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Some of you are familiar with the work Linda Lee and I have been doing this past year on assessment in language arts. With a team of ten teachers, we designed and conducted an oral assessment as part of an evaluation of the implementation of the current language arts curriculum in the Winnipeg School Division. We randomly tested roughly 40% of the grade eight students (in 20 schools), analyzed results and presented findings to the division. Teachers and administrators encouraged us to write about how we designed the instrument and conducted the assessment as well as about its results and effects on classroom practice.

When we began writing, we were working in the same school division, with offices some miles apart. Initially we wrote the two halves of the paper—process and analysis—separately, meeting to talk and rewrite. Then Linda left the division to work with her husband in a company specializing in educational evaluation. We met in her back yard once, then in her office in front of the computer. By this time we were working so well I quite forgot we were two people; working together took on the character of an internal dialogue. I was hardly aware of her as a separate person until we wrapped up, made plans, parted.

Before the paper had reached its final draft, I moved to the NWT and we began a third stage in our long-distance collaboration. The urgency to get this thing off to a journal before it became old stuff necessitated the use of electronic mail, a first for me. At this point, working essentially through EM is not the problem it might have been earlier, before we had built the necessary shared meanings (Linda refers to) on a "sea of talk" and common research experience. Such distance must strain collaboration when it concerns more than final editing—though perhaps this is a matter of becoming accustomed to the difficulties imposed by distance. (It is painfully clear to me right now how a move across the country interrupts any productive activity.)

One other thought: I am struck by the importance of a fairly cohesive community available to us through CCTE and Inkshed to support projects in language arts education so that in our case the collaboration has extended much beyond the two of us. Patrick Dias provided the model we adapted for use in the assessment, the teachers on the assessment team helped to design the instrument and the process, an audience at CCTE in Halifax gave encouragement and asked useful questions (as well as for a copy of the early draft) and shortly we'll send the paper off to Patrick Dias for a response, coming full circle. In fact, the process of collaborative writing is not unlike the image of small and large circles in our version of Dias' collaborative model, an experience of it which may be somewhat unique to our professional (and Canadian?) context. I could be wrong about its uniqueness, but I am grateful that such a context exists.

Collaborative writing seems to me to be a powerful instrument for building deeper relationships, both personal and professional (and as such has, as some of you have
suggested, powerful potential for classroom pedagogy). Our experience suggests that at the very least multi-collaborative writing is sustenance-giving in a difficult profession.

C.B.
Department of Education
Fort Smith

This morning, the first thing that strikes me about writing collaboratively is that you are forced to sit down and put your fingers to the keyboard...

The process which we went through really contains different ways of writing collaboratively. Part of the process is clearly the discussion before and during writing. ("What are you trying to say here? "What do we want to say here?") We have written separately and edited each other's writing. We have sat in front of a computer screen and written together. The writing "together" in itself takes on different forms. Sometimes one of us would dictate, sometimes we would work out a sentence or a paragraph together, sometimes we would just stare blankly at the screen (or at each other).

There are difficulties with the process, particularly in trying to mesh the styles of people writing from two (somewhat) different professional backgrounds. This was more problematic for me, I think, as I was trying to move out of my regular "research" voice into something more like ?? (Soo, I still don't know what I was doing!) Although it is easier to write the separate pieces, it is more difficult to fit them together; at least in staring at the screen together some combined style does emerge.

The advantages outweigh the difficulties in a number of ways. Our different backgrounds and expertise will give the finished product more breadth. Of course we know the benefits of peer editing!

I think there are certain conditions, however, which may have to exist if two (or more) people are going to write collaboratively. Working together through other activities (planning and administering the review, for example) helped us to understand each other's ways of doing (and saying) things. We knew each other before we started writing the article. We had also written together before—although more in the "writing separate pieces and editing" mode.

Obviously you must be prepared to share the credit (or the rejection) with another person which is not easy for some people to do. The fact that we are used to taking suggestions (criticisms) from other also helps. We also agreed upon who was going to do what throughout the process (one would try to find readers, the other took charge of making
It seems to me as I reflect on this, I have had the easy bits! Now I shall fax this across the country to contribute to something different in the way of collaborative writing. Maybe another advantage of the process is that it helps you keep in touch with colleagues.

L.L.

Winnipeg

COLLABORATIVE WRITING: A FEMINIST APPROACH

Ten years ago, I would have said, with Jamie MacKinnon (Inkshed, 1989), that "writing alone" had been one of the great pleasures of my life, "the glorious exception" to the "socially bound" life of the school, where "Individual differences were not generally nourished, but rather starved through the various forms of peer pressure, institutional power, and societal expectations." Now, however, I find myself convinced that the only way to preserve individuality is to work collectively, and that the way in which I have most successfully dealt with all those external pressures in my adult life has been through concerted acts of collaborative writing.

I have to admit that I stumbled upon this knowledge, rather than thinking it out and acting upon it. I could certainly never have begun writing collaboratively without a long period of adjustment to collaborative activity. One of the first steps was leaving a very isolating and marginal university teaching position and taking a job in the newly created Quebec Cegep system where I felt much more engaged with the life of the institution. Because it was the early seventies, we had a very consciously democratic model, and I felt very comfortable working within it. Later, as the English Department took form and became less a malleable and organic group to work with, I shifted some of my attention to Women's Studies which, for both ideological and practical reasons, continued to operate as a collective. I participated in interdisciplinary team-taught courses, in evolving policies for dealing with women's safety from assault and harassment, in preparing and hosting International Women's Day celebrations.

There was a lot of writing involved in all of this work, in both of these Departments: drafting and revising policies, preparing college briefs, and so on, but what we tended to do was talk over the principles, look around the room for "the best writer" (the willing dog with a way with words), persuade that person to "write it up," and then critique that product as a group. I call this collaborative action, not collaborative writing.
But when the issue of women students' marginalization in many of their classes came very forcibly to our attention, three of us began a very different kind of process, devising and refining a feminist pedagogy for post-secondary teachers. I found the initial brainstorming with my two colleagues extremely difficult: I was trained in literature, and they were trained in sociology and physics: we thought differently, worked differently, and spoke a different language. These differences had seemed rich and interesting in all our former contexts, but we had always been able to keep our own orientations distinct, linking them together like box-cars on a train going somewhere, but never unpacking and opening them up to devise an entirely new vehicle for learning. When we first began writing things down for a research grant proposal, we had a perfectly dreadful time: we could agree with nothing in each other's texts, and we were chillingly polite about our disagreements.

Fortunately, we were convinced enough of the value of what we were doing to continue our dialogue, and I think this shared conviction is a *sine qua non* of any collaborative enterprise. What happened then, over time, were two further developments, without which our collaboration could not have continued. First of all, the more we talked, the more we developed a common discourse. This was a deeply unconscious process, because all we were aware of was that we disagreed, but the discussion finally gave us enough common knowledge and vocabulary to begin to actually appreciate something important about each other's writing. And that appreciation was the second development in our collaborative process: we began to see that we each had a kind of expertise, over and above our discipline training and much more related to personality and interest, that made us "the best writer" for a particular part of the proposal. The entire concept of "best writer" had shifted and deepened, and writing had become profoundly connected with both person and shared communities. We were then each able to relinquish control over sections of the proposal that we felt the other two could better finalize, and, conversely, we felt validated and empowered to take control of our own. The result was an amazing web of ideas which we wrote and rewrote with each other's help, and, in the end, we not only got our first funding from the government, but the proposal was judged to be the best produced that year in Quebec.

