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CHAPTER I

Contexts for Computer-Enhanced Composition

Introduction

Computers are currently used in writing classrooms in at least four ways: as a tool to produce and analyze texts, as a means to instruct, as a channel to promote conversation, and as a medium to disseminate information. To which uses the computer is put and for what ends are determined by the knowledge, skills, and beliefs of those who create computer-enhanced composition programs and the teachers who teach in these programs. As Kenneth Bruffee correctly points out, when we introduce computers into our writing classrooms, we cannot retreat into the passive voice ("The computer can be used to . . ."). Students use invention software or do computerized drill and practice exercises or participate in computer conferences because those who administer computer-enhanced writing programs and teach computer-enhanced writing classes choose to make these activities available and direct students to engage in them. Since these administrators and teachers determine how computers are used in writing classes, what they know about computers and what they believe computers can/should be used for are important but, as I shall discuss, largely unexplored issues. It is, therefore, these critical issues which I investigate in the case studies
of computer-enhanced composition programs and composition teachers presented in this dissertation.

Before presenting these case studies, I first contextualize them in the succeeding sections of this chapter by briefly reviewing and analyzing research and scholarship conducted in the area of computer-enhanced composition. I begin with studies conducted from the introduction of the microcomputer in the late 1970s through the late 1980s. As I will discuss, much of this early work focused on the ability of computers to improve the writing processes and writing quality of individual writers. I explore the reasons for this focus and the assumptions about writing and computers which it reflects. I also discuss the limitations of this research as well as the tentative conclusions about computers and composition which can be drawn from this early work. Finally, I situate research in computer-enhanced composition within the larger framework of composition studies and discuss more recent research and scholarship in computer-enhanced composition, placing the present study within the context of this work.

Early Research in Computers and Composition

The Computer Landrush

Although research into the uses of the computer in composition began in the 1960s, the "landrush" of investigation into the area began in the early 1980s shortly after the development of the microcomputer. Composition researchers confidently predicted that the computer, particularly the computer as word
processor, would improve student writing, and many English departments enthusiastically introduced the technology into their composition classrooms. The results of much of the first generation of research were, given the high expectations of the investigators, disappointing. Computers were not found to consistently or automatically improve the quality of student writing (Hawisher "Research").

Discussing the focus of much of the early research on computers and writing, Andrea Herrman observes:

At the risk of oversimplifying the matter, we can say that the question at the foundation of much of the work, either implicitly or explicitly, was whether or not computers, particularly in the form of word processors, made writing better. (128)

In 1989, Gail Hawisher analyzed the results of studies of computers and word processing completed between 1981 and 1986 ("Research"), and an examination of her findings tends to support Herrman’s observation. Hawisher’s corpus, which excluded surveys and informal reports, included most of the formal studies of word processing and writing conducted during the period covered. While an analysis of Hawisher’s review shows that some researchers were concerned with other issues, such as how using computers affected students’ attitudes toward writing or how the presence of computers influenced classroom interactions, it also clearly reveals the search for "improvement" as a dominant theme within the research. Of the forty-two studies she examined, writing quality was a concern in twenty-five, about sixty percent. Since several of the studies involved professional writers or students beyond the undergraduate level, when only those
studies which considered the effects of word processing on writers at the undergraduate level and below are considered, the percentage which included writing quality as a concern increases. Of the thirty-five studies that focused on this population, twenty-three, or about sixty-six percent, included an examination of writing quality. Of the twelve studies of student writers which did not directly examine writing quality, eight looked for changes in the ways students revised their texts, hypothesizing that students would revise more and in more productive ways with word processors than without. Based on these studies, it seems safe to conclude that the hopes and expectations of most of the researchers were that word processing would, perhaps even dramatically, improve students' writing processes and written products in ways that could be straightforwardly documented.

But as scholars such as Deborah Holdstein and Cynthia Selfe have recently pointed out, expecting the computer in itself to automatically improve student writing now seems naive. In "The Case for Teacher as Researcher in Computers and Composition Studies," Gail Hawisher and Michael Pemberton compare the assumptions and expectations of researchers studying computer-enhanced composition during the 1980s to those of earlier researchers studying the effects of typewriters and other production tools on writing. They conclude that the approach to research in both cases was "wrong-headed":

In their groundbreaking monograph, *Research in Written Composition*, Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer called for a research agenda in composition that would investigate, among other things, the effects of writing technologies—notably the
typewriter—on composing processes. . . . If only we can discover the right tool (or the right software) for the job, the belief seems to go, then the myriad problems of writing—and writing instruction—will be solved. But studies which answer the call of the Braddock report and center themselves on the instruments of text production seem to miss the point, or at least they seem to be missing the fact that there are many points to consider when discussing writing processes, not just the isolated effects of a given technology on individual writers. (77-78)

Why did so many researchers interested in computer-enhanced composition "miss the point" by concentrating on "isolated effects" and "individual writers" while largely overlooking the larger contexts of writing instruction into which the computer entered?

Much of the answer lies in the atmosphere in which the computer entered composition classrooms. In the late seventies and early eighties, educators at every level were enthusiastically embracing the computer. In "Resisting Technological Momentum," William D. Taylor and Jane Johnsen discuss several reasons for the rapid introduction of computers into schools during this period. Two of these reasons seem particularly relevant in explaining the high expectations for computers and the speed with which computers were incorporated into composition programs. First, there was the pressure applied by the mass media which "created a national 'need' through advertising and 'news' features" (217). This pressure generated enormous community interest and subsequent legislative and administrative support and resulted in schools earmarking money for computers even when budgets were being slashed in other areas (Taylor and Johnsen 216-17). At the same time, the computer industry,
seeking to expand its market, was eager to provide educational grants and discounts. Consequently, like other educators, composition specialists found themselves lured by the availability of funds and often directly urged by administrators to place computers in their classrooms.

Second, at a time when "education was undergoing a major decline in public confidence and support, . . . the image of the microcomputer projected by the mass media offered to those educators who embraced the microcomputer movement the chance to transcend the doldrums in which education and educators found themselves" (222). While composition studies were certainly not in "the doldrums" in the late seventies and early eighties, the field continued to battle an image problem. Although the area was in the midst of a prolific renaissance of interest and activity, as Stephen North has observed, it was still struggling to be regarded as a serious and rigorous discipline. Computers, associated with the serious milieu of the business world and the rigorous domain of the hard sciences, presented another avenue to respectability. The field also faced another vexing and persistent problem. Verbal scores on the SAT continued to decline and, although The Writing Report Card, the report of the National Assessment of Educational Progress on students' writing skills, would not be published until 1986, its conclusions had already been anticipated. According to this report, seventy-five percent of eleventh grade students could not write well enough for educational advancement or business and technical work (cited by Linden and Whimbey, 2). Consequently, the public was still
asking, "Why can't Janie and Johnny write?" The computer appeared to provide a ready solution to this problem.

In addition, as the 1980s began, the race to stake claims for the computer's ability to improve student writing seemed a natural extension of previous efforts in writing research, although, as I will discuss in a later section, perspectives which might have led researchers toward other lines of inquiry were already emerging within the discipline. Between 1963 when Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's monograph calling for more adequate research in composition was published and the introduction of microcomputers to writing classrooms in the early 1980s, a resurgence of interest and a flurry of activity in composition studies had created a significant body of disciplined research and scholarship into writing and writing processes. This emerging body of work led Maxine Hairston to conclude in 1982 that composition studies had undergone a "paradigm shift" and to announce that the result would be a "revolution . . . in the nation's classrooms" (86). Drawing on the work of Richard Young, James Berlin, and others, Hairston described the old model, or what has become known as the current-traditional paradigm: it focused on the written product; it assumed that writing is a mysterious activity that cannot be analyzed and, consequently, cannot be taught; it views expository writing primarily as a skill, a tool for communication; it is based on the positivist assumption of an unchanging reality that is independent of the writer; it assumes that competent writers know what they are going to say before they begin to write and largely neglects the teaching
of invention; it assumes that composing is a linear process that moves smoothly from planning to writing to rewriting; its practitioners believe that teaching editing is teaching writing; and it is based on a priori assumptions about writing rather than careful, theoretically and methodologically sound research. In contrast, Hairston observed that the new paradigm is based on viewing writing as a process. As Hairston defined it, the writing-as-process paradigm includes strategies for teaching invention and discovery; a basis in rhetorical principles; a view of writing as a recursive process; the belief that writing is a way of learning and developing as well as a communication skill; the belief that writing is an activity which can be analyzed, described, and taught; and a reliance on theoretically informed, methodologically sound research.

While several scholars have voiced objections to Hairston’s comparison of the change that was taking place in the discipline to Kuhn’s model of paradigm shifts, few have argued with Hairston’s appraisal that a new emphasis on the composing process, along with a belief in the importance of disciplined inquiry, was informing scholarship in the field. The composing process began to be systematically described and analyzed. Janet Emig’s seminal descriptive study, "The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders" published in 1971 delineated ten "dimensions of the composing process" and introduced case study methodology to composition studies. Emig’s study was followed by similar projects which described the composing processes of other types of writers such as Donald Graves' "An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children"
(1975), Sondra Perl’s "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers" (1979), and Sharon Pianko’s "A Description of the Composing Processes of College Freshman Writers" (Pianko, 1979). Other researchers focused on specific aspects of composing such as revision. For example, Nancy Sommers compared the revising processes of student writers to those of experienced adult writers; Linda Flower and John Hayes, using protocol analysis, focused on the choices writers make as they revise; and Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte developed a taxonomy which they used to classify the revisions writers make. Other scholars, such as Richard Larson, Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike, focused on invention and proposed ways to help writers discover and develop ideas while composing. While a review of the numerous efforts which contributed to the endeavor is not needed here, the result was that the "knowledge gap" which had been decried by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer seemed to be narrowing. Thus, by the beginning of the 1980s, composition specialists had created through disciplined research and scholarship a body of knowledge about the nature of writing processes and the composing problems writers faced upon which the computer could be brought to bear.

Finally, a number of those initially interested in the potential for the computer in composition had themselves recently begun using word processors for their writing, and the rhetoric of many early discussions of the potential for computers in writing classrooms is marked by inspirational anecdotes attesting to the "conversions" of the authors, or other experienced writers to word processing,
and the immediate benefits they had received. Discussing the overwhelming enthusiasm of recent "converts," the authors of one review of the literature observed, "We can hardly escape the 'new users' who have a habit of offering up testimonials about how word processors have changed their lives as writers" (Bridwell, Nancarrow, and Ross 381). The "turn about" made by Donald Graves serves as a good example of this phenomenon and demonstrates how even a skeptic could be converted through personal experience. In an interview with John Green, Graves discusses ways in which word processing can be used in writing classrooms. Green reveals that Graves was one of many scholars who were initially skeptical about the suitableness of computers as writing instruments. Graves was concerned that the "seductiveness" of neatly printed text might distract writers from concerns with content (Green 21). However, Green reports, Graves began extolling the virtues of word processing shortly after his own introduction to WordStar. As Green puts it, "Now his eyes sparkle as he extols a particular feature of his new word tool" (21). Given their own positive experiences, then, many researchers simply expected that student writers would also spontaneously benefit from word processing. Using a word processor blocks of text can be moved easily, so writers can quickly try out different methods of organization; using a split screen, two versions of a text can be compared; and proofreading and editing are made easier using add and delete functions to quickly and efficiently change wording and correct mechanical errors. Finally, the need for recopying is eliminated because clean, neat copy
can be produced at the touch of a print command. The scholars and researchers felt that providing students with word processors and placing all this power and convenience at their finger tips would inspire student writers, even in the absence of instructional intervention, to change their writing processes and produce more fully developed, more mechanically correct, higher quality products.

The Treatment Model: Positive and Positivistic

The basic assumptions on which much research into the effects of computers on student writing has been based emerged from the interaction of these forces: the surrounding culture, which promoted high expectations and promised immediate results; the existing research and scholarship in composition studies which suggested many areas where the computer might be effective; and the personal experience of many potential researchers which seemed to confirm that improvements in students' writing and writing processes could be found both quickly and easily. Consequently, in the minds of proponents of computers, the question of whether or not computers would improve student writing begged to be asked and almost begged asking. Given this basic research question, Andrea Herrman observes, computer-enhanced composition researchers overwhelmingly selected a positivistic treatment model for their research (128). Even those researchers who used case studies tended to compare the writing processes and writing quality of students using computers to that of the same students using pen and paper (Herrman 129).
Predictions about the computer's potential to improve writing by encouraging revision illustrate some of the difficulties inherent in the assumptions made by researchers during the 1980s. Writing researchers had documented that different types of writers revised in different ways. Experienced writers seemed able to view their texts from the perspective of readers and tended to revise in ways that led to changes in meaning and, consequently, to improved writing quality. Young or inexperienced writers seemed less able to view their texts from the perspective of readers, were less likely to rework their texts spontaneously, and, when they did revise, were less likely to do so in ways that led to changes in meaning and improved writing quality (Beach; Bridwell; Flower, "Writer-Based"; Perl; Sommers). Drawing on these and other conclusions from research in writing and linguistics, researchers postulated that using word processors would help students improve their writing by both revising more and revising more like experienced writers. For example, Richard Collier in his 1983 article "The Word Processor and Revision Strategies," lists four difficulties inexperienced writers have revising their work and concludes that "encouraging students to work at their writing, particularly revision, on a word processor would, one might guess, resolve most of these problems" (150). But research quickly began to show that while students did write more and revise more, their products weren't necessarily of higher quality than those they produced with pen and pencil. Increases in length tended to be accounted for by material added to the ends of texts, rather than by more fully developed
ideas, and increased revisions were only at the local or surface level (Anderson 1983; Beserra 1986; Collier 1983; Daiute, 1984, 1985; Duling 1985; Kurth 1987; Moore 1987; Nichols 1984; Posey 1986). A few studies even found no evidence of increased revisions or decreases in some types of revisions (Coulter 1986; Harris 1985; Hawisher 1987).

Expectations that the computer could improve student writing by making revision easier reflect two of the basic limitations of the treatment approach taken in much computer-enhanced composition research. First, the approach takes into account only a very small portion of the computer's possible effects on both the students and the composition classroom. Second, it predicts that these limited effects will be unrealistically large. Consequently, the researchers frequently have been disappointed by their results.

Because of the treatment effect sought by many researchers, studies often took the form of media comparisons that used either pre- and post-measures or experimental and control groups to discover the differences between students' writing with the computer and with pen and paper. The media comparison approach taken by computer-enhanced composition researchers is far from unique. As Gavriel Salomon and Howard Gardner point out, "The question 'Does it teach better than . . . ?' dominated media research for decades" (14). Discussing the impact of this approach on research on instructional television, Salomon and Gardner observed that implicit in the question "Does it teach better than . . . ?" posed in most early instructional television research was the
hidden assumption that all television versions were the same and that, therefore, any television program was suitable for such a comparison (Salomon and Gardner 14). Thus televised "talking heads" were frequently compared to live versions of lecturing teachers supplying the same information. As anyone who has ever viewed an inexperienced weather reporter stumbling through the text of a weather bulletin while vaguely gesturing toward a cloud map can imagine, the results of such studies sent instructional television into a tailspin from which it has taken years to recover.

Like those conducting early investigations into instructional television, researchers studying computer-enhanced composition have tended to speak of "the computer" as if differences in hardware and software capabilities were of little or no importance. While writing a review of the research on word processing and student writers, I discovered that some researchers did not identify the hardware and software with which their experiments were completed, and most neglected to describe the specific features of either the computers or the word processing packages (Ertel 14). Yet, for experimental studies seeking a treatment effect, hardware and software variables could be of critical importance. As Salomon and Gardner point out,

Researchers have learned that only specific, relatively unique features of a medium make a difference. Thus television researchers replaced the search for average effects of the medium . . . with more refined questions . . . . One could easily remain unclear about the nature of the 'it' in the conclusion that 'it makes a difference. . .' unless one had conceptualized . . . and manipulated that particular attribute to which learning outcomes are to be attributed. (14)
The tendency to regard computer hardware and software as a monolithic block may help to explain why the results of experimental studies of computers and composing have so often been inconsistent, inconclusive, and even contradictory (Ertel). These studies may have obtained different outcomes partly because they were measuring different "its."

A second limitation of media comparison studies is the necessity for holding instructional variables constant. As Salomon and Gardner point out, "As research on television has taught us, knowing the typical effects of a particular attribute (which may be underutilized or poorly designed) is different from knowing the effects it can be made to have" (15). Therefore, "the failure to find profound effects on word processors may have little to do with the qualities of such tools and far more . . . with the way word processing is taught" (Salomon and Gardner 18). As I point out in the discussion of these studies which appears later in this chapter, only recently have a number of researchers begun to investigate pedagogies which actively seek to teach students how to exploit the capabilities of particular hardware and software combinations in their writing.

Andrea Herrman has noted another difficulty associated with much early research. Its foundational question, "Will word processing improve student writing? implies a simple yes or no answer. But measuring and judging improvements in how students write and the texts they produce is not so simple. Many of these studies looked at writing in terms of quantifiable features such as length, frequency and types of revision, number and types of errors, and scores
on holistic and analytic tests. Herrman questions whether features such as the number of errors, the number of revisions, or the length of texts account for all, or even the most important, aspects of determining improvement: "Can we really assume that writing quality is related to length? Isn't shorter just as likely to be better, since it is generally difficult to write short pieces well" (128)? Referring to Gail Hawisher's 1989 analysis of studies of word processing and composing, Herrman also points out Hawisher's observation that since the studies arrived at their results using different methods of textual analysis, their conclusions, although often expressed in the same quantifiable terms, aren't comparable. Finally, Herrman argues that even if the researchers had used the same instruments in the same way so that error counts, number of revisions, and other quantifiable features could be compared, the result would still be of limited value because "Understanding the role such features play in the creation of a written text is frequently impossible without a comprehensive understanding of the writer and the context in which the writing developed" (129). Following in the footsteps of scholars on whose work they were attempting to build, researchers studying computer-enhanced composition focused on the written products and composing processes of isolated writers; the ways in which the presence of the technology influenced or might be made to influence the writing context were rarely considered.

Despite arguments which undermine the assumptions of research based on the presumption that "the computer" will by itself improve student writing and
the inability of a decade of research to consistently demonstrate such an effect, the belief that word processing alone can improve student writing persists. Although, as I will discuss in the next section, many researchers have begun to explore other issues, in four of the five studies on computers and writing reported in the most recent "Annotated Bibliography" published in Research in the Teaching of English, the fundamental issue still seems to be whether or not the computer improves students’ writing.

Conclusions from Early Research

Amid the complexity of outcomes and the limitations associated with early studies, a number of scholars have nevertheless observed that the existing research, along with the large number of informal observations made by both teachers and scholars, points toward several tentative conclusions. Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Cynthia Paris, and Jessica Kahn have formulated these conclusions into a series of five propositions which I will reduce and restate here to summarize what can reasonably be said about the relationships between computers, particularly word processing, and student writing.

Proposition One: Using word processing affects the composing processes of student writers.

Along with this general proposition, it is possible to make several more specific observations. First, students often make a greater number of surface-level revisions and error corrections, but in the absence of specific instruction, they do not tend to make more changes affecting the
meaning of their texts with word processing than without. Students who use word processing accompanied by computer prompting make more changes which affect the meaning of their texts than students who use word processing alone or students who write with pen and paper, but prompting is most effective for students with weakly developed writing skills. Second, without instructional intervention from their teachers or computer prompting, students tend to use word processing to support their current composing behaviors so that students who have better developed writing and revising skills use word processing more successfully without instruction than students who have less developed skills. Finally, when used in combination with pedagogies that invite students to view writing as a meaning-making activity, word processing helps students view their texts as fluid rather than static and increases the number of changes affecting meaning which students make, although, as Proposition Two suggests, it does not necessarily result in overall increased writing quality.

Proposition Two: Using word processing affects the quality and quantity of student writing.

Specifically, once they have developed basic keyboarding skills, many students produce slightly longer texts, write more texts, write more often and for longer durations, and produce neater, more error-free texts
with word processing than without. They do not, however, produce texts of higher overall quality.

**Proposition Three: Student writers respond positively to word processing.**

Many researchers and teachers have noted positive affective outcomes when using word processing. Students generally like using computers to write, and their attitudes toward writing often improve when they begin to use word processing. These observations are not only consistent across most studies, but also seem to be persistent, suggesting that the positive affective changes associated with the use of word processing are more than "halo effects."

**Proposition Four: After an initial learning period, students are able to master keyboarding and word processing skills for use in age-appropriate writing tasks.**

Although some early reports mentioned that some students had trouble mastering the technology, improvements in equipment and word processing programs seem to have reduced or eliminated many of these difficulties. For the most part, students seem to have only minor keyboarding problems and can quickly master basic word processing functions with minimal instruction.
Proposition Five: The social organization of classrooms, the goals and strategies of teachers, and the ways that word processing are used for writing are interrelated.

The most basic outcome supporting this proposition is the observation that teachers use word processing in their classrooms in different ways. How word processing is used and the effects of word processing in classrooms depend on the larger culture of the school environment, the goals and strategies of individual teachers, the social organizations of classrooms, and students' skills, all of which change over time. However, at least one observation consistently recurs in discussions about the effects of computers on writing classrooms: the physical requirements of word processing change the social arrangements in classrooms tending to make writing more public and leading to new patterns of interactions, frequently including increased collaboration among students as they write.

Taken together these propositions suggest that the effects of word processing on students depend not on the computer alone, but on the totality of the instructional context into which it is placed. Since most early studies focused on discovering the isolated effects of word processing on individual writers, what we know about the interaction of word processing and instructional contexts is largely the result of informal reports and work completed during the closing years of the eighties and beginning years of the nineties as scholars within the
area of computer-enhanced composition gradually broadened their research agendas.

