



---

# *Inkshed*

Newsletter of the Canadian Association  
for the Study of Language and Learning

Volume 12, Number 3, February 1994

---

## **Inside *Inkshed***

	What is "Inkshedding?" CASLL E-mail Excerpts	1
Carole TenBrink	Teaching Poetry in the Process Model	12
Renée Norman	Poems	20
<i>CASLL</i> Executive	Call for Nominations	22
<i>CATTW</i>	Tentative Conference Schedule	23

---

.....

12.3 February 1994

*Co-Editors*

Anthony Paré, Ann Beer

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  
Memorial University

Neil Besner  
University of Winnipeg

Coralie Bryant  
South Slave Divisional Board of Education  
N.W.T.

Wayne Lucey  
Assumption Catholic High School  
Burlington, ON

Susan Drain  
Mount Saint Vincent University

Richard M. Coe  
Simon Fraser University

Lester Faigley  
University of Texas

James A. Reither  
St. Thomas University

Judy Segal  
University of British Columbia

Graham Smart  
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 \$25.00 payable to Faculty of Education, McGill University.

.....

---

# What is “Inkshedding”?

## CASLL E-Mail Excerpts

[Editors' note: the following conversation about inkshedding occurred on the CASLL e-mail list. The discussion began with a question about inkshedding at CCCC, but quickly became an attempt to define inkshedding. We have included only those excerpts of the conversation that were on the network when we went to press and were directly related to the topic of inkshedding, and in some cases we have edited the excerpts slightly. In doing this, we experienced the same dilemma posed by a number of the contributors below - that is, can a discourse be removed from its context? We realize that the people whose e-mail messages we have excerpted did not intend them to be published, and we apologize. In future, we will ask for permission to publish e-mail. Copyright lawsuits should be addressed to the non-existent CASLL executive.]

**W**ould it be possible to do inkshedding as part of a preconference workshop, thus to introduce it to the CCCC culture?

**Rick Coe**

I'm not sure if [the above] is meant to be a private message or a public message to CASLL, but I'm going to respond to your question as if it was addressed to CASLL. I think that's a great idea. Despite the fact that I've got lots of other stuff to do - don't we all? - my mind's already at work on possibilities. We could talk about Inkshedding, of course - where it came from, how it got started, where it's been done - those sorts of things. More important, we could have people do Inkshedding. They might even Inkshed about Inkshedding. And we could intersperse anecdotes in which people talk about times they Inkshedded or had others Inkshed and what the effects and consequences were. We could thus explain and demonstrate ranges of possibilities for Inkshedding in the classroom, at conferences, and anywhere else that people might use writing and reading to develop ideas, pool thinking and knowing, build knowing, get on the edges of other people's thinking. We could talk about and demonstrate why Inkshedding works ("theory").

As I say, great idea, with great possibilities. The only problem might be that it lacks ambition: Why not simply Inksheddize the who shebang, and introduce Inkshedding to the Cs in that way?

**Jim Reither**

[The 1995 CCCC will be in Washington, DC, and will run from Wednesday, March 22, to Saturday, March 25.] There will be half-day workshops on Wednesday as well as full-day ones (new

## What is "Inkshedding"?

---

wrinkle). Also the usual half-day workshops on Saturday. It might be possible to do a linked pair on Wednesday and Saturday.

Lester Faigley

So, Jim, you want to be a little more ambitious about this 1995 CCCC Inkshedding plot, do you? How about linking the Wednesday/Saturday workshop (before and after) to individual sessions during the conference itself? In other words, workshop participants who are also involved in individual or group presentations could work some inkshedding into their sessions. I'm not sure how we'd do this, but the Wed./Sat. split begs for some kind of throughline. By doing this, we would be taking some steps toward inksheddizing the whole conference.

Anthony Paré

And speaking of throughline, what about online? Ever since Russ described the inkshed process to me it's seemed like the Net[work] would be a natural venue for the practice. And of course the first problem somebody will go and bring up is: How are people at 4Cs going to get to computers and who's going to build a network at a convention center? I just know somebody's going to ask that. Good question, too.

But doesn't it sound like just the thing, given the technological means available? Or am I all wet?

Eric Crump

I would just like to second Eric Crump's idea that inkshedding could be done on the internet. It seems to me that we could have "virtual conferences" periodically about specific topics or based on papers that people might want to post to the list. This makes me wonder, though, about differences in the nature of the things people will write to a list – they often won't write the same things to a list as they would during an inkshedding session. That's my hunch, anyway, but it is also a difference we might explore to understand the place of this list within the framework of Inkshed's activities.

Roger Graves

This reminds me of when I wanted to know what inkshedding was, how it differs from freewriting, etc. If we hold an internet forum, is that inkshedding? Is this discussion inkshedding? Or does inkshed need to have more of a social/collaborative process? What I fear is that part of what is so special about inkshedding will get lost or coopted or erased if...

Once upon a time, we inkshed with pens. Some typewriters, a scanner, and one wordprocessor w/printer should be sufficient technology. I'm more worried about how inkshedding works at a conference with concurrent sessions, i.e., where the various inksheddors are

not responding to shared experiences. And about if – and if how – the vast quantity of ink likely to be shed would be edited/winnowed.

**Rick Coe**

Rick's right. Online computer conversations and inkshedding are different beasts. Responding to shared experience and editing/ winnowing seem to be key to inkshedding. Pooling, too. I have no problem with setting up an online forum, but I don't think it ought to be called inkshedding. Not if inkshedding is to mean anything or to survive.

**Jim Reither**

I agree entirely. This isn't inkshedding. Inkshedding, as I value it, is near-immediate written response to an oral presentation (occasionally an outcome of a discussion, maybe, even a response to a reading). Its value seems to lie in capturing reactions, those fleeting responses that dissipate as soon as someone articulate speaks and shapes and reorients one's developing, nascent response. I think inkshedding trades on writing as a means of shaping, discovering, etc. I suspect the time pressure and the presence of others involved in the same task is a catalyst for some productive thinking.

**Patrick Dias**

Yes. But also, there's a pressure involved in the incipiently social nature of the writing (it's going to be read, and in a particular sort of way) that is also, I think, involved in the catalyzing effect.

It's interesting to me that we have not (as I remember, anyway) before thought collaboratively about what it is that inkshedding is (& isn't). I'm finding this process very productive.

I hope, though, it's clear to everybody who hasn't been around the development of this... concept? activity?... since the beginning that this is not a matter of Colonel Sanders having a recipe and making sure all the franchises follow it. For me, anyway, I'm discovering more of what I think about inkshedding through this discussion of what kinds of activities are too far from the prototype to be identified with it.