As I read this over now it all seems so obvious and trite that I can hardly believe that it came upon us so slowly and as such a thunderous discovery. But it did. It did because we had all been trained to write and think alone, to guard our own interests and territory as individuals trained in battling "peer pressure, institutional power and societal pressures," and to compete, in fact, at being experts, rather than to pool expertise. It was hard to develop a trust deep enough to risk sharing not only our moments of confusion and ignorance, but our wildly vacillating moods about our writing, which swung from quite vainglorious heights to the depths of self-criticism. And I am absolutely convinced that individually we would never have received research funding, and would not therefore have been able to begin to uncover some of the important territory for individual female learners that we are now developing together.
Though one of us has had to withdraw from the research, two of us are still working together, and our collaborative writing is now like a symphony in five movements. We study texts or data; we write and talk about our writing; we map out the territory we have created together; we each write a piece of the whole we now envision; and we then take turns marrying the pieces together. Writing collaboratively helps us learn individually, forces us to teach each other, and makes it imperative that we write from the knowledge and convictions we have developed together: the writing may not have the distinctive stylistic eccentricities which the work of a single author might have, but it has a kind of power which only shared and communally shaped subjectivities provide.

And I have become an addict. All my most engaging activities of the last ten years have arisen out of collaboration with other women, and our success has always depended in some measure on truly collaboratively written materials. I have even had the courage to join a bilingual research team: we have not yet refined our collaborative method, but we are beginning to develop a rhythm of reading in our own language, talking in French, and composing our texts simultaneously in the two languages. The process is exceedingly slow, but fascinating.

Clearly, despite a natural inclination for working with others, my own background contained such social and educational reinforcement for competitive individualism that I had to work very hard to allow myself to write collaboratively. Our research shows this up as well: as feminists, we are convinced of the importance of devising strategies for connected knowing, learning and writing, but we have found these processes extremely problematic for both students and teachers at the post-secondary level. A second point to be made is that collaboration asks so much of individuals that without a real sense of the urgency and personal importance of the task, collaborative units can break down, be taken over by the most assertive or task-directed individuals, or be abandoned entirely. People can have very bad experiences, and stop there.

My research colleagues and I consider collaboration a feminist undertaking, but we recognize that the process can be used by anyone who shares a belief in collective action and in the social and communal aspects of knowing and learning. It continues to interest us that the largest group with whom feminists share these convictions are teachers of writing, and this is a liaison which we would like to explore further. For the present, however, we are still responding to our original sense of urgency to get other teaching areas, where women feel marginalized and inferior, to consider the possibilities of a more collaborative, democratic and process-oriented mode.

Vanier College
Montréal
### HOW WE COLLABORATE  / /  CHRIS BULLOCK, MARIAN KOWLER, KAY STEWART

**Reader #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Reader #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no, OK</td>
<td>yes, focus on what is most obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the way we did this before</td>
<td>sounds like a good idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, since we’re not going to use that vocabulary why reinforce it?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like &quot;spiritual meaning&quot;</td>
<td>omit spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the stone angel also becomes a symbol of Hagar herself:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her hardness, her blindness, her approaching death, and also</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her search for spiritual meaning. SALVATION? FORGIVENESS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say something about why rhythm is important to consider in analyzing texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure, then, gives shape to the work as a whole.</td>
<td>a bit gruesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But what is shaped? Just as bodies are “fleshed out” with muscle, skin, organs, fingernails, each serving a different function but all integrated with the skeletal framework, so we can think of texts as “fleshed out” through different methods of development. I KNOW, I KNOW—I’LL DROP OR CHANGE THIS ANALOGY WHEN I CAN THINK OF SOMETHING BETTER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLABORATIVE TEXTBOOK WRITING  / /  MARIAN KOWLER

Sometimes Kay and Chris and I are asked, "Which one of you wrote this part of the book?" or "How do you decide who will do what?" We’ve never been able to answer either question very satisfactorily. We begin by dividing up the work according to our individual strengths and interests, but we end by doing whatever is necessary to meet a deadline. Although we can usually remember who wrote the first draft, by the time something has gone through several revisions, to which we have all contributed, it’s no longer clear just whose words and whose ideas have ended up on the page.
For instance, I might write the first draft of a particular chapter. When I’ve finished, I pass it on to Chris and Kay for comments and I read the sections they have been working on. Their work on other parts of the text changes my ideas about the part I’m working on, as do their comments. So I go back to work on my section and they work on theirs and the whole process goes through another cycle. At this stage, the advantage of never feeling alone is balanced by the disadvantage of never feeling finished.

While working together slows us down, it also speeds us up because none of us wants to disappoint the others by not keeping an agreed deadline. Working together also makes it easier to try out new ideas or an approach that could work if more than one person thought about it. Thus we’ve developed the habit of interrupting the progress of a manuscript with specific pleas for assistance: “I know this isn’t working,” one of us will say, “but I can’t think of anything better. PLEASE HELP!”

And the best thing about collaborative writing is that we can help each other because we are working on the same project and wrestling with our common problems.

English Department
Grant MacEwan Community College

COLLABORATIVE WRITING: PERSPECTIVES BY INCONGRUITY
[excerpt from a presentation at CCCC, Chicago, March 1990]

ANDREA LUNSFORD, LISA EDE, AND JAN SWEARINGEN

L: When I arrived in Columbus last November to work, we joked that we’d be the first people in North America to have a draft of their 4Cs talk. And we did come up with a draft—one that we wrote together sitting in front of the computer (a first for us). Our goal at that time was to prepare a straightforward report of the long research project on collaborative writing that we had recently completed.

A: The problem with this straightforward goal, however, is that over the years our understanding of collaborative writing has altered so dramatically that the form of the traditional research report no longer “fits” our understanding. Singular Texts/Plural Authors has over 100 pages of appendices based on part of our research. But the information they present is part of what we want to say about collaborative writing.

L: We have other concerns as well. Our research has encouraged us to challenge the conventional construct of the “author” and the related privileging of public over personal or
private discourse. We want to enact this challenge today—yet we can hardly stand up here and chat as if we were in one of our kitchens, chopping vegetables and talking not just about what to have for dinner (important as that subject is to us and to all good rhetoricians) but about how to resolve a difficult theoretical or stylistic problem. We’re quite aware that a scripted, rehearsed dialogue is no less constrained and artificial than a traditional academic paper. And though we hope that our dialogue will help break down barriers between us and you, our audience, we can’t be sure that will happen. A colleague who read an early draft of our talk commented that he felt excluded, silenced by our dialogue. And yet we have decided to take the risk of giving a non-traditional presentation, one which challenges several of the conventions of public academic discourse and highlights the way in which our work on collaborative writing is grounded in our own experience as friends and coauthors. Our personal experiences, as well as the work of a number of feminist scholars, have encouraged us to view our collaboration as at least in part subversive, as a form of resistance. Working together has allowed us to weave a fabric that connects, rather than separates, our academic and private lives, our inner realities as well as the public faces we prepare to meet the faces that we meet. And our goal has been political in another sense as well, for we are attempting to make collaborative research and scholarship acceptable—in the academy in general but in the humanities in particular.