**New Directions in Computer-Enhanced Composition Research**

**The Social-Epistemic View in Composition Studies**

Although composition studies had coalesced around a process-centered model of writing when research into the use of computers in writing classrooms began, the discipline was not unified by a single theory of composing. In "Competing Theories of Process," Lester Faigley delineated three major perspectives on the composing process: an expressive view, which emphasizes the 'authentic voice' and personal growth of the writer; a cognitive view, which focuses on developmental stages in the life of the writer or on the ways in which the writer processes information during a given writing task; and a social view, which contends that processes of writing are social in character instead of originating within individual writers. James Berlin noted similar divisions within composition studies in his monograph *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. His taxonomy of the rhetorics underlying composition pedagogies from 1960 to 1975 included the categories of objective, subjective, and transactional rhetorics (139-179). Berlin classified what Faigley called the "expressive view" under subjective rhetoric, and placed under transactional rhetoric the "cognitive" and "social views," the latter of which he terms "epistemic" (meaning that it involves the generation as well as the transmission of knowledge). According to Berlin, objective rhetoric assumes the
existence of a reality external to the knower which the writer can faithfully record. Subjective rhetoric is based on the conviction that reality is a personal and private construct. In contrast, Berlin explained, transactional rhetoric "discovers reality in the interaction of the features of the rhetorical process itself-in the interaction of material reality, writer, audience, and language" (155). Berlin observed that rhetorics within both the subjective and transactional categories seemed, particularly since 1975, to be moving toward an epistemic view that regarded rhetoric as principally a method of discovering and even creating knowledge, frequently within socially defined discourse communities.

Much of the work in composition studies during the 1980s reflected a movement toward the social-epistemic view of composing identified by Faigley and Berlin. Embracing this view, a number of scholars moved away from an exclusive focus on individual writers and internal cognitive processes toward inquiries into the wider social and political contexts of writing. For example, Charles Bazerman studied the social and rhetorical conventions used by published writers in the social and physical sciences. Anne Herrington and Carol Berkenkotter reported on the difficulties student writers encounter as they learn the conventions appropriate to writing in engineering and the social sciences, and Patricia Bizzell and David Bartholomae theorized that inexperienced college writers need to appropriate the scholarly language of the academic community before they can write effectively for an academic audience. Andrea Lunsford, Lisa Ede, Kenneth Bruffee, and Kenneth Kantor also investigated the
implications of a social view for teaching and learning within classrooms and advocated pedagogical strategies which emphasize shared learning activities. In contrast to the work of these and other scholars, the majority of work done on computers and composing during the 1980s was primarily informed by a cognitive view of composing.

The Social-Epistemic View in Computer-Enhanced Composition

Not until the late eighties did the rhetoric of computer-enhanced composition begin to demonstrate a concern for the implications of computer technology in the creation of knowledge and in the social contexts of classrooms. As a number of scholars studying computer-enhanced composition shifted their positions toward the social-epistemic view of rhetoric, questions like whether students revise more frequently when using word processors than when writing with pen and paper that dominated the work in computer-enhanced composition during the early eighties began to be replaced, or at least complemented by broader, more open-ended questions about the nature of word-processed texts and the role of the computer within classrooms. As the area of computer-enhanced composition has developed, it has finally caught up with its parent discipline, and has begun to regard the computer not simply as a writing instrument which may affect individual writers, but as a tool, a technology which forms part of the context of writing and can be used to promote specific ends. Many salient questions for research and scholarship to explore result from this view. What, for example, are the influences of computers within a given
context? What ends do we use the computer to promote and how? What ends can we use the computer to promote and how? And, increasingly, what ends should we use the computer to promote and how?

Although scholars are only beginning to look for answers to such questions, many have begun to suggest that those of us within composition studies who use computer technology must do so more critically than in the past.

As Carolyn Handa argues:

Emerging at a particular period in time, in a particular social context, the computer is a tool reflecting the politics and ideology of both. Clearly, then, those of us using computers to teach composition in our classrooms . . . must be aware of these implications . . . (161)

Unfortunately, as Gail Hawisher and Cynthia Selfe point out in "The Rhetoric of Technology and the Electronic Writing Class," many writing instructors who use computers continue to express unguarded enthusiasm for the technology and incorporate computers into their classrooms without pausing to reflect on the more problematic aspects of the technology (55). Such teachers may unconsciously promote—sometimes even as they seek to avoid—traditional societal hierarchies and values which the computer, as cultural artifact, embodies:

In many English composition classes, computer use simply reinforces those traditional notions of education that permeate our culture at its most basic level: teachers talk, students listen; teachers’ contributions are privileged; students respond in predictable, teacher-pleasing ways. (55).

Just as the computer by itself has not been shown to improve the overall quality of student writing, the computer by itself seems unlikely to automatically improve
the overall climate of writing classrooms. This responsibility rests largely with the administrators who create and manage computer-enhanced composition programs and with the teachers who teach within these programs.

The Present Study

In the remaining pages of this dissertation, I present case studies of two computer-enhanced composition programs and four teachers who teach within these programs. I describe the origins, development, and present goals of these programs, focusing on these broad questions:

What beliefs about computers inform these programs?

What did the developers of these programs hope to gain through the use of computers?

How they have used computers to reach these goals?

How have their beliefs and objectives evolved over time?

The case studies of teachers focus on the knowledge, beliefs, and practices of the teachers. Each addresses these basic questions:

What do the teachers know and believe about computer technology and how did they acquire their knowledge, beliefs, and skills?

What do they know and believe about computers and writing and how did they acquire their knowledge and beliefs?

How do they translate their knowledge and beliefs into pedagogy and practice within their classrooms?

I also explore two questions concerning the relationship between the computer-enhanced composition programs and the teachers:
To what extent are the teachers’ goals and practices consistent with those of the computer-enhanced composition programs in which they teach?

How have the teachers adapted their goals and practices to those of the computer-enhanced composition programs in which they teach?

While my goal is simply to illuminate the beliefs and practices of the administrators and teachers in these case studies, my hope is that this project will contribute to the continuing conversation about the use of computers in composition instruction and the implications of computer-enhanced composition programs on the knowledge, training, and pedagogy of composition teachers and the structure, administration, and curriculum of composition programs and English departments.
CHAPTER II

Methodology

Rationale for the Study

In the "Introduction" to Part Four of *Evolving Perspectives on Computers and Composition Studies* Gail Hawisher and Cynthia Selfe observe:

How computers are introduced into our society and, particularly into our schools is ultimately a political question with serious implications for us as teachers, as members of school or university communities, and as citizens... Power now belongs, to a great extent, to those members of our society who can use technology to access and manipulate the expanding world of information... Given this situation, our use of computers in English classrooms must be carefully considered and monitored to ensure that we are achieving those goals we deem most important as humanists and teachers.(275)

Similarly, in "The Politics of Writing Programs," an article which appears in *Evolving Perspectives*, James Strickland contends that "the power of the computer belongs to those who have one, and to those who control who may use it and to what purpose" (300). Strickland argues that the introduction of computers into composition involves "those issues most vigorously contested in the profession today," such as the power and authority of writers and the changing status of the profession. He concludes that in considering the consequences of the presence of computers in writing programs, we "need studies that look at how pragmatic decisions shape theory and how theoretical politics drives practice" (314).
Given such conditions, the goals and beliefs embodied in computer-enhanced composition programs and the knowledge, skills, and beliefs of teachers who teach in those programs become critically important. Since the administrators of computer-enhanced composition programs and the teachers who teach in these programs directly determine who uses computers and how computers are used in writing classes, their goals, beliefs, knowledge, and skills may in large measure determine what changes using computers will bring to students, to composition teachers, to writing programs, and to the field of composition and rhetoric.

But despite the interest researchers in computers and composition have expressed recently in the context for the use of computers in writing classes and calls for research such as Strickland's, relatively little research into the goals and beliefs of college computer-enhanced composition program administrators and writing teachers who use computers in their classrooms exists. Clearly, inquiry into this important area is needed.

**Parameters for the Study**

In calling for research into the pragmatic and theoretical consequences of the presence of computers in composition, James Strickland observes that we must realize that political questions . . . have little to do with statistics and research. Most political issues are settled by narratives about "the way it is" at home . . . . These narratives are a political device, shaping our expectations about what is and what is not possible in writing programs with computers. We need to listen to each other and our stories about writing programs and what each program has done with computers. (314-15).
In this study, I describe "the way it is" and how it came to be that way in two computer-enhanced composition programs and the classrooms of four teachers, two within each program.

Using case studies, I trace the development of the programs, explore the beliefs and goals reflected in the programs, and examine the relationship between the programs and the teachers who teach within them. I also examine what knowledge of computers and computer skills these teachers possess, how these teachers acquired their knowledge and skills, what these teachers believe about computers and writing, and how they translate their knowledge, skills, and beliefs into practice within their classrooms.

The research paradigm guiding this study of computer-enhanced college writing programs and teachers is naturalistic. I chose this paradigm because it presents an opportunity to reflect the complexity of the human beings and human contexts included in the study more fully than alternative research paradigms such as the experimental or scientific paradigm. Therefore, before describing the design and methods of the study in detail, I will provide an overview of naturalistic inquiry and discuss its benefits and limitations.

**The Nature of Naturalistic Inquiry**

**Assumptions and Features of Naturalistic Inquiry**

In using the term naturalistic to describe this study, I refer not to the study's methods or design, but rather to the basic assumptions and axioms that underlie the inquiry. As Egon Guba and Yvonna Lincoln point out, research
paradigms are not differentiated by their surface features. The case study method, for example, can be used within the naturalistic paradigm or within the positivistic paradigm with which naturalistic research is often contrasted. Guba and Lincoln argue that

paradigms differ from one another on matters much more fundamental than the locale in which the inquiry is conducted, the format of the inquiry report, or the nature of the methods used—namely, they differ on the basic axioms on which they rest. (233)

As explicated by Guba and Lincoln, the naturalistic paradigm has five basic assumptions or axioms. These concern: 1) the nature of reality; 2) the inquirer-subject relationship; 3) the nature of knowledge claims; 4) the attribution and explanation of action; and 5) the role of values in inquiry.

1) The nature of reality

The naturalistic paradigm assumes there are multiple, divergent realities which can be studied only holistically, and that prediction and control are unlikely outcomes, although some level of understanding can be reached.

2) The inquirer-subject relationship

The naturalistic paradigm assumes that researchers and subjects, especially human subjects, interact and influence one another. The researcher must minimize, but ultimately acknowledge the inevitability of this mutual influence and account for it.
3) The nature of knowledge claims

   The naturalistic paradigm assumes that its knowledge claims are
temporally and contextually bound. However, some transferability
of hypotheses from situation to situation may be possible
depending on the degree of temporal and contextual similarity.

4) Attribution and explanation of action

   The naturalistic paradigm assumes that actions may be explained
only in terms of the multiple interacting factors that shape them
and are part of them.

5) The role of values in inquiry

   The naturalistic paradigm assumes that inquiry is always influenced
by the values of the researcher, the values of the paradigm which
guides the inquiry, the values embodied in the choice and
formulation of the problem, the values reflected in the methods
used to gather and analyze the data, and the values of the context
in which the inquiry takes place. Its data, therefore, present a
story to be read; they do not and cannot speak for themselves.

Because naturalistic researchers regard reality as composed of complex, socially
constructed realities, they regard their research task as coming to understand
how the participants in the study construct the world around them and
interpreting the relationships among and within these constructions (Glesne and
Peshkin 6). This task gives rise to a number of features or characteristics that,
while they should not be taken to define naturalistic inquiry, are frequently associated with naturalistic studies.

As the name implies, naturalistic studies take place in natural settings. Researchers study the setting "as is" without imposing constraints or manipulating conditions to meet specific criteria. Naturalistic researchers also avoid forming a priori hypotheses, believing that hypotheses carried into a setting "reflect more the conceptual framework of the investigator than that of those being observed" (Brice Heath 34). Consequently, naturalistic researchers are required to maintain what Michael Patton calls an "active-reactive-adaptive" stance, operating inductively to create working hypotheses as they collect and analyze data (18). Similarly, naturalistic researchers adapt their research designs to the setting and in many studies, allow designs to emerge gradually as their studies progress. To capture the complex, multiple nature of the realities they seek to describe and increase the "trustworthiness" of the data, most naturalistic researchers utilize a combination of methods of data collection and report the data collected and the means and methods of collection "in depth and in detail" (Patton 22). The most frequently used data collection techniques are participant-observation, interviewing, and the examination of artifacts such as documents or records (Glesne and Peshkin 24). These techniques depend heavily on researchers as instruments for collecting and analyzing data.

These characteristic features contribute to both the advantages and problems associated with naturalistic inquiries.
Advantages of Naturalistic Methodos

Proponents of the use of naturalistic inquiry in educational and social research have pointed to numerous benefits they associate with this mode of inquiry. Commonly cited advantages are the relevance of the findings, the "fit" between naturalistic designs and "real world" conditions, and the "sensitivity" of the researcher as an instrument for collecting and analyzing data.

Many proponents of naturalistic inquiry argue that its results are more likely to be relevant to educators than results derived from experimental research. For example, composition scholar/teacher Donald Graves criticizes traditional experimental research for its "context-stripping" techniques, arguing that the data derived from experimental studies of how children learn to write are "sterile," and cannot be transferred to the "alive and inquiring faces" teachers actually encounter in their classrooms (Graves 918). Discussing the increasing use of ethnography in educational research, Shirley Brice-Heath observes, "Gradually, many educators have begun to realize that large scale surveys, correlational studies, and exclusively quantitative studies do not provide actual data about events either in the classroom or the communities of students and teachers" (43). Similarly, Guba and Lincoln contend that the results of experimental research in education "have so little meaning that the effort to apply them is wasted" (235). To scholars like Graves, those referred to by Heath, and Guba and Lincoln, the fact that naturalistic inquiries examine "real world" settings and "real people" is one of its primary advantages.
The relatively unobtrusive methods associated with naturalistic inquiry also "fit" the actual conditions of classrooms and other social settings better than the more intrusive and manipulative methods associated with experimental designs. Guba and Lincoln argue, for example, that the random sampling demanded by most experimental designs is a virtual impossibility in most educational settings and conclude, "Finding a paradigm that can tolerate real world conditions surely makes more sense than manipulating those conditions to meet the arbitrary design requirements of a paradigm" (234). They also observe that random assignment to treatments, a requirement of experimental designs, entails ethical as well as practical complications (234). If, for example, a researcher believes a treatment is beneficial, withholding this treatment from those it could help for the purpose of testing it experimentally requires that scientific values be elevated above ethical ones.

Another advantage of naturalistic inquiry is the involvement of the researcher. As a primary instrument for data collection, researchers can "come to understand and are able to show the complexity, the contradictions, and the sensibility of social interactions" (Glesne and Peshkin 7). Within naturalistic inquiries, therefore, the researchers' "personal and subjective judgments are not only permitted, but essential to the research enterprise" (Kantor and others 297).

Problems with Naturalistic Inquiry

Problems associated with naturalistic inquiries center on three major issues: internal validity, external validity, and reliability. These terms, borrowed
from experimental inquiry, refer to the basic criteria which determine the status
of an inquiry's knowledge claims, or, to use the term coined by Guba, the
"trustworthiness" of its findings. Internal validity involves objectivity and
confirmability. Critics of naturalistic inquiry often raise concerns about the
internal validity of naturalistic studies because of the status of naturalistic
researchers as participant-observers. As participant-observers, researchers may
project biases on to the data or succumb to the human predilection to "find what
we look for." Researchers may also fail to distinguish, capture, or faithfully
record the relevant data. Another concern related to internal validity involves
the problem of "reactivity" or possibility that the presence of the researchers will
affect the setting or responses of the participants in the study.

External validity, the next criterion of trustworthiness, refers to the
generalizability of an inquiry's findings or the extent to which results are
comparable across individuals within a group or across groups. Within
experimental inquiries, external validity is established by randomizing, stratifying,
or ensuring in some other statistically reliable way that the population studied is
representative. Because naturalistic inquiries focus on particular cases rather
than representative samples, they do not produce findings which can be readily
generalized. Consequently, some critics question the value of the results of
naturalistic studies.

Reliability, the remaining criterion of trustworthiness, is a matter of
replicability, the ability to repeat an inquiry in another place and time. Within
the experimental paradigm, discrepancies between the results obtained from repetitions of the same study indicate error or unreliability. Since naturalistic inquiries take place within natural settings and often involve emergent research designs, they can never be replicated exactly. Critics of naturalistic inquiry therefore wonder how errors within naturalistic studies can be detected and how the dependability of naturalistic findings can be determined.

Proponents of naturalistic inquiry have sometimes responded to these concerns by arguing for the "sophisticated rigor" of naturalistic inquiry. For example, advocates and practitioners of naturalistic inquiry have suggested several means of minimizing threats to internal and external validity and determining reliability, including the "triangulation" of data, the inclusion of "member checks" and the use of "thick description." Evaluation researcher Michael Patton defines "triangulation" as "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomena or programs" (108). Triangulation decreases the likelihood of selective perception and subjective analysis by permitting researchers to cross-check a variety of data sources, data collection methods, perspectives, or theories against one another. In addition to triangulating data, naturalistic researchers can also test the objectivity and accuracy of their interpretations through member checks, the practice of asking participants to review the researchers' presentation of the data. Discussing the value of member checks in establishing the credibility of findings, Guba and Lincoln assert:
Naturalists do have at least indirect access to the multiple realities they deal with: since these realities are in the minds of people, . . . naturalists can ask those people whether their realities have been represented appropriately. (247)

Internal and external validities and reliability can also be increased through the use of "thick description," the practice of systematically describing data and the methods and conditions of data collection in great detail. The requirement for systematically recording and reporting data in detail contributes to internal validity by both enabling and encouraging researchers to tie their interpretations closely to the data; it also provides a basis for judging the credibility of the researchers' interpretations. For example, discussing ethnography, a form of naturalistic inquiry, anthropologist Clifford Geertz concludes that because of its thick description, ethnography's "freedom to shape itself in terms of its internal logic is rather limited" (244). Guba and Lincoln contend that thick description also contributes to establishing both external validity and reliability. Discussing external validity, they point out that although naturalistic inquiry discounts the existence of "context-free laws" which have "enduring truth value," some transferability of findings is possible if thick description is available "to facilitate judgments about the extent to which working hypotheses from that context might be transferable to a second and similar context" (248). Guba and Lincoln also conclude that thick description which "delineates all methodological steps and decision points and which provides access to all data in their several raw and process stages" provides an "audit trail" that can be used to judge the reliability of a naturalistic inquiry (248).
In addition to defending the rigor of naturalistic inquiry, proponents of
the naturalistic mode have answered critics by suggesting that claims of validity
and reliability in experimental studies are also questionable. Eliot Mishler, a
critic of experimental inquiry, has argued, for example, that no study is truly
"replicable." Absolute replicability would require the use of identical subjects,
materials, and instruments which is impossible even in the natural sciences
(Mishler 4). Similarly, Guba has responded to concerns about subjectivity and
reactivity by observing that work in the hard sciences has "aptly demonstrated"
that "findings emerge from the interaction of inquirer and inquired into" (20).
He cites Heisenberg’s famous Uncertainty Principle and the Bohr
Complementarity Principle to support his assertion.

Finally, proponents of naturalistic inquiry have contended that criticisms
of naturalistic inquiry based on criteria derived from experimental inquiry are
simply invalid because naturalistic inquiry reflects a fundamentally different view
of reality. For example, while contending that some generalizability or
"transferability" is possible, Guba and Lincoln reject the need for naturalistic
studies to possess external validity. Unlike experimental studies, naturalistic
studies do not attempt to confirm existing hypotheses or demonstrate the
existence of generalizable laws; in fact, naturalistic inquiry denies the existence of
such laws (247). The purpose of naturalistic inquiry is to provide an
understanding of particular cases through close examination and description, and
whatever insights emerge are acknowledged to be tentative as well as temporally
and contextually bound. Ultimately, the value or relevance of a naturalistic study is determined by practitioners and other researchers and depends on the extent to which its findings can be applied to their own situations or to which its findings suggest areas and working hypotheses for their own research. Such relevance emerges from particularization rather than generalization, from revealing differences as well as similarities among situations.

These "defenses" of naturalistic inquiry remind me of the defense presented by a poor servant woman in a Hindu proverb who was accused of damaging and failing to return a cooking pot borrowed from the kitchen of her rich employer. Realizing the magistrate was unlikely to take her word over that of her prominent and well-respected employer, the poor servant decided to offer every possible argument and hope the magistrate would accept at least one. She argued first that the pot was in perfect condition when she returned it. Then she asserted that the pot was already damaged when she borrowed it. Finally, she contended that she had never borrowed the pot. Like the poor servant woman, proponents of naturalistic inquiry are in the position of challenging an established and respected authority--experimental inquiry. While it is possible to simply dismiss concerns about validity and reliability as irrelevant given the foundational assumptions of naturalistic inquiry, until naturalistic inquiry achieves a level of respectability and orthodoxy comparable to that of experimental inquiry, practitioners of naturalistic inquiry may continue to find their research evaluated according to criteria established for and by experimental inquiry.
Under these circumstances, they may do well to continue to follow the practice of the poor servant woman and "defend" naturalistic inquiry using all available arguments.

