have invention seen or thought of as this or that process; however, process invention is (no more than) a product of pedagogical discourse, supplemented, (mis)appropriated.

Invention refuses to be "pinned down." It accommodates multiple/contradictory representations: both accidental and deliberate, both mystical and mechanical, introspective and outward-looking, discovery and production, expressivist and technician ... and yet, neither one nor the other.

The "truth of invention" proves to be (nothing more than) text written and (therefore) re-writable. Invention is text occasioning its (own) re-writing. Invention (as) re-invention (as) de-invention, etc. Inventive/invective! Untamable, fluid, altered.

An "altered heuristics" is hardly free from conventional difficulties: re-invented inventions make no panacean promises; they (only) signify ongoing re-invention -- always self-reflexive and -effacing, ambiguous, playful, texted.



Alteration, interruption, and interrogation might gesture towards, or be gestures of, a post-deconstructive (re)invention(ing), but they will never be allowed to *be exactly such*. Always (re)negotiable. Anticipated, and mediated, by and within language, (re)invention is not the "spirit of experience"; it is not **before** writing; it is not anterior to language; it is not intact and self-authenticating; it is not (the) signified; it is not **identifiable** (as) ...

Inextricably bound (up) in language, altered inventions collapse entrenched process binaries: process and product, text and context, writer and writing, experience and language, etc. Altered/ing heuristics mimic and mock various "forms" of discursive gesture, always/simultaneously constructing and deconstructing text and idea.

(The paper was first presented at Inkshed 9 in Banff, May, 1992).

### Works Cited

Murray, D. (1986). Write before writing. In T. Newkirk (Ed.), *To compose: Teaching writing in high school*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Flower, L. and Hayes, J. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L. Gregg and E. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dawson Harms  
Faculty of Education  
University of Manitoba

---

## Some Thoughts on the Regularization of CASWAR

One of the reasons that some people have been calling for a more formal association is that it would allow us to rotate leadership more formally, thus helping break down what has been perceived as a gap between "insiders" (chiefly founding members) and "outsiders" (presumably meaning relative newcomers). I agree that the insider/outsider thing may have been artificially exaggerated by last year's conference. I wasn't there, but much of the problem may have been a result of its being held in Montreal, site of one of the largest concentrations of Inksheddors in the country. There may have been simply too many McGill people there at once, on their own turf, allowing -- almost forcing -- a clique to form where normally none would have. But there really is a sort of "founding mothers and fathers" group of people who have the energy, commitment and history with the group; without a formal means of rotating leadership, such people will keep being the driving force not because they want to keep "power" to themselves but by default. There is no easy way of bringing the new voices on line. Incorporation may be able to do that, in addition to making sure that no-one is left holding a financial bag.

Careful research is needed to discover what sort of organization will indeed assure that sort of protection. Do we need a board of directors? If so, I suspect that the law reads that they have to hold the financial bag in times of crises. Becoming a society does not absolve people of financial responsibility in the way that incorporation does. We would undoubtedly need an official and legal AGM. Do we need a formal executive structure or can we go with an informal rotated steering committee? Answering these questions is job 1. It seems to me that there is something called the "societies act" which spells this sort of thing out.

The constitution: aside from legal folderol, the constitution should spell out our vision of ourselves in much the way it has been done in the Progress Report (*Inkshed* 10.1). A few paragraphs should do it. If we get too specific we will get too rigid. Constitutions are mightily hard to amend and once things get written down they tend to rigidify. The whole purpose of a constitution is to provide a sort of bedrock of stability against which other things can be measured. They are easy to create in a vacuum of no previous constitution, but once created can become a powerful force that requires a tremendous degree of consensus to change -- more consensus than we may ever get again.

## Some thoughts on the regularization of CASWAR

Things like conference structure, rotation of the newsletter, etc. very likely should not go in the constitution. They will get too rigid if placed there. Rather, they can be written up as a separate set of guidelines where they can easily be re-examined every year.

The conference: The conference seems to me to be one of the important defining structures of Inkshed. Its small size is important, but the defining characteristic seems to me to be the lack of concurrent sessions. The instant we break into smaller interest groups in different rooms, the character will change. But we could get somewhat bigger without that happening. How big? 60? 75? Maybe all we can do is try it -- let it grow gradually until we start seeing a breakdown in present structure. Then we can look at capping enrollment or changing the structure.

The economics of transportation in Canada will probably mean that this will only be a problem when the conference is in Ontario or Quebec. Conferences on either coast will probably be self-limiting.