A: When we began our study of collaboration, we assumed we could simply oppose collaborative writing to the established writing of solitary authorship. Were we wrong? Of course. For we quickly (well, semi-quickly) realized the ways in which that assumption had been constructed for us by our society’s tendency to think in terms of binary opposites, of contrast, of either/or. As a result, our method—in our research, our writing, and our presentation today—attempts to resist this tendency toward opposites and oppositions. Thus the shape of our argument resembles much more a series of spiral loops than a systematic movement from A to B leading inexorably to C. These changes reflect our growing realization that as researchers—as Burke says—“What we want is not terms that avoid ambiguity, but terms that clearly reveal the strategic spots at which the ambiguities necessarily arise.”

J: The question of solitary authorship and the question of opposing views, agonistic discourse, are related questions although they don’t initially seem to be so. The solitary authorship model is the model of truth sprung like Athena, ex nihilo, from Zeus’ brow, the isolate genius, without contexts and sources, outside the stream of ongoing dialogues. It would seem that this prophet crying out in the wilderness mode is quite different from engaged debate or opposing one view with another. And yet the strong propositions marching through most monolithic prose are part of our agonistic legacy because they posit a view that is, explicitly or implicitly, against other views. You are right to describe your discourse as resisting this tendency and as moving not so much forthrightly forward as in a series of spiral loops, recircling, coming back to, to look again and incorporate and mingle different understandings.

* * *
A: Discussions of authorship, of course, led us immediately to much contemporary criticism reassessing the concepts of subject, author, and text.

J: The epistemologies of self, voice, and text that you have spent so much time studying do indeed run throughout the "transfer of Neutral information from . . . sender to receiver" model held by the professional writers you interviewed. It's almost as if the worst versions of monologic, agonistic, and single-author models have been incorporated into the models given students in "writing" classes; even without pedagogies, a high premium is placed on that final individual, the individuation of a student's unique text.

* * *

A: Our desire to highlight the plurality of voices that animate any piece of discourse led us to develop in our book what we call intertexts, excerpts from quite a variety of sources that precede each chapter. We tried to arrange these intertexts so that they both "talked" with each other and predicted or highlighted issues raised in the chapter. The first intertext, for instance, is a moving statement from the preface of Women's Ways of Knowing about the authors' collaboration. But the second intertext, from a brief news story in my local newspaper, describes how "A Kinsey Institute sex survey that could [have helped] . . . researchers understand how AIDS spreads was delayed for almost a decade because two of its authors fought over whose name should appear first on the title page."

L: We hope that the intertexts do call attention to the many different voices which animate not just our text but any text. Though the intertexts highlight this multivocality, these shifts and multiple voices occur throughout the text, not just at those moments where we explicitly quote from others or highlight excerpts in the intertexts.

J: The distinction between drawing on sources and calling attention to the many voices which animate your text is illuminating for it describes how makers draw on some extratextual or prior ideas, works, sources, but also incorporate many voices from within themselves: personal and academic, anecdotal and researcherly, expressive and reportorial, not to mention the many styles that can be mingled.

A: We're sliding toward a reference to Bahktin here, of course, talking about the way, as Bahktin says in The Dialogic Imagination, that the relationship of the author to the language in which he or she writes

L: " . . . is not static—is always found in a state of movement and oscillation that is more or less alive . . . the author exaggerates, now strongly, now weakly, one or another aspect of the 'common language,' sometimes abruptly exposing its inadequacy to its object and sometimes, on the contrary, becoming one with it, maintaining an almost imperceptible
distance, sometimes even directly forcing it to reverberate with his own 'truth,' which occurs when the author completely merges his own voice with the common view.” (302)

A: Bahktin is concerned with language in the novel, but his analysis of heteroglossia and dialogism in that genre is particularly evocative to us and many others in composition studies. We occupy a moment in history, one in which The Dialogic Imagination has particularly strong resonance (is it any accident that it has gained such popularity precisely now?), a moment that, we could argue, is itself particularly dialogic, rather than monologic, one that is thus particularly open to collaborative writing. It remains for those of us in composition studies to take this lesson to heart, to begin to act as though collaboration were the norm, as if the dialogic nature of language were not just a concept but a practice we enact. Doing so would mean, for one thing, looking at any piece of language, including our own, to identify what Bahktin calls “the speech of another” which exists "in concealed" (Dialogic Imag., 303)—or at least unmarked—form in the text.

L: Indeed, such speech, such voices, do exist in the text of this dialogue as well as in the text of our book. We could point, for instance, to the voice of Eliot’s Prufrock that speaks through allusion in this text—Prufrock’s "face to meet the faces that we meet”—a voice we were hardly aware of as we "wrote" this dialogue but that we later questioned. Why Eliot and not Virginia Woolf or Marianne Moore? We all know the answer. Because our educational training and background allowed certain voices to speak while suppressing others. And our text, unexamined for its heteroglossic features, silently continues such suppression.

A: Or we could point to the place, early in this presentation, in which we questioned the tradition of cross-currents sessions, questioned the foregrounding of oppression and contrast. Did you hear in this passage the voice, the language, of debate, of confrontation, and yes, of opposition—even as we were calling the confrontational and oppositional into question? That voice is there, creating an ironic echo to the challenge we present.

J: Bahktin’s dialogics and heteroglossia indeed compound the questions concerning the agonistic mode. When is dialogue not contest and agon? It seems to me that dialogue avoids those modes when it is many voices spanning (dia: across, not "two") and composing. Though the voices may be multiple and inherited, the weaving becomes a tapestry. To wit, you "question the foregrounding of opposition and contrast," in a way that leads toward new ways and new understandings, and not simply in order to argue against it. Yet, as you note, that voice of contrast and arguing is still lurking there. My nine-year-old son contested one of my parental set speeches: "Comparisons are odious." He corrected me: "No, mother, comparisons are not odious; contrasts are; comparisons say how things are the same and that’s not a bad thing." If nine-year-olds can figure this out, why haven’t we?
A: We can continue this self-reflective analysis by pointing to the language of the traditional academy—particularly that in English studies—which not surprisingly often inserts itself throughout this discussion. It has been interesting to us to note in this regard how quickly terms like "valorizing," "marginalizing," "silencing," or "constructed" have appeared with increasing regularity across multiple texts in our field, including our own. What screens do such terms create, and how do they direct our attention and understanding? If you had the time and the patience to continue with us, we could together begin to hear even more clearly the language of many, many others embedded in the words which we today have spoken.