**Research Questions Guiding the Study**

As Hawisher and Selfe argued in the quotation with which I began this chapter, if we want to be certain that we are achieving those goals we consider most important "as humanists and teachers," when computers are introduced into writing classrooms, we must know how computers are being used and why they are being used in these ways. A descriptive study of computer-enhanced composition programs and teachers who teach within in them is one way of gaining insight into these important issues.

This study, therefore, involves two kinds of case studies: case studies of composition programs in which computers are used and case studies of teachers using computers within their classes. The case studies of the two programs are guided by four broad questions:

1. What goals did the program developers and administrators hope to meet through developing computer-enhanced writing instruction?

2. Have these goals changed or evolved, and, if so, how?

3. How successfully have these goals been met?

4. How do these goals relate to those of the teachers who teach within them?
The four teacher case studies are guided by five questions:

1. What knowledge of computers and computer skills do the teachers possess and how did they acquire their knowledge and skills?

2. What do the teachers know and believe about computers and writing and how did they acquire their knowledge and beliefs?

3. How do the teachers use their knowledge about computers, computer skills, and their knowledge and beliefs about computers and writing in their computer-enhanced writing classes?

4. To what extent are the teachers’ goals and practices consistent with those of the developers and administrators of the computer-enhanced composition program in which they teach?

5. How have the teachers adapted their goals and practices to those of the developers and administrators of the computer-enhanced composition program in this which they teach?

**Design of the Study**

**Overview**

My project reports case studies of two computer-enhanced composition programs and four teachers, two from each program. All case studies were conducted during Spring Quarter, 1992. I use the case-study method to describe what the participants know about computers, what they believe about computers and writing, and how they enact their knowledge and beliefs in their programs and classrooms. My role is that of a participant-observer, and my approach is naturalistic since I do not attempt to manipulate or impose influences upon the programs or the teachers.
Selection of Sites and Participants

I examine programs and teachers in two very different contexts, a metropolitan community college, which I shall refer to as Middleton Community College or MCC, and a large research university, which I shall refer to as Center State University or CSU. Participants in the program case studies and the case study teachers have also been assigned pseudonyms. The two programs and the four teachers reflect the very different missions of these institutions. My selection of these institutions does not imply an attempt at representative sampling. Rather, I hope that differences between these settings will provide the perspective and contrast necessary to allow describable images to emerge from the chaotic stream of experience. I believe the case histories and current profiles of these programs and teachers, while only a fraction of the many possible histories and profiles, provide useful contrasts and offer insights into the evolution and current status of computer-enhanced composition instruction.

To compensate for the possibility that some participants would drop out of the study, six case studies of teachers were conducted. Although one teacher dropped out of the study before data collection began and was replaced, all six teachers from whom data were collected completed the study. To reduce the data to an amount manageable under the time and other constraints under which I am working, I elected to analyze and report only four of these case studies. Since Margaret also participated in the MCC Program Case Study, I chose not to report the teacher case study I conducted of her. The CSU teacher
whose case study I have chosen not to report was Susan. Because she is no longer at CSU, I reasoned that contacting Susan to clarify issues and answer questions that might come up as I analyzed the data would be more difficult than contacting the other two teachers from CSU.

Since I am interested in the evolution of computer-enhanced instruction in composition, I elected to study only programs which had been operating for several years. I selected MCC and CSU based on my proximity to them and the duration of their computer-enhanced composition programs; both had offered computer-enhanced writing instruction since the late 1980s.

Discussing the use of computers in composition instruction at the college level, James Strickland notes that computers have been introduced as "serious academic components" within composition programs, whether these programs are "broadly defined within a curriculum such as a first-year composition program, or within a location encouraging writing, typically a writing center" (301). Both kinds of programs described by Strickland are represented in this study. At MCC the computer-enhanced composition program is based in the Writing Center. At CSU the Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program is defined primarily by its curriculum. This curriculum was originally the first-year composition course, but has now expanded to include basic writing, upper-division undergraduate composition, and literature courses.

 Although my selection of teacher-participants was ultimately restricted by practical considerations such as the willingness of the teachers to participate and
the compatibility of the teachers’ schedules, I initially tried to include participants whose computer-enhanced classes reflected the range of computer-enhanced writing instruction at their institution. In Spring Quarter, 1992, the computer-enhanced writing courses scheduled at MCC were basic writing and introductory composition; the computer-enhanced writing courses scheduled at CSU were basic writing, first-year composition, and upper-division writing courses. Because of scheduling and other problems, I was unable to secure the participation of a basic writing teacher at either site. The three participants from MCC all taught introductory composition classes. At CSU two participants taught first-year composition and one participant taught an upper-division writing course. In addition to attempting to represent the range of classes, I also wanted to select teachers whose computer skills and experience teaching computer-enhanced writing reflected the different skills and experience among teachers teaching computer-enhanced writing at each institution. At MCC, I determined the potential participants’ computer skills and experience based on information provided by their chairpersons and on self-reports provided by the teachers during my initial contact; at CSU I gathered this information from the Computer Coordinator and from the teachers’ self-reports. The skills and experience of each teacher are described within each teacher’s case study.

Once I had identified the potential sites, I contacted the English and Developmental English Chairpersons at MCC and the Coordinator of the Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature (CEWL) Program at CSU by
phone. I explained the nature of my project and secured permission to conduct the study at their sites. I asked the Chairpersons and the Coordinator to assist me in identifying the individuals most knowledgeable about the history and operation of the programs. At MCC these individuals were the two faculty members who wrote the proposal for MCC’s computer-enhanced Writing Center and the Manager of the Writing Center. At CSU these individuals were the Coordinator of the CEWL Program and the faculty member who wrote the grant to obtain funding for CSU’s original computer-enhanced writing project. I also asked the Chairpersons and the Coordinator to identify teachers who might participant in the study at this time.

Initially, I contacted each of these individuals by phone, except the Coordinator of the CEWL Program with whom I had already spoken, to explain my project and request their participation. All tentatively agreed to participate, and I arranged to meet with them to discuss the project and their participation in more detail. Prior to our meetings, I sent each potential participant in the program case studies a packet containing a cover letter, a research abstract, a description of data collection activities, a timetable for data collection activities, a list of materials to be collected, my credentials, and a copy of the agreement participants would be required to sign if they elected to participate in the study (Appendix A).

I met with the prospective participants in the program case study of MCC in their offices during the first week of Spring Quarter. During these meetings I
answered the participants’ questions about the study, reviewed the types of
documents I wanted to examine, and obtained the participants’ signed
participant agreements. I arranged to collect the program-related documents the
next week and to interview the participants in the MCC program case study
during the week after I received the documents. Since the two faculty
developers had worked on the Writing Center project together, the developers
and I agreed to hold a joint interview.

At CSU I met with the faculty member who wrote the Program’s original
grant, but this was our last meeting. We discussed his involvement in CSU’s
computer-enhanced composition program for about half an hour, and he gave
permission to use the data he had provided during this discussion in the study.
He agreed to answer any questions I might have later, but he explained that
since his direct involvement in the Program was very limited, he felt he had little
to add beyond the data he had already provided. Because the CEWL Program
Coordinator had been called out of town on a family emergency, I did not speak
with him to discuss collecting documents and scheduling a long interview until
mid-quarter. When he returned to CSU, we spoke by phone, and I arranged to
collect the program-related documents during the following week. We agreed
hold the long interview near the end of the quarter.

Since only six teachers were scheduled to teach computer-enhanced
writing at MCC during Spring Quarter, 1992 (compared to thirty-one at CSU), I
identified the teacher-participants from MCC first. I initially contacted the six
potential participants from MCC by phone. After identifying myself and the purpose of my call, I explained the nature of the study and briefly outlined what would be required of participants. I also asked those teachers who did not volunteer this information to describe their computer skills and how long they had been teaching writing with computers. I sent the five teachers who expressed an interest in participating in the study a packet of materials similar to those I had sent to the potential program case study participants (Appendix A). After giving the teachers approximately one week to review these materials, I recontacted them by phone to determine if they would be willing to participate in the study; all five teachers agreed to participate. I selected three participants based on the criteria already outlined: a basic writing teacher, Max, and two teachers scheduled to teach introductory composition, Ann and Nancy.

However, citing numerous other commitments, Max dropped out of the study just before data collection was scheduled to begin. I replaced Max with one of the faculty developers who had already agreed to participate as a case study teacher if requested. The faculty developer, Margaret, was scheduled to teach introductory composition.

After I identified the teacher-participants from MCC, I contacted seven potential teacher-participants from CSU. Since few of the potential CSU teachers had telephones in their offices, I sent potential CSU teacher-participants a short note inquiring whether or not they would consider participating in the study. I also sent the project abstract, the description of the
data collection activities, and the timetable for data collection activities (Appendix A). Five of the seven teachers responded to my note and expressed interest in participating in the study. I sent these five teachers the remaining information that I had sent to the MCC teachers. Based on their teaching schedules and computer skills, I selected three CSU teacher-participants: Julie, who was a CEWL Program assistant and was scheduled to teach an upper-division writing class; Brian, who was scheduled to teach a first-year composition class; and Susan, who was also scheduled to teach a first-year composition class.

**Data Collection**

I obtained data on the programs from three sources: existing documents describing the programs and their origins and goals, interviews with key individuals responsible for developing and coordinating the programs, and direct observation. I gathered data about the teachers from five sources: a questionnaire designed to obtain information about the participants’ academic backgrounds, their computer skills and training, their experience teaching writing, and their personal, non-teaching uses of computers; documents such as syllabi, assignments, handouts, and lesson plans; a long interview in which I asked the teachers to describe their beliefs about computers and writing, their pedagogies, and their goals in teaching writing with computers; two weeks of direct classroom observations of each teacher (one week near midterm, a second toward the end of the quarter); and a post-observation interview.
Teacher Questionnaires.

I distributed questionnaires to the teachers during the second week of the quarter (Appendix A). I gave five of the teachers a self-addressed, stamped envelope and requested that they mail their completed questionnaires to me so that I could review them before I conducted long interviews during weeks four and five. I collected one teacher's completed questionnaire in person. I received all the completed questionnaires before conducting the teachers' long interviews.

Program Documents and Teacher's Class Materials.

For the program case studies, I began by collecting documents and materials. At MCC I obtained documents from both the faculty developers and the Writing Center Manager. The developers provided numerous documents generated during the development of the Writing Center, including their proposal for the Center and their preliminary drafts of this proposal. The Writing Center Manager provided documents related to the Center's operation including copies of training materials used and created in the Center; a copy of PC Write, one of the word processors used in the Center; and a description of the Center's mission and philosophy. The Manager also provided her resume, copies of her original and updated position descriptions, an outline of a workshop on computers she had created, and a copy of an article she had written about the Writing Center which appeared in a campus publication in 1989. At CSU I was given four three-ring binders containing information about
the CEWL Program compiled for a recent self-study undertaken by the CSU English Department. The documents contained in the binders were created by a number of individuals who had been or were currently associated with the Program and included copies of the original grant proposal for the computer-enhanced writing project, copies of subsequent grant proposals, samples and summaries of surveys of teachers and students, descriptions and results of research, a 1989 report on the Program compiled by two outside consultants, samples of the program's newsletter, samples of a journal of student writing published twice each quarter, sample syllabi, a five-year plan for the Program, and course descriptions and sample syllabi for classes offered through the Program. I obtained the binders from the Coordinator during the seventh week of the quarter. During the tenth week of the quarter, I asked for and was given samples of materials used during the CEWL Program's training workshops and sample copies of journals kept by teachers.

I received documents from the participating teachers either through the mail or in person when I collected their completed questionnaires. The documents included the teachers' syllabi, handouts used in their classes, and copies of their assignments. The specific materials collected from each teacher are listed and described in Chapters 3 and 4 in the teacher's individual case studies. I collected additional assignments and handouts from the teachers during my classroom observations.
Long Interviews.

I audio-taped long interviews with both the program participants and the case study teachers. I interviewed the participants from the MCC program case study during the third week of the quarter. I interviewed CSU's CEWL Program Coordinator during week ten and again during week eleven. Interviews with the participating teachers were conducted during weeks four and five. For the interviews with the participants in the program case studies, I constructed an interview schedule (i.e., list of questions) which I modified for each participant based on my review of the data in the documents the participants had provided. I followed a similar procedure for the teachers. The interview schedules for the program participants consisted of open-ended questions covering the participant’s background and training, the program’s mission and philosophy, the operation of the program, the participant’s relationships with faculty, administrators, and other individuals and units within and beyond the institution, and the participant’s general knowledge and opinions about the role of computers in composition and English studies. The teachers’ interview schedules consisted of open-ended questions covering the teacher’s experience using computers, beliefs about computers and writing instruction, training and experience teaching with and without computers, and uses of computers in teaching writing (Appendix A). I adjusted the interview schedules for the teachers to include specific questions about the class materials they had provided and their responses on the questionnaire. Although I used the prepared
schedules as guidelines, the interviews were quite informal, and discussions were not limited to the items on the prepared schedules. Following the procedures for conducting long qualitative interviews recommended by Seidman, I asked additional questions that occurred to me as the interview proceeded and encouraged participants to provide any information which they thought might be relevant to the study. Because of their "loose," open-ended structure, the duration of the interviews varied from approximately one and a half hours to approximately two and a half hours. The duration of individual interviews is provided near the beginning of each case study description. Except for the interview with the MCC faculty developers which took place in the home of one of the developers, all interviews were conducted in the participants' offices. The atmosphere during the interviews was relaxed and informal. All tape-recorded data from the long interviews were transcribed into print for analysis.

Site Visits and Classroom Observations.

During my long interview with the MCC Writing Center Manager, the Manager gave me a tour of the Center's facilities. During the tour, I made a list of the Center's hardware and software and recorded the physical arrangement of the classrooms and reception/tutorial area. I also observed part (the final ten minutes) of a tutorial session which was taking place as I completed the site visit.

During the first week of the quarter, I attended a workshop held in the CEWL Program's IBM-equipped classroom/lab. Conducted by two CEWL Program graduate assistants, the workshop was attended by twelve students and
provided an introduction to *Word for Windows*, the word processor used in the Program's IBM-equipped classroom. After the workshop, one of the graduate assistants gave me a tour of two of the CEWL Program's four other classroom/labs. During the workshop and tour, I recorded the physical arrangement of the three classroom/labs. I recorded the physical arrangements of the Program's two remaining classroom/labs during classroom observations of the participating teachers.

I observed each participating teacher's designated class for two weeks. Because I wanted to focus on how the participants used computers in their classes, I scheduled class visits during the middle and end portions of the quarter rather than earlier in the quarter when students would be adjusting to the class and still learning the basics of its computer system. Observations at MCC took place during weeks six and eight. Observations at CSU took place during weeks five and seven for two participants and during weeks seven and eight for the remaining participant. In some classes I acted strictly as an observer; in others, I was a participant-observer. I describe my exact role in each class in Chapters 3 and 4 within the descriptions of each teacher's case study. In all classes I took two kinds of notes. I recorded observational notes which described the activities during the class, the materials used, the participants, and the duration of the activities. I also took evaluative notes in which I recorded my impressions of the class and my speculations about the causes, effects, or relevance of events and
details. The evaluative notes are the basis for the commentaries which accompany the descriptions of my classroom observations.

**Post-Observation Interviews.**

I had hoped to conduct two post-observation interviews with each teacher, one following each of the weeks when I observed that teacher's class. In this way, I thought I could capture the teachers' impressions and evaluations of their classes while the events of the class were still fresh in their minds. However, because the teachers' schedules proved too hectic, I conducted only one post-observation interview with each teacher. For all but one of the teachers, this interview was conducted in the week following my last observation of the teacher's class. Prior to or during this interview, I gave these teachers a summary of my descriptive notes to review. During the interviews, we discussed the summaries, and I added details to some of my descriptions based on their comments. I also asked the teachers about some of the impressions I had recorded in my evaluative notes. Because of a scheduling problem with the remaining teacher (Julie), I conducted a short post-observation interview immediately after my last observation of her class. Although she reviewed only the summary of my first observation of her class at this time, she provided feedback on my second observation of her class when reviewing a draft of the descriptive portion of her case study during Fall Quarter, 1992. Although I audio-taped the post-observation interviews, these tapes were not transcribed.
When analyzing the teachers' case studies, I listened to the tapes and consulted the notes I had taken during these interviews.

Data Analysis

Data presented in the descriptions of the case studies correspond to the broad questions guiding the study. Adapting I. E. Seidman's procedures for studying and interpreting data from qualitative interviews, I categorized, reduced, and organized the data from the interview transcripts, documents, questionnaires, and field notes to produce a description of the various elements composing the individual case studies.

To maintain the authenticity of the case study descriptions, I tried to allow the participants to speak for themselves; I quoted participants frequently and at some length. Nevertheless, the case study descriptions, although "factual," are also "fictions," versions of reality that have been consciously constructed and narrated. To check the versions of reality I constructed against those of the participants, I submitted a working draft of the descriptive section of each case study to the participant or participants who had provided the data for review and comment. Participants were instructed on procedures for revising and commenting on the drafts in an original cover letter (sent to participants in the program case studies) and a revised cover letter (sent to participants in the teacher case studies) which accompanied the working drafts (Appendix A). Two participants requested to review the descriptions after the revisions they suggested had been incorporated. One of these two participants, who felt she
had been inaccurately represented in the original description, made her
continued participation in the study contingent upon revision of the descriptive
portion of her case study. Both participants who requested to review their case
studies were satisfied with the accuracy, authenticity, and fairness of the
descriptions after reviewing them a second time. Virtually all the revisions
suggested by all the participants were incorporated in the final drafts of the case
study descriptions. The descriptions of the case studies contained in Chapters 3
and 4 are, therefore, collaborative pieces, factual/fictive narratives that emerged
from the "dialogues" between myself and the participants.

Within the individual analyses and cross-analyses of the case studies, the
data are organized using the questions guiding the two types of case studies. I
carefully read each case study description and marked passages to indicate their
relevance to particular questions. I then grouped and analyzed these passages to
generate answers to the study questions.

In addition to marking data within the case study descriptions, I tabulated
three kinds of data from each of the teacher case studies. In order to facilitate
comparisons of the sources of the teachers’ knowledge about teaching writing
and teaching writing with computers, I combined and tabulated the teacher’s
responses to two questions from the pre-interview questionnaire concerning the
sources of their knowledge about teaching writing and about teaching writing
with computers (questions eight and twenty-two). I also tabulated the
assignments made by each teacher during my observations of that teacher’s class,
briefly describing the assignment, its format (written or oral, in-class or homework), and the medium in which the assignment was completed. Finally, to facilitate comparisons between the teachers' characterizations of their teaching with my observations of their teaching, I tabulated the activities I observed in the teachers' classes and their durations. I define "activities" as classroom events in which the students' participation (listening, observing, discussing, or writing) is directed or organized by the teacher. In the table, each activity is described by an action (such as lecturing, reviewing, writing) and classified by its setting (whole class, small group, or individual). Although distinctions between activities were usually clear during the observed classes, in a few cases, activities such as lecturing and discussing were intermingled making the nature of the event difficult to characterize. In such cases, I separated the constituent activities and listed them individually when this seemed possible; otherwise, I defined the event according to what seemed to be the primary activity (lecturing, discussing, modeling) involved. In several cases, events included "transitional periods" in which activities flowed together making the duration of each activity difficult to establish. In these cases, I divided the time of the transitional periods equally between the two activities.

I draw conclusions from the program and teacher case studies of MCC and CSU in the final chapter and discuss their implications for composition studies.
CHAPTER III

Great Beginnings: Computer-Enhanced Writing

at Middleton Community College

This case study of the computer-enhanced writing program at Middleton Community College (MCC) is to a large degree a tale of two programs—the program as it was conceived and planned by members of the writing faculty and the program as it emerged from the myriad of pragmatic and politically motivated modifications of these plans. The result of these changes is a program which in large measure neither reflects the philosophies and goals of the faculty nor supports their pedagogical needs.

In the remainder of this chapter, I trace how this bifurcation came to be and its effects upon computer-enhanced composition at MCC. I begin by discussing the history and development of computer-enhanced composition at MCC—describing the program both as conceived by the faculty members and as it was created and analyzing the causes and effects of decisions effecting the program. After describing and analyzing the program, I present case studies of two teachers who teach within the program—first describing their knowledge, skills, and goals, and then analyzing the impact of these elements on their pedagogy and their relationship to the program. Finally, I analyze the relationships between the program and the case study teachers, examining how
the teachers' goals relate to those of the program administrators' and how the teachers have adapted their goals and pedagogies to the program.

The College

Middleton Community College is a two-year college located in the heart of a medium-sized Midwestern city. Although MCC recently celebrated the centennial of the first classes held by its founder in the reading room of the local YMCA, billboards off the interstate highway that passes by the College and catchy, upbeat radio spots featuring the slogan "Middleton--A Great Place to Begin!" announce that it is a thoroughly modern institution. MCC began to operate at its present site and achieved its status as a state- and county-supported community college in the late 1960s. It now has twelve modern buildings (and will soon add another) and enrolls approximately 22,000 full- and part-time students. Most students come from Middleton, its county, and contiguous counties, and the student body reflects the ethnic make-up of these areas--predominantly white with a significant African-American minority. The average MCC student is twenty-seven years old, works full-time and attends classes part-time. MCC offers over sixty programs leading to associate degrees or certifications and has direct transfer agreements with several nearby universities where many of its students will go on to complete four-year degrees. Non-credit programs and classes are also offered through its Office of Corporate Services.
Like most community colleges, MCC has no housing facilities, so all its students commute. In fact, one MCC faculty member referred to her students as "PCP Students"—parking lot, car, parking lot. Since my first visit to the College was on a rainy day, I also appreciated immediately that MCC provides students and visitors with low cost parking in a large garage across from the main buildings. Many of MCC's programs and policies were created to accommodate these nontraditional, commuting students. For example, more than fifty courses are offered each quarter on video cassette and other nontraditional formats through MCC's Individualized Learning Center and TV MCC programs.