**Russ Hunt**

Rick – I agree that the distinctions could get blurred. Currently I and my students are inkshedding in class, and have just started doing so on e-mail - building knowledge for assignments, etc. The merge option seems crucial for this, allowing someone to take someone else's message and add, interject, combine ideas. Otherwise you just have a series of individual voices taking turns. "Merge" seems to allow for the possibilities I remember Jim initially explaining to me at my first Inkshed conference .. not only spontaneous shared writing, but also the chance to highlight and respond to parts of the text and share those ... I'm sure other people will have other definitions, though, and maybe there are important differences to consider too.

**Ann Beer**

## What is "Inkshedding"?

---

I should have read Jim, Rick and Patrick's criticisms of the idea of computer inkshedding before sending my [above] message! However I am finding with a class of electrical engineering writing students that their sense of social interchange in writing, and collaborative processes, truly seems to include the virtual as well as physical classroom. They spend a lot of time working on group projects by e-mail and move from this to in-class work with no sense of strain.

Could this be a generational difference? I'm just reading Myron Tuman, *Wordperfect: Literacy in the Computer Age*. He has very intriguing insights on all this....

Ann Beer

Well, yeah, Russ, inkshedding isn't something that can be owned by anyone and franchised out the way Kentucky Fried Chicken can be. Still, there are elements enough of ripeness that make Inkshedding a different dish from online network discussion. There's context, for example (as alluded to by Rick and Pat), and there's purpose (also mentioned by Rick and Pat). And I've always seen at least these elements of the recipe-for-doing as necessary to produce the dish to make it recognizable as inkshedding:

people share something – a common experience such as a conference presentation they've all heard; an issue that has come up in a discussion and that needs resolving; a reading that has provoked thought – something like that;

people write their take on what they share – responding, criticizing, challenging, pointing out what needs to be emphasized, seen differently, added to the mix;

others immediately (or at least very soon after the writing) read what got written – pens in hand, marking, asterisking, writing comments in the margin – identifying the "good" bits (the well put, the interesting, the startling, the challenging, whatever) so those marks and that marginalia become part of the reading;

and (in the original form), what gets marked a lot gets "published" (excerpted and printed out and photocopied; or, in later versions, at least read aloud) so that what gets written and read and excerpted becomes part of the ongoing conversation of whatever "larger" event the inkshedding was embedded in.

That, to me, is the "recipe"; it's what I refer to what I use the word inkshedding. Take away any one ingredient and, for me, the dish has been transformed into something else (which is most frequently simply what Macrorie called freewriting).

I would not deny that others might think otherwise about just what goes into this dish (and it's entirely possible that I would happily accept revisions and additions to what I have written here – because I'm freewriting here [the "first" step in inkshedding] and what I have written has come exploratorily "off the top of my head"; if I had wanted to write more definitively, less exploratorily, I'd have written off-line, uploaded, and sent to CASLL – not the "first" step in inkshedding, for me).

Gotta go. I see there's another message come in from CASLL. Maybe it's about inkshedding (I know it's not the dish itself; can't be).

Jim Reither

[In response to Ann Beer] I don't think this is a generational difference, only. Even us old fogies move easily among virtual and physical places and among online discussion (such as that we're engaged in right now) hallway conversations, classroom discussions, inkshedding....

Jim Reither

[In response to Pat Dias] Very important insight, Pat. That's one reason online writing is so different from uploaded writing, eh? And one way in which online writing and the freewriting that stands as the "first" "stage" of inkshedding are alike – they both capture "reactions [and] fleeting responses that dissipate as soon as someone articulate [or inarticulate, for that matter] speaks and shapes and reorients one's developing, nascent response." Wonderful insight. Articulate! The great thing about both inkshedding and online discussion is how close they can come to what happens to people's thinking and knowing when they're engaged in a good oral conversation. That's part of what Russ and I were trying to do with Inkshedding at Inkshed I – fold written "conversation" into the normal oral conversation that would go on at the conference – to change the nature of the conversation, not just be including written "conversation" in the oral, but also by infusing the oral conversation with the special differences we were sure would mark the written conversation. That's what we were out to do, and I think inkshedding does that more "thoroughly" than online conversation does.

Makes me think online conversation is closer to regular oral conversation than inkshedding is. Maybe not, but right now it feels that way to me.

I remember Deanne Bogdan's observation – that "inkshedding puts me on the edges of other people's thinking." Right on, eh, Pat? And I ask, does online discussion (such as that we "see" on CASLL) do that same thing in the same way? I dunno. I think there's a difference in degree here. Inkshedding's more immediate, less edited, I think. But I'm not sure. As Russ says, this conversation is really important and helpful. It's interesting to me that when Rick and Anthony tried to get a conversation on inkshedding going in *Inkshed*, nothing much came of it – even though they both said interesting, helpful, challenging things. Why? Why was it a no-go there, but a go here? What would happen if we actually got together sometime and inkshed on these questions a number of times? Russ and I talked about getting a passle of folks together in one place to do just that, so as to inkshed a monograph on inkshedding. That was some time ago, but we were enthusiastic about the idea and I still think I'd like to do it. What is inkshedding? How is inkshedding similar to and different from other, similar processes, activities... "things"? What does inkshedding accomplish? What can we do and learn by inkshedding that we maybe can't do or learn in other ways? And so on. Fascinating.

Jim Reither

[In response to Jim Reither] First time I've written two e-mail responses on one topic on the same day! You've certainly stirred the pot and my memory. I remember that first Inkshed Conference and the inkshedding and I have already mentioned what made it particularly valuable for me. I recall now that another useful aspect was that in some way the writing released a lot of stuff you might have said out aloud if you got a turn; however, in many cases (at least for me), writing it down had somehow cleared my head. What I had written had to be said/written; but it didn't matter any more. Occasionally something floated to the surface that surprised me; the rest was better left unsaid and (as it turned out) unpublished. Which reminds me of W.O. Mitchell's character in his, *Since Daisy Creek*: he teaches Creative Writing and instructs his students (adults in a Cont.Ed. course, I think) to "write whatever floats to the top of your head." Unlike freewriting, inkshedding is not a search for something to write about and develop; it is a search for what really mattered in what had just been cast into the conversation and what one might do with it; it was also registering questions and puzzlement.