L: This semi-Bahktinian reading of our own text emphasizes a point we have tried to make in a variety of ways in our book—that the term collaborative writing, which at first seemed to us straightforward and unproblematic is instead highly problematic—and in very fruitful ways. Some researchers have worked hard to develop concrete and limited definitions for the term collaborative writing—and this decision often makes sense given their own research agenda. Partly because of our commitment to a multi-perspectival examination of collaborative writing, we've chosen to complicate, to emphasize not the importance of clear definitions but definitions as heuristics that are, inevitably, always probes, always incomplete.

A: We are aware today of the ways in which our attempts to enact a multi-voiced collaboration, to probe those places in which our text is voiced through the language of others, and hence to challenge the standard presentational format of CCCC conferences represent a series of risks.

L: We risk being unclear.

J: But then why and by whom is clarity valued above other qualities in academic discourse?

A: We risk, as well, being considered self-indulgent or silly.

J: But then why is playful silliness automatically outside the realm of academic discourse?

L: We risk being criticized because this presentation is staged or performed.

J: But then what discourse is not framed and represented on a series of stages?

A: You must help us understand the degree to which these risks have been worth taking, for only you can tell us whether they have enabled us to establish a richer perspective on collaborative writing and more directly link us to you in collaborative conversation. A final
risk, however, we feel more confident in evaluating. In our insistence on writing, and publishing together, and in our insistence on pointing up the ways in which our work is full of the voices of others, we risk the charge of a loss of individuality, of homogenization, of fading into the tribe—a fear Jim Corder discusses at length in a recent essay in *Rhetoric Review*.

L: Our presentation today may—indeed must—have flaws. Some of the risks we mentioned a moment ago may represent false starts, flawed but necessary steps toward a reconceptualizing of our academic rhetorical situation. But to Corder’s charge that an emphasis on collaboration, on collaborative writing, on writing as a social process, results in an inevitable “tribalizing” or levelling of ideas, we must respond with an emphatic NO.

J: Isn’t it odd, after all, to fear a loss of individuality within collaborative learning and thinking? That strikes me as an excessively separationist notion of self, voice, and learning. Thinking and writing with and alongside is the true home of all discourse. Who does Narcissus talk to? This emphasis on individuation, whether of self or of text, is itself highly contrasty—as if to say that you aren’t at all, unless you’re apart from. Do we really want to return to Descartes? Besides, who will talk to the grocer or negotiate the contract for publication of yet another “I think, therefore I am”?

A: We agree with Jan—and with Nancy Miller, who in “Changing the Subject: Authorship, Writing, and the Reader” argues against the kind of either/or thinking that Corder’s essay typifies. Either individuals write alone (and thus preserve their identity and connection with texts) or individuals “fade into the tribe.” Writing in the context of current critical theory, Miller notes that the postmodern decision to declare the author dead “does not necessarily work for women and prematurely forecloses the question of identity for them” (106) because it merely substitutes the autonomous reader, one awash in a sea of textuality, for the autonomous author. Instead, Miller suggests that identity can never be merely collective *or* solitary but that it instead “depends on displacement and translation” (120), and on realization in a “field of language” that, Miller argues, “constitutes [our] otherness to [ourselves].”

J: Here’s a nice reintegration of Bakhtin into the problem of identity as either collective *or* solitary. The other voices, the others’ voices, are within us and in being called up, and called on, become self as well. Reworking the other-self, theirs-mine dichotomies seems to be what your work is all about.

L: Our experience of writing has been for us finally not one of loss of self or subjectivity but instead a primary means of constituting our “otherness” to ourselves and hence of experiencing a deeply enriching and multiplicitous sense of self.
A: It has been this enriched sense of self and subjectivity, one fostered by our friendship (which we cannot and do not wish to separate from our coauthorship), that has encouraged us to take risks, to try new forms of oral and written presentation, and to speak our own voices—public and academic, personal and private—as well as to recognize, value, credit, and make room for the voices of others.

HETEROGLOSSARY

Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival.

—Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1973)

It appears that the work of the Russian social and literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin is having its homecoming festival. Dormant all these years, the texts of Bakhtin survived the dark night of Stalinism and have slowly emerged in the past twenty years across the literary boundaries of translation. The discovery of Bakhtin takes place "in the full light of the historical day," that is, Bakhtin enters into the present cultural dialogue as a full fledged participant. As Bakhtin says: "Even past meanings..., those born in a dialogue of past centuries, can never be stable (finalized, ended once and for all)—they will always change (be renewed) in the process of subsequent, future development of the dialogue" (1986, 170).

As a newcomer (latecomer?) on the scene, Bakhtin is the subject of an ongoing interpretive struggle. Allon White cautions not "to join the literary lemmings as they hurl themselves with blind fervour into the Bakhtinian Baltic" (1988, 217). However, Bakhtin's vocabulary is often used uncritically, spilling forth from the lips of speakers who have not had the benefit of an extensive read through Bakhtin's texts. Blas Matamoro comments that "we had Bakhtinian folklore before we had sufficient contact with the actual texts of Bakhtin" (1988, 33). This is compounded by the fact that terms such as carnival, polyphony, dialogism, and heteroglossia are open-ended, and wide open to interpretation. In fact, one of the more apparent stylistic features of Bakhtin's oeuvre is the tendency towards the repetition and reworking of concepts. This sort of cyclical discourse favours complexity rather than precision of thought, but, more importantly, it bespeaks of an unwillingness to close off dialogue. In effect, Bakhtin's vocabulary is full of loopholes, "the retention for oneself of the possibility for altering the ultimate, final meaning of one's words" (1984, 233). Bakhtin is in dialogue with the voices which form his context, but he is also in dialogue (not monologue!) with himself.

The intention of this "heteroglossary" is both centrifugal and centripetal: on the one hand, to distinguish some of Bakhtin's "social process" terms from one another, and on the other, to work towards a complex understanding of the interactive nature of these same
terms. This is not a set of definitions; Bakhtin’s dialogism reviles against such a monologic act. For Bakhtin, meaning is social, it occurs at the borders of discourses (“genres”) and utterances. At worst, to define his terms is to ossify them and to close them off to dialogue. However, if these definitions are taken as “chronotopics,” as particular time-space relationships which are both private (my dialogic interactions with Bakhtin’s texts) and social (the heteroglossia of which Bakhtin and I are only a part), then perhaps this glossary can be sufficiently open-ended to be called a “heteroglossary.” After all, Bakhtin’s notion of great time mediates against any static notion of intellectual labour. “There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future)” (1986, 170). Even if Bakhtin had written his own glossary (or “heteroglossary”), he would have done it in full knowledge that though it had a chronotopic reference for him, it would have a whole other frame of reference for someone in another time and/or place.