**Computer-Enhanced Writing at MCC: An Overview**

Computer-enhanced writing instruction at MCC takes place in the classrooms maintained and managed by the College's Writing Center (Figure 1). The Writing Center offers computer training for students who wish to use computers for their writing, open-access to computers for MCC faculty and students, and peer tutoring for students with writing needs. In addition, the Writing Center is used jointly by the Department of English and the English Section of the Developmental Studies Department, which offer sections of basic, first-year, and business writing courses in the Center's classrooms. Supporting these classes is a primary function of the Writing Center. The Department of English and the Developmental English Section control the content and staffing of the writing classes offered in the Center. Sections of classes offered in the Center are not designated as computer-enhanced in the quarterly course bulletin,
FIGURE 1: MCC Writing Center
so most students registering for these sections are unaware that they will be using computers until they arrive in the classroom the first day. While both the English Department and the Developmental English Section have offered several different computer-enhanced writing courses through the Center, the Center supports only a small fraction of the total number of sections held each quarter. Courses which have been offered through the Center are MCC’s two developmental English courses (DEV 075 and DEV 110), the first two courses in MCC’s three course first-year English sequence (ENG 111, which focuses on expository writing and ENG 112, which focuses on argumentation and the research paper), and MCC’s two business communication courses (ENG 131 and 132). During Spring Quarter, 1992, only four of forty-seven sections of English 111, two of thirty-nine sections of English 112, and four of thirty-one sections of Developmental English 110 were offered in the Center. All course sections offered in the Center met during the day, except DEV 110, which had both day and evening sections. No sections of Fundamentals of English (DEV 075) or business communication courses were offered in the Center during Spring Quarter, 1992. No literature courses, writing courses that include literature, honors, or ESL courses have been taught in the Center, although individual sessions of ESL classes have occasionally been held in the Center. Most of the classes offered in the Center are sections of English 111 and basic writing courses. About sixty percent of the faculty in the Department of English and
about thirty percent of the faculty in the Developmental English Section teach in the Center at least once a year.

Rooms 1 and 3 of the Center are used to support the computer-enhanced writing classes offered by the Department of English and the Developmental English Section and to provide computer training and open-access to computers for students and faculty who wish to use them in their writing. In order to accommodate students and faculty on a walk-in basis, classes are not scheduled in Rooms 1 and 3 simultaneously so that one room is always open for walk-in use. Room 2 houses the desks of the Writing Center Manager and her assistant and, other than supporting the Center's administrative functions, is used primarily for tutoring. Room 2 also has two PCs that can be used by walk-in students and faculty if needed, although they are used primarily by the Writing Center staff. Although they vary from quarter to quarter, open-access hours are generally provided from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. weekdays, with additional hours on some weekday evenings and Saturday mornings.

When it opened in Winter Quarter, 1988, the Center had one computer-equipped classroom. This classroom, Room 3, is equipped with NCR 286-based PC 8s with EGA (enhanced graphics adapter--i.e., medium resolution, color) monitors. Room One, added in 1989, has NCR 286-based PC 810s with VGA (video graphics array--i.e., high resolution, color) monitors. The systems in both rooms are equipped with two floppy drives (one 5 1/4 and one 3 1/2 inch). The PCs are housed on two person workstations with two sliding keyboard drawers.
Since the PCs take up most of the desktop, the computer workstations provide very little space for students to store their things, to do pen and paper work, or to place a book while reading. Some workstations, however, have a shelf above the computer area for storage, and all have been provided with two secretarial style copy holders, one for each student.

Room 3 has twenty-four PC 8s and eight Epson FX86E dot matrix printers on sixteen workstations. The workstations are arranged in rows, one down each long side of the rectangular room and two back-to-back down the center of the room. One printer is located at each end of the four rows. There is one empty workstation near the front of the room and an overhead projector beside one of the printers at the front. When it was configured, Room 3 was wired to allow it to be connected to a local area network (LAN) using a file server shared by other computers in the building, but this option has not been implemented. Room 1 is slightly larger but roughly the same shape as Room 3, but the equipment and furnishings are arranged differently. Instead of rows, it has twenty PC 810s and eleven Epson LQ 510 dot matrix printers on ten workstations placed around three sides of its perimeter. Room 1 also has six small tables in the center, each with four chairs, and a moveable lectern. Both rooms have whiteboards at the front.

The Center has three word processing programs: *PC Write Standard*, which is used by all English classes and all walk-ins who are not enrolled in a Developmental English class; *Norton Textra*, which was recently adopted for use
in all Developmental English classes; and Bankstreet Writer, the program formerly used in Developmental English classes and which continues to be used by former Developmental English students. The Center also owns Webster's Spell Checker, but since both PC Write Standard and Norton Textra now have built-in spelling programs, it is no longer used very often. Although the Center owns other programs (Grammatik III, a style analyzer; Practical Grammar, a grammar tutorial; and English Simplified, a grammar and mechanics tutorial), none are in general use. At least one teacher also brings in some additional programs on her own which she uses in her classes.

Peer tutors have important roles in the computer training, technical assistance, and individualized writing instruction the Writing Center provides. Students qualify as writing tutors and are given initial tutor training through MCC's Tutorial Services Office, a central tutoring center which supports several subject areas. They are then interviewed and hired by the Writing Center's Manager, who also provides them with training on the technical aspects of the Center's hardware and software, as well as additional training on helping students to improve their writing skills. Peer tutors provide walk-in students with training and technical assistance on the Center's hardware and software. Providing training and technical assistance accounts for about ninety percent of the peer tutors' hours. Peer tutors also conduct one-on-one writing tutorials. Tutorials take place at tables located near the rear of Room 2 and are strictly on a walk-in basis. Students who need regular tutorial assistance are referred to the
Tutorial Services Office where they can arrange to meet with a tutor on a continuing weekly basis. Computers are rarely used during writing tutorials. Although the scheduled hours vary from quarter to quarter, tutors are on duty in the Center about forty hours each week.

The Writing Center is directed by the Manager of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Resources Centers (LASRC) who reports to the Dean of the Division of Arts and Sciences. As LASRC Manager she is responsible for managing the budget, hiring, training, and supervising staff, purchasing software, hardware, and other materials and equipment, and overseeing day-to-day operations for a total of five computer-equipped learning centers, including the Writing Center. However, for the Center's first three years of operation, the Manager, who then was titled Writing Center Coordinator, managed only the Writing Center and reported to the Chair of the Department of English or, for a short time in 1989, reported to both the Chair of the Department of English and the Chair of the Developmental English Section. In addition to the Manager, the Writing Center's staff also includes a part-time technician who assists the Manager in operating the Center and supervising the peer tutors.
Case Study of the Computer-Enhanced Writing at MCC:

The MCC Writing Center

Creating a Writing Center: John and Margaret


The idea for developing computer-enhanced writing at MCC originated in 1984 when the Department of English invited the Developmental English Section to join a committee formed to investigate the possibility of creating a "computer writing center." Soon after the original committee was formed, Margaret, a professor in the Department of English, and John, an associate professor in the Developmental English Section became responsible for developing a proposal. I interviewed Margaret and John during a single session at Margaret's home and asked them questions about the creation of the Center and its operation.

While both John and Margaret are experienced writing teachers, neither had had any direct experience with writing centers before undertaking the task of creating MCC's Writing Center, and only Margaret had had prior experience with computers. Both said they were excited about the possibility of adding a computer-enhanced writing center to their areas' writing programs, despite the pessimism of several other faculty members who felt the project had little chance of getting funding or support from the higher administration. As Margaret explained,

They did not believe that the development of a Writing Center would ever happen. Anyway, they were very negative about the idea. And when we [the joint committee] met the third time, we decided that the best way to pursue it was to find out more. At
that point, I think, [John] and myself started . . . getting busy with ways to proceed. We arranged visits to nearby sites.

After they assumed responsibility for undertaking the project, John and Margaret began visiting nearby writing centers and reading "an abundance of articles and books" in order to get a better idea of what currently was being done with writing centers. John said the journals he found most useful were *The Writing Lab Newsletter, The Writing Center Journal*, and *Computers in Composition*. For a while they attempted to write précis of the articles they read so that the summaries could become part of a resource bank that would be available for faculty at the Center, but this practice soon proved to be much too time consuming and they abandoned it. John and Margaret also recalled attending several conferences. A few days after our interview, John provided a list of conferences attended, sites visited, and books and periodicals ordered during the planning stages that he felt was fairly complete (Appendix B).

In the early stages of planning, while Margaret firmly believed that a computer-enhanced writing center would benefit student writers, neither John nor Margaret had a very firm idea of what their center would be like or if they would even have a center of their own. Both agreed that site visits to writing centers at other colleges and universities, during which they talked with writing teachers and with writing center personnel, were extremely important sources of ideas, even though most of these centers were not supporting computer-enhanced writing classes. The list John provided included the names of eight colleges and universities visited during 1985 and one in 1986. John and
Margaret recalled that one of the strongest convictions they formed from these visits was the necessity for keeping the Center limited to writing. As John said,

From what I remember at that point . . . we were looking at trying to use the resources on campus that we already had. Would it be feasible to somehow tie . . . into sources that already existed to somehow use the computers to help with the teaching of writing and so forth, rather than create a whole new lab? And then when we started doing the visits, I remember that when we were asking people, "Well, what should we do?" they said, "Don't do that. Don't try to share the lab because you'll get pushed around or your students won't have the full benefit from it."

At this point, John and Margaret went to MCC's Vice-President for Instruction to discuss their idea for an independent computer-enhanced writing center. As Margaret explained,

I guess, in a sense, we overstepped our bounds as far as we went to the top. We didn't go to our chairs. We went to the Vice-President for Instruction . . . . What we decided was that we would try to get reassigned time to look deeper into this matter because there was just too much. We couldn't really do a lot of things following full teaching loads. And they did give us reassigned time. . . . [The Vice-President for Instruction] said, "Just look at it on a small scale and see whatever it is. Study the problem." And that's what, in effect, we did.

After receiving a small grant from the MCC Foundation in Autumn Quarter, 1985, John and Margaret began operating a pilot lab. For the first year, the lab was used only for previewing and testing equipment and software.

**The Pilot Lab and the Philosophy for a Computer-Enhanced Writing Center: 1985-1986.**

When asked what beliefs about writing and about the use of computers in teaching writing influenced their thinking as they developed plans for the Writing
Center, John and Margaret both stated that they believed process-centered instruction was preferable to lecture or presentational style instruction and that they felt computers would facilitate instruction in the writing process. John explained his beliefs by saying,

I think primarily my focus has always been that you have to do writing to get writing. . . . And as I started learning how to use computers, I saw that this would help students. It would motivate them, I thought, to revise more. . . . We'd had people tell us that it did make a difference, that if students actually used computers . . . that they would see things they hadn't seen. So that's . . . what I was excited about, and I noticed positive changes in my own writing, in my own prose. So that was one thing I kind of looked for—testimony like that when I read journals and when I read books.

Margaret seemed to have similar beliefs about writing and drew similar conclusions about the potential benefits of computers in teaching writing and said, "I couldn't see even at that point how it [the writing center] could not have computers.

Unlike John, who had never used a computer for writing before beginning this project, Margaret could also base her beliefs about computer-enhanced composition on her own extensive experience using computers for writing:

Because, again, I felt that all the work that I did [writing a dissertation], how much easier it was for me to get my work done, . . . that was really part of the driving force. The other was assisting students to use updated technology to improve their writing skills. I saw writing beyond practice and rote teaching.

John's and Margaret's convictions were reinforced by their reading and through their conversations with other writing professionals at conferences and during site visits. John explained that from his point of view,
... the big theme ... from some of these early conferences was that the computer should be used for writing and word processing. ... as a tool, not for drill and practice and as an audio visual aid. ... We looked at software and grammar programs like that, but early on, I think our interest was strictly on the writing and how can you get the word processing and make ... an easy transition for students to use it and really exploit it.

Margaret also remembered the theme that computers should be used as a tool for writing rather than for computer-assisted instruction from journal articles and conference sessions and recalled the names of scholars she was most influenced by:

I read a few, I think, in the different conference areas. Cynthia Selfe, of course. I had read quite a bit of her insights. We received her magazine for a while. Richard and Dawn Rodrigues had quite a bit to say about managing a lab and how to teach students in this type of environment. ... And I remember ... Muriel Harris was quite instrumental, I think, in just talking about writing and how effectively [a lab] environment could work.

A little later in our interview, Margaret also recalled speaking with Helen Schwartz at an NCTE conference and getting a copy of Schwartz's Seen program to preview as a result of their conversation. John remembered speaking with Marilyn Styne and being influenced by her enthusiastic recommendation of Bankstreet Writer, the program that he later selected for use in the computer-enhanced Developmental English classes.

While John and Margaret felt they were getting a lot of good information and feedback about writing centers in general during this period, they recalled that they had few models to use as guides in developing the computer aspects of their center. John explained, "And at this stage ... there had been writing
centers before with peer tutoring, but the aspect of adding the computers in, that was kind of new.... We were sort of on our own there." As Margaret recalled, "I think the only computer writing center that we saw was at [a nearby research university]."

Although their beliefs about how people learn to write and what they had learned from their research led them to believe that word processing would be the primary way that computers would be used in their writing center, John and Margaret continued to be interested in other ways the computer might be useful. They hoped to find software that could be used for giving tutorial assistance or for independent study by students who were not enrolled in computer-enhanced classes, but who came to the Center seeking help with their writing. With this in mind, they examined a variety of the different kinds of software available: tutorials for grammar and mechanics, packages to assist writers with particular kinds of writing tasks such as writing résumés or research papers, tutorial packages that guided students through invention and revision exercises, literature tutorials that accompanied specific pieces or genres, and tool packages such as disk organizers, grade managers, and data bases. Margaret explained,

You know, the thing is that we were just testing because we were really looking at all aspects of writing. We were not only looking at word processing. Later on, that's how it was accepted, but we were looking at interactive programs that teachers could use if they really wanted to go beyond word processing and maximize computer use.

Examining programs was easy, although time-consuming, because, as John commented,
You could preview anything for thirty days. You didn’t have to pay for it. We took advantage of all those programs to get copies. We had all sorts of programs to preview.

But, Margaret adds, many of the programs they saw did not impress them:

I think what really made us decide as far as tutorials or whatever was that we could not find good packages. Many were being developed by people in computer science. Most [software developers] were not English composition teachers. We tested so many of [these programs], and we felt that they were not really what we had hoped to find. They may have given the student a little bit of help in some way, but when one considers the time that one spends with a student, it has to be really effective, and these tutorials weren’t.

John agreed:

We looked at a lot of different things and . . . I can’t recall any, really, any of the grammar-type programs that I was overly impressed with. . . . I think we probably returned three-fourths of what we looked at. . . . Some of the articles would point out some of the shortcomings, and they would also point out that, "Gee, with the technology, we ought to be able to do this, this, and this." But the software wasn’t doing it at that time.

When prompted to list the programs they examined, John and Margaret recalled a few packages by name: Resume, Sidekick, Seen, Grammatik, Rightwriter, and two word processors specifically designed for student writers that include segments to assist in invention, revision, and editing—HBJ Writer and Writer’s Helper. Although they found the invention and revision segments of these word processors interesting and potentially worthwhile, they considered their text analysis capabilities too primitive and were concerned that they would be potentially confusing to student writers. The latter was a criticism that they had of all text analysis programs they looked at during this period. Margaret
remarked, "They were just at the inception of using [text analysis] packages. I mean, they were not good. Even today's are better, you know, right now, and they are not what they should be."

Margaret was particularly interested in text analysis programs and programs that lead students through the writing process because she and her husband, who was working with computers, were authoring similar packages of their own at the time:

My husband and myself went ahead and wrote a small program to test the maturity of the writer. . . . They would type it [a paragraph] in and it would count the number of words, count the length of the words, the length of the sentences, highlight all transitions . . . highlight verbs, and they could see trails of different things or whatever. . . . And what we were doing with that, we were trying to get the teachers to recognize it [the level of writing maturity] in terms of the writing that the student would do.

They were also writing an audience analysis and invention program. They finished the audience analysis portion and Margaret now uses it in her computer-enhanced English 111 sections. Margaret conducted early tests of the program with students using the pilot lab and presented her results at at least three conferences.

John and Margaret based their evaluations of software primarily on their beliefs about teaching writing, their experience as writing teachers at MCC, and their own intuitions and experiences as writers, although they read and considered published reviews from several sources. Margaret remembered that one of the most useful sources for software reviews were NCTE "Councilgrams: "I remember we had all those "Councilgrams." There was one big section on
computers and writing. We read those faithfully." John and Margaret kept track of all the software packages they previewed and their evaluations by recording them in a written matrix and in a computer data base Margaret developed as part of an artificial intelligence class she was taking at the time. The computer data base, called *Insight*, was later used in training sessions by MCC writing teachers who used it to learn about data bases and about the kinds of software available for use in writing and other English classes. Ultimately, John and Margaret’s examinations of various instructional software packages further reinforced their belief that computers could best be used in writing classrooms as word processors rather than for computer-assisted instruction using instructional software programs.

However, some of the administrators John and Margaret worked with while developing the Center initially had quite different beliefs about how computers might be used. As Margaret recalled, she and John found that having "done their homework" was quite important:

> In fact, that saved us in a meeting with [the Vice-President for Instruction] one time. . . . He talked about having seventy some computers, thinking it would be nice if you could have a big lab class where you'd just need one teacher. And so, I said, "No way!" I said, "Who's going to grade all the papers?" They were thinking of cost effectiveness. Teachers would be equated with technicians. . . . They [students] get all the information from the computer. . . . We really had to hold to our beliefs and our information to clarify it for the administration.

John and Margaret also formed impressions of several hardware options based on their research and their experience using various brands and platforms
in the pilot lab. Neither John nor Margaret could remember exactly what equipment they had at this stage. Both recalled that they had an NCR DecisionMate V, at least one Apple IIe, and some sort of MS-DOS based machine, probably an IBM XT—all on loan from other departments. They also saw demonstrations from vendors; John remembered visiting NCR. In addition, they saw other systems, such as the Macintosh, during site visits. Margaret recalled some of the computer systems and options they considered:

We really had looked at bigger screens for the monitors. We wanted to get a full page on the screen... We looked at that early. And, of course, they weren't popular and people did not see it, the computer, just in terms of writing, where we were coming from... We did actually ask for VGA [monitors] because we really wanted much better monitors because they [students] really sit there for a long time. They need more resolution... I think we had evaluated the NCR [PC 8s] because they... were available at [MCC] at that time and they were more cost effective. ... I mean, you know, Macintosh were not even considered, but we were seeing some Macintosh. Apples, I absolutely said no. In my own estimation, I didn't want Apples... And it was more the kind of software, the kind of cumbersome operations. They seemed like they were oversimplified in a sense. And the thing was, they really were not leading to some of the packages that had more memory like the IBMs had.

John added that they also realized that they would not have complete freedom to choose hardware for the Center. Major decisions about hardware platforms and vendors would be made by the upper administration based on a policy the College had already formulated. As John explained,

I think at [one of the sites they had visited] they had both. They had an IBM lab and a Macintosh class. And the teachers who taught in the Macintosh class really liked the Macintoshes and the way they were set up. But I think, our concern on campus is that they wanted to make the campus consistent. And so, we didn't
even ask for Macintoshes because, to me, it was understood that
the campus was going IBM. That really wasn’t in our hands. . . .
How many we wanted, they said the VGA, and some of the minor
things, I mean, that was a choice. But as far as it would include a
computer area, they were going to negotiate the best deal in town.

In Autumn Quarter, 1986, John and Margaret presented their findings
and a proposal for an extension of their grant to MCC’s Foundation, which
agreed to extend the pilot lab’s funding for the 1986-87 academic year.


In Winter and Spring, 1987, John and Margaret conducted a series of
faculty development workshops. Both John and Margaret agree that these
training sessions were a very important step toward gaining faculty support for
the Center, especially its computer component. As John remembered,

I think once we had those training sessions, that really, to me, was
the key. Because if we hadn’t had the opportunity to work with
those faculty one-on-one and break down their misconceptions and
their own fears that "Students can’t do this. This is too much for
them to deal with. You know, they can’t even write. How can you
expect them to use a word processor?" then we wouldn’t have
gained their support.

John said that the importance of training faculty and getting them involved was
something he remembered being stressed at conferences and during site visits:

I recall some of the people that talked to us had said, "If you can
get the support of your faculty, if you can somehow get training for
them that . . . excites them . . . and let them be paid for doing it.
Just don’t expect them to put all this time into it." And the
administration really bought that. You know, they supported us on
that. . . . They gave a stipend of $250 [to each faculty member
who completed the workshop].
Participation in the training was voluntary and was provided by John and Margaret on a one-on-one basis in the pilot lab. The major focus of the workshops was introducing faculty to word processing using *Multimate*, the word processor then in general use at the College, and *PC Write*. The decision to use *PC Write*, an inexpensive, shareware word processor, was based partially on John and Margaret’s feeling that they wanted something faculty (and later students) could learn relatively quickly and begin using to create syllabi and other short, uncomplicated documents. John explained that the decision was also influenced by a workshop sponsored by the Department of English during Spring Quarter, 1986:

Appleby and Bernhardt from Southern Illinois University were invited by the Department of English to do an in-service . . . and they had been using *PC Write* on their campus, and they were probably the ones that had quite a bit of influence in our deciding to choose *PC Write* because it was shareware and the students could actually copy it.

