

Inkshed

Newsletter of the Canadian Association for the Study of Writing and Reading
Volume 5, number 6. December 1986.

Inkshed

| | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----|
| | Editorial Inkshedding | 1 |
| Anthony Paré | Response to Doug Brent: A Collaboration | 2 |
| Carolyn Pittenger | Acknowledging Acknowledging | 4 |
| Paul Nay-Brock | Another Deep Winterwalk in New Hampshire | 6 |
| | Inkshedders at CCCC, Atlanta | 9 |
| | Conferences | 10 |
| | Table of Contents | 11 |
| Stan Straw and Nan Johnson | Call for Proposals: Inkshed IV | 12 |

Writing is an attempt to exercise the will, to identify the self within the constraints of some discourse community. We are constrained insofar as we must inevitably borrow the traces, codes, and signs which we inherit and which our discourse community imposes. We are free insofar as we do what we can to encounter and learn new codes, to intertwine codes in new ways, and to expand our semiotic potential—with our goal being to effect change and establish our identities within the discourse communities we choose to enter.

James E. Porter, "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community,"
Rhetoric Review 5.1 (Fall 1986): 41.

Inkshed

5.6. December 1986.

Editor

James A. Reither
St. Thomas University

Consulting Editors

Phyllis Artiss
Memorial University

Neil Besner
Mount Royal College

Coralie Bryant
David Livingstone ERC

Richard M. Coe
Simon Fraser University

Susan Drain
Mount St Vincent University

Russell A. Hunt
St. Thomas University

Anthony Paré
McGill University

Judy Segal
University of British Columbia

Inkshed is published six times during the academic year, supported financially by St. Thomas University and the voluntary contributions of subscribers. As far as possible, its subscribers have free access to its pages. The following is a schedule of approximate submissions deadlines and publication dates:

20 January, for 1 February
5 March, for 15 March
20 April, for 1 May

5 September, for 15 September
20 October, for 1 November
5 December, for 15 December

A primary objective of this newsletter is to intensify relationships among research, theory, and practice relating to language, language acquisition, and language use—mainly (but by no means exclusively) at post-secondary levels. Striving to serve both informative and polemical functions, *Inkshed* publishes news, announcements, notices, reports and reviews (of articles, journals, books, textbooks, conferences, workshops); commentaries, discussions of events, issues, problems, and questions of concern to academics in Canada interested in writing and reading theory and practice.

Send inquiries, materials, subscription requests and payments to

James A. Reither
Editor, *Inkshed*
St. Thomas University
Fredericton, NB E3B 5G3

The great art of writing is the art of making people real to themselves with words.
Logan Pearsall Smith, *Afterthoughts*.

Editorial Inkshedding

I guess it's no news that composition studies—which did not exist twenty-five years ago when I started teaching—has become a truly interdisciplinary endeavour. Like everyone else in our field, I read a lot; and I experience almost daily a kind of quiet glee as I discover yet another of those wonderful cross-disciplinary connections that could not have existed for us a couple of decades ago. It's great fun finding relevance in the writings of such people as anthropologists Clifford Geertz (*The Interpretation of Cultures* [Harper, 1973] and *Local Knowledge* [Harper, 1983]) and Stephen A. Tyler (*The Said and the Unsaid* [Academic P, 1978]) or historian of science Thomas Kuhn (*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* [2nd ed., U of Chicago P, 1970]) or philosopher Richard Rorty (*Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* [Princeton U P, 1979]) or sociologist Karin Knorr-Cetina (*The Manufacture of Knowledge* [Pergamon, 1981]). What these people have said about their own fields has helped me understand that writing truly is a profoundly social (as opposed to merely cognitive) activity. And occasionally they have even helped me think about the proper function of *Inkshed* in this community of ours.