Heteroglossia:

hetero: from Greek heteros; means other, different
glossia: from Greek glossa; means tongue, language

As the etymological evidence suggests, heteroglossia refers to other, or different, languages. For Bakhtin, heteroglossia is the meeting of utterance with context; it is the social reference which is present in each and every utterance. This social conception of language veers away from the reification of professional, academic, and other specialized discourses, exposing them all as historically and socially rooted in the vital and dynamic language of the everyday. For example, Bakhtin says of Shakespeare that “the semantic treasures (he) embedded in his works were created and collected through the centuries and even millennia” (1986, 5). Not only does this work towards debunking the myth of “originality” or individual “genius,” but it also affirms the inevitable social reference of all language, regardless of who utters it. Of course, heteroglossia is not only present in “great literature,” but in any and every discourse.

Heteroglossia does not homogenize discourse, but it diversifies it. Bakhtin explains that the “languages of heteroglossia...are specific points of view on the world,” which “do not exclude each other, but rather intersect with each other in many different ways.” Thus, the picture that emerges is one of a web, or network, of languages:

...at any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the contradictions between the present and the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles, and so forth, all given a bodily form. (1981, 291)
This conception of heteroglossia is operative both at the level of national language and at the more local level of individual speech genres (see below), but heteroglossia also extends to the level of the individual utterance and word. Says Bakhtin: "The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his own intention." For Bakhtin, each word "tastes" of the contexts in which it has lived. Though the dictionary might offer a spectrum of possible "tastes," it surely does not define a word except in a narrow, monologic way.

Of particular note is Bakhtin’s discussion of heteroglossia in the novel, which is at once the site of many of his insights, as well as the discursive terrain to which he is sometimes relegated. Bakhtin is not (just) a literary critic. Nevertheless, Bakhtin has significant implications for the study of literature, particularly in the case of the novel. For Bakhtin, one of the primary traits of the novel is heteroglossia, a "stylistic three dimensionality, which is linked with the multi-linguaged consciousness realized in the novel" (1981, 11). Heteroglossia in the novel takes a variety of forms: "direct authorial literary-artistic narration; stylization of the various forms of oral everyday narration (skaz); stylization of the various forms of semi-literary everyday narration (i.e., the letter); various forms of literary but extra-artistic speech (i.e., literature in its broader sense); and the stylistically individualized speech of characters" (1981, 262). These diverse forms are integrated into the novel, which has become the site for our culturally significant narratives. The immensity of Bakhtin’s work on the novel precludes any further treatment here, but suffice it to say that heteroglossia distinguishes the novel from the epic, and, in our time, the novel from ethnography.

Dialogic: from Greek dialogikos; pertaining to dialogue.

Another key term of Bakhtin’s is “dialogic.” It follows very closely from heteroglossia in that it also describes the relation of the utterance to its context, the essentially social nature of language. The dialogic, however, refers specifically to the interaction of languages, the clashes and juxtapositions which result in discourse. Bakhtin says that languages crossed in discourse “relate to each other as do rejoinders in a dialogue” (1981, 76). For example, Bakhtin describes the dialogic interactions of an author with what is considered “normal literary language.” Rather than simply reifying the authorial discourse as masterpiece, Bakhtin insists on its part in a cultural dialogue. For Bakhtin there is both internal and external dialogism: the languages that make up the heteroglossia of an utterance are in dialogic interaction with one another, as is the interaction of utterance and context.

Bakhtin refers to the “dialogic vigor” which can push the limits of what is considered knowledge to make new discoveries. For example, in philology “every step forward in our knowledge of the word is preceded by a ‘stage of genius’—a sharpened dialogic relationship to the word—that in turn uncovers fresh aspects within the word” (1981, 352). The similarities of Bakhtin’s “dialogic" to the dialogue as pedagogy of Brazilian educator Paulo
Freire are striking, in regards to this creative notion of language. Whereas for Freire dialogue is a crucial step towards critical consciousness, for Bakhtin the dialogic is the vitally dynamic nature of lived discourse.

It is important to note that not all utterances are considered dialogic. In fact, an important part of the definition of "dialogic" is "not monologic." Monologism tends toward reification:

To speak of a discourse as one might speak of any other subject, that is, thematically, without any dialogized transmission of it, is possible only when such discourse is utterly reified, a thing. (1981, 355).

For example, an abstract discussion of grammar, or any abstract discussion that is thoroughly decontextualized, can be monologic. Of course, authoritarian discourse is fundamentally monologic.

Polyphony:

poly: from Greek polys; means many
phony: from Greek phonia; means voice or sound

Similar to "heteroglossia" and "dialogic" is the term "polyphony," which is a metaphor derived from music and applied by Bakhtin to the novels of Dostoevsky. Whereas heteroglossia refers to different languages or discourses present in any utterance, polyphony emphasizes the many voices which can be present in an utterance (a monologic utterance is probably not polyphonic, though it is still informed by heteroglossia). Just like in music, the diverse voices implicated in polyphony do not fuse into a single consciousness, but operate on different levels simultaneously:

If one is to talk about individual will, then it is precisely in polyphony that a combination of several wills takes place, that the boundaries of the individual will can in principle be exceeded. (1984, 21)

Polyphony is both participatory and collective. It has less to do with liberal pluralism and "tolerance" of difference than with giving voice to previously marginalized voices. Bakhtin goes on to say that "the artistic will of polyphony is a will to combine many wills, a will to the event." Thus, polyphony involves not only the raising of voices, but their active integration into history.

To contextualize Bakhtin's notion of polyphony, the novels of Dostoevsky must be mentioned. According to Bakhtin, Dostoevsky created "a completely new type of artistic thinking" which involved the complex play of ideological voices. Of course Bakhtin does not
subscribe to an essentialist notion of genius, but sees Dostoevsky emerge from the heteroglossia of his epoch:

The objective complexity, contradictoriness and multi-voicedness of Dostoevsky's epoch, the position of the declassed intellectual and the social wanderer, his deep biographical and inner participation in the objective multi-leveledness of life and finally his gift for seeing the world in terms of interaction and coexistence—all this prepared the soil in which Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel was to grow. (1984, 30).

Though Bakhtin identifies the predecessors of Dostoevsky through his project of "historical poetics," he sees a historical break with Dostoevsky. But unlike traditional theories of literature, Bakhtin locates the change in a historical, rather than stylistic, framework.

Carnival: from Latin *carnem* + *levare*; to lift flesh

Carnival is a common term for popular festivity, which is by no means a Bakhtinian invention, though it, and the adjective "carnivalesque," are synonymous with Bakhtin in contemporary cultural criticism. This term follows very closely from heteroglossia, dialogic, and polyphonic as again it refers to the essential social reference of discourse. However, carnival stands out for its emphasis on the popular element of culture. Bakhtin's major work on carnival is *Rabelais and his World* (1968), where he shows the popular roots of Rabelais' oeuvre. He shows carnival to be an attitude to the world which had belonged to folk communities for millennia, an attitude which valorized laughter and the fundamental aspects of life, that pertaining to the "material bodily lower stratum."

Carnival refers to culture with no "footlights": "Carnival is not a spectacle seen by people; they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all the people." Particularly in the context of the "high seriousness" of the official culture of the Middle Ages, the response of the "unofficial culture" of carnival was to turn the "world upside down," to invert the order of established hierarchies, albeit for a short time. Nothing was sacred in the culture of carnival, even the sacred itself which was the object of carnivalesque laughter. Laughter, at once festive, universal in scope and ambivalent, had an almost revolutionary impact. Thus, "on the borderline between art and life," carnival inverted the established social order to privilege the popular vision of life.