In addition to word processing software, faculty also used the commercial programs *Sidekick* and *Résumé*, Margaret’s invention program, and a grade keeping program written by Margaret’s husband. They also had the opportunity to use Margaret’s *Insight* database to get an overview of the different kinds of software available for use in English classes. According to Margaret, *Insight* "introduced them to the idea that there’s an abundance of software available. Then later on, if they really wanted something, the Writing Center would help them get something." However, the main goal of the training was to familiarize faculty with word processing and teach them basic computer skills such as how to
handle disks, load and save files, and use menus. All the English Department faculty and several teachers from the Developmental English Section completed the training workshop.

In addition to the faculty training workshops, John and Margaret also involved faculty in planning for the Center by conducting a survey. Although neither John nor Margaret could remember many of the specific questions from the survey, both recalled that the faculty wanted the Center’s computer component to focus on word processing. They also recalled that faculty wanted the Center to have both a computer-enhanced and a traditional classroom so that teachers could choose to conduct their classes in either teaching environment depending on what they were doing on a given class day. John and Margaret incorporated the faculty feedback from the survey into the proposal they were drafting.

John and Margaret’s original proposal called for a Writing Center with three main components: a computer-enhanced classroom, a tutorial area, and a conferencing/resource area. As Margaret explained, they wanted the Writing Center to serve students at whatever point they needed through each of those three areas. They may use it with a class, you know, with computer-aided instruction. While on the tutoring, if students had problems, they would get help. While the conferencing, that was actually going to have two areas. It was going to have an area where the teachers could take a student and work with a student, and it was going to have a computer and a laser printer. They could actually design their materials and things like that.
John added, "We were trying to take little pieces of what we had seen that we liked."

As John and Margaret envisioned it, the Center would also help promote writing-across-the-curriculum. As John explained, Part of what we were thinking was to try to set it up so that ... people outside the English area could use it as well as English teachers. ... So, we wanted to have it [the computer-enhanced classroom] ... reserved for writing classes, but with the other areas, we wanted to try to promote kind of the idea of writing-across-the-curriculum.

John and Margaret completed their proposal for the MCC Writing Center and presented it at a meeting of the MCC Board of Trustees in Spring Quarter, 1987. Both said they felt very confident, and as Margaret recalled, they didn’t have any trouble getting funding:

We didn’t have any problem getting to the point of where, "Hey, we are going to go ahead. Now we know we’re going to try to see if we can get a writing center." Then we began to have ... an obstacle course set for us. ... They [members of the higher administration] were trying ... to determine what we wanted when we already knew what we wanted.

Once funded, the first obstacle they faced in completing the Center as planned was space. They had difficulty finding a space that was both accessible and large enough to meet their needs. Although the space donated by the Developmental English Section had three rooms, they were small and only two were initially reserved for the Writing Center. Margaret remembered that she and John were disappointed

until [the Vice-President] told us all the computers we’d have and then we weren’t so sad about the small space. Because we also
worried that if it was very big, "What are we going to do? Are they going to saddle us with more students than we can really teach?"

Both John and Margaret felt that the small space dramatically altered the Writing Center from what they had envisioned. For one thing, the lack of space eliminated the suggestion for having a traditional classroom as part of the Center. John explained that the idea for the conferencing/resource area was also abandoned and more emphasis was placed on the Center's computer component:

Those areas that would have been just as a writing center... like the conferencing which would have been more just traditional writing, those have kind of taken a backseat because we do have regular classes and classrooms.... They [the English and Developmental faculties] just felt like they wanted more computers. Where do you go? Obviously, the proximity is better to have all those areas strictly computers, and you kind of put the rest on the back burner....

Restrictions on the use of their grant money also contributed to a greater emphasis on technology and equipment because most of the funds were earmarked for equipment.

The small size of the rooms, along with complications caused by MCC's procurement policies and feedback from administrators, also led John and Margaret to rethink their design for the computer-enhanced classroom. Originally, they planned a horseshoe-shaped arrangement in which the students' workstations lined three sides of the room and faced inward; teachers were given a computer workstation located in the center of the classroom from which they could manage instruction. However, they had trouble communicating their
rationale for this design, as well as for their hardware and software selections, to
the vice-president who was responsible for authorizing their purchases. As
Margaret explained,

He was trying to push not only the design and the furniture that he
thought, he was trying to push certain computers that he thought,
certain word processing that he thought. And here we had . . . the
design in our own minds and we had drawings . . . There was a
lot of compromising. But as it turns out, the thing that he did best
was . . . send us a consultant whom we were able to talk to.

John added,

What the consultant helped us do was kind of work at the links
between what we wanted and what the school could purchase, see,
because they have these certain purchase agreements so they had
to go through certain vendors. And we were looking through all
these books trying to find furniture, and somebody should have
told us we couldn't do that . . . We put this incredible list
together and [the vice-president] looked at it and said, "We can't
do this." That was frustrating because we were out of our area of
expertise there. So getting the consultant was very good.

With the consultant's help, they decided on the four-row arrangement that is still
in use in Room 3.

In addition to the conferencing area and the original classroom design,
many of the "little things" they had seen during site visits and wanted to include
in the Center were eliminated. As Margaret recalled,

We envisioned many things, even couches where people could sit
to talk and think. We saw a lot of things in the places we visited .
. . but it was impossible in that space. I mean, all we could do was
have little tables . . . . But only we know what we really wanted, so
we're the only disappointed ones.
Besides the changes necessitated by the lack of space, another change that would have a major impact on the Center’s final form was in the way the Center would be staffed and managed.

In their original proposal, John and Margaret provided for direct faculty involvement in the management of the Center. The Center was to be jointly managed by two faculty co-directors, one from the Department of English and one from the Developmental English Section, and a non-faculty coordinator who would report to the directors. The non-faculty coordinator was included primarily to provide the computer expertise which the faculty lacked and to assist the co-directors with administrative tasks. The faculty directors would be given reassigned time to work in the Center and the directorships would rotate among the faculty. Part of their rationale for the co-director arrangement was that it included both areas, English and Developmental English, in the Center’s management. John and Margaret felt both of these areas needed to be involved equally to insure that the needs of each area would be met. They also felt that the Center would benefit through having input from many different faculty members and that faculty members would support the Center more if they were directly responsible for its management. John also recalled that the need for faculty involvement was mentioned in some of the articles they had read:

The main thing was to get different perspectives on it. Like the idea of rotating chairpersons in the department. . . . So, I think that’s why we had that kind of built in, and also the idea of faculty having their needs met directly rather than having a management type of technician status given to the director, which many of the articles we read warned against. "They’ll try to put. . . somebody,
like a half time person in, or they'll try to just say, 'Well, technicians can just run this and the teachers can refer students there,' and that just reduces the legitimacy of the Center itself.' So the one thing was, you want to push for faculty involvement and to try to have someone full-time committed to doing it.

Margaret recalled that they had received similar advice from people they talked with at conferences and during site visits, "Everywhere we went they said, 'As soon as you let it out of the hands of faculty, you're in trouble.'"

The search for a non-faculty coordinator was conducted by a committee of faculty from the Department of English and Developmental English Section during Autumn Quarter, 1987. The position description written by John and Margaret (Appendix B) emphasized that the ideal candidate would have "experience in English composition and knowledge of computer use and applications (especially word processing as it relates to the teaching of composition)." However, the committee discovered that none of the applicants had both experience in teaching composition and experience in computer applications and word processing. As John explained, with the time-limit on their grant about to expire, the committee felt they had to make a choice:

We were looking for a person who had technological ability plus English background, and at the time we interviewed people, we didn't really find anyone that had both. And, I think I can say, the faculty at that time felt that if you had to have one or the other, their anxiety level was so high regarding the technology that they wanted someone who could keep the machines running and we would have confidence in as far as being able to manage, and that we could do the English part ourselves. But tied into that was our idea that we would have direct input . . . so we felt that we weren't making that much of a tradeoff.
Prior to the Center's opening, the idea for faculty co-directors was dropped. As Margaret recalled, "As things happened, the plan was just dismissed." After the committee selected a candidate and submitted the name to the administration, the candidate and the administration negotiated an agreement that increased the Coordinator's authority and eliminated faculty from the Center's management structure. Rather than reporting to the co-directors, the Coordinator assumed sole responsibility for developing and coordinating the Center's operations and reported directly to the English and Developmental chairpersons. According to John,

As things kind of evolved... the support for our idea of having input, which in a way we let be key [to the decision to select a technically-oriented candidate], that was just lost. That was just unacceptable. And so, we didn't push it... We had kind of been counselled not to allow someone from outside the area to get control, but we thought we had built in a safety net for that, and then we really didn't pursue it enough, I don't think. We let the chairs take over.

Margaret added, "And see, since they didn't do the research, they didn't really see it through." After the Coordinator was hired, the faculty's involvement in the Center, including John and Margaret's, was limited to teaching classes in the Center's computer-enhanced classrooms. Faculty have had no direct, formal involvement in determining the Center's philosophy and direction, setting its policies, selecting the equipment and software they teach with in its classrooms, training its tutors, or overseeing its day-to-day operations.
Implementation: Jessica, the Writing Center’s Manager

Jessica’s Training and Background.

Jessica was named the Coordinator of the new MCC Writing Center in December, 1987. In 1987 and 1988 Jessica reported only to the Chair of the English Department. However, in 1989, Jessica began reporting to both the Chair of the English Department and the Chair of the Developmental English Section. In 1990, she was made Manager of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Resource Centers (LASRC) and began reporting directly to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Before accepting the Coordinator’s position, Jessica had been a corporate trainer and office systems analyst for the Middleton office of a national corporation. In this position she had provided software and hardware training to employees within the corporation and to outside customers, as well as recommended the proper computer equipment and training for customer’s offices. When asked about her background, Jessica emphasized that she had very strong corporate experience, a strong technical background, and a sensitivity to the liberal arts.

I interviewed Jessica near the beginning of Spring Quarter, 1992. We spoke for approximately two hours in the Writing Center. I had created an interview schedule based on documentary materials Jessica provided before the interview which I used to guide our discussion (Appendix B), but I pursued
issues as they came up rather than rigidly following the schedule. I also toured the Writing Center during this visit.

Jessica reported that she was proud because she was able to get the Center organized and ready to open only a few weeks after she had been hired. Although she had found only two rooms filled with boxes of equipment when she became Coordinator during the December break, the Writing Center began supporting classes at the beginning of Winter Quarter in January, 1988, a full quarter ahead of the anticipated opening. She attributes this quick start to her experience in the corporate world:

In terms of my transition, I think it would be harder to go from academic to corporate than from corporate to academic because in academic, I still operate pretty corporately in that I get things done now. Corporate is much more rushed—a lot more rushed than this is. This was still a very large challenge to me. When I walked in here, there were boxes sitting everywhere. No program was developed. I mean, how to handle students, what to do first, and on and on. That was a lot—to build it, and see it grow, and see it flourish.

Jessica feels her experience in the corporate world and her background in the liberal arts make her appreciate the importance of professional development and "trying to be a well-rounded individual." Jessica began graduate school after coming to MCC and will complete a master's degree in liberal arts at a nearby university at the end of Spring Quarter, 1992. When asked what other professional development activities she participates in, Jessica said that she reads many journals and has attended numerous conferences and seminars. When asked which periodicals she reads, Jessica listed The Writing Center Journal and
*The Writing Lab Newsletter* as examples. She also indicated that she reads many computer-related magazines and named two, *Info World* and *PC World*. Jessica is also a member of the state’s NCTE affiliate, the local NCTE affiliate, the National Association for Developmental Education, the Writing Centers’ Association, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the American Society for Training and Development. She regularly attends local, state, and national conferences for these and other organizations. Jessica said that she also attends professional conferences and development seminars in areas related to the other Liberal Arts and Sciences resource centers.

**The Center’s Mission and Philosophy.**

Jessica said that the Writing Center’s mission and philosophy (Appendix B) have remained relatively unchanged since its opening. When asked to discuss the Center’s mission, Jessica explained that one of the primary goals is to introduce computers to students who might not otherwise gain experience with the technology:

> I think primarily there’s the desire to introduce computers to all students, not just students in the science areas and things like that. . . . There might be students who take a major who never even have to touch computers, and since everyone has to take English, this is the perfect opportunity for them to learn this. So that’s important—introducing computers to a whole new group of students.

A second goal Jessica considered important was helping students to improve their writing, both through providing access to word processing and through tutoring:
Number two, the Center is also providing a place where students can come and work on their papers and feel more comfortable working on their papers. If they have a computer to use, most of them are willing to spend more time revising. It doesn't necessarily make an "A" paper for some of them, but it does increase their awareness to try harder. It does motivate them. In addition, students can come in and if they're rusty on how to do a certain paper or they're unsure about something, they can sit down with a tutor.

Jessica stated that developing students' computer skills through proper training is a major goal, and one that she believes is particularly important. Because of this belief, she created a one and one-half hour on-line tutorial and requires all students except those who have recently completed a class through the Center to complete it before using the Center's equipment:

It's important to build that foundation for them regardless of their computer background. In here [the Center] they have to be trained by us. Whether that takes place when they walk-in or if they go to a class taught in here, they will be taught. Every time. Regardless. Even if they say, "Well, I work on one of these at work. I don't need to go through this." They need to. That way we maintain a degree of consistency, and we're sure that they were trained properly.

Jessica attributed her belief in the importance of this training to her experience as a corporate trainer:

I think it has a lot to do with where I came from and my background. I feel like you can train students easily on word processing. You don't have to do everything. You don't have to touch keys for them. You don't have to get them all set up and just have them start typing. They can be responsible for what they're doing. They can be responsible for printing, for saving. So built into this mission is also the desire to build that foundation and train them the right way. It takes a lot of time up front, but it insures more student satisfaction, and students really get a lot more out of it.
One of the documents Jessica provided for this study states that the Writing Center’s philosophy is "to encourage students to write better via a variety of experiences. We want to help them become better, more independent writers" (Appendix B). When prompted to discuss what is meant by "better" and "more independent" Jessica explained that by better, she meant

Better not so much necessarily grade-wise because you can’t. Even if they have technology to produce a paper, it doesn’t mean the content is better. I mean a better effort, a more focused effort in trying. I’ve gotten so much feedback from faculty that a student who has a paper to write will know it’s not quite right, but won’t be willing to type it again. In here, they’ll come back and try because it’s easy for them to do that. . . . And so, by better, I just mean better effort.

When I asked what she meant by more independent, Jessica stressed the belief that students need to take responsibility for their own work and put more effort into their writing. As she explained,

The experience we provide is also one of responsibility on the part of the students to take their learning seriously. So if they’re going to come all the way in here and they want to use the computer, they need to go through the training. You know, it’s an investment of their time for their future. . . . I want the environment to be comfortable, and I want students to feel easy coming in. . . . I want them to feel, on one hand, nurtured, like we’ll help them, but on the other hand, responsible. So . . . you can nurture them to let them know that you’re there for them and, for instance, we provide all that training up front and we’re always there to answer questions, but then the students need to do as much as they can, you know, to take on that responsibility of learning. . . . If you have a student who’s asked you ten times how to print, obviously, they don’t want to remember it. They want you to do it for them. Then you have to take an active role and say, "Let’s write that down so you have directions you can follow." We give it to them everywhere, so that means they need to be responsible, too.
When I asked if the role of computers in the Center's mission or philosophy had changed since the Center first opened, Jessica said that it had not.

**Hardware, Software, and Arrangement.**

Jessica indicated that she is very satisfied with the Center's current equipment and software. She said she felt the Center's NCR computers are reliable and "appropriate for the application." She is also pleased with the performance of the Center's dot matrix printers:

> Oh, we're very satisfied with the printer situation. The only thing is that when the ribbons get low, they might get kind of light. . . . The dot matrixes are super fast. We have near letter quality. The LQ 510 will print out a really nice copy. So that's not a problem.

Jessica has added a laser printer for the Center's administrative work, but doesn't anticipate adding laser printers to the classrooms:

> I don't think there would be any advantage to switching to laser printers for the labs at all. Mostly because of the cost. Laser printers are expensive, and for what the students are doing, I don't think so.

When I asked if any other changes had been made in the Center's hardware, Jessica indicated that she had upgraded the memory and added 3 1/2 inch drives to the computers in Room 1. She added that the most significant change was that "we gained that classroom [Room 1] and we put tables and computers in there."

Jessica said that Room 1 became part of the Writing Center in Summer Quarter, 1989, after the Center was given funds to purchase additional equipment. When asked about the equipment selected for the room, Jessica
said maintaining consistency and compatibility between the two classrooms was a major consideration:

We still bought NCR, even though the school was buying the Tandys at that time because we wanted some consistency among equipment... and we only needed 286s. I mean, I didn't need to buy twenty 486s for our applications, even though I want to remain technically sound... And again, in purchasing NCRs, we were sure that you could move up with them. So, I mean, the school won't let you or tries to prevent you, if no one else has caught it along the way, from spending too much on a system you don't need.

Jessica explained that at MCC all request for software and hardware are reviewed by a Computer Coordinator, a former Air Force colonel, to make sure the College gets the best, most appropriate computers for the intended use at the lowest available price. Commenting on this review process, Jessica added, "Because I do have a background in this, my requests always go through because I know what to ask for. I know what we need or what we don't need in here as well as other areas."

When asked to describe what role the English and Developmental English faculty play in selecting hardware, Jessica explained,

First, of all the decision is not entirely up to faculty. I seek their input because I want them to be happy in this. They don't make those administrative decisions, but I solicit and value their input so we have equipment they feel can help them teach... For instance, I'm in charge of another area right now where there was a computer that a faculty member thought would be necessary, even though they're not really in charge of that area, but he thought, "Well, I think we need this" because he read something somewhere. It was way beyond the application of what they're doing in there.
Jessica also discussed the Center’s network options and explained why the computers in the original classroom were not networked when the Center was first set-up:

There are different LANs around campus. We would be connected to a server on this floor.... What you have is your own sector of that server, if you will, that is only serving up the software that you want for your area.... I'm connected to the network at my station [in Room 2]. We have electronic mail administratively, but that's not coming up in any of the labs yet....

Initially, it [Room 3] was wired and at that time the network school-wide was brand new also. There was lots and lots of downtime. Also, those are not hard drives in there, so with the way the network was initially, students would still have had to boot up with the network disk, which is the same difference as booting up with the program disk. It was actually more steps for students if we had the network in there initially. That was number one. So we just went stand alone because really, to them, to a student, it's neither here nor there. I mean, as long as they can get into a program and type, that is what matters. I still believe that.

Jessica did not see any potential pedagogical advantages to be gained by networking Rooms 1 and 3 and was not sure faculty would benefit from a networked teaching environment:

There would be the expense of wiring that room and cards for each of those computers. Again, since they still would, at this point, have to boot up separately with a different disk, it might not be easier for faculty to teach on that.... I don't think in this environment there is a great disadvantage, necessarily, to not being networked because we only use two pieces of software, one for DEV [Norton Textra] and one for English [PC Write Standard], so the need to access all the software on the school server is not necessarily there.
However, Jessica added that networking is "an issue that might come up again" because "the school's network is really competent now."\(^1\)

When I asked what hardware changes she anticipates making or would want to make given the funds, Jessica said,

A hard drive [for each classroom computer] is probably the biggest thing because we could have software already loaded on it and students could just get into that directory and go. Right now, because we have different printers in each room and they have different print tables . . . you can't share disks. A hard drive would be nice in that case. You can load all that on there and it's already specifically geared to the printer it's hooked up to. And it's much faster, so that would be the biggest thing.

I also asked Jessica if she would like to have any other hardware if she had the opportunity to create an ideally equipped computer-enhanced writing classroom. She indicated that she would like to add an overhead-type screen project and explained that she felt the Center might need to acquire some equipment for students with special needs:

We have to accommodate handicapped students, so there might be changes in that area. Recently, for example, I had to have a key guard built to lay over the keyboard because they don't make one for NCRs. I couldn't find one anywhere, so maintenance built one. . . . So there are some changes that you have to go through. But we don't need a lot of modems and things like that. So, I think hard drives would be the primary, the biggest thing.

When I asked Jessica how software selections were made, she explained,

"I buy what faculty would like to use. I do consult with them." However, the

\[^1\]While reviewing her case study description in fall, 1992, Jessica indicated that she has changed her mind about the pedagogical advantages which might be gained from networking, noting, "I now think there are many advantages to being networked."
decisions to use *PC Write* and *Bankstreet Writer* were made before she became Coordinator:

*PC Write* was chosen initially because [Margaret's] husband is very involved in computers... and he had somehow discovered *PC Write*. [Margaret] was very strong on *PC Write*. Other faculty didn't know software from one way or the other, so they pretty much went with the idea. When I got here, I agreed to *PC Write* based on some of those reasons. Plus, it was shareware. We could give a copy to students, which would further reinforce their training. It was very reasonably priced. *Bankstreet Writer* was something that [John], who led up the Developmental Department during that time, chose. He felt they needed something easier than *PC Write*. And so he chose *Bankstreet Writer*. It was a really nice, simple package.

Both the Department of English and the Developmental English Section have recently changed word processors; English classes now use an upgraded version of *PC Write*, *PC Write Standard*, and Developmental English classes now use *Norton Textra*. I asked Jessica to describe how the decisions to change word processors were made:

When we decided to go to *PC Write Standard*, I thought it was a good thing to do. I told the English chairperson, "There's a new version of *PC Write*. I'd like to send it to you, and if you like it, I'd like implement it in the Center. What do you think?"