Just the other day, for instance, I read another piece by Stephen Tyler, one that clarifies for me the function of *Inkshed* as a newsletter serving those of us interested in writing and reading theory and practice. Tyler's essay, "Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document," is published in a book called *Writing Culture*, ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus (U of California P, 1986). Here (although I'll substitute the word *Inkshed* for Tyler's phrase "post-modern ethnography" and, a bit later, "scholarly" for "ethnographic") is what Tyler said:

Because [*Inkshed*] privileges "discourse" over "text," it foregrounds dialogue as opposed to monologue, and emphasizes the cooperative and collaborative nature of the [scholarly] situation in contrast to the ideology of the transcendent observer.

My idea of *Inkshed* has been, from the first issue (though I didn't have the language back then), that this newsletter ought to be a "parlor" in which people can carry on their conversations about writing and reading theory and practice. It is *not* a journal, privileging text over discourse, monologue over dialogue. It never should be. It's a place where people talk with other people, collaborating with one another in the search for meaning in their fields and their worlds. It's a place for exploration, not domination.

That's why I like an issue of *Inkshed* such as this one is. Here in our parlor people are talking to one another, telling each other about things, exploring issues and ideas with them, jostling each other's conceptualizations, disagreeing, sharing experiences, learning from and with each other, handing out invitations to get together. All of it tough-minded and rigorous, none of it mean-spirited or entrepreneurial.

Anthony Paré, in the piece that leads off this issue, calls his agreements *and* his disagreements with Doug Brent "a collaboration"—and it surely is that. As we read his piece we see Anthony and Doug and you and me all making meaning together—*different* meanings, no doubt, but made-together meanings nevertheless, meanings we could not have come to alone, without one another's probes and provocations. Anthony ends his piece with an implicit invitation, which I would phrase in this way: "Don't be an eavesdropper. Come on in and join us in this conversation. Help us make sense of all this."

I hope you'll accept Anthony's invitation. I hope you'll be generous with us by putting in your oar. Drop us a note. And happy new year, eh?

Jim Reither

Response to Doug Brent: A Collaboration

/// Anthony Paré

I would like to collaborate with Doug Brent (*Inkshed* 5.5; 1-2) by disagreeing with him. Like Doug, I believe that "collaboration does not necessarily require consensus"; in fact, I believe that when consensus is reached, both interest in the matter at hand and collaboration cease. Of course, in order to collaborate, we need at least the appearance of some basic agreements, a few assumptions whose sharedness is not under challenge, and mutual or at least similar goals. However, collaboration thrives not on agreement but on disparity; it is driven by the tensions created when multiple perspectives attempt to move toward a single vision. Since we are both teachers and readers of *Inkshed*, I assume Doug and I are willing to acknowledge sharing some assumptions and similar goals; furthermore, since I do not share his perspective on collaborative writing, we have an ideal situation for collaboration.

My disagreement with Doug begins when he labels his group writing experiences at the Inkshed III working conference "collaborative writing." What he describes is *group composing* or *literal co-authorship*, probably the most difficult (and the rarest) form of collaboration in writing. I believe we need a broader definition of collaborative writing, one which includes, for instance, this response to Doug. Although written by me, this essay was inspired by Doug, commented on by three colleagues, and influenced (directly and indirectly) by the many people who have affected my thinking on this subject. Then, of course, there is Jim Reither who, as editor, collaborates with everyone who writes for *Inkshed*. Finally, the people who read what Doug and I have written are, in a very real sense, collaborators as well.

My disagreement with Doug continues when he refers to collaborative writing as a "teaching technique." Such a definition reduces collaborative writing to a mere pedagogical device, a trick or tool of the classroom. However, the practice of collaboration in writing is supported both by a rich theoretical perspective—a way of thinking about *all* writing as dialogic—and by observation of "real world" writing—the writing done on the job in a wide variety of professions.

The theory supporting collaborative writing is captured briefly and powerfully in the Kenneth Burke parlor conversation allegory which ran on the title page of three consecutive *Inksheds*. It is a profound view, one which, in the extreme, challenges the notion of individual authors and casts each of us in the role of co-author of whatever we write and read. At least, that is my interpretation of—that is to say, my collaboration with—Burke and a number of contributors to volumes 47 and 48 of *College English*, including Bruffee, Cooper, Faigley, Perelman, and Reither.