We should not, I think, get too evangelical. That is, we should welcome and encourage new voices but not seek formal systems to get hordes of people on board. I don't think it is too cliquey not to want to get too big too fast.

Name: Canadian Association for the Study of Rhetoric would be a big mistake in view of the existence of a Canadian Society for the Study of Rhetoric, which has an entirely different focus. Something about "Writing and Reading" suggests the pedagogical edge that makes us distinct from the much more theoretical bent of CSSR. We don't use the term "rhetoric" as a foundational term all that much. And if SHRRC knows CASWAR, let's keep it even if it's ugly.

Association (chronologically) with ACCUTE: this has good theoretical justification but real practical problems. ACCUTE is part of the Learned. People who go to the Learned want to drift in and out of various related societies -- technical writing, Canadian studies, Communication Association, etc. etc. If we had Inkshed next to ACCUTE and that time slot overlapped with other Learned Societies, we would get people drifting in and out of Inkshed. Also conference overload. I don't think our association with CCTE is broke enough that we should try to fix it just now.

Publications: Stan has proposed a publication series which eventually would mature into a specific number of monographs or collections published each year. This is a big issue and we really didn't get a chance to address it at the meeting. I understand the attraction of a publication series: a publication series lends prestige and credibility to an organization, and it would allow us to project a more coherent "Canadian" perspective on composition studies. But the seductive appeal of such a project could blind us to some potential problems.

The biggest danger as I see it is the idea of creating a set of annual slots to be filled. The proposed four slots are definitely too many, but I am worried about having any "slots" at all. If vacant publication spaces arise at regular intervals, there is pressure to fill them even if they have to be filled with poor material. There is a very small pool of potential contributors here, and *Textual Studies in Canada* and *English Quarterly* are already competing for them. We need to ask ourselves what the advantages would really be. Is there material that really needs to get itself published that is not getting out through the present channels? Is there a need for a set of publications that is specifically designated as "Canadian"? I fully support the idea of a trial run of one or two publications, but I would really like to go slow on this one. Of everything we are proposing, it seems the biggest step and one which we have had least time to discuss. These seem to be interesting times for CASWAR; there is a place for a more formal organization doing more formal things at this point in history, I think, and we do things that neither CCTE nor ACCUTE is doing. Let's not get bogged down in fear of change, but let's take enough time to make sure we get it right.

**Doug Brent**  
University of Calgary

---

## Introducing: The Case of the Peer Journal Writers

"You'll be writing two sets of journals - - one for me and one for a student in the other class I teach."

With these words I launch my latest investigation: a search for the answer to the question, "Can peer journal writing play a role in the Effective Written Communication Course (EWC)?" The date is September 9 of this year; the subjects are twenty seven first year Education students; my employer is the Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing at McGill University. The case is in progress.

I'm an investigator or, if you prefer the more common term, an instructor with the Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing. I teach two of the twenty sections of EWC, a writing course sponsored by the Centre. One of my classes includes first year Education students; the other is open to students from all faculties. EWC, designed to help our students become more effective writers both within and beyond the academic community, includes journal writing as an integral part of its agenda.

I have been teaching the course for eight years, but during that time my students have had only one audience for their journals - - me. I have tried the odd experiment of asking them to write at least one journal entry for their classmates, but generally these single efforts made them uncomfortable. Invariably my next batch of journals would bring complaints that they did not like writing to their peers.

Still, I was convinced that peer journal writing would work, given the right conditions. Perhaps, I thought, if my students were to keep peer journals for a full term, they would have time to develop a comfortable rapport with their peer partners.

I have several reasons for suspecting that peer journal writing can play a role in EWC. The principal reason for my suspicions rests with the fact that my students often express feelings of aloneness in their journals - - they are sure that they are the only round pegs resisting square holes. By sharing their writing with their peers, they might help each other see that they are not alone, that other students also suffer from lack of confidence, academic pressures, and unhappy relationships.

Secondly, the peer journals might help students see that different audiences have different interests, needs, and background experiences. My students will have two audiences now instead of one:

Me: a middle aged woman, old enough to be their mother ( but not all of them at once); a figure of authority in the classroom and, in their eyes if in no one else's, an expert in the business of writing; a student once, but so long ago that professors wore caps and gowns to class.

Their peers: members of the same generation, born within a few years of each other; figures in subjection to a half dozen or so professors who seem to view their particular courses as the only ones being taught; confreres and consoeurs involved in like struggles with course loads, love relationships, and economic hardships.