Just one more thing before I test your patience: e-mail somehow demands an immediate response (and is like Inkshedding in that way) simply because you feel you have something to say and if you don't say it now, the conversation will have moved without your having dipped your oar in (to recall Burke's parlour conversation analogy). Ok I've cleared my head. And yes, writing about Inkshedding is a something you ought to get going on.

**Patrick Dias**

A few thoughts from a newcomer: the first time I experienced inkshedding (at the Canadian Caucus of CCCC), I thought I recognized it right away as freewriting, so that's what I did. Then someone said we had to pass them around to be read. What?? No way, not my own private only-for-myself freewriting. You see, that was what I always valued about freewriting – the fact that no one else would ever see it except me. Knowing that, I could be completely free to use whatever language I wanted, not worry about grammar, invented spellings, or punctuation, be totally honest, even baldly critical without worrying about the trappings of tact. So I refused – yes, refused outright – to share my inkshedding. I'm sure I was seen as quite rude. Very un-Canadian, not to share.

So my oar is about the communal character of inkshedding. That's what struck me about it, and that's what I think makes it a different animal than freewriting.

**Susan Dobra**

[In response to Jim Reither] It sounds to me like inkshedding needs both an oral and a written component, which would mean that you can't do it electronically unless you are also in close physical proximity with the people you are inkshedding with. There has to be a face-to-face interaction to supplement the written texts. On-line conversations allow writing to become more like speaking, but they don't allow for speaking to become infused with the special differences that mark the writing.

I don't know what inkshedding really is, I don't think, so I'm not in a position to make judgements. But that's the first thing I've heard said here that points to what seems to me to be a

clear difference between inkshedding and other forms of... of concepts? activities? It's quite possible to do almost everything else that's been mentioned electronically. Inserting comments into other people's texts, using the texts and comments to create more texts and new understandings, and publishing relevant bits are all things that a decent mail program will let you do. But mail programs can't, alas, put all the members of the conversation in one physical location.

Does that make sense? I'm just trying to figure out what y'all are talking about...

**Marcy Bauman**

This conversation about inkshedding and its attributes is getting more and more fascinating. I have really appreciated Jim and Pat's clarifications and that helps me to see that there are indeed some features of inkshedding that depend on physical presence. So whatever it is we do electronically will have to be called something else (though I agree with Marcy that almost everything except the oral/physical presence part can be done by a good electronic set-up).

The funniest part about this whole thing is that the name INKshedding is itself a sign of a certain type of technology – pens and paper – rather than the "dancing of electrons" as Russell Hoban calls it. What is the new on-line version going to be called, then?

P.S. Jim, I didn't for a moment intend to suggest that "Old fogies" couldn't do this – anyway I have never thought of you in those terms!! My point was more that the new generation of completely computer-literate science students (in particular) has an extraordinary intuitive acceptance of collaborative electronic writing processes – and one that is remarkably international and (to some extent at least) "democratic."

**Ann Beer**

Well! I learned a chunk about inkshedding these past few days. Thank you Jim, Rick, Ann, Karen, Pat, & Russ for collectively constructing such a clear portrayal of, not inkshedding, but the sense and feel of inkshedding. I think I see it clearer than I did. But, stubborn old Missouri mule that I am, I haven't been disabused of the notion that the net is a good place to conduct such business, in spite of some misgivings by the people who helped create inkshedding. You see, I think everything Jim identified as essential to the practice can be accomplished online (maybe – with the right machine configurations, the right crowd, etc.). [Here is an abbreviation of what Jim said about inkshedding:]

people share something – a common experience... people write their take on what they share – others immediately... read what got written and (in the original form) what gets marked a lot gets "published" (excerpted and printed out and photocopied; or, in later versions, at least read aloud) so that what gets written and read and excerpted becomes part of the ongoing conversation of whatever "larger" event the inkshedding was embedded in.

At the same time, I have to concede that the result – whatever it might be – could very well be something different from inkshedding. But it would at least be a descendant, and that, I guess, is what I was fishing for anyway when I wondered (not knowing that Ann was already doing it) about online inkshedding. I'm thinking more of an online environment infused with the inkshed spirit and practice rather than an online exchange just like the one we're carrying on here or like the ones we see on other lists. I argue variously (depending on the time of day, the position of the zodiac, and the mood of the crowd) that network technology changes everything and that network technology changes nothing. Both are quite true (or as Sandy Stone puts it: technology and culture constitute each other). So inkshedding online might not be inkshedding. It might be inkshedding online. I see that as a good thing if for no other reason that the move online increases potential reach without necessarily sacrificing the social dynamic, the intimacy, of events.

So while going online might alter the nature of the thing, the nature of the thing might alter online interaction in a good way, too. A trade-off.

**Eric Crump**

I've been reading the messages on inkshedding with a lot of interest, as apparently a number of others have, and feel the need to contribute, much as I would in a real (as opposed to "virtual") inkshed session. As I think Eric Crump, Susan Dobra, and others have pointed out, many of the things that inkshedding does can be duplicated on-line. At ISU we use a program called Daedalus that allows for a real-time (rather than delayed) forum for messages and comments in the networked classrooms here. The technology can mimic the pen and paper inkshedding, and most theoretical concerns (such as Jim was trying to list in one of his messages) can be applied to on-line exchanges: the social nature, the parlour metaphor, and so on. There are differences, though, as we have been seeking to identify. For me, one of those differences is control. Computer conversations in the classroom free up students who would not otherwise speak and gives them a chance to contribute. Similarly, those of us out here in the ether who would not usually speak up may feel more encouraged to contribute. In some ways this new technology disperses the social control that face-to-face inkshedding imposes; hypertext has a similarly unsettling effect of changing control structures for those accustomed to reading printed books. All of this leads me to speculate about the privileging of inkshedding as a face-to-face encounter. It isn't that I don't like people – honestly, ask my friend! – but not being present physically has its advantages. It also allows those who can't afford the time or money to go to conferences a chance to participate, and as Ann Beer points out, the status of the individuals participating is much less noticeable.

**Roger Graves**

Roger, you say you're concerned about the privileging of inkshedding and then you go on to say that,

not being present physically has its advantages. It also allows those who can't afford the time or money to go to conferences a chance to participate, and as Ann Beer points out, the status of the individuals participating is much less noticeable.

I guess you don't see that those who have access to networked classrooms might be privileged over those who don't? And, by the way, who controls whether or not students join in on network conversations?