Admittedly this all sounds a tad mystical and the teacher in us screams for something to do on Monday morning. I think we should be patient and careful. The rush to turn the process theory of writing into pedagogy (and textbooks) resulted in some truly dreadful practices, and incomplete understandings of that theory continue to surface. Many of the techniques or "heuristics" which became popular with this process theory assumed that writing was essentially a cognitive activity, an individualistic and inward process. We all dutifully taught our students invention strategies, brainstorming, discovery techniques. And now there is no shortage of activities which support a view of writing as a social phenomenon and force the students' attentions outward toward the contexts within which writing occurs. But peer-editing, group drafting, multiple authorship, audience analysis, or team research are not, by themselves, collaborative writing any more than brainstorming is *the* writing process. Without a consistent and unified theory of writing as collaboration, these activities are reduced to mere tricks.

Why take a collaborative approach to writing in the classroom if "real world" collaboration

in writing is, as Doug argues, a debatable point? Well, I don't think the point is debatable any longer. Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford found that 87% of the people they surveyed in six different professional associations wrote "as part of a team or group" (*EQ*, Winter 1985, p. 122). Pick up *any* copy of *any* medical journal: while single authorship is extremely rare, articles with six to ten authors are common; the annual report for Hydro-Quebec is written by nine people; ten people wrote the cyclical review document for our department—and the list could go on and on. The point is that collaboration in writing, in all its varied forms, is a "real world" fact of life. Even in academia (the real world?) we recognize the cooperation inherent in discourse. Why else require students to cite their sources?

A final disagreement, and I quote Doug: ". . . it is no simple matter to make a discourse community bloom in the sandy soil of the classroom." Although it may be difficult to introduce students to *our* discourse community, I think it would be a mistake to overlook the many discourse communities *already represented* in our classrooms. This point raises some important questions: How many of our students will (or wish to) join the academic community? How much do we teachers of language know about the discourse in our students' present and future communities? If we force our students to use *our* discourse, to simulate *our* knowledge gathering and sharing activities, then the soil of the classroom will be sandy indeed. If, on the other hand, we engage our students in the discourse and discussions of the communities to which they belong or aspire, we may find the soil considerably richer.

In the midst of the current collaborative frenzy, my colleague Pat Dias has a warning: *we cannot teach collaboration*. Who needs another context-free skill? What we can do is provide students with a variety of opportunities and real reasons to collaborate. We cannot practice collaboration, nor can we assign it, but we can develop assignments which are completed most effectively and pleasantly by collaboration. We can encourage our students to work together and draw their attention to the help they receive and its effect on their work. [See Carolyn Pittenger's report on pp. 4-5 of this issue of *Inkshed*.] We can allow students to experience writing as a social activity.

So, this installment of my collaboration with Doug is over; we may or may not pick it up at some later date. At any rate, we didn't start the conversation, and we certainly won't see it to its conclusion, but—to return to Burke's allegory—we have put in our oar.

♪ ♪ ♪

Years and years and years ago, when I was a boy,
when there were wolves in Wales, and birds
the color of red-flannel petticoats whisked past
the harp-shaped hills, when we sang and wallowed
all night and day in caves that smelt like Sunday
afternoons in damp front farmhouse parlors,
and we chased, with the jawbones of deacons,
the English and the bears, . . .
it snowed and it snowed. But here a small boy says:
"It snowed last year, too. I made a snowman and
my brother knocked it down and I knocked my
brother down and then we had tea."

Dylan Thomas, *A Child's Christmas in Wales*

Acknowledging Acknowledging

Today's English teachers, aware of the important role played by the social context in which their students learn to read and write, are developing pedagogies that allow students to work more productively in group settings. These pedagogies need only a gentle readjustment of standard teaching practices and points of view. In our Effective Written Communication course at McGill, we have been developing practical ways to implement the collaborative theories of James Britton and other writing theorists. Our students work together brainstorming ideas, evaluating plans for each other's papers, nutshelling and teaching their ideas to each other in order to reveal underlying patterns of organization, and responding to each other's rough drafts by using specific group-editing techniques: Peter Elbow's non-critical feedback method, Donald Murray's three-reading strategy, and the Rand Corporation's Delphi technique.