Jessica said that the decision to switch from *Bankstreet Writer* to *Norton Textra* was initiated by the Developmental English Section.

I also asked Jessica if the departments or individual faculty members ever request that the Center purchase particular software packages or types of packages and she said,

They do, and if they do, and if it's something that's reasonable and that they can use, I'll get it. If it's something that for some reason
our computers can't handle, I'd have to tell them that. Or, I ask them, "What's the application that you would like to use it for?" A lot of times I'll get them a review copy and they find out they don't like it anyway.

Jessica recalled ordering and returning review copies of several grammar analyzers for one faculty member who was interested in these packages but couldn't find one with which he was satisfied. She also indicated that she has ordered software packages based on a faculty member's request.

When I asked if the Center had any software in addition to its word processing packages, Jessica said that no other software was in general use, but that individual instructors sometimes brought in other software and the Center did have a few other packages that instructors or tutors might occasionally use:

There's some additional software. Practical Grammar is one, but we don't use it a lot. . . . We did have Grammatik III, which is a grammar checker, but we never incorporated that, because when you go through that, I and faculty alike felt like, you know, if it says you're using passive voice, do they know what passive voice is? They couldn't make those decisions with the grammar checker. Plus, the grammar checkers aren't quite perfect. So Practical Grammar is the only other one, but it's not used, necessarily, in the classes. If the student just comes to you, "Is there anything I can go through on adverbs?" we can put them through that.

Commenting on the Center's emphasis on word processing, Jessica added,

From what I've talked with them, faculty aren't big on drill and practice software. . . . They've found that students don't feel like they learned. Ten years ago students did drill and practice, and faculty did not find that students retained a lot of that. This center went in a different direction--a true writing center focusing on writing.
When I asked Jessica if there are any software packages or kinds of software she anticipates adding to the Center or that she would add if she had the funds and equipment necessary, Jessica said,

I think it's pretty much what we've got. I think we're doing fine. . . . The thing you have to think about is that we're a two-year college. You've got very beginning writers. I think we have to keep our audience in mind. . . . If something comes out that could bridge any kind of gap that we have, I would look into that, but I can't say there's one right now that I'd like to have here.

Jessica and I also discussed the arrangements of the computer classrooms, and she said she is very happy with the way the classrooms are arranged and reported that instructors are also satisfied:

We're lucky. A lot of times you set something up and it doesn't work well. I've gone to conferences before where they had cluster stations. . . . That doesn't always work because the students are looking at each other, back to the teacher. . . . We were very fortunate because both rooms are open in area. There's a focal point for the instructor, the students can see the instructor clearly, and they can see their neighbors should they need to, you know, do brainstorming together or something like that. So, we've been very lucky that both situations work. Another was the opportunity to do that room [Room 1]. Had that been done at first, it may have been configured the same way [as Room 3]. Then we would have been more stuck because this one [Room 3] has a non-moveable strip down the middle that you can't do anything about. But some faculty like it that way. Some don't want those tables . . . but we've been very fortunate. I think that the right decisions were made.

When asked about her decision to arrange Room 1 differently from Room 3, the original classroom, Jessica explained,

I asked faculty, "Do you want another room just like this or would you like one where students can write?" This was asked in response to faculty comments such as, "Well, they can't write out their papers." So that's why that room has developed like that and
I configured that room, you know, with the tables in the middle and the computers around the periphery. So, now we've got, really, the best of both worlds because some faculty like that. A lot of DEV classes like that room [Room 1] because students can sit down and write because they have a lot more tests to take in class, while English ones who want a lot more writing in class like that [Room 3]. It just gives them options.

Jessica said that instructors may choose to teach in either of the two classrooms:

I don't mind. Whatever room they want. A lot of times, some faculty like [Room 3] better due to the size of their class. There are twenty computers over there [Room 1], twenty-three over here [Room 3]. Classes in the Writing Center are [usually limited to] twenty because it's a lot for that instructor to run around, not only because of the English, but also because of the computer situations which are going to come up. But occasionally they'll get that twenty-second student, so they teach over there even though they like that room better.

Peer Tutoring and Open-Access to Computers for Writing.

In addition to supporting computer-enhanced writing classes, MCC's Writing Center also offers word processing and basic computer literacy training, access to computers to all MCC students who wish to use them for writing (once they have completed the Center's mandatory training), and tutorial assistance for students with writing needs. The Center's peer tutors play an integral role in all of these services.

In addition to the Writing Center, students can receive tutorial assistance with their writing from MCC's Tutorial Services Office. Jessica explained that while the Writing Center provides walk-in tutoring to students needing occasional help with their writing, Tutorial Services offers regular, weekly tutorials to students with serious writing deficiencies. Jessica said that Writing Center tutors
have the same training and qualifications as writing tutors who work in MCC's Tutorial Services Office:

The tutors in here have the same qualifications as tutors in Tutorial. In here, though, they report to me and I hire them. Now, the English tutors, the tutors in here, go through Tutorial first and they [are tested and receive some training] in tutoring. . . . When I need a tutor . . . I call Tutorial and let them know . . . so they send me a list of possible candidates from their pool . . . and these are candidates who they think might work well in a fast-paced situation. And then I interview them and make the decision.

Jessica added that tutors do not need experience with computers before being hired, but that they will need to develop computer skills in order to work in the Center:

When I hire a tutor, it doesn’t matter to me if they have computer experience as long as they’re willing because of my corporate training background. I’ve done this so long, it’s not difficult for me to teach them. So tutors acquire a second knowledge in here that they don’t have, necessarily, in Tutorial. You know, they acquire a whole new set of skills in here, very refined skills.

Jessica explained that she teaches the tutors *PC Write Standard* and *Norton Textra* and DOS commands, such as those for deleting and copying files and disks, and trains them to troubleshoot hardware and software malfunctions as well as technical problems caused by student errors. She also provides additional training to help the tutors quickly access and address students’ writing problems, and explained, "Since the tutor only has about fifteen or twenty minutes with students who need tutoring assistance, it is important for the tutor to use his or her time efficiently and effectively."
Jessica described the tutors’ role in helping students with their writing by saying, "If a student comes in and they just want to sit down and be tutored, then they’re there for that. They’ll explain to them." When asked to describe the kinds of writing assistance tutors give, she added that they usually help students with particular writing assignments or papers rather than with more general writing problems:

If they need help with grammar, we have some exercises. They can do some handouts. But it’s usually with their assignment. If they need too much help in grammar or too much help in basic things . . . if you come in and a student has absolutely no fundamental building blocks, then this is not the environment.

Jessica explained that tutorials in the Writing Center are usually short, about twenty-minutes, and are conducted only on a walk-in basis. She emphasized that students with serious writing needs are sent to the Tutorial Services Office where they can arrange to meet with a tutor for an hour once a week. Jessica also stressed that tutors in the Writing Center do not proofread students’ papers and said she feels that it is important that students coming to the Center understand the nature of the assistance the tutors provide:

To me, it’s very important that the students understand what they’re going through. For instance, if they come in and say, "Can you proofread my paper?" we always tell them, "That’s not what we do." We don’t let the students leave here thinking their papers were proofread.

When I asked Jessica how the peer tutoring and computer aspects of the Center were related, she responded,

The tutors set students up on computer training. When students come in to learn on the computer--they want to type a paper--the
tutor will ask them if they have ever been in here before. We need to determine if they have been in a class in here last year or if it was two years ago and we've changed programs. . . . The tutor has to learn how to ask those probing questions to find out what the student really wants. . . . When they come in and it is determined that they want to go through training, then the tutor will set them up. They'll show them the parts of the Writing Center, show them where they'll get their disks . . . get them set up on the tutorials, explain the keyboard, explain the drives. We go the extra mile and we don't just sit them down and say, "Here." I brought a lot of that in here, too, because I feel like proper computer etiquette can be taught. . . . So they teach the students that. When a student has a question, they'll come out here, "Uh, my printer's not working," and the tutor will go in there and point out what the problem is and have the student correct it.

Jessica feels that the computer training provided by the tutors is one of the Writing Center's most important features and sets it apart from other computer labs on the campus where open-access to computers for word processing is available:

They [other campus labs] don't engage in training like we do. They pretty much expect students to know word processing. Like I can send a student down to the library where they use Multimate only and the student doesn't have to go through training. . . . I've had tremendous numbers of students come back. They'll say, "Well, can I go to the library? Do I have to go through this?" "No. They expect you to know it." They come back in ten minutes. . . . So we're the only area that actually offers the mandatory training.

Jessica emphasized that although they could be, computers are not used during peer tutoring sessions:

I'm not sure about tutoring for computers in the same sense as tutoring for English or math. If they're taking a COBOL class, I can definitely see the need for a tutor. . . . When you're doing word processing, I don't see tutoring in the same role. . . . If they're generating ideas, you know, they don't go to the computer and do it. Students new to computers rarely compose or
brainstorm on a computer. They sit down [and write with] paper and pencil. As a matter of fact, if a student's in here and says, "I'm doing this paper," we need [the student] to print [the composition] out and sit down one-on-one [with a tutor away from the computer]. No scooting up to the screen, looking at the screen, fix that, fix that, fix that. So some things are done totally without the computer.

Therefore, while the Center provides computer-equipped classrooms for sections of writing classes, computer training, open-access to computers for MCC students who wish to use word processing for their writing, and walk-in tutorial writing assistance, these functions are relatively independent of one another.

**Relationship to Faculty and Other Programs.**

In addition to managing the Center's staff and its day-to-day operations, the Manager is also responsible for training faculty "on hardware and software applications for academic instructional use" and advising them "in integrating instructional materials to be used in a computerized environment" (Appendix B). When I asked Jessica how she accomplishes these tasks, she said that initially she gave workshops to all Department of English and Developmental English Section faculty to familiarize them with the Center's hardware and software, and added that she "had to give another one this year, because we changed software."

When prompted to describe any other ways in which she supports faculty and assists them with integrating computers into their teaching, Jessica responded,

> It depends. They might come to me and say, "I read about this software package. What do you think?" If they have it right with them ... I'll read it and we'll have a meeting. ... If they see something they'd like to incorporate ... we need to know how it's going to work. Initially they weren't aware that you could have files, like their syllabus, already on student disks. You know, they
would pass them all out a dittoed syllabus, and I'd say, "Well, you know, you could type it right on there, and we'll copy it on every student's disk and they can just pull it up themselves." They also come in and say, "What do you think about me trying this or should I have them call it this?" or different things like that where there's just too many things for me to cite specifically. It's just an on-going rapport about these kinds of things. They know I'll give them my honest opinion and that I know what I'm talking about, too, because they know I know equipment. They know I know the environment. They know I know these types of things.

Jessica also frequently assists faculty with their personal computer-related questions:

I can't tell you how many requests for information I get every school year. "I'm buying a computer. What should I do?" I'll usually spend time with them about that... to be sure that they're compatible with here so that they can go back and forth between home.

According to the position description, the Manager is responsible for "developing instructional materials for faculty, tutor, and student use" (Appendix B). When asked what sorts of materials she has developed, Jessica explained that she has created a number of handouts and tutorials for use in the Center (Appendix B). Most of these are one or two page reference sheets which explain how to operate the Center's computers or how to perform basic functions and create simple documents using the Center's word processing programs. Jessica also wrote the on-line tutorial used during the Center's mandatory training sessions and created a word processing workshop which she presents yearly to students in MCC's dental hygiene program.

In addition to advising faculty, the Writing Center Manager is also responsible for publicizing the Writing Center, as well as the other Liberal Arts
and Sciences Resource Centers, and establishing and coordinating relationships among the Writing Center and other areas and departments at MCC. When I asked Jessica to describe how she publicizes the Center’s services and reaches out to programs beyond the two English areas, she mentioned an article she wrote for the MCC Information Services Newsletter in 1989 (Appendix B). She also cited the yearly dental hygiene workshop and a non-credit introductory computer workshop she taught in MCC’s division for corporate services.

However, Jessica said the Center’s most important relationships were with other computer-related areas on campus:

The Writing Center maintains a very, very strong relationship with all other computer areas on campus. We all help each other so much. The whole computer services area, which runs the school network, and . . . is responsible for fixing things we need fixed—a very strong relationship there where I can work out almost anything that I need done.

Assessments of the Writing Center’s Operation and Direction

The Developers’ Views: John and Margaret.

I asked John and Margaret, as the Writing Center’s developers and as faculty who teach in the Center regularly, to reflect on the Writing Center’s operation since its opening and describe the areas in which they felt it has been most successful. John and Margaret are generally pleased with the Center and gratified that it has had so much support from the administration and faculty. They feel that its biggest success has been reaching as many students as it does through classes. As John explained,
I think accommodating classes, the fact that they get enrollment for those classes. You see, initially, that was a big question. Some teachers thought students would need keyboarding as a prerequisite. However, everybody we talked to said that students don’t need all these keyboarding skills. At first, though, we wondered, "What if it really doesn’t make it?"

When I asked them to discuss the areas in which the Center has been least successful, John cited the Center’s role in writing across the curriculum as the area with which he was most disappointed:

I don’t see that the writing across the curriculum has been successful. I don’t see other departments using it enough. I know some do. I know some teachers send students, but I don’t think that’s been explored much.

Margaret agreed that the Center had not promoted writing across the curriculum enough and added that she had hoped more teachers, especially part-time teachers, would become involved. She and John also felt the Center could serve ESL and foreign students better. Margaret said that she felt foreign students sometimes were intimidated by the Center’s staff and policies. John agreed and added, "The high functioning ones go in there, and they’ll use it, and they don’t care, but the ones who need more attention don’t use it."

When I asked John and Margaret to discuss the Writing Center’s environment, they responded that the environment "lacked warmth." Margaret commented,

For a while, there were all kinds of signs. "Don’t put disks here. Don’t do this. Don’t do that." I mean, that kind of sign, but that
seems to have relaxed a little bit this year. But it has really been an environment that's really stiff in a number of ways.

John explained that when they created the Writing Center, they wanted to create an atmosphere that would be comfortable and relaxed and also would encourage students to view writing as a worthwhile activity:

One of the comments I've had from other teachers is that it's just a little too sterile. There should be more posters up. You know, informative posters. Things about English, not just pictures, but there should be posters, either quotations from writers or things that would lend themselves to writing, that would create the atmosphere of a writing "place" a little more than it does. . . . But I feel somewhat intimidated or reluctant to even suggest it because--well, if I were asked, it would be different, you know.

The Manager's View: Jessica.

Jessica is proud of her accomplishments in establishing the Writing Center and feels that it has been very successful in achieving its goals and mission.

When I asked Jessica to describe the two or three areas in which she feels the Writing Center has been most successful, she said,

Reaching a great number of students. . . . There's a huge amount of student retention because maybe they've been introduced to this in [an instructor's] class, but then they go on to take Social Psych and think, "Hey! I can still use it." And they do. That's a great success.

She added that she is also pleased with the amount of administrative support and faculty involvement the Writing Center has had:

The area has had such great student success that we were given the opportunity to grow and expand, you know, with total administrative approval. Faculty became involved, even the ones who were initially hesitant to teach in here. Now there's a big group. I think that's important, too.
I also asked Jessica if there was anything she would have done differently or any areas in which she feels the Center has been less successful than she had anticipated. She said the only change she would have made was in the initial management arrangement. When the Center first opened, Jessica reported to both the Chair of the Department of English and the Chair of the Developmental English Section. She found this arrangement very awkward:

The only major battle was when the departments fought against each other when I was caught in the middle. That was very difficult and probably should have been changed a long time ago.

She feels that reporting to only one person was an improvement and that reporting to the Dean is better for her and more appropriate because of the scope of her responsibilities as LASRC Manager.

Finally, I asked Jessica to describe what changes, if any, she would like to make in the Writing Center’s mission or operation, and she explained,

I think my plans to change remain flexible. If a new software package comes out that’s better, that’s easier for students to understand, that faculty would enjoy teaching, then I’ll implement it. Recently we just introduced the new PC Write Standard level which is different than before. All new [training materials and reference sheets] had to be written for that. Well, these things were written differently than we wrote them before. We tried to make it more concise in language that students can understand. . . . But I think those are the kinds of things I look at to improve. . . . You’ve got something that’s working very well and is very successful, but it doesn’t mean you can’t continually improve. There may be a really developmental area that needs to be worked on, but I don’t think that’s the case here. . . . There are a lot of good things going on and what we can do is just make sure that we are meeting the needs of the students that come in.
Contrasts Between the Manager and the Faculty Developers.

Many of the comments made by John and Margaret reveal that their views of the Writing Center’s management and are very different from those expressed by Jessica. While Jessica is satisfied with almost every area of the Writing Center and would make few changes, John and Margaret, while generally pleased with the Center and hesitant to criticize Jessica, suggested several changes they would like to see implemented.

Jessica is very happy with the Writing Center’s hardware and would make no changes, except perhaps adding hard drives to the classroom computers. In contrast, John and Margaret feel changes and additions to the Center’s equipment should be considered. They are particularly interested in the potential of networked classrooms, an area where Jessica saw no particular advantage to students or faculty. As John explained,

It sounds like some of the things that students do on networks, such as working on the same paper, doing some interactive revision, peer reviewing, and things like that, would be fun and instructive. It would be useful.

Margaret agreed:

Conferencing, telling students, "Now, OK. Check your screens..." It would be so much easier if I could set a bulletin board and I could just put everything I need in it and let them see it right off the screen.

In light of Jessica’s very different assessment of the potential benefits of networking, it is significant to note that John and Margaret attributed their renewed interest in the networked classrooms to what they have learned from
attending conferences, some of the same conferences also attended by Jessica.

Discussing his experience at a recent conference, John explained,

At the time the network idea was proposed back then [when the Writing Center was created], there wasn’t much conversation, really, about networks and writing, but at this last CCCC’s conference, there was a lot about it. It sounded really intriguing.

He also said that the Developmental English Section is considering creating its own networked classroom that would be completely separate from the Writing Center:

It would be a networked writing center for Developmental students that would have software built into it so that it would kind of fit into what our classes do. [The chair] is very interested in computers—he teaches in the Writing Center—and he really wants it.

In addition to exploring networking, John and Margaret would also like the Center to acquire an oversized monitor and an overhead-type screen projector for classroom demonstrations both in the Center’s classrooms and in traditional classrooms. Both are pieces of equipment they requested in their original proposal. Commenting on the usefulness of a portable computer unit, Margaret said,

I also suggested at one time and I think this would also probably be helpful, that maybe even to bring in a computer into the [traditional] classroom so that students can see how it works. Maybe have somebody working on something or whatever and that may lead them to see that, "Hey, papers are going to be done over, or revised or whatever." Then they might want to go to the Writing Center to use the computers.

John would also like to have printer mufflers for the printers in the Center’s classrooms:
Sometimes I've been in there when I was just working on something on my own, and a couple of printers are going and man! It's tough. And I'm thinking, "If I were really under pressure to do something here, this printer racket would drive me up the wall."

Margaret added that she feels that the ribbons on the Center's printers should be changed more often and said that she sometimes finds it difficult to read student papers and recently had an original sent back from the print shop because it was too light. She also noted that although the Center's printers can all produce letter quality print, the software has been set to default to draft mode, a feature that most students and some instructors do not know how to override.

In addition to these changes and additions to the Center's hardware, John and Margaret also feel that faculty teaching in the Center need computers in their offices. As Margaret commented,

You know, if I have my computer and I have a modem, I can be at my office and plug in all the stuff I want them to use tomorrow. I don't have to be over there physically. I can be doing this from my office. . . . I really think teachers who teach at the Writing Center need a computer that's compatible and a printer. It's not even that faculty need to develop materials for students. I get students all the time . . . and I'm trying to demonstrate something. It's a lot easier when my computer's right there. I say, "Well, come on over here. Here's what I was talking about in class."

Margaret said a Department of English faculty member had written a proposal to get funds to buy equipment for faculty offices, but it had been turned down by the administration.

While John and Margaret, like Jessica, are fairly satisfied with the Writing Center's word processing software, they would like the Writing Center to more
fully accommodate the needs of faculty and students who use it. Margaret was concerned about the limited control faculty have over the parameters set for the Center's word processing software:

What really bothered me since I've been taking classes there is that I should have the right to decide what I want to put on my [students' program] disks, what kind of commands I want to prompt. . . . This quarter we have *PC Write Standard*. . . . The way Jessica's put the margins, everything is all against the edge of the screen to the left. When it prints, it prints okay. However, if you're trying to get, like if you want to maybe have indented numbers or whatever, when you try to move them in, it forces you back. And it plays havoc! You cannot change the margins. All my graphics stuff that I have developed! I mean, I took forever getting some of my charts and things on graphics. They are all scrambled up. They're all a mess because she had put this command on the ruler line that, again, we cannot remove. She had it, you know, locked in there. And to me, that is taking out of what I want to do with my classes. Just because she doesn't want to be bothered with them talking about pages and margins. They have to learn the things she wants them to learn, not the things I want them to learn in terms of using the package. I'm sorry we have the *Standard*. . . . There are some nice things with it, but it's complicating my teaching because I'm messing with something new.

Margaret also feels it would be helpful if the Center had more utility programs:

My husband wrote a nice program called *Superspool*, so you can keep everybody working while they're printing. And that, to me, is the biggest help. I gave it to Jessica, but she probably hasn't told them [instructors] about it. Because I find those are the kind of packages that even though they're not world-stopper things, they're little helps, little packages that are out there that make your life easier. Just like the disk managers and things like that. They make your life easier.