**Jim Reither**

In response to Jim's questions, let me say that my concern was not with privileging *per se* because everything we do is situated within structures of power and control. My concern was with valuing face-to-face inkshedding over computer-mediated forms of sharing ideas. Today I read a posting about the Computers and Writing conference Eric Crump is running which has both on-line and in-person versions; like the two kinds of inkshedding/interchanging, they are different and overlap in purpose and effects. My experiences in networked classrooms lead me to think that in some ways there are advantages to the computer interface, though, as Jim points out, even to work in these classrooms is a form of privilege. Jim also points out that these network interchanges are also subject to control, both in the times such interchanges are opened up and in the decision to participate in them. The point I wanted to make was that in some ways the absence of physical presence changes the dynamic and quality of sharing, and that these changes might not be a bad thing. But that's just where all this reconsideration of what it means to Inkshed lead me, particularly since one important difference seems to be in the absence or presence of the interlocuters, as Perelman would say.

**Roger Graves**

I've been following this conversation and having to wait for twilight to respond - which is one of my observations about the difference between electronic nets and inkshedding: for me, only rarely are electronic messages at the center of my consciousness. I get them and answer them in odd moments, between doing other things. Inkshedding, for me, has been a fully engrossing experience, shared for a limited but intense time with a community engaged in one activity. It's not only the physical presence of others, but the particular place where the inkshedding happens. There was something about picking up the inksheds from the table in Wyoming and watching everyone walk off reading them that's part of the focusing power of the experience. Inkshedding is so physical in my mind that I associate it with shedding skin, little visible bits of epidermis. For me, the problem with electronic communication is that it remains discrete pieces, never coming back together into a new skin. That may be a perception, something to do with algorithms, step by step and distant instead of simultaneous and present. I have trouble imagining a new whole discourse emerging from the pieces. But then, I'm an old fogey. However, I am serious about offering to try a proto-inkshedding at this year's 4 C's if the others involved in our workshop ("Kitchen Tables and Rented Rooms") are willing and [big] IF someone(s) can help with the logistics. The workshop is for writing and responding to our own essays. I'm assuming at least some of the participants will follow an essay thread through the conference and could inkshed on the sessions they attend and maybe find a time to come back together on Saturday. If this seems a useful project, let me know.

**Jean Sanborn**

Reading Roger's posting just focused something for me about the difference between inkshedding and online talk: whereas he says the online gives the otherwise silent type the opportunity to speak up, I find that it often makes me more apt to sit back and watch the screen roll by. In the face-to-face inkshed I can't do that because the pressure of the situation gets my pen going – everyone expects me to contribute; that's the point of it and why should I be a schmuck and hold out. And once the pen starts, the strangest things happen, as we all know. So the inkshed, in my experience kicks you into writing; the online is a free invitation, with no reaction if you don't. On the other hand, as for inkshedding's circulating and eventually publishing the most commented on items: well online does a version of that as well. In reading this series of postings I've found salient points picked up by a subsequent poster and expanded or countered etc., much like in the inkshedding circulation phase. I've even, God forbid, deleted a lot of the postings, but I've kept the most scrawled on ones, if you get my drift; and who knows, they or parts of them might be quoted in something I do in the future. So isn't this inkshedding too? I guess the difference for me is the dimension of social pressure that inkshedding exerts; online just doesn't reflect it.

Laurence Steven

I've been thinking about all the perspectives voiced here in recent weeks about what inkshedding "really" is, and it occurs to me that the biggest surprise for me was the notion that it was tied to face-to-face, real-time situations. I've moved so much of my classes on to electronic media over the last couple of years that I'd begun, I think, to forget how important the social occasion of inkshedding is. Laurence Steven's note pulled me right up short. Among other good things, he contrasted e-mail with a "classical" inkshedding situation: "In the face-to-face inkshed... the pressure of the situation gets my pen going – everyone expects me to contribute; that's the point of it and why should I be a schmuck and hold out. And once the pen starts, the strangest things happen, as we all know. So the inkshed, in my experience, kicks you into writing; the online is a free invitation, with no reaction if you don't... I guess the difference for me is the dimension of social pressure that inkshedding exerts; online just doesn't reflect it."

That seems to me dead right, and extremely powerful. Most of us are used to the power of expectation, in dialogic relationships, to pull ideas out of us we didn't know we had. This works in one-to-one e-mail correspondences, where there really is a Bakhtinian expectation of response, but, as Laurence points out, it doesn't work in the usual multilogic e-list situation. Everyone who's spent any time on lists has remarked on, or heard others remark on, the "lurker" phenomenon: the people who just read and don't post. Nothing wrong with that, of course, but it's not inkshedding. Like Laurence, I've found the most powerful impact of inkshedding to be the expectation that (a) everybody will write (and thus everybody will have access to the floor), and (b) that the stuff that's just "cranking the engine," or thinking with the pen, or just not very interesting, will be simply passed over. It won't interrupt others, or keep them from having the floor, and nothing much will depend on it. The inkshed reading process is important – we read looking for the good bits, for the striking stuff, for the moments when someone writes her way into a new idea. One doesn't read email that way, or at least not so thoroughly. Does it make sense to say this: e-mail is linear (I read one piece, then the next) where inkshedding is simultaneous (I may read pieces one at a time, but their generation, and the way I think about them, is simultaneous). It's as though I could attend to

dozens of simultaneous conversation strands, instead of one at a time. One way to put it might be to say that the bandwidth is wider. I need to say that I'm extremely grateful to everybody for having pushed my thinking on this whole issue so hard.

Russ Hunt

And one more thing Russ: as you said, writing on-line is linear - both the writing and the reading. I would like to add that inkshedding, besides being urged on by the physical presence of co-writers, occurs in response to a "statement" that all have heard/read in common. It participates in the same kind of headiness that follows when I step out with friends from a powerful film or theatre experience. We all want to talk at the same time, confirm our responses, register puzzlement, raise questions. Responding on-line, I am as you say responding as I find my place in line, choosing how much space I want to take up (as now) or wondering whether I should wait till this linear conversation develops and then make my contribution - there's a kind of self censorship there that sort of precludes the top-of-the-head immediacy and discovering. In other words, before I write on-line, I must decide I have some kind of response that will advance the "conversation" in some way or at least redirect it. In inkshedding (*in situ*?) I don't have to worry about what I may or may not say and whether it might be relevant or not. Your contribution certainly confirmed something very important for me about inkshedding.