Another important aspect of carnival was the emphasis on the "material bodily lower stratum," the fundamental aspects of life which translate in art to grotesque realism. As Bakhtin says, "the leading themes...are fertility, growth, and a brimming-over abundance," and the images are ones of feasting, copulation, defecation, birth, death, etc. It is a generative and regenerative notion of culture, where the individual is subsumed by the "collective ancestral body." The essential principle of this worldview is "degradation, that
is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity." Of course, this transference of the high to the low has its analogy in literature where a carnivalesque interpretation would be one which valorizes the popular roots of much "great art."

Notes
1. "Hemos tenido antes un folclore bajtiniano que un contacto decoroso con los textos del propio Bajtin."
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RESPONSE TO "CRITICAL MASS IN CANADIAN RHETORIC"  //  JUDY SEGAL

Doug Brent asked us to complete and send him our questionnaires so he could improve his sense—and ours—of rhetorical education in Canada. I smiled as I completed mine, adding up the number of writing, rhetoric, and composition theory courses offered at the University of Waterloo. We've got a great program here, a program (*mea culpa*) that has been underpublicized in these pages. When our Ph.D. program finally was approved in the spring of this year, advertising our offerings was less exciting than inventing them.

An honours undergraduate program in Rhetoric and Professional Writing began here in 1985 and a Master's program in Language and Professional-Writing began in 1986. Both have attracted scores of students (we currently have 200 majors in RPW and 30 LPW graduate students). Undergraduates choose from a variety of courses in composition, technical writing, rhetorical history and theory, stylistics, linguistics, grammar (!), directed research in specific writing applications, research in rhetoric and composition—23 courses
in all; graduate students choose from a shorter list of courses in rhetorical history and theory, composition theory and pedagogy, and professional writing (this last category has recently included courses in computer interfaces, hypertext, and typography). We have as well a Centre for Professional Writing, primarily a research centre which counts several graduate students among its staff.

Perhaps the best indicator of the nature of our program, still very much in the process of shaping itself, is in the research projects of graduate students and in the jobs they find once they graduate. A partial list of completed projects, then, in no particular order:

* a proposed curriculum integrating reading and writing in freshman English courses (Marilyn Mathews)
* a study using the on-line OED to correlate lexical change and paradigm shifts in views of psychosomatic disease (Barry Sutherland)
* a process study of the rhetoric of AIDS information (Josee Duffhues)
* a process study of two advertising writers, using think-aloud protocols and discourse-based interviews (Christine Fischer)
* a writing-process guide for the Fort McMurray School District (Victor Steel)

And a short list of jobs. Our M.A. graduates have gone on to be (or to return to being) public school teachers; some are college and university writing instructors; others are technical writers, corporate writers, editors for publishing houses; one coordinates local AIDS services; another works for a government information project on violence against women.

The doctoral program kicks off in the fall. It’s not a program in rhetoric and composition per se, but an interdisciplinary program in literature, rhetoric, and professional writing. It requires students to declare some speciality, but also to take “bridging” courses and become conversant in all three areas of study. Twelve students were admitted to the program this year (five with a declared interest in rhetoric and writing), some having already taken so many graduate courses, they are poised to write field exams and have areas of dissertation research all mapped out. I have no doubt that by say, 1994, this university will be able to send job candidates to fill positions like that at the University of Alberta, complete with doctoral preparation in rhetoric and composition, teaching experience, and publications in the field.

Of course, getting these programs together and getting them to work hasn’t been (isn’t) easy. We’ve been doing it with the smallest possible number of faculty, but with a great deal of department and university support. Only two of us at the moment (David Goodwin and I) are considered “full-time rhetoricians,” which means we don’t teach anything but rhetoric and writing courses. Other faculty carry a great load of rhetoric and writing courses, but teach other courses as well (Neil Randall teaches professional writing—and
Canadian Literature; Lynne Magnusson teaches stylistics—and Shakespeare; Mary Gerhardstein teaches research in rhetoric—and the 18th Century Novel). We are now advertising for a "senior" full-time person in rhetoric and composition, someone to replace Jasper Neel who was with us for only a year. A full-time position in professional writing is becoming available as well. Any Canadians interested in either of these positions are urged to apply.

It may be that in time rhetoric in Canada will approach critical mass. At this university, in any case, our intentions are good, program support—moral and financial—is great, and our vision is sound. I welcome your thoughts on our program and inquiries from any of you. For published information on graduate courses and the like, please write to The Graduate Secretary, Department of English, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1. Send job applications to Gordon Slethaug, Chair.

Department of English
University of Waterloo

A REAL WRITING ASSIGNMENT: PART TWO

The types of writing tasks we assign students are very important. Is that a gross understatement? One dominant motivation for me has been to create assignments which help produce real writing. A session I attended at the Ottawa CCTE conference in 1979 led by Tony Adams reassured me that most writing in school was rather artificial, replete with dummy runs through forms that would be of little value once my students were out in the real world. What did it matter that they could write a short essay answer from regurgitated bits of information about setting in Macbeth?

Writing for real, required a genuine purpose, a live and kicking audience and a content that the student could explore and shape in order to make sense.

At the time I was surrounded by the Product Pedagogy. You didn't get students ready to write, set an assignment, help develop means to deal with the transforming text and polish the piece through peer and teacher conferencing. You wanted a clean piece of errorless writing, produced in the form of a Good Copy in a specified period of time. Underlying this perception was the notion that a Bad Copy preceded the Good Copy, a copy that was neater.

My response at the time was to publish the works of my students for the school and the community to read; we produced a poetry and prose anthology called Lupines. I marvelled
then at how determined my students were to produce the best possible text, regardless of the form. They talked to each other about their text, sharing the process and the problems and possible solutions. It seemed very real to me. They worked together.

The writing assignment that I would like to tell about is one I attempted with my Senior Writer's Craft Course. I had two classes. I had suggested, as a possible topic for Independent Study, that those interested in pursuing a career in education might want to observe young writers in the flesh. I supplied those who were interested with a variety of journal articles I had collected from various journals such as Language Arts, authored by Graves and other adherents to process pedagogy. They were to observe the students over 10-15 classes over a two-month period. They were encouraged to share the reading material and to talk about what they were seeing. They kept a journal of their observations. The Independent Study is a required component of the course worth 20%. An oral report and a written text is mandated. Students are able, in conference with the teacher, to decide on how they want to report and what form they want to choose.

The five students who selected the topic were interested in pursuing a degree in education. They selected classes ranging from Grade 1 to Grade 3. The presiding teacher selected a student considered to be a good writer for them to observe. One student chose to work with her sister, a grade 4 student who she claimed need a lot of work on her writing.

I was surprised that they wanted to write articles much like the ones they had read. I wasn’t concerned that they would copy the style of the author they had read. I was glad they selected the format. They kept a journal of their observations and photocopies of their student's work. Most of them observed one student, while one student watched three students write.