John was unaware of the *Superspool* program and said he didn't know whether Jessica had installed a program to spool printers on the classroom disks or not.
When I asked John and Margaret to describe how software packages for use in the Center are selected, they responded that they did not know and indicated that as far as they know, faculty are not consulted or asked to provide input in any systematic way. John and Margaret also feel Jessica does not actively investigate new software or assist faculty in keeping up with new software developments as much as she could. As John explained,

I mean, when we were previewing things, it was very easy to write to vendors and they would send it. You could look at anything for thirty days. I don't really know how much she does of that, but my impression is, I don't really think she does it very much.

When asked if instructors ever ask Jessica to purchase or preview a specific software package for the Writing Center, John responded,

[An instructor] asked me one time if I knew of any simple graphics program because he wanted to do something with boxes. But he didn't want it to be too complicated, and I was going to a conference and I said, "Well, I will ask." Later I told him I didn't see anything, but I don't know what the process is... whether [Jessica] pursues that or not. But my impression is not very often.

Margaret agrees with John's perceptions and attributes Jessica's limited interest in acquiring new software to her lack of experience and training in English and composition. Margaret feels Jessica's background also explains why she never created the resource area and information file Margaret and John had intended to include in the Center:

The fact that we got a person that does not have any writing background, that kind of changed things because she was not really interested in all this other resource idea. She strictly saw it as, "Okay. They're going to be teaching writing classes. I'm going to organize it." I don't think she's ever really accommodated getting new software, checking it out, and so you don't have a resource
area. And we, well, we quit pushing. We figured, "Now this is her job, whatever she's going to do.

Despite their resignation, John and Margaret are concerned about the Writing Center's management. When I asked John and Margaret if they could discuss the Manager's role, they agreed, but John was careful to stress:

It's a perceptual thing. As I see it, it's kind of the perception, well, her perception of her role is so much different from our perception and from actually the written perception, from what we'd ever planned. . . . I mean, it really doesn't have to be personal.

One area of difference in their perceptions concerns the Manager's role in promoting the Center and introducing students and faculty to its services.

Both John and Margaret would like Jessica to take a more active role in giving workshops and visiting classes. Margaret emphasized,

I've urged her, and I have been saying it to her every quarter, I think really the best thing would be for them to come around every quarter to every classroom where there's an English class going on and let them know about the Writing Center . . . and invite them and give their own version of what the Center is . . . . And I would gladly have them. I feel like I can tell them [her students], but it's not the same as if they came from the Writing Center and invited them.

John commented that he didn't realize Margaret had asked Jessica to provide orientations and added, "She needs to be more visible at the College."

Perceptions about the Manager's role in supporting faculty and assisting them in teaching effectively in a computer-enhanced environment also differed. When I asked John and Margaret to describe and assess how these responsibilities are performed, Margaret responded, "That has totally been
negated. I think the most that we see from her is like, she will put the system on
the disks. She'll give us the system that we're supposed to use." John added,

This isn't exactly supporting, but with the new *PC Write*, there was
a kind of sheet that had notes—a guideline sheet. But as far as
giving direct suggestions, I think she's pretty much let that be our
area. . . . I think we originally saw it as, you know, the
Coordinator would be the motivator to try to encourage other
faculty to use it and try to bring other disciplines and new ideas,
but that kind of changed when she was hired and the position was
changed. We wanted a lot of faculty involvement, and we saw the
Coordinator as being someone who would not only run the lab but
also help faculty. . . . We've even had, well, couple of people in
our area worked in the lab for a while, but then quit because they
just felt they weren't getting enough support.

Margaret added, "A lot of the problem there is that she does not have credibility
as a writing teacher as such." Although John and Margaret said they feel the
instructors who teach in the Center are "one hundred percent comfortable," they
added that others would probably teach in the Center if they had more support
so they could feel comfortable with the technology.

John and Margaret are also concerned that Jessica's new responsibilities
as Manager of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Resource Centers will reduce the
attention she pays to the Writing Center and further remove her from the role
they would like to see the head of the Writing Center assume. John commented
that his chairperson had been completely opposed to the change in Jessica's
responsibilities:

He generated all sorts of memos last year and he tried to get a
meeting with [the Vice-President for Instruction]. He was really
upset when . . . Jessica's position was put under [the Dean of
Liberal Arts and Sciences], and I think rightly so because that
really changed her role totally, and that splintered her. In other
words, it took away some of her energy. Her attention is supposed to be totally directed to the Writing Center, and now there are these other areas. And really, she sees herself only as a manager, sort of hands-off in a sense. And it was never originally intended for the Writing Center Coordinator to ever see him or herself in that role.

Margaret said that the Department of English had also been concerned about the change in the Coordinator’s position:

Even in our department, I mean, we talked about it. [The chair] appointed a committee. . . . It’s still operating, but it’s stupid. Why even bother with it because we’re not heard about what we’re saying. Everything I’ve said to you, they’ve all heard it. . . . It’s just kind of frustrating. I just keep thinking, "Well, I don’t want to fight [Jessica], but I wish that it was the way that it was supposed to be." And so, your hands are tied. I mean, you can’t do anything about it. . . . The communication is pretty much shot.

Despite their frustrations and criticisms, John and Margaret maintain a generally positive attitude about the Writing Center and about Jessica as its manager. Evaluating Jessica’s effectiveness, Margaret concluded,

I think [Jessica] needs to get herself out to a lot of workshops. And I’ve wanted her to do that because she has to learn a lot. It’s not really a negative that she’s not a writing teacher because she could still be a good coordinator. I just feel she’d not exposed to enough information about what can happen for us that’s exciting.

John explained,

We’re glad, I’m glad to see the people using it, liking it, and I’m glad to see the tutors there, and I think Jessica does a good job, you know, keeping things running, but it’s not only running we want. We see the possibilities for the Center to be even better.

John and Margaret were hopeful that an outside team who would soon be evaluating the Liberal Arts and Sciences Division would also see possibilities and suggest changes in the Writing Center’s management, and operation.
Analysis of the MCC Case Study

Four questions related to the program case histories guide this study:

1. What goals did the programs hope to meet through developing computer-enhanced writing instruction?

2. Have these goals changed or evolved, and, if so, how?

3. How successfully have the programs met their goals?

4. How do the programs’ goals relate to those of the teachers who teach within in them?

In my analysis of the MCC Writing Center’s development and operation, I have concluded that these questions do not yield single answers. The answers I found depended on which participants provided the data, the faculty developers or the LASRC Manager. The differences between the views expressed by the faculty developers and the Writing Center Manager are both numerous and significant. Indeed, they are contributing to serious tensions that have begun to emerge between MCC’s writing programs and the Writing Center. I analyze these differences, first by looking at the knowledge and beliefs of the faculty developers and Writing Center Manager and their definitions of the Writing Center’s goals, then by examining the faculty developers’ and Writing Center Manager’s divergent opinions about how well the Center’s goals have been met. Because the faculty developers are also teachers in the Writing Center, my analysis in this section also touches on the relationship between the Writing Center’s goals and those of the teachers its serves. I continue to explore this
question in the analyses of the teacher case studies, and most directly, in the final section of this chapter, "Cross-Analysis of the MCC Case Studies."

**Different Knowledge, Different Authority, Different Goals.**

**Knowledge and Authority: The Faculty Developers.**

John and Margaret are faculty members in the English Department and Developmental English Section. It was their knowledge and experience as writing teachers and their status as members of academic units concerned with writing instruction rather than their expertise with computers that provided the authority with which they undertook the task of creating a computer-enhanced writing center.

When they began the project, both had training and experience in English studies; John had an M.A. in English and Margaret a Ph.D. in linguistics, and both had taught writing at MCC for many years. On the other hand, their computer-backgrounds were quite dissimilar. Margaret was conversant with both word processing and instructional software, the kinds of software that were most frequently used in writing classes during the mid-1980s. For example, she had used a computer to write her dissertation, and--relying on the technical expertise of her husband, whom she described as a "computer expert"--she was developing instructional software for use in writing classes. In large measure, it was her experience using computers which led to her involvement in the Writing Center project. Unlike Margaret, John had not used computers before undertaking the project. Nevertheless, he also assumed that computers would be part of the
Center and was not intimidated or overwhelmed by the task of learning about computers and their applications in writing instruction.

The basic computer skills John and Margaret had or gained while developing the Writing Center and their knowledge and experience as writing teachers enabled them to effectively gather and evaluate information about writing centers, computer-enhanced composition, and computer hardware and software. As a result, they drafted a proposal for a writing center that was consistent with current scholarship and practice and with the needs of their local instructional context. For example, several of their recommendations resulted directly from their examination of current scholarship and practice in writing centers and computers in composition: their decision to create a separate computer-supported center for writing rather than sharing the facilities of existing computer labs, their plans for faculty training and participation in coordinating the Center, their design for the Center's computer-enhanced classroom, and their scaled-down plans for using CAI in the Center. Other recommendations, such as including a traditional classroom in the Center, were based primarily on their consultations with their colleagues and their knowledge and experience as writing teachers at MCC.

John and Margaret's lack of standing as computer specialists was not a serious impediment as they developed plans for the Center and the role computers would play in it. In fact, it increased their sensitivity to the needs, as well as their appreciation of the capabilities, of their colleagues and their
students who would use computers in the Center. John and Margaret's most serious impediments were their lack of administrative experience and their inability to persuade administrators, who did not share their perspective as writing teachers and the knowledge of computer-enhanced composition they had developed, to maintain the management structure and faculty education they proposed to include in the Center.

**Knowledge and Authority: The Writing Center Manager.**

In contrast to John and Margaret, Jessica's authority as Writing Center Manager depends on her status as a computer specialist and her management skills. She came into her position with no educational background in composition studies or experience in writing instruction, and except for a short stint in the public relations department of the university where she was completing her undergraduate degree, she had never worked in an academic setting. Her managerial skills and her knowledge of teaching and pedagogy are based on her experience as a trainer and analyst for computer office systems.

Jessica had never considered a background in composition as particularly relevant to her position either as Writing Center Coordinator or LASRC Manager, and she was unaware that faculty do not agree with this assessment. Indeed, she considered herself "an outstanding candidate" for the position of Writing Center Coordinator based on her "strong technical background and corporate experience" and "sensitivity to the liberal arts," and she was not required or forcefully encouraged to develop her knowledge of composition
through formal study. Consequently, although she completed a master’s degree in liberal arts since becoming Writing Center Manager, she has pursued no formal training or education in composition studies. While she indicated that she reads several journals and regularly attends conferences related to writing and the operation of writing centers, she seems to have developed only a cursory understanding of the issues involved in writing instruction and the uses of computers in composition. Consequently, she has not followed many of the plans for computer-enhanced writing instruction as John and Margaret outlined them in their proposal, which were congruent with research in composition studies, and has instead developed her own agenda for computer-enhanced writing at MCC.

Jessica has also not fully adapted her managerial style to the academic environment. Although she did not consider the transition from the business to the higher education difficult and has gained the confidence of her administrative superiors, her relationships to faculty and students suggest that she has been less than successful relating to them. Although she consults faculty before making decisions about such things as selecting hardware and software, she considers this more a courtesy rather than a requirement and has never created a mechanism to enhance and formalize the faculty’s role in decision-making. As she said, she "still operates pretty corporately." She wants faculty and students to be happy, but faculty and students are her customers, not her partners. Even so, John and
Margaret's criticisms of the Center's operations suggest that she has been less than successful in satisfying the needs of the faculty and students who use it.

**Goals of the Faculty Developers.**

The creation of the Writing Center and its computer-enhanced writing program was motivated by a desire to support and promote writing at MCC. John and Margaret wanted the Writing Center to be a resource for students and faculty within and beyond the English Department and Developmental English Section. As they originally proposed it, the Writing Center had three parts, all supported by computers: a tutorial area, a resource/conferencing area, and a classroom area. The mission they proposed for this three-part center was quite broad. It was to offer peer tutoring for students with writing needs, provide resources for faculty to learn about writing instruction and create teaching materials, support teacher/student conferencing, and, not least importantly, offer computer-assisted instruction and other individualized, traditional and media-supported writing instruction, support computer-enhanced writing classes, and provide students and faculty with open-access to computers for writing.

Although neither articulated a detailed philosophy, John and Margaret both had specific beliefs about writing and computer-enhanced composition which informed their vision for the Writing Center. They believed that students learned to write "through writing itself" rather than by studying models or learning precepts. They valued the computer because they believed it could enhance this process-centered, learning-by-doing style of instruction. Within this
pedagogy, they felt the computer could be useful in two ways. First, when used as a writing instrument, the computer had the potential to motivate students and, by engaging them in writing, to help them to improve their writing skills and processes. Second, when used as an instructional tool, the computer could help teachers individualize instruction and intervene in students’ writing processes as they composed, the point at which such intervention would be most useful. Although their original proposal was eventually scaled back, the Writing Center that John and Margaret described in their final proposal included plans for using computers, primarily as word processors, both as writing instruments and as instructional tools in all its areas and services.

However, several of the elements in John and Margaret’s proposal were not included in the Writing Center as it began to operate in 1988. The most significant modifications of their plans resulted from administrative decisions based on purely pragmatic concerns. In fact, it is disturbing to see how easily elements of their proposal that John and Margaret had considered pedagogical imperatives were set aside in the face of practical challenges.

Making what is clearly the most significant change, the administration removed faculty from the Center’s management. John and Margaret had considered including faculty in the direction of the Center extremely important because it would create the high level of faculty involvement and help maintain the interdepartmental cooperation that they felt was needed to insure the Center’s successful operation. They based this conclusion on both their research
and their knowledge of their local context. Equally important, acting as Writing Center co-directors would also have given faculty the time and opportunity to learn about computers and their use in writing instruction for themselves and enabled them to bring what they learned into their teaching and the teaching of their colleagues. Because of the MCC writing faculty’s limited experience with computers and their heavy teaching loads (like teachers at many community colleges, they often have two or three preparations and teach four or five sections each quarter), this provision was critical to helping teachers adapt and integrate computers within their pedagogies.

In addition to these major alterations, John and Margaret made three other important changes due to the small space allocated to the Center. First, they eliminated the planned resource/conferencing area. This removed a resource faculty might have used to develop their computer skills and their knowledge about potential uses of computers in composition. Second, John and Margaret changed the design for the Center’s computer-enhanced classroom. In the redesigned classroom (Room 3), computers occupy the physical center of the space, dominating the room, and teachers have no computer reserved for their use. Finally, John and Margaret scaled down their plans for the tutorial area, reducing its size and eliminating all instructional media except computers.

The combined effect of these modifications was to increase the Center’s emphasis on computers and, at the same time, to decrease the faculty’s sense of ownership and responsibility for the Center and decrease opportunities for them
to learn about computers and their potential uses in writing instruction through the Center.

**Goals of the Writing Center Manager.**

Jessica did not present a clearly articulated philosophy which she uses to guide her direction of the Writing Center. The written statement of the Center’s philosophy which she provided expressed a clear objective, but does not reflect an underlying theory or guiding set of principles. Unlike John and Margaret, she did not clearly state a set of beliefs about writing or how writing should be taught. Even abstracting her beliefs about writing and writing instruction from the documents she provided for this study or the statements she made during our interview is difficult since she said very little that pertained directly to writing instruction, even when specifically invited to do so. For example, when asked to describe the assistance provided during Writing Center tutorials, Jessica listed what tutors do and do not do (they do "explain," and "help" with specific assignments; they do not help students who have "absolutely no fundamental building blocks," or proofread students’ papers), but she did not describe how they "help" or what they "explain." Similarly, when asked to discuss the Center’s written philosophy statement ("to encourage students to write better via a variety of experiences. We want them to become better, more independent writers."), she focused not on describing characteristics of students’ writing processes or written products, but on the importance of instilling certain attitudes in students. Specifically, she hopes that after coming to the Writing Center, students will
become more self-motivated. She believes computers contribute to this objective by motivating students to write and simplifying the production of texts—as she explained, "a student who has a paper to write will know it's not quite right, but won't be willing to type it again. In here, they'll come back and try because it's easy for them to do that." She also values computers because they create opportunities for students to become more self-reliant: students demonstrate responsibility for their own learning by taking the initiative to come to the Center to type their papers or go through computer training.

The mission of the Writing Center and the role of computers within it as carried out under Jessica and as she articulated it in our interview differ significantly from the mission and use of computers proposed by John and Margaret. Jessica described the Writing Center's mission in terms of two primary goals: introducing students to computers and helping students to improve their writing. The importance which Jessica assigns to introducing students to computers is illustrated by the mandatory program of computer training which she created and instituted, a service which she estimated accounts for ninety percent of the instruction provided by the Center's tutors. This goal, promoting computer literacy among MCC students, was an objective considered only tangentially by John and Margaret. The second goal Jessica included in the Writing Center's mission--helping students to improve their writing--was also a major part of the Writing Center's mission as John and Margaret defined it, but Jessica omitted several of the services related to this objective which John and
Margaret included: writing-across-the-curriculum efforts, faculty education efforts, and, except for providing computer literacy training and access to computers for word processing, all computer-assisted instruction.

To sum up, as would be expected, Jessica changed the goals and objectives of the Writing Center to reflect her own background and training. She dramatically expanded one part of the Center’s mission, its role in promoting computer literacy at MCC, and dramatically reduced and simplified those parts related to writing instruction, and especially, to faculty development. She also circumscribed the role of computers within the Writing Center more narrowly than John and Margaret had. Beyond their design for its computer-enhanced classroom, John and Margaret’s plans for incorporating computers into the Center were incomplete. They envisioned faculty developing strategies for using computers as they helped to manage the Center and while using the Center itself as a resource. Consequently, when Jessica became Coordinator, she assumed responsibility for fleshing-out the roles of computers in the Center which John and Margaret had only outlined. Like the goals and objectives she set for the Center, the philosophy and practice of computer-enhanced writing which she advocates reflect her status as a computer-specialist and her background as a corporate trainer.

Like John and Margaret, Jessica considers using word processing valuable for students because it motivates them and, by simplifying text production, encourages them to rewrite. Echoing statements made by John and Margaret,
she also doubts the efficacy of drill and practice software and the ability of students to effectively use software such as style analyzers. However, John and Margaret considered the computer useful as an instructional tool when used as a word processor because it could enhance teachers’ abilities to intervene in and shape their students’ writing processes. In contrast, Jessica does not see the computer as a useful instructional intervention, at least not for the community college students the Center serves and, consequently, strictly separates the Writing Center’s role in supporting access to computers and computer training from its role in providing writing instruction. As her comments about the relationship between computers and writing tutorials make quite clear, in Jessica’s view students can learn about computers and can use computers to produce texts, but cannot learn about writing through using computers:

I’m not sure about tutoring for computers in the same sense as tutoring for English or math. If they’re taking a COBOL class, I can definitely see the need for a tutor. . . . When you’re doing word processing, I don’t see tutoring in the same role. . . . As a matter of fact, if a student’s in here and says, "I’m doing this paper, we need [the student] to print it out and sit down one-on-one. No scooting up to the screen, looking at the screen, fix that, fix that, fix that.

The separation Jessica maintains between text production, in which computers have a role, and writing instruction, where computers have only a limited role, is completely different from the more integrated and integral role of computers in the Center foreseen by John and Margaret.

The differences between John and Margaret’s and Jessica’s conceptions of the Writing Center’s mission and the role of computers in writing instruction
result from their different backgrounds and the different perspectives from which they have been involved in the Center. John and Margaret had a set of beliefs about writing and writing instruction from which they could project potential uses for computers and the potential needs of faculty new to computer-enhanced instruction. As writing teachers and faculty members, they also had a standing from which to promote their beliefs and agendas among their colleagues. Unfortunately, they lacked a position of power from which to convince administrators to maintain the integrity of their proposal. Having no experience or expertise in teaching writing, Jessica lacked a similarly well-formed set of beliefs about writing and writing instruction and had a different understanding of the needs of faculty and students. But Jessica did possess expertise and authority as a computer specialist and manager. Based on her corporate experience, she also had strongly held views of what constitutes good learning behaviors, basic computer literacy, and adequate word processing skills. She constructed her more narrow view of the appropriate goals for the Writing Center and uses for computers in it within this context.

**Different Goals, Different Perspectives, Different Assessments.**

Partly because they have quite different understandings of what the Writing Center's goals for computer-enhanced writing are and should be, John and Margaret and Jessica also have conflicting opinions about how well these goals have been met. Jessica believes that students and faculty are being served well by the Center and gave no indication that she is aware that the faculty and
academic units its serves are not entirely pleased both with the goals she has set for the Center and how these goals are being pursued.

In sharp contrast to Jessica’s satisfaction, John and Margaret expressed serious concerns about the appropriateness of the Center’s current mission and goals. They lamented the lack of formal faculty involvement and the almost complete abandonment of the faculty education and writing-across-the curriculum efforts which they had considered major aspects of the Center. They also judged the Center’s success in meeting the mission and objectives which Jessica established much less positively than she. Although their overall assessments of the Writing Center were positive, they had numerous criticisms, including questions about who should determine the word processing skills students need, complaints about the frequency with which printer ribbons are changed, and concerns about the Center’s "stiff," business-like atmosphere. These criticisms and, perhaps even more clearly, the revelation that the Developmental Section is now considering creating a separate computer-enhanced center of its own, reveal the growing distance between the Center and the faculty it serves.

The dissonance between the participants' evaluations of the Center is symptomatic of two important and interconnected themes within the MCC Writing Center's development—the willingness of faculty to relinquish responsibility for determining the context for computer-enhanced writing
instruction within their institution and the separation of the Writing Center from the academic units most concerned with writing instruction at MCC.