Students sometimes question the ethics behind all this group work. They enjoy collecting responses to their writing, and they enjoy reading other students' work in order to let the writers know their messages are clear; however, they wonder about the honesty of accepting this group assistance. Warned by former teachers about plagiarism, and taught to perceive each writing task as a test of individual abilities, students worry that this group work might be a form of cheating.

One way to solve this problem and to promote full collaboration is to call upon an idea which is in no way new, namely the idea of the acknowledgement page. In my EWC class, I ask students to submit, along with their completed assignments, a page that names the people who contributed to the paper and thanks them for the roles they played. Often, there are many people to include: the instructor who, during a writing conference, suggested ways to narrow the topic; a fellow student who patiently read the almost indecipherable rough draft, pointing out where she needed more information and where she needed less; a roommate who proofread the final draft for mechanical errors; a Writing Center tutor who guided the student to choose appropriate time-management strategies and to understand her reader's needs; and, sometimes, a parent who typed the paper. Further, there may be people the writer interviewed to get the data for the paper, people who just listened patiently as she voiced her opinions on the topic, people who gave emotional support when the writer got discouraged, as well as people who developed her thinking by what they said in class discussions or what they wrote in the books and periodicals she read.

Universities have traditionally stressed the importance of students building their knowledge on the sound theory and research of other scholars by reading their work and acknowledging that reading through quotations, references, footnotes, and bibliographies. At the same time universities have told students that they value creativity and unique contributions to knowledge. These two goals are, of course, not contradistinguishing; however, students often view them so. They see an idea as belonging either to them or to someone else. However, the goal of accurate scholarly writers is not merely to footnote some ideas and claim the rest as their own; rather, their aim is to let the reader of the paper know which ideas belong to a specific source, which ones are generally held by a number of sources, which ones are the authors' own assumptions or inferences they are drawing from the work of others, and which ones are their own genuinely unique and original contributions.

Students will gradually learn this complex and delicate lesson not by concentrating on accurate footnote and bibliography formats, but by doing a lot of writing, submitting that writing to the scrutiny of their readers, rewriting, and finally making sincere efforts to credit *all* their sources. As they work through these various stages of developing their papers,

EWC students are asked by their instructors to keep process logs of their work. In this way, every student keeps track of the group contributions made to their work at various stages and of their own insights as they occur. When the time comes to write their acknowledgement pages, the students have merely to review their logs for the pertinent facts.

The log and the acknowledgement page work together to make the students aware of all the strategies they use, all the sources they draw upon in writing their papers, and of the ways writing grows in collaborative settings. For example, a student may begin by collecting several written responses to one of her drafts. After discussing the comments with the students who wrote them, she compares the responses and then, in her log, she writes a response to these responses. She explains why she finds some suggestions valid and why she rejects others. Finally she formulates a revision plan and proceeds to make only those changes that *she* feels must be made.

This negotiation of meaning between readers and writers reflects the way professional writers often work. Moreover, it encourages students to be honest, to take full responsibility for their work, and—with the encouragement of their readers—to take those risks which allow them to stretch and grow as writers. Being required to submit logs and acknowledgement pages also directs the students' attention to the importance of group work. Sometimes students go so far as to ask their group recorder for a photocopy of her notes so each member of the group can see which ideas were her own and which must be acknowledged as others'. Working through this process convinces even the most wary students that the group is supposed to assist them, sometimes by giving them ideas they later develop, sometimes by showing them which ideas are not working, and sometimes merely by letting them know which ideas are valued so that they develop the confidence they need to present those ideas. In this way, collaboration lets students become genuine, confident members of the university 'community of scholars.'

Note: Thanks to Anthony Paré for telling me this idea was worth writing up and for nagging me until I did write it up. Thanks to Patricia Dias for the snappy title. Thanks to Jane Brown, our own *arbiter elegantiae*, for checking the finished draft. Thanks to all my students for showing me how useful the acknowledgement technique really is.