Patrick Dias

I think there's something very powerful in the notion that, as Laurence and Russ have pointed out, "classical" inkshedding situations set up the expectation that everyone will contribute. Russ notes that since everyone will write, everyone will have access to the floor; I wonder if there isn't also an element of "everyone will be in the same boat" there, too? If we are all engaged in an enterprise together, if we're all being asked to take the same risks (and it is risky, giving your half-formed thoughts or ideas about something to a group of people), the situation invites/compels people to develop into a certain kind of community. Again, I haven't (yet) been to an Inkshed conference, but my experience with other, similar communities suggests that maybe one of the hallmarks of such communities is that there's an absence of a certain kind of personal judgement. With inkshedding, I suspect this might mean that you can pass over the stuff that's cranking the engine, the stuff that isn't very interesting, because everyone produces it, and there's no shame in doing that. (But I'd hesitate to say that "nothing much will depend on it" because I bet everything else does depend on it - or arise from it - and that, too, might be a reason why everybody seems to feel they had a hand in producing the "good" bits, which is something else I'm hearing in this conversation.) And now I really wonder if it would ever be possible to replicate that experience on-line. I doubt it would be possible even to replicate that experience face-to-face if not everyone had to participate; people who aren't in that boat are somehow free to evaluate its "products" in a way that people who are madly rowing are not. And I can also imagine situations where the unequal risk-taking could be damaging to the people who do take the risks. Even assuming there wasn't outright damage, I can certainly see that I'd probably say very different things in the two situations.

Marcy Bauman

---

# Teaching Poetry Writing in the Process Model

After years of teaching composition in the process model in various settings, I was struck by the relevance of process methods to the teaching of creative writing, especially poetry. If I mentioned this to composition colleagues, the response was usually vague interest, but no real discussion. Mentioning it in creative writing circles brought either total incomprehension, or terror over loss of standards (i.e., control) over an elite product (the perfected poem). So, over the last few years, I'd gotten only as far as a file of idea scraps on how to use the process approach to teach poetry.

Then, recently, I had the good fortune of sitting in on the advanced poetry writing course of Jack Ridl at Hope College, Holland, Michigan, and soon realized, to my amazement, that I was in the middle of a breathing, vital, process oriented poetry writing workshop. It was wonderful to see my vague, sketchy notions fleshed out in the well-grounded course that Ridl had developed over a period of years. He told me later that he'd been moving more and more toward process, partly from instinct about how writers and poets need to develop, partly from remembering his father's way of coaching young athletes, and partly from the influence of William Stafford, who discusses his own brand of process approach in his book, *You Must Revise Your Life*.

Absolutely fundamental to this course, and to Ridl's and Stafford's philosophy, is a belief that poetry (and any art form) gives the imagination a valued place in one's life, a place that our present culture has all but extinguished. In a culture where critical, analytical reason and materialism have completely taken over, such a course aims, not to train students to produce a certain kind of poetic product, but to live, for a period of time, from within their imagination. If poetic potential is tapped and fine poems begin to come, this is wonderful. If people learn something about how their imagination and aesthetic sensibilities can enrich their lives, that, also, is wonderful. This is the deepest sense of process, and suggests that Stafford is dead serious: revising your life is the project at hand.

This is also the most profound difference between this creative writing course and all other courses, workshops, and poetry groups that I've ever been part of. The focus is on the student, not on pre-established poetic standards.

## The Traditional Poetry Writing Workshop

It's useful here, especially for composition teachers, to describe the traditional and still predominant poetry writing workshop. There, the teacher is the primary authority and sets standards that are either explicit or implicit. Activities are product oriented, a matter of seeing how well current drafts approach the standard, or how they could be improved to better do so. The student, while supposedly trying to explore where her imagination could take her, is more likely to

censor her drafts and find them wanting. The effort is to measure up, to enter the magic inner circle of those who can write a "good" poem.

The biggest problem with this typical workshop is that, no matter how kind or warm or open the teacher's style is, an atmosphere of competition and favoritism tends to develop, because everyone comes to know what the game is, and who's succeeding. At best, this encourages effort at revision. At worst, it throws a wet blanket over the student's deepest imaginative impulse, which, after all, is where real poems could come from. So the "best" students learn to write poems that meet accepted standards of excellence, and the other students struggle to keep some faith in their imaginations, in spite of the class. But the students who excel are, potentially, not well served either; what if their emerging poetic impulse is stifled by attempts to meet the teacher's standards? A lifetime could be spent producing well crafted, fine poems, which never tap or bring to fruition the deepest imaginative source.

## The Process Oriented Workshop

From my first day in Jack Ridl's course, I sensed that something was up. In the five drafts discussed that day, I noticed an experimental daring, both in form and in subject matter; these students seemed more sophisticated about poetry than I expected undergraduates in their second semester course of poetry writing could be. They obviously felt a level of trust and freedom that was unusual.

The discussion was student-focused. They commented with some authority about aspects of each other's poems and compared current to previous drafts. The teacher took a back seat and asked the students genuinely open-ended questions, like "what pleasure did you get doing this poem?," "what did you learn from the way you did this poem?," or "are there some things you would like us to pay attention to?" The aim behind these questions seemed to be to make sure the student felt in charge, and remained the expert about his own work. Students were given permission to take themselves and each other seriously.

If students bogged down, lost courage or energy for the tough work of thoughtful response to someone's draft, Jack was ready to introduce practical procedures; for example, he would say, "today let's have a first responder and second responder (from a list passed around), and then anybody can jump in." What impressed me over all was the breadth of commitment students had toward each other as fellow poets engaged in a common effort of imaginative exploration.

As winter ended and finally spring showed some signs of approach, I kept coming, trying to deepen my understanding of what made this class work so well. The rest of this paper explores some major aspects of Ridl's approach: his basic foundation, some key principles, and a little methodology. I'll finish with two critical comments.

One major aspect of Ridl's approach is the teacher's role. I believe Jack is trying to understand and coach an emerging imagination and the poems that imagination produces. He'll ask questions like this: "Is the way your imagination worked in this poem different from many of the previous

ones we've seen?" Students used this modeling when they helped a classmate see how, over time, something has been evolving in their work.

The best specific technique I saw for facilitating perceptive class discussion of a draft was to have each person write a response to the poem before talk began. This way each reader was forced to become clear about her own thoughts, before becoming influenced by others. Also, the widest possible discussion could occur, and class "leaders" did not customarily set the discussion off on their own particular tacks.

## Foundation

Jack sets an excellent foundation in his introductory course (which all students must take) and provides a firm sense of direction for that course and for the advanced one. Basic to his approach is Jack's way of encouraging individual responsibility among students. He says outright, the first class, "Don't come to me and ask if your poems are any good. It's not my aim to say." In an interview, he put it this way:

I want to connect art (poetry) to the person. I want for them to find out the value of creative thinking, of compassion, of life with imagination. If they write a wonderful poem, that's great. If they write a weak poem, but have this experience with the process of imagination, that's also great. So, of course I'm happy to see a fine product. Most people mis understand this method, and think I don't care about a high standard of poetry. But the bottom line is that I want any product to be part of this process of valuing the inner self, a place of freedom and spontaneity.