Even if they write to me and to their peers on the same subjects, their journals are not likely to be written in the same style or contain exactly the same content.

## Introducing: The Case of the Peer Journal Writers

---

Thirdly, writing to alternative partners might encourage students to use their journals for markedly different purposes: writing about their extra-curricular activities with their peers and exploring their fields of study with me. If this does happen, I shall regret not reading my students' personal stories, for these are often their most moving entries. Still, I think they need to learn how valuable an academic journal can be; and it is exciting to see young people broadening their horizons, discovering new and unexpected concepts.

Fourthly, with their writing partners coming from different classes, the relationships they develop will depend upon the writing they do. The people they are writing to are likely strangers to them; they must explain their ideas clearly enough so that these strangers, removed from them in time and space, can understand them. Writing to strangers also creates an air of mystery for them, intensified in some cases by students using pseudonyms. For example, one student signed his initial peer journal, "Slapharbartfast," a character from *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*; in response, his peer partner signed her journal, "Zaphod," a character from the same book. The peer journals are a mystery to me, too, for I don't get to read them; I'm only the postal service.

At the end of term, I shall ask my students to evaluate the peer journals, to let me know whether or not they found them beneficial. This will help me decide if my suspicions are correct: peer journals can play a role in the writing class. When I have the results, I'll write again. So be watching for the next installment of the Case of the Peer Journal Writers.

R.L. Stanton  
McGill University

---

## Call for Papers

### Inkshed 10

May 27, 28 and 29, 1993  
In (or around) Ottawa

Following from Jamie MacKinnon's thought-provoking talk at last year's Inkshed conference on "Invention in a Museless World," it was decided to focus the 1993 Inkshed conference on issues relating to "Invention." The following questions come in part from questions posed by Jamie in the introduction to his talk; we have added others.

In the spirit of invention heuristics, please use these questions as "probes" to come up with your own question which you want to answer in your presentation.

1. What implications do an emphasis on community and social context have for invention? That is, how can we reconcile notions of the "spiritual muse" with theories of social construction?
2. What can a "museless" writing theory make of inspiration, of ideation which is transcendent? Why, in a "postmodern" age, is it easier for theorists to speak of 'magic' (e.g. Elbow, 1981) than of "inspiration"?
3. What does the denial of the 'spiritual element' (or the 'numinous') in writing conceal among those of us who profess to "invent"?
4. A variety of contemporary writers refer to 'the muse' when they talk about invention (e.g., *The Paris Review*). What do you think writers might mean when they use this term?

5. In your own writing experience, where do new ideas come from? In what ways can you model your experiences for your students?
6. What do we teach when we teach invention "heuristics"? What don't we teach?
7. What does it mean when a student says s/he can't come up with any ideas in a research paper and/or in a piece of expressive writing?
8. How do we look at traditional rhetoric's notions of "inventio" from today's rhetorical perspectives?
9. Does a theory of invention require a distinction between 'rhetorical' writing and 'creative' writing? Between 'dialectical' and 'rhetorical' reasoning? Between 'formal' reasoning (premises given, nothing added to or subtracted from them) and 'informal' reasoning (one "may add to or subtract from the premises as one delves into one's knowledge" Perkins, Farady & Bushy, 1991)?

We welcome both pedagogical and theoretical-philosophical proposals on issues related to "invention" of varying length and format: 10-minute informal reports on research and pedagogy, 20-minute papers or formal talks, 45 minute workshops or interactive demonstrations.

Following from the advice proffered by the Inkshed 8 Organizing Committee, we ask that "all proposals should include plans for involving conference participants in some talking, writing, or both... and that papers should be written for listeners rather than for readers." (*Inkshed 9.2*)

Proposals should have a covering page with the title of the presentation, presenter's name, address, and phone numbers. The proposal itself should include a title, a brief description or abstract (200 words or so), a very brief description of the method of presentation, and a statement of aim or purpose. The proposals will be vetted by Deanne Bogdan (OISE), Mary-Louise Craven (York), Susan Drain (U. of T.) and Leslie Sanders (York).

➔ Deadline: December 15, 1992  
Please submit EITHER hard-copy to:  
Mary-Louise Craven,  
The Computer-Assisted Writing Centre,  
530 Scott Library,  
4700 Keele Street, North York,  
Ontario M3J 1P3  
OR  
e-mail to [mlc@writer.yorku.ca](mailto:mlc@writer.yorku.ca)  
OR  
Fax to 416-928-0392 (Leslie Sander's fax number)