Carolyn Pittenger
McGill University

♪ ♪ ♪

'There are always Uncles at Christmas.
The same Uncles. And on Christmas mornings,
with dog-disturbing whistle and sugar fags,
I would scour the swatched town for the news of
the little world, and find always a dead bird
by the white Post Office or by the deserted swings;
perhaps a robin, all but one of his fires out.
Men and women wading or scooping back from chapel,
with taproom noses and wind-bussed cheeks,
all albinos, huddled their stiff black jarring
feathers against the irreligious snow.'

Dylan Thomas, *A Child's Christmas in Wales*

Another Deep Winterwalk in New Hampshire

- I Dressing
for New Hampshire winterwalking
is my new found survival art
roll neck jumper
over skivvy
under cardigan
cabled by boa constrictor scarf
buttressed by lumberjacket
thumpingly thick gloves
clumping snowboots
two pairs of socks
leaving thighs to the shins
merely denimly jeaned protected
from the hoarcold
as I leave the warm airlock
- II Through old thick snow
my boots crump lushly
across lately melted refrozen snow
my boots skid crazedly
down the sharp slope of the pool
my boots knuckle over
tumbling me headlong.
I laugh
lest
experienced onlookers might detect
my burning blue blush
of greenhide embarrassment
- III Up and down the pool
I plough
my forty laps of daily grind
it keeps me sane
locking me into
the discipline of physical repetition.
Out now
and under the shower
I check the mirror
hoping
that yesterday's bulges
will be
willed watered and wasted away
today

Inkshrd 5.6: 7

- IV The ritual of re-dressing completed
 up the slope I go
 smashingly sinking
 into feet deep newdropped snow
 like freshly setting pavlova.
 The steelblued subarctic sun
 wimps towards the horizon
 as back up the milelong road
 I sludgily trudge.
- V Shoals of snow
 and greybleak stripped trees
 are merely black and white background
 for these New England houses
 which
 prettily
 quaintly
 sturdily
 proclaim their
 reds, greens, blacks and golds
 of weatherboard cladding
 window slatted shutters
 Cape Cod rooves and
 radiate a
 snuggily comfortableness
- VI I hug to myself
 my private fantasy
 of only 100 days to go
 Is it only 33 since
 we were ripped asunder at LA?
 Christ
 You mean I've got to do this
 three times as much over again?
- VII Battering facefreezing wind
 at minus 30 degrees
 how can there be droughts
 at plus 40 degrees
 where my world and love are
 and I belong?
- VIII Stay on the proper side of the road
 Pal
 And don't fall
 or you'll never see them again
 Is anything worth this?

- IX Only one block to go now
 past the cemetery
 stark greygranited blocks
 delicately manicured
 ridicule
 those moss clagged broken stones
 of Norfolk graveyards
 or monoliths vaults and rutted cesspits
 of Paris mausoleums
- while
 silhouetted against
 flamegoldribbed brilliance
 of a kaleidoscopic Dover sky
 this cemetery symbolises
 a future I fear.
- X Back now at the house
 I knock at the door
 of this centrally heated spaceshuttle
 protecting yet hurling me
 towards and from
 an eternity
 I re-cling to the rituals
 of down-dressing and coffee
 a few words to the dog and cat
 then back to the typewriter
 which mercifully
 consumes feelinglessly
 my passionless hands and mind
- XI In this way then
 I've slowly killed another day
 of sterile fruitfulness
 It's on again tomorrow
 but by then
 there'll only be 99 days
 to go.

Paul Nay-Brock

Paul Nay-Brock teaches at the University of New England, Armidale, N.S.W., Australia. He lived and wrote for five months last winter in Dover, New Hampshire, separated from his wife and family, but getting acquainted with a passel of Inkshedders—most of whom will understand what he experienced and be grateful that he allowed us to walk with him.

Inkshedders at CCCC, Atlanta (19-21 March 1987)

Rick Coe (Simon Fraser University), Karen Burke LeFevre (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute), and Jim Reither (St. Thomas University) will be conducting a full-day CCCC pre-convention workshop on "Teaching Writing as a Social Process." The workshop is set for 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Wednesday, 18 March.