The students' role in this class is not to take on the teacher's poetry writing process but, rather, to begin to discover and develop their own processes. They also help each other see how their imaginations want to work. As the semester progressed, they began to say things to each other like, "this poem shows how well your story-telling style is developing," or "I'm always interested to see what kind of invented form you'll come up with next."

## Key Principles

Jack Ridl has articulated several principles which help promote this active, confident role students take with each other in regard to both content and craft issues. One principle, which was apparent even very early on in the course, is that of constantly offering a choice, showing both sides of an issue, no matter what comes up. It dissolves any attempt by one student to offer "rules" to another (e.g., "you need to revise more, get rid of these cliches, you've got too many general words here"). The aim is not only to force students to think through these issues for themselves, but to give them the absolute ownership every artist needs. Ridl again:

They're the artist, so they have to be free to find their own principles. My job is to fill them in on both sides of the argument as it's discussed in the poetry world today.

A most dramatic example of this concerns the almost universally-advocated rule in poetry circles: "get rid of the clichés." When the "rule" came up in discussion, Jack said that some poets are

masters at turning a cliché on its ear. "What if you exaggerate it?" And he'd make up some examples or throw in a little discussion about a specific poet who liked to do that.

As this is done consistently, with every issue, students see their choices becoming richer and more complex; they are given increasing power. It was interesting to me that through out the course no one ever asked, "but, Jack, which way do you believe is best?" They seemed instinctively to understand that the answer for his writing could not be theirs. They also seemed hungry for this deep and rare entitlement they'd been given: "You are the artist, and an artist, by definition, asserts his own boundaries and territory."

Another of Jack's teaching principles is individual instruction. He helps each student take an active role by focusing clearly on that student's unique way into the imaginative process, so he can coach her/him along in the direction each takes. This is most obvious when he suggests that one of the students read a particular poet, because "she does with narrative something similar to what you're trying." Jack then goes on to explore and explain the connection in some depth, both for the student and for the class. Or, to everyone's amazement, he'll say, "Ah, ha! Here's just the sort of narrative poem I saw you struggling toward months ago. I knew from the way your imagination works that one day you'd write this kind of poem...and look: today you did it!"

Such a remark, on the surface of it, often seems almost clairvoyant, and while Jack Ridl may be an intuitive thinker, he also uses very detailed observation and analysis of what's coming from each student to be able to discern so much. He says this:

I look for several things. One is obsessional subject. Sometimes, for example, a word like "grandfather" only has to come up twice, and I know. That's it. Or other times, it's from what's avoided, or where a writer stumbles in reading a poem. Or maybe tone will tell me.

Another clue he analyzes is language choice and how it shows a person's thought pattern: "for example, Erin is a singular noun person, and Foley thinks with juxtaposition." To make this discernment work, he has to have a deep, subtle grasp of each student. It is an unusual teacher, I find, who can so wisely outline for a student where her imagination tends, needs, and want to go. Partly, Jack can do this well because he's thinking not only of the artistic imagination, but also of the whole person, her history, emotional life, her intellectual, spiritual and human needs. He takes it all together.

Jack never announces or pushes his poetic concerns or values. His total focus is on the student. He is a humanist and extends that to what he feels art is. "The supreme allegiance to art damages people", he says, and continues:

I think that the product (art, poetry, music) must be part of an imaginative process with life. I don't subscribe to this view that art is the highest thing. There is a value to great art, but art has to bring something to somebody's life. For me, there's a danger if you separate the work from the life. My eyebrows go up and down when I hear that old Yeats' quote about perfection of the work or perfection of the life.... Yes, it is a kind of female connectedness, I

value over the "male product in the world" view. I say no to art that destroys, and yes to art that connects. The product has always to be connected to a life-affirming process.

This focus on the product-in-the-process was firmly established by Jack's comments at the first class of the introductory course:

Let's take the pressure off: consider the poems you bring to class as early drafts. There is no censoring allowed. This needs to be a safe place where you can work out what you want to explore. If you bring a poem to every class, do the reading, and respond to others' work, you'll get an "A" grade. So does that make this a blow off course? Writing a poem is about your experience, your way of being alive. So the question is like asking, do you want to blow off your life? If you have to write every day for this course anyway, why not make it meaningful, make it count? You can write to stay in touch with yourself, to explore and discover what you've lost since childhood days of spontaneity. All children are artists. Remember, your aim here is not to produce something that people will like. Your aim is to see what language can bring you, to get your imagination back. You have to find a way so that you'll like the "doing" of this. A poem gives you permission to feel, to imagine, to reflect, to create. In the arts, we can create a moment, instead of always having to explain it.

Then, a little later on in the introductory course, he gives more practical advice about how to keep the imaginative poetry writing process flowing: "If one day you can't write a poem, read someone else's to find a starting place. Or lower your standards. Get rid of the 'watcher at the gate', the one who says 'that's no good, never say it that way', or 'Oh boy, you'll really get in trouble if you say that'. Or wear a hat, write for a child, write about an animal, day dream onto the paper. All art is about perception, and we're all perceiving all the time."

The result of this approach is a poetry writing workshop that looks like the traditional one only on the surface. Students bring in drafts, xerox copies are circulated, the teacher starts the class with announcements and chit chat. The poets each take their turn reading their poem. Then someone else reads it, and discussion begins. Within this general formula, the differences are profound, and involve many of the things process oriented composition teachers generally value: an atmosphere of trust where risky exploration becomes safe, a place where growth and change are valued equally with a high standard product, student centred discussion, an emphasis on discovering each student's strengths, a strong sense of student ownership of the process and project, a place where revision is seen as a continued conversation between the writer's inner sense and the text, and where grading takes second place behind the value and experience of the activity.

## Methodology

Some interesting specifics of Jack's methodology are worth pointing out. As mentioned before, the course grade is based solely on writing practice, reading, and participation. Doing these things consistently earns an "A," and marks work down depending on what's missed. This puts the student in control over grade, and frees the teacher student relationship from this power element. The relation builds solely on friendly coaching and self-initiated learning about poetry, with nothing to get in the way.