I waited anxiously for their reports and their observations about what they thought they saw. They had a limited reading base, a limited sample of students and a limited number of sessions to observe. But still they were going into the classroom to watch. They had selected the topic, were exploring it and I waited for the sense they would shape.

They reported that good writers were also good students. These good writers were successful at other skills too. Foremost, my students were very concerned about how dependent the students in each of the classes they observed were on the teacher. The following behaviours were a constant in the time period my students were in the classrooms. The young writers need a topic, instruction on how to do the task, to have identified what was wrong with the text, praise and a grade from the teacher.

My students felt this type of relationship hindered the student’s development as a writer. They sensed there was a genuine need for these young writers to grow away from the
teacher. My students asserted that these young writers needed to pursue their own interests and write for more than the teacher. I was astounded. I found it rather ironic that my students who, at times, still cling to me would observe this type of relationship going on.

Our board advocates a process approach to writing instruction where writing folders are an essential part of the day-to-day management of writing. My students’ discoveries were enlightening, probably more so for me than for them. I tend to agree that this type of dependency works against the writer’s development of a personal voice and other individual rhetorical choices. Alarm lights go off, usually after I’ve done something whenever I find my teaching is making my students dependent on me. It’s perhaps the hardest, most subtle part of the relationship between writing teacher and student writer. The two labels I’ve just used suggest much that is part of this relationship. One’s accomplished and the other has miles and miles to go. However, it is when I feel I am not learning that I know my students are not learning. So, I am the writing teacher who is always a student of writing. I have listened to my students as they teach me about dependency.

The writing assignment worked wonderfully well. My students were able to see how writing is taught in a real setting. The artificial nature may still be there, but this was reality for those elementary students. My students witnessed a variety of interpretations of process teaching. They were able to read about writing development and report what they observed about how writing starts out.

If one of the tasks of education is to prepare students for the next level of education, or better still work with what you have and help them to realise their best, the writing assignment did just that. It is a real writing assignment for many reasons, not the least, because it is much like what education students will be involved in in the field, but because the resources within the system are used. The students are using them to learn about themselves. When we are able to best realise what we are all about, we are closer to what communication is all about.

The oral reports were sessions that ran over time and kept the class intrigued and wondering why they hadn’t selected the same topic. The students repeated their enthusiasm for the topics claiming their study was really neat. What an awful word. Usually. But in this instance, the word was testimony to what was learned and appreciated about what young writers go through and I think what my students were able to relate to from their own experience about their writing development. How real can an assignment get. That’s no understatement, is it?

Assumption High School
Burlington, ON

Ω
Dear *Inkshed* Colleagues:

Nothing is more rhetorical in nature than a deliberation as to what is too much or too little, too early or too late.

Kenneth Burke

Many of you were probably surprised to see, in this number of *Inkshed*, a Call for Papers for a new journal, *Textual Studies in Canada*—especially after a similar insert had appeared for *Literacies* in the last number. You’d think that Inkshedders have been infected with the Renaissance craze for *Copia*. Indeed, since Inkshedders will also continue to support *English Quarterly*, we may very soon have three journals celebrating rhetoric in Canada. And the Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric has also considered its own journal. What a reversal from just two years ago!

As you may have guessed, and as the list of names of Editorial Advisory Board members indicates, the place of *TSC* in this plenitude has not developed without wide discussion. The names of the editorial advisers also suggest, however, that the planned constituency for *TSC* extends into interdisciplinary studies well beyond the field of rhetoric related to English studies. What we want is a journal whose scope will extend beyond the traditional bounds of rhetoric and composition. Indeed, a colleague in archaeology recently asked, “Why shouldn’t a dig be interpreted as a text?” Editors and Advisory Board members, therefore, include professionals from such fields as sociology, modern languages, urban studies, psychology and Canadian studies, as well as reading, writing, and rhetoric.

Jim Reither hopes that *TSC* will be “gutsy, daring... and exploratory in its policies and experimental practices,” pushing at the constraints of defining "what a refereed journal is, how it should be organized, ... how authorship and co-authorship should be acknowledged, and so on.” We’re intent on collaboration, in writing, editing, and publishing.

Whereas Stan Straw indicates that *Literacies* hopes to receive research reports “which reflect a wide range of research efforts,” both “critical and empirical,” *TSC* will publish essays akin to those found in, for example, *College English* and *Rhetoric Review*, or even in the *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, or in such books as McCloskey’s *The Rhetoric of Economics* and Prelli’s *A Rhetoric of Science*. Rather than competing, *English Quarterly*, *Literacies*, and *TSC* have an opportunity to work together—to cooperate with and complement one another, by publishing different kinds of articles, by referring submissions to one another, and by staggering publication dates. Further, *TSC* at present proposes one annual number, expanding to two only as submissions and subscribers warrant. Since *Literacies* also does not project quarterly publication, we should have time to enjoy all the articles anyway.

The editors of *TSC* invite you to acclaim with us—and with *Literacies* and the continued *English Quarterly* (and let’s not forget our own *Inkshed*)—the study of rhetoric in its various
guises in Canada. We need your suggestions, support, and manuscripts; and we need your help in advertising *Textual Studies in Canada* among your colleagues in various departments, as well as in your classrooms, for TSC is also meant to encourage new scholars into the professional conversation associated with both the production and analysis of the "range of rhetoric" in its full Burkean sense.

**HENRY HUBERT AND WILL GARRETT-PETTS**
*Cariboo University College*

**EDITORIAL INKSHEDDING**


The "Doublespeak" Award had no "grand winner," but Audrey McLaughlin received an "Honourable" Mention for her explanation of why the NDP Resolutions Committee's position on Meech Lake did not subvert the party's official position:

> I supposed [sic] it is a rejection of the accord in the sense of as it is without the amendments. That is not necessarily a change of substance. *Winnipeg Free Press*, September 20, 1989.

Thanks to Nancy Carlman for passing on the news release.

* * *

The International Reading Association is holding the Second North American Conference on Adult and Adolescent Literacy in Banff, Alberta, March 21-23, 1991. For more information, write Patti Martineau, International Reading Association Conference, c/o Medicine Hat College, 299 College Drive SE, Medicine Hat, AB, T1A 3Y6 or fax (403) 529-2437.