Linda Shohet, editor of the *Literacy Across the Curriculum* bulletin at Dawson College (\$6.00 per year; 350 Selby Street, Room 3255, Montreal, PQ H3Z 1W7), will be a member of a panel addressing the topic of "Redefining Writing Across the Curriculum." Her talk is entitled "Literacy Across the Curriculum: Awakening an Entire Community"; the session is scheduled for Thursday, 19 March, 12:30-1:45 p.m.

The Canadian Caucus SIG session is scheduled for Thursday, 19 March, 5:30-6:30 p.m.

Jim Reither (St. Thomas University) will speak on the question, "What Do We Mean by 'Collaborative Writing' (and What Difference Might It Make)?" This panel session, on Friday, 20 March, 3:30-4:45 p.m., will address "Issues in Collaborative Theories of Writing."

Please, if you are presenting at the Atlanta CCCC—or even if you're just planning to attend—drop me a line with the details, so we can tell people.

Again, this request: The room rate for the CCCC convention hotel (the Westin Peachtree Plaza) is U.S. \$70.00 for a single. If you happen to know Atlanta well enough to suggest an alternative and less costly hotel, reasonably close to the Westin, please let me know so I can publish a note about that, too.

♪ ♪ ♪

Always on Christmas night there was music.
An uncle played the fiddle, a cousin sang
"Cherry Ripe," and another uncle sang "Drake's Drum."
It was very warm in the little house.
Auntie Hannah, who had got onto the parsnip
wine, sang a song about Bleeding Hearts and Death,
and then another in which she said her heart
was like a Bird's Nest; and then everybody
laughed again; and then I went to bed.

Dylan Thomas, *A Child's Christmas in Wales*

Conferences

Cariboo College Computer Conference '87

Cariboo College, Kamloops, BC, 13-14 February 1987

The theme of this conference will be "Changing the Ways We Communicate: Implications for the Learning Process."

The speakers' list includes **Helen Schwartz** (Oakland University, Rochester, MI); **Larry Friedlander** (Stanford University); **Betty Collis** (University of Victoria); **Patti Brown** (University of Alberta); and **Robert Arn** and **William Idsardi** (co-authors, *English 1*). The conference will feature "an effective combination of stimulating lectures, hands-on workshops [with a variety of computers], and equipment/software displays" and "representatives from three major computer companies."

Write:

David Ranson
Communication Arts Department
Cariboo College
P.O. Box 3010
Kamloops, BC V2C 5N3

Young Rhetoricians' Conference

San Jose State University, San Jose, CA, 18-20 June 1987

This conference will feature **Edward P. J. Corbett** (Ohio State University) chairing a panel made up of **Andrea Lunsford** (Ohio State University), **Robert Connors** (University of New Hampshire), and **Lisa Ede** (Oregon State University); **Joseph Williams** (University of Chicago); **Gabriele Rico** (San Jose State); **Susan Miller** (University of Utah); and **Hans Guth** (San Jose State). The conference organizers are promising that "teachers and scholars committed to the upgrading of composition as an academic subject will gather for lively presentations on the state of the art, spirited discussions, and festive evening events." Great location between San Francisco and the Monterey Peninsula. Inexpensive accommodations. The amount of the registration fee was kept secret in the announcement I received. So,

Write:

Hans P. Guth, Program Chair
Young Rhetoricians' Conference
Department of English
San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95129-0090 U.S.A.

Table of Contents

Lester Faigley, Roger D. Cherry, David A. Jolliffe, and Anna M. Skinner. *Assessing Writers' Knowledge and Processes of Composing*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1985. xvi; 272.