While poems discussed in the intro and advanced courses are seen as drafts, there's not as much stress on revision as one might expect in a process model, although students do create a portfolio. Four poems are submitted at the end of the course; it's understood that these are poems one has reworked and come to value. But there is no special requirement to do or show revisions. The reason for this is, again, related to the principle of choice. The means and time for revision are matters that each student must establish for himself. In class discussion, Jack makes clear that, among accomplished poets, there are those who revise through 20-100 drafts, and those who value spontaneity, or who do most of the mulling over in their head before the poem comes down on the page.

This focus on what practicing poets actually do, as opposed to an emphasis on abstract rules, is another refreshing aspect of Jack's courses. To do this well takes a poet-teacher who is well versed both in contemporary poetry and (from interviews or face-to-face contact) with the lives and work habits of poets. Occasionally, Jack will tell homey anecdotes about what a visiting poet did while staying over at the Ridls' home to help make poets seem more humane and ordinary.

By making the poet and the poetry-writing process more immediate and real, Jack can demonstrate how revision is a personal choice. There is no pressure from the class to go and make any poem better. Jack or a student might ask the writer, "are you satisfied with what came from this? Are there areas where you have a concern or question? If you were to do something more with this, what do you think you might try?" Jack does say that, thanks to discussion with Ellen Bryant Voight, who was a part of the advanced course during a two week visit, he has gained more ideas on how to present revision as integral to creative exploration, and not as something tacked on cold, from the outside, at the end. One interesting idea here is to see revision as interacting with the poem, letting the poem talk back to you and give you signals. In this light, he now sees the advanced course as really an intermediate one, so that ideally there should be a third level where students would be more ready for serious revision.

Jack Ridl's courses are in great demand and obviously fill a hunger students have but satisfy infrequently. I suspect it's a hunger to have their inner impulses respected, to find a place within the rational culture of critical thought (which academia is training them in) where imaginative, associational, emotive thinking is valued.

## Critical Remarks

I came away from a wonderful semester's experience with only two critical questions in my mind. One is quite a concrete one about how discussion gets started with each poem. Sometimes the response process was left open ended, with no structure. This often seemed to have certain disadvantages. Sometimes a painful silence ensued (even after the group had become established and comfortable) until someone dared to break the ice and say the first thing. A few "leaders" tended to start and their natural preoccupations became the focus of discussion, closing off other avenues. More serious was the fact that as these ideas became seen as "expert," the quieter students felt less able to bring up their own "modest" views.

I want to emphasize, in bringing this up, that it is much less of a limitation than what usually happens in the traditional poetry workshop, where the teacher signals who the leaders are. Yet, it's worth asking why it occurs. Perhaps academia, and the culture in general, are so imbued with competition and one-upmanship, that it sneaks even into the most egalitarian setting by the silent acquiescence of both the "leaders" and "modest followers." When a structure for response was tried - that is, when students were asked to write their response before discussion and give it to the writer after - this tendency was immediately erased. So, my suggestion might be to stick to a structured method of response for the most part, or at least to point out the "leader/follower" phenomenon.

My second question is larger, and has to do with entitlement for female students. Even in this process method, so student-centred and with such a confirming teacher, three male "leaders" emerged. Their poetry and their ideas about poetry were seen as excellent and serious. There were also at least five very capable female student poets, but none of them took up much verbal space. One of these young women did see herself as seriously considering a poetic career; yet she was quietly careful when letting one of her ideas out in class. Two others sometimes carried on quietly rebellious private conversations in the corner, when "the guys" took over. This didn't alter their entitlement or the group dynamic. Another very imaginative female student put on a sort of gushy, flighty air (one that, to my horror, I had to recognize in myself some years back). Another sophomore (younger than the rest) remained totally silent unless she was addressed with a question; then her response was always stunning in its depth and clarity.

I had to ask myself why this was happening in such an egalitarian process. When I reflected on it out loud to another visiting poet, Mary Stewart Hammond, she said that she'd seen it all over, and it doesn't matter whether the teacher is male or female, or what method the class is conducted in. I've finally concluded tentatively, after discussion with Jack and a few other class members, that it has to do with the way academia still operates in a male culture model, which makes females somewhat unsure of themselves, uncomfortable and less entitled. Males are encouraged to defy, to assert difference and get recognition for it. Females are more comfortable with an inclusive mode, and revert to compliance or submission (or quiet rebellion) when their mode is not in operation.

This cultural training is still powerful enough that no methodology, by itself, is going to effect dramatic change. However, it can help to point out when women students acquiesce into silence and male students take over the discussion. Jack Ridl consciously tries to counteract this tendency in a number of ways. Strong female writers are brought in for the visiting writer series, as he recognizes the hunger women students have for role models. Also, his encouragement of female students is absolutely genuine, serious and thoughtful. But he does recognize that as a male, he is hampered sometimes:

The rub comes in informal contact. The guys can come and "hang out" with me - go for a beer. I'd love my female students to feel free to do that too... but you can see how loaded that is.

I would say that Jack has more understanding of female culture than most men I know, certainly at a level which is rare in academia. Yet, he says that even this appreciation puts him a bind sometimes:

With male students I feel free to assert, and know that they'll disagree, assert back. But with female students, I'm more tentative, because I feel unsure. I try to follow their lead.

In closing our discussion of this subject, he said,

I am sure this process model is a step in the right direction. In the last six years, we've had as many, or more women who've gone on to do MFA's and/or publish as men. They've done very well; I'm confident they've gotten a strong start here.

This poetry writing course and the teacher's approach to it seem to me valuable for both composition and creative writing teachers to reflect on. I learned a lot from Jack's classroom. I'd welcome responses, comments and questions on his teaching and my interpretation of it here.