* * *

A CALL FOR PAPERS

Textual Studies in Canada, a refereed journal, provides a collaborative and interdisciplinary forum in which researchers and teachers can address issues related to the study of texts within a Canadian context. We are interested in how texts are composed, read, and variously defined according to disciplinary and cultural presuppositions. Submissions are invited on all aspects of textual life in Canada—with special reference to Canadian literature (including "non-fiction"), popular culture, rhetoric, composition, reading theory, pedagogy, and critical theory. In keeping with TSC's definition as a "collaborative" journal, we are particularly interested in receiving articles of joint or multiple authorship. Contributors are requested to submit two copies of manuscripts (and a copy on computer disk) to the Editors, Textual Studies in Canada, Department of English, Cariboo University College, Box 3010, Kamloops, B.C., V2X 5N3.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

I have enclosed $9.00. Please send the Summer '91 issue of Textual Studies in Canada to:

NAME

ADDRESS

POSTAL CODE

FEMINIST PEDAGOGY IN THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

A Collaborative Research Project, 1990-1993
Fran Davis and Arlene Steiger, Vanier College, Montreal

This research will test teaching strategies intended to improve female students' confidence and their engagement with and commitment to the physical sciences. Strategies to be used in the project include systematic self-disclosure methods for teachers in lecture-discussion classes and in the marking of student written work, peer support partnerships for students inside and outside the classroom, and writing in the learning process. Two teachers, one French and one English, will teach one experimental section and one control. The testing period will be four semesters, with one semester for pre-testing and one for global analysis. Effects will be assessed by attendance, failure and abandon rates, grades, one standardized test for enjoyment of physical sciences, student and teacher interviews, and specific student assignments.

TOWARDS GENDER-FAIR EDUCATION IN THE CEGEPS

A Collaborative Research Project, 1990-1993
Fran Davis, Greta Nemiroff and Louise Poisson, Montréal, Quebec

This research proposes to develop a model for gender-fair education for Cegep courses in Core English and French, Humanities and Philosophy. The model will include principles, strategies, and guidance for the selection of subject matter, texts, and student tasks. The model is based on these research methods: bibliographical research, survey and critique of existing Cegep practices, participation and critiques by teacher-participants, and one semester of attitudinal testing of the students in experimental and control groups for these disciplines.
CALL FOR PAPERS

ACUTE

Special Sessions on Pedagogy and on Teaching Writing

At the May 1991 Learned Societies meetings at Queen's University, the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English will be having a plenary session on teaching writing and between six and nine workshops, panels, and paper sessions on various aspects of pedagogy, with an emphasis on the teaching of writing. Professor Andrea Lunsford of the University of Ohio, well-known for her essays on teaching rhetoric, will deliver the plenary address. ACUTE invites submissions from interested persons for the panels, workshops, and paper sessions.

INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS CAN TAKE THREE FORMS:

1. Completed or substantially completed papers ranging from 8 to 20 pages, and designed to take into account that almost all sessions will have two speakers, will be limited to 75 minutes, and must allow time for discussion.
2. Abstracts of one to two pages for a paper, workshop, or panel discussion. These should be sufficiently detailed to establish the scope and cogency of the proposed contribution.
3. A proposal for a special session, in which the person making the proposal submits an outline of the entire session, and abstracts, as in (2) above, from each of the proposed participants.

REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSIONS:

1. Papers and abstracts must be submitted with a covering sheet giving the author's name and address. The proposals will be vetted anonymously; therefore, the author's name must appear nowhere on the paper itself. Two copies of the paper must be submitted by November 15, 1990. They should be accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope if you wish them returned.
2. Two copies of proposals for special sessions (as in 3, above) must be submitted by December 15, 1990. Such proposals should include a brief description of the aims of the session and of the role the moderator intends to play, and abstracts of the contributions of the participants. [Papers on pedagogy and the teaching of writing will also be considered in this category.]
3. Only papers and proposals submitted by members of ACUTE are eligible for consideration. ACUTE membership includes the Newsletter and a subscription to English Studies in Canada (a forthcoming issue of which will be devoted to questions of "Curriculum and the Canon"). It costs $65 for full-time members of the profession, and $30 for retired faculty, graduate students, and unemployed or part-time members of the profession. Memberships can be sent with paper submissions.
4. Proposals and papers, along with membership dues, should be sent to Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, Department of English, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E1
Call for Proposals

INKSHED 8

Schooling and Other Cultures

April 12-14, 1991
Montréal, Québec

The theme of this conference invites two readings. The first points to the school itself as a culture; the second places the school in relation to other cultures. Both readings suggest broad anthropological or sociological perspectives, but we encourage a specific focus on writing and reading and their relationship to culture. The following questions are offered for reflection:

- What values, myths, texts, activities, rituals, and structures form the culture of the school?
- Is there cultural continuity or conflict between levels of schooling, from day care through adult education?
- Do students cross cultural boundaries when they move from one academic discipline to another?
- Are there sub- or anti-cultures in the schools?
- How are aspects of culture reflected or embedded in the discourse of the school?
- How will increasing multi-culturalism affect schools and schooling?
- In what ways do discourse communities and the cultures they promote affect the writing and reading done in schools?
- To what extent are elements of the mainstream culture in conflict/collusion with school culture?
- What effect does popular culture have on the school?

We seek presentations of varying length and format: 10-minute informal reports on research and pedagogy, 20-minute papers or formal talks, 45-minute workshops or interactive demonstrations. Please consider your presentation a contribution that raises questions rather than a statement that settles matters.

We encourage unusual, even experimental presentations, but we would like to offer two guidelines: first, all proposals should include plans for involving conference participants in some talking, writing, or both. Second, we believe that papers should be written for listeners rather than for readers.

Proposals should have a covering page with the title of the presentation, presenter's name, address, and phone numbers. The proposal itself should include a title, a brief description or abstract (200 words or so), a very brief description of the method of presentation, and a statement of aim or purpose.

Deadline: December 14, 1990

Send proposals to: Patrick Dias, Inkshed 8, Centre for the Study and Teaching of Writing, McGill University, 3700 McTavish Street, Montréal, PQ H3A 1Y2 Telephone: (514) 398-6960 Fax: (514) 398-4679
In this issue of *Inkshed* you will find a Call for Proposals and a Registration Form for *Inkshed* 8, to be held in the Montréal area April 12-14, 1991. Please circulate the Call and the Form to friends and colleagues who might be interested. We will not be advertising this conference widely and count on *Inkshed* readers to spread the word.

You will see that the deadline for registration is January 4, 1991. The early date of *Inkshed* 8 makes it impossible to book college or university residence facilities, since they will still be in use in April. As a result, we have reserved a block of rooms at Auberge Handfield, a small inn south of Montréal. We have agreed to let the people at the Auberge know the exact number of rooms required by no later than the beginning of January. While rooms may be available after that date, we cannot be sure.

We realize that Inkshedders are interested in intellectual matters only and can sustain themselves on the nutrition provided by rich and heady discourse. However, for those few who are interested in worldly matters, the Auberge has an excellent dining room and a pleasant location on the banks of the Richelieu River, close to Mont Sainte Hilaire. We have managed to keep the costs close to those of *Inkshed* VII, thanks to the profit made at that conference and forwarded to us by Susan Drain.

A chartered bus will leave from McGill to go to the Auberge on Friday, April 12, following the CCTE conference. The bus will return to Montréal on Sunday afternoon. Exact times will be determined later. The cost of the bus is included in the conference fee. We strongly encourage local participants to stay at the Auberge, rather than commuting, since the one-way drive takes approximately one hour from downtown Montréal. Those who cannot stay at the Auberge can pay a fee for the conference only; however, they will have to pay for whatever meals they eat. The cost of individual meals has not been determined, but we expect it will not be exorbitant.

More details to follow...

Patrick Dias
Anthony Paré