Preface to the Series. Preface. Introduction. **PART I: RESEARCH ON WRITERS' KNOWLEDGE AND PROCESSES OF COMPOSING.** Chapter 1. **Theories of Composing:** Three Generations of Research on Composing; Current Theoretical Positions on Composing; Composing Theories and Composing Research. Chapter 2. **Research on Planning:** The Timing of Planning; The Nature of Planning; Employing Planning Strategies; Instruction in Planning; Implications for Assessment. Chapter 3. **Research on Producing Text:** Psycholinguistic Research on Discourse Production; Oral Versus Written Discourse Production; Instruction in Producing Texts; Implications for Assessment. Chapter 4. **Research on Revision:** Systems for Classifying Revisions; Studies of Writers Revising; Instruction in Revision; Implications for Assessment. Chapter 5. **Research on Writers' Knowledge:** Language Systems and Discourse; Written Texts; Functions of Writing; The Writer-Reader Relationship; Subjects for Writing; Implications for Assessment. Chapter 6. **Methodologies for Assessing Knowledge and Processes of Composing:** The Classroom as Discourse Community; Methods; Implications for Assessment. **PART II: ASSESSING CHANGES IN WRITERS' KNOWLEDGE.** Chapter 7. **The Development of Performative Assessment:** The Need for Descriptive Writing Assessment; Aims of Performative Assessment; Issues of Reliability and Validity; Steps in Developing Performative Assessment Instruments. Chapter 8. **The Performative Assessment Instruments:** Classification; Writing an Inductive Argument; Writing a Deductive Argument; Constructing a Hypothesis; Addressing a Specific Audience. Chapter 9. **Using Performative Assessment for Teaching and Evaluating Writing:** Uses in Assessment; Uses in Teaching Writing; The Potential for Performative Assessment. **PART III: ASSESSING CHANGES IN PROCESSES OF COMPOSING.** Chapter 10. **Can Composing Processes Be Measured?:** The Development of Composing Processes; Approaches to Metacognitive Assessment; The Process Instruments. Chapter 11. **How the Process Instruments Show Changes in Students' Composing Strategies:** Two Approaches: A Close-Reading Approach; A Continuum Approach. Chapter 12. **Using the Process Instruments for Teaching and Evaluating Writing:** Uses in Assessment; Uses in Teaching Writing. **PART IV: NEW DIRECTIONS FOR WRITING ASSESSMENT.** Chapter 13. **The Need for a Theory of Writing Assessment:** Elements of a Theory of Writing Assessment; Implementing Writing Assessment. **APPENDICES:** A Descriptive Statistics for Performative Assessment Instruments; Sample Introduction Essays; Sample Audience Essays; The Process Checklist. Process Logs and Rating Commentary; Self-Evaluation Questionnaires; Sample Interviews. **References. Author Index. Subject Index.**

A Call for Proposals
Models of Instruction in the Teaching of English
(The Fourth Inkshed Working Conference)

Winnipeg, Manitoba
Sunday, 10 May - Tuesday, 12 May 1987
Program Chairs: Stan Straw, Nan Johnson

Deadline for Proposals: January 12, 1987

Conference Purposes:

- To consider the various theoretical arguments supporting direct or indirect instruction in the teaching of reading and writing;
- To explore pedagogical practices in each mode (direct and indirect);
- To evaluate research which validates the claims of one mode or the other;
- To discuss possible syntheses between the two approaches.

A deliberate effort will be made to structure a professional dialogue involving as wide a cross-section of English language teachers as possible.

Methods: We encourage a wide range of activities which will stimulate group discussion and shared professional learning. The seven to eight sessions will be made up of a variety of types of presentations: papers (30 minutes), workshops (30 minutes to one hour), panel discussions (one hour), and informal reports on work in progress (20 minutes). Proposers should feel free to suggest a contribution of these types or to suggest another type of presentation that could facilitate group exploration of the topic. (If you are proposing a panel discussion, please provide the names of all the participants and contact them about their willingness to participate.)

Proposals: Proposals should include name(s), address(es), phone number(s), title of proposed session, brief 200-word description or abstract (or description of the content for the session), brief description of the methods to be employed in facilitating group interaction, and a statement of the purposes of the session. The call for proposals is directed to all professionals in all areas of English education and English studies at all levels of instruction, pre-school to post-secondary. We hope to create the broadest-based discussion possible among educators in English studies and language arts.

Send your proposal to:

Nan Johnson
Department of English
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC Canada
V6T 1W5