Carole TenBrink  
Montreal

---

# Poems

## Toeing In

tiptoeing  
tripping  
treading lightly  
through the narrow university walls  
of the men's club  
(where women too  
close the silver-knobbed  
blue-painted doors of academia)  
women with beige-white legs  
well-cut matching flowered suits  
and immaculate impotent hair

doors opening and closing between  
the men and the doctoral boys  
conversing in the halls  
lingering by those doors  
exchanging well-known names and pleasantries  
that really all say clearly  
just who belongs to  
the club

we'll just let you in the  
threshold of the door  
if you're brief  
if you don't disagree with the article  
if you stop relying on that intuition which

paralyses  
the tolerance of  
the men and the PhD boys who  
claim they admire wit and wisdom and intelligence  
as long as it doesn't obstruct  
the men's club  
is hushed docile still  
and stays where it belongs  
not behind any more blue doors for écru legs  
not in the carpeted halls of blustery camaraderie  
not coupled with that intuition and mind and body reading  
but in the

safe  
distant  
faraway place of

part-time  
home-bound  
mother-hooded  
non-academic  
woman  
dabbler

## Twirling

two of my cousins  
 on my mother's side  
 (her brother's daughters)  
 twirled batons  
 for years  
 when they were children  
 entering contests  
 later judging other stick-twirlers  
 I would watch the two of them  
 dressed in little scalloped skirts  
 throwing those silver-tipped batons  
 in the air  
 on a summer afternoon  
 while we sat mesmerized  
 trapped on chairs  
 in the back yard  
 of yet another child-run exhibition  
 even then  
 sitting by the pea vines  
 crawling full of pods  
 out of their dirt box garden space  
 I would wonder  
 at my cousins' skill  
 dexterity  
 nerve before a crowd  
 allegiance to a stick  
 conviction the baton  
 would return  
 the baton spinning  
 round and round their routines  
 always  
 when a baton accidentally dropped  
 a cousin would pick it up  
 as if nothing had happened  
 and continue twirling  
 but I thought I felt  
 their dismay  
 at the way those batons  
 sometimes had a mind  
 of their own  
 despite the many hours  
 of practice  
 I used to laugh inwardly  
 at their dedication  
 to a stick  
 but now  
 I twirl words  
 the same way  
 enter contests

astonished  
 how the words  
 like that baton  
 sometimes have a mind  
 of their own  
 spoiling my routines  
 and me  
 a non-believer once  
 laying down my words  
 at the altar of my own addiction  
 a practice of allegiance  
 no different than the way  
 my cousins daily  
 threw those batons  
 into the air

Renee Norman  
 University of British Columbia

---

# Call for Nominations

The Canadian Association for the Study of Language and Learning (CASLL) is seeking nominations for its Board of Directors. The election of the Board of Directors will take place by mail-in ballot in April.

## What are the terms of office?

Normally, the term of office for a member of the board of directors is three years. At this time, however (as laid out in the constitution), the membership will elect two directors for a one-year term, two directors for a two-year term, and three directors for a three-year term. This is to ensure continuity on the Board of Directors from year to year in the future.

## Who can be a director?

Directors cannot be less than 18 years of age and they must be members in good standing of the association (i.e., they must have paid their 1993-94 membership fee).

## Can I nominate myself?

Yes.

## What should a nomination include?

A nomination should include:

- (1) The name of the nominee.
- (2) An indication that the nominee knows about the nomination and has agreed to let her/his name stand.
- (3) An indication of whether the nomination is for a one, two, or three year term.
- (4) A paragraph no longer than 100 words describing the candidate. This paragraph should be suitable for distribution with the ballot.

Nominations should be submitted by mail, FAX, or E-mail no later than Friday, March 25, 1994 to:

Susan Drain  
Department of English  
Mount Saint Vincent University  
Halifax, NS  
B3M 2J6

E-Mail: [SDRAIN@LINDEN.MSVU.CA](mailto:SDRAIN@LINDEN.MSVU.CA)  
FAX: 1-902-445-3960

---

# Tentative Schedule: *CATTW*

Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing  
Learned Societies Conference 1994  
University of Calgary

## Reflections/Directions in Technical Communication

Friday, June 3, 1994

- 9:00** Opening Remarks and Welcome
- 9:15 - 10:30** Chair Lilita Rodman, University of British Columbia
- Diana Wegner, Douglas College**  
"Advocacy Writing and the Individual: Persona, Modality, and Positionality"
- Graham Smart, Bank of Canada, Ottawa**  
"Knowledge-making in a Central Bank: The interplay Between Representational Models and Written Genres"
- 10:30 - 10:45** Refreshment Break
- 10:45 - 12:00** Chair Michele Valiquette, Simon Fraser University
- Céline Beaudet and Pamela Russell, Université de Sherbrooke**  
"Pour une typologie des résumés fonctionnels: réflexion sur l'acte de classification"  
"Investigating Summary Typology: Criteria for Classification"
- Linda LaDuc, University of Massachusetts**  
"Proposal Writing as Social Action: Taking a Hermeneutic Perspective on the Relationship Between Technical Writing and Leadership Communication"
- 12:00 - 1:15** Lunch
- 1:15 - 2:15** **Carolyn R. Miller, North Carolina State University**  
"The Rhetoric of Accident Analysis: The Use of Emotion in Technical Discourse"
- 2:15 - 2:30** Refreshment Break
- 2:30** *CATTW/ACPRTS* Annual General Meeting
- 5:00 - 7:00** President's Reception (Olympic Oval)
- 7:00** *CATTW/ACPRTS* Dinner

**Tentative Schedule: CA/TW Dinner**

---

Saturday, June 4, 1994

**9:15 - 10:30** Chair Pamela Russell, Université de Sherbrooke

**Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu, Université d'Ottawa**  
"Le poids de trois siècles de normativisme linguistique"

**Jennifer J. Connor, McMaster University**  
"Self-Help Medical Literature in 19th-Century Canada and the Rhetorical Convention of Plain Language"

**10:30 - 10:45** Refreshment Break

**10:45 - 12:00** Chair Anne Parker, University of Manitoba

**Randy Allen Harris, University of Waterloo**  
"Science Writing for Technical Communication Students"

**Ron S. Blicq, RGI International, Winnipeg**  
"Presenting a Technical Writing Course to a Foreign-language Audience"

**12:00 - 1:15** Lunch

**1:15 - 2:15** **John Hagge, Iowa State University**  
"Justifications for Formal Conventions in Science and Technical Writing:  
A Historical Survey of Early Textbooks and of Professional Style Manuals"

**2:15 - 2:30** Refreshment Break

**2:30 - 3:45** Chair Christine Parkin, University of British Columbia

Workshop on Changes in Legal Writing

**Michael P. Jordan, Queen's University**  
"Towards Readable Precise Legal Language: A Scholarly Approach"

**4:00** Mountain Ranch Barbecue

Sunday, June 5, 1994

9:30 - 10:30 Chair Jennifer J. Connor, McMaster University

Panel on Reflections/Directions in Technical Communication in Canada

**Ron S. Blicq, RGI International, Winnipeg;**  
**Jacqueline Bossé-Andrieu, Université d'Ottawa;**  
**Janet Giltrow, Simon Fraser University;**  
**Michael P. Jordan, Queen's University;**  
**Lilita Rodman, University of British Columbia**

10:30 - 10:45 Refreshment Break

10:45 - 12:00 Discussion and Concluding Remarks