While Margaret cited pessimism about the likelihood for receiving administrative support for the writing center project as the reason for the low level of early involvement and enthusiasm by English Department and Developmental English Section faculty, the fact that the Center was to include computers was undoubtedly very significant in determining the faculty's interest in the project and willingness to participate in it. As the "key" role of computer training ultimately played in getting faculty support for the project demonstrates, most MCC faculty were neither knowledgeable nor comfortable with computers when the writing center project began. Furthermore, as community college teachers with heavy teaching loads, they saw developing a computer-enhanced writing program as a responsibility they had little time to undertake. The elimination of the resource/conferencing area and the removal of faculty from the Center's management only exacerbated these impediments to the integration of computers into writing instruction at MCC.

As a computer specialist with no educational background or experience in writing instruction, Jessica has provided faculty who teach in the Center with little of the assistance or support they needed to develop their knowledge of computers and create pedagogies for the computer-enhanced classes they teach. Instead, she has helped faculty cultivate only the minimal computer skills required to operate and teach students to operate the Center's current hardware
and software. Furthermore, although Jessica increased the emphasis on computers within the Center's mission, she has promoted computers only as a tool for transcribing, and to a more limited extent, producing texts. Consequently, computer-enhanced instruction has remained a small, isolated part of MCC's overall writing program. Although several different writing courses have been offered through the Center, the percentage of sections of these courses taught in the Center is actually very low, and while most English Department faculty teach in the Center from time to time, only a few faculty from either the English Department or Developmental English Section teach in the Center regularly. Computer-enhanced instruction has also not expanded significantly beyond the writing program. Writing-across-the-curriculum has not become a reality, and although John and Margaret included literature courses among the classes they proposed the Center would support, since Jessica has focused on the use of computers for text production, there is little impetus for using computers to teach any English course in which composing (narrowly defined as producing texts) is not the central concern. For the same reason, most of the classes the Center supports are sections of English 111 and basic writing courses. These classes are convenient places to introduce students to word processing since they are beginning courses and have no research or literature components to provide additional content.
From Writing Center to Word Processing Lab

The fact that the Writing Center now operates as an administrative unit completely separate from the English Department and Developmental English Section is not surprising. What began as a writing center designed to support and promote writing instruction through the use of computers has become a computer lab specializing in word processing. Jessica’s assertion that no "really fundamental changes" are needed in the Center reflects her belief that this is an appropriate function for a writing center at MCC. Her satisfaction with the Center’s day-to-day operation shows that from her perspective as manager, the Center is serving this function well. In contrast, John and Margaret’s dissatisfaction with the Center’s current mission demonstrates that they do not believe a word processing lab is what their Writing Center should be based on what they knew about computer-enhanced composition before they began the Writing Center project, what they learned as they developed the Center, and what they have learned since the Center opened. In addition to this more fundamental concern, their pragmatic concerns about the Center’s day-to-day operation reveal that even as a word processing lab, the Writing Center is not serving them or their students well as they believe it could and should.

In sum, the MCC Writing Center is not a dynamic program in its own right, and although it has, to use Jessica’s words, grown and flourished, it has not become a major part of MCC’s English and Developmental writing programs, is not a source of vitality and innovation within these programs, nor a vehicle for
promoting writing as a way of learning across-the-curriculum at MCC. The goals for computer-enhanced writing at MCC—increasing students' computer literacy, helping them to develop word processing skills, and providing them with access to computers for writing—have proven to be attainable and satisfying goals for Jessica, but not John and Margaret, who, in John's words "see the possibilities." While Jessica's failure to educate herself about writing instruction, especially computer-enhanced writing instruction, has contributed significantly to this outcome, the responsibility for the context of computer-enhanced writing at MCC is shared by John and Margaret who failed to press for faculty participation in the Center's management and for continuing faculty education after the Center opened, and by the administrators who failed to understand that the faculty involvement and development which characterized the creation of the Center needed to continue and required administrative support.

MCC Teacher Case Study One: Ann

Profile and Context

Ann has been a full-professor at Middleton Community College and Director of the MCC Honors Program since 1985. She was an assistant professor in MCC's Department of English from 1976 to 1982, an associate professor from 1983 to 1985, and has continued to teach English courses regularly. She earned a B.A. in English in 1967, an M.A. in English in 1969, and a Doctor of Arts in English with a major in composition theory in 1983.
Ann has taught writing for nineteen years, the last sixteen at MCC. She has taught all three courses in MCC’s freshman composition sequence, as well as courses in vocabulary building, ethnic studies, drama, world literature, and women’s studies. She regularly teaches honors sections of MCC’s freshman composition courses. Ann has taught English 111 using computers for three years. She has taught no other computer-enhanced courses. In Spring Quarter 1992, her teaching schedule included the computer-enhanced section of English 111 I observed, another computer-enhanced section of English 111, and an honors section of English 113, the final course in MCC’s freshman composition sequence.

During the fifth week of the quarter, I met with Ann in her office for approximately two hours to discuss her non-teaching experience with computers, her teaching experience with and without computers, her knowledge and beliefs about teaching writing, and her knowledge and beliefs about teaching writing with computers. Many of my questions followed-up responses Ann had provided on the pre-interview questionnaire (Appendix C). I met with Ann once more near the end of the quarter to share a written summary of my observations and ask additional questions about what I had observed.

Introduction to Computers and Range of Experience with Computers

Ann began using the computer for her own writing in 1988 after being encouraged to do so by a friend and former student. In addition to her desire to develop word processing skills for her personal writing, she also wanted to
develop her skills because she knew MCC was in the midst of creating its
computer-enhanced writing center. Ann currently uses a word processor to write
personal and professional letters, business correspondence, and academic papers,
and to create course materials such as syllabi. Grading and commenting on
students’ themes, writing quick memos, and recordkeeping are the only writing
activities for which she rarely uses the computer. Ann does not use computers
for any non-writing purposes.

While Ann would like to know more about computers, she is satisfied
with her knowledge of computers and computer skills for her personal, non-
teaching purposes. She describes her computer knowledge and skills as very
basic, but indicated that a friend with whom she collaborates, "keeps her moving
ahead and learning." All of her computing experience has been on MS-DOS-
based, IBM-compatible systems. Her home system is an IBM-compatible with a
color monitor and an Epson dot matrix printer. In her office she uses an older
model IBM-compatible system. In the classroom she uses IBM-compatible, 286-
based NCR PC 8 computers with EGA monitors, and Epson dot matrix printers.
The only software she uses are the word processors Professional Write and PC
Write Standard. Although she used to use the original PC Write at home to
create class materials, she no longer uses PC Write at home because the
upgraded, Standard version, which is currently used in the Writing Center,
requires too much memory to operate on her home system. Ann said that she
selected her IBM-compatible system and Professional Write word processor based
on the recommendations of the friend and former student who introduced her to
word processing. She has not seriously considered purchasing any other software
for her own use, but she is thinking about upgrading her home system so she can
use *PC Write Standard*.

Ann learned to operate her computer and use *Professional Write* on her
own and with the help of her friend. Her only formal instruction in using
computers and word processing was the one-on-one training offered to teachers
just before MCC opened its Writing Center. Through this workshop, Ann
learned to operate the NCR IBM-compatible and *PC Write* word processor then
used in the Writing Center.

**Attitudes and Beliefs about Computers and Writing**

Ann enjoys word processing because it makes the writing process quicker
by making revising easier. She also appreciates that it makes her writing more
legible and easier to store and access for future reference and editing. She feels
that her writing "seems to live" when on the computer screen so that the act of
writing is more engaging and enjoyable when done on the computer. When
asked to complete the sentence, "I don't like writing with the computer because"
on the pre-interview questionnaire, Ann left the sentence unfinished. When
asked about the item, she indicated that she could think of nothing to write
because she "thoroughly enjoys" writing using computers.
While Ann does not feel that word processing has changed her writing process dramatically, she indicated that her use of word processing has undergone a significant change. As she explained,

When I first started using a word processor, I couldn't compose on the machine. Now, except for brief notes and personal letters, I only compose on a word processor. Even if I'm only going to do a draft of a memo and my secretary is going to rewrite that memo, put it into Multi-Mate [the word processor used in most administrative offices at MCC], I'll still sit there and do it on the machine rather than do it by hand. I like to look at it. I like the ease of editing and revising.

Sources and Assessment of Knowledge about Teaching Writing

On the pre-interview questionnaire, Ann rated the degree of importance of six items to two aspects of her knowledge about teaching composition: her general knowledge about teaching composition and her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Each item was rated as either very important, important, not very important, unimportant, or not applicable for each aspect (Table 1). She also had the option of listing additional items. During our first interview, Ann discussed the significance of these items and the differences between their contributions to her general knowledge about teaching composition and her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Ann rated the contributions of her colleagues and associates as "not very important" to her general knowledge about teaching composition but "very important" to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Commenting on the contribution of her colleagues to her general knowledge about teaching composition, Ann said,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues/Associates</td>
<td>Not Very Impt.</td>
<td>Very imp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coursework</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Coursework</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journals</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Not Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Conferences</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Hands-On Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the traditional classroom we remain very much autonomous, and we do very little sharing. I think that there are some faculty within the Department that are very close, and they share back and forth with each other a great deal. Except for my encountering a colleague at a department meeting, my colleagues don't speak to me... beyond, "Hello. Hi. How are you doing?" As far as intellectual exchanges between colleagues... for me, there is little.

Ann said that she rated the contribution of colleagues and associates as "very important" to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers primarily because of the technical help and suggestions about ways to teach basic word processing skills she received from colleagues when the Writing Center first opened. She explained, however, that such exchanges of information and ideas among colleagues have not continued:

As far as what goes on day-to-day in the classroom, we don't do much exchanging. Many people involved in a new technique or approach spend time exchanging ideas. "Here's what I did," or, "This doesn't work." That's not on-going here. I don't believe there is strong enthusiasm for innovation. I don't know why it's not there, but I don't see it.

Commenting on the contributions of her graduate and undergraduate coursework to her knowledge about teaching writing and teaching writing with computers, Ann explained that while she felt her graduate coursework was "important" to her general knowledge about teaching composition, she considered it "not applicable" to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. She explained that because her doctorate was in composition theory, she considers her graduate work important to her general knowledge about teaching composition. However, because she completed her doctoral work in 1983 and had no experience with word processing while in graduate school, she
does not feel her graduate work contributes to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Ann considers her undergraduate coursework "unimportant" to her knowledge of teaching composition and "not applicable" to her knowledge of teaching composition with computers because her undergraduate work was focused on literature and personal computers were not yet available when she completed her degree.

Ann rated the contribution of her teaching experience "very important" to her general knowledge about teaching composition and "important" to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Discussing her ratings, she said,

So much that I know as a writing teacher has just been two things: OJT [on the job training] and dealing with students on a one-to-one basis. . . . Experience has really been the most important for me in both traditional and computer-enhanced classrooms.

Referring specifically to her teaching experience with computers, she added,

When I went in the first day of class, I thought, "I'm going to teach these students to use this program and I don't know it that well myself." I hate not being in control of my subject matter. . . . I had asked one of the other teachers, "How was it? You taught in the Writing Center this quarter. I'm going to try it next year. Did you like it?" He said, "Well, it was interesting. I won't do it again," and I thought, "Oh! It was that difficult." So when I went in, I was frightened that I would confuse the students, that I wouldn't be able to control the situation. I think I was put off a bit the first quarter by the changes in approach, but I got encouragement from other people who knew more about it than I did and would say, "Well, just do it this way," or "Why don't you try this?" So at first I just felt flustered . . . but now that I've taught it two or three years, I'm more comfortable.
Ann rated the contributions of professional journals as "very important" to her general knowledge about teaching composition and "not very important" to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. She listed *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* as journals that she reads regularly and indicated that she reads other NCTE journals and publications on an occasional basis. Ann said that one reason she found her reading less important to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers was because the articles and books she has read on the subject were too general. As she explained,

> I think that books and articles on computers and writing perhaps have to be general because publishers don’t know what specific software is available in a college. When a writer addresses cognition and strategies for invention and other kinds of techniques used to generate the writing process outside computers, writers are more specific about strategies.

Ann also felt her reading was less important to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers because there is less emphasis on computers and writing in the scholarship.

Ann considered the contribution of workshops and conferences "important" to her general knowledge about teaching writing but "not applicable" to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers. She explained that she assigned these ratings for many of the same reasons she described for her ratings of the contributions of professional journals. However, reconsidering her "not applicable" rating of the contribution of conferences and workshops to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers, she commented,
As a teacher, I receive more information through conferences where they’re sharing information with you hands-on. Maybe the company is trying to promote a software program, and I can just stand there and learn a great deal about what can be done and what’s available. . . . In that sense, yes, I think demonstrations provide a great deal of new information.

To illustrate her need for "hand-ons" instruction when learning to use software and hardware, Ann reported what happened after Jessica introduced PC Write Standard:

Jessica came in and said "I’m going to teach you how to use this," and she did. . . . It looked so quick and easy when she did it, so then she gave me the guidesheet and I was sitting there and I deleted the entire syllabus. I had to go back to scratch and start over again which was very frustrating.

Ann is very comfortable with her knowledge about teaching writing in traditional classrooms. She considers herself a good teacher, and although as Director of MCC’s Honors Program much of her time is devoted to her administrative duties, she feels teaching is very important to the satisfaction she experiences in her professional life. Commenting on her teaching, Ann said,

I do try to keep myself fairly abreast, although I’m swamped. Community college requires such a heavy teaching load. Graduate school . . . really improved my teaching ability. I feel comfortable with my teaching, and I’d say it’s been a combination of looking at research and experience. Also I think . . . I’m flexible enough that if I see new strategies that are good, I’m going to want to adopt or adapt them.

Ann is less comfortable with her knowledge about teaching writing in the computer-enhanced classroom. When asked to assess her knowledge about teaching writing with computers, Ann replied,
My knowledge of teaching writing on the computer is minimal. I'd say I have little knowledge of what's available, and I really haven't gone out to educate myself a great deal about it. That is a weakness of mine. I would own up to the fact that I haven't worked enough on computer-enhanced instruction.

When asked if there were specific computer skills or areas involved in teaching writing with computers that she needs or would like to know more about, Ann said,

For example, when there is software related or integrated with the text, as *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, 3rd edition has, I would like to know what it is and how to use it. [Jessica], the Writing Center's manager, was going to buy the software . . . and give us instruction on how to use these materials. I don't know what happened. There was no follow through.

Ann also explained that while she would like to learn more about teaching composition with computers, she does not know how she would find the time. As she explained, "Always my greatest difficulty is pressure, pressure to complete." Discussing her workload, she said that in addition to her administrative duties as Director of the Honors Program, she teaches three courses each quarter:

My chair usually gives me three separate preps. . . . This quarter is the first time I've only had two preps in two years. I never teach in the summer in order to give myself time to recoup, and I also use my summer to learn new things, but I'm taking on a new responsibility in teaching a special vocabulary course to the American Sign Language classes . . . so I'll be spending the summer meeting some of the new demands of this course. . . . I also completely revise and redo my syllabi every summer, so there are always so many things I want to do and so little time even in the summer.
Beliefs about Teaching Writing with Computers

How Computers are Used in Writing Classrooms.

When asked to describe the ways in which computers are used in writing classrooms, Ann indicated that while she is neither very familiar with computer-assisted instruction nor up-to-date on the scholarship on computers and composition, she believes that word processing is the most prevalent use. Beyond word processing, she believes software packages which assist students as they go through the writing process and help them with invention are probably widely used since they now accompany many textbooks. She believes that computers are also being used effectively at many colleges and universities to facilitate communication and collaboration in writing classrooms. She listed spelling and grammar checkers as other frequently used computer software. Ann considers software packages that assist students with the writing process as probably the most important use for computers in writing classes.

Ann believes that how and how much computers are used at a particular college or university are determined by the philosophy guiding its English Department and how much money the institution is willing or able to invest in computer technology. As she explained,

What guides the philosophy of the department are several things—for example, how seriously they take composition, and how much emphasis they place on quality instruction. . . . I would say, for example, at a community college, money fuels most innovations, but I think there is faculty resistance to implementing new approaches to composition.

Citing MCC as an example, she explained,
You see, there is little emphasis in our school on the faculty themselves continuing to develop professionally. You can if you want to. If you don't, you don't. It will not necessarily jeopardize your job or your promotion. So I think that there is phobia, resistance to computers, to change. And I'm not saying that we're just out and out conservative, but I still think that there is resistance: "Well, I'll do it if I have to."

Ann believes such resistance hampers the development of computer-enhanced writing classes and other innovative teaching strategies at institutions like MCC.

**What Writing Teachers Who Teach with Computers Should Know About Computers and About Computers and Writing.**

Ann believes that teachers who use computers in their writing courses need special training and feels this training can best be provided through specialized courses and workshops for faculty. Citing the situation at MCC as an example, she said,

We need to have courses for teachers to learn to use and teach with computers, and they could be available in any number of ways. I don't believe this school has availed itself of them. We've brought in speakers for in-service. For example . . . we've had somebody come in and talk about what's available on computers, but that's not the same as making a major investment. . . . When the College set up the Writing Lab . . . those of us who chose to could learn to use the particular system that was going to be available; many people seemed to have a good experience with this short-term instruction, although I didn't. . . . But there have been a great number of additions that we need, particularly for the people who are very interested in CAI. We could educate faculty very easily, and I think, fairly cheaply with a grant.

When asked to describe, based on her knowledge and experience, what knowledge of computers and computer skills writing teachers who teach with computers should have, Ann indicated that teachers must know the system that
they teach with "absolutely well." She also feels that teachers should be aware of other kinds of systems that are available and teaching strategies that have been developed particularly for computer-enhanced classrooms. Summing up, she commented, "Writing teachers need to know what's available, what we can do with computers."

The Effects and Potential Effects of Computers on the Teaching of Writing.

When asked to discuss the most important effects computers have had on the teaching of writing, Ann replied,

I would say for myself, and I don't know whether this is true for others, the computer decents the classroom. Computers move the teacher from behind the lectern and shift student interest. . . . You're no longer protected by the lectern, saying, "When I walk into the classroom, I'm the authority." When I walk into the Writing Center, unlike walking into a traditional classroom, I'm not the center because the students are tuned into the machine. . . . I think that because the computer does decenter the class, it puts some of the responsibility onto the students to learn, and I think that's wonderful. The students should become participants in their own education, and not just passively wait--"Well, I have to sit here and wait for someone to tell me what to do."

Ann feels that the decentering teachers may experience in computer-enhanced classrooms could account for some teachers' reluctance to teach in these classrooms:

Many teachers who have been ten or fifteen years behind the lectern may not feel secure. . . . I don't know if I would have been as easy to teach writing in the lab if I had not already centered my honors classrooms, where I gave control of the classroom to the students. But even my honors classes aren't as decentered as my computer class. So I say that teaching custom accounts for faculty resistance.
When asked to describe the most important potential effect of computers in writing classrooms, Ann explained that while she feels decentering is very important, she considers the computer's ability to enhance students' creativity and writing process as their most significant potential contribution to writing classes:

The best potential of the word processor is that the writing is being generated as the students think, and the students see it much more quickly if they're fairly adept. It doesn't have to be great prose; the students begin to see a nice clean product. The writing may not be interesting and it may not be grammatically correct, but the students are looking at a nice clean product instead of the messy handwritten text. . . . I think the screen allows the students to see something that they've done in print. I realize that we get the same effect on the typewriter, but so few community college students have access to or take the time to type their papers. The second improvement is editing. Editing and revising are so easy on the computer. I think the students cue into editing very quickly, and they become less resistant to revising, which is, I think, the greatest difficulty we have in a test-taking society where the test-taking mode, which the student comes already bearing, is that she gets one shot at producing text. So that's how students approach writing. "This is my first shot. This is my best shot. I'm not going to revise it. I can't make this composition more interesting." The simplicity of revising and editing and getting students to realize the difference between revising and editing and proofing is a wonderful benefit.

Ann also believes that computers can enhance collaboration in writing classrooms and considers this another important potential effect. As she explained,

Computers offer opportunities for collaboration. As we know, some of our great critical works are collaborative texts. And let's face it. In the real world, in the future world, there's very little produced that is single text. I believe teaching students to collaborate is also teaching them a skill that they're going to encounter in the real world, and community colleges are supposed
to be real world colleges. . . . We’re teaching students to go out and work in a very practical sense on the job. So collaboration is one of the good opportunities that can come out of computer-enhanced writing, especially at a community college.

When asked if she felt there were any potential problems or drawbacks associated with using computers in writing classrooms, Ann indicated that while increased plagiarism might be a potential problem, she does not consider it a serious one.

Assessment of the Teaching Environment: Instructional Support, Academic Freedom, and the Classroom Environment

Teaching Writing in the English Department’s Traditional Classrooms.

Ann believes that the amount and kind of support for her teaching furnished by the Department of English and the College is adequate. She feels that the classrooms and offices are generally well-maintained, but would like to see teachers in the Department of English receive computers for their offices as faculty in many other departments have. She explained that while she has a computer in the Honors Program office,

It took three and a half years to get and is a piece of outdated machinery that somebody didn’t want. For example, when the College upgraded to 5.0 DOS, the Honors program’s computer could not be upgraded. It also has only one 5 1/4 inch floppy drive when most of the College uses 3.5 inch disks.

She feels teachers should have computer systems in their offices capable of running the software available in the Writing Center.

When asked, "What is it like to teach composition in a traditional classroom in the Department of English at Middleton Community College?" Ann
said that she feels she has a great deal of autonomy. She considers most of the
Department's policies and guidelines reasonable and believes they support good
teaching and meet the needs of the students. Discussing the Department's
master syllabi for its freshman composition courses and its use of a common
textbook, Ann commented,

I'm sure some people would consider having a master syllabus
restrictive and also having a selected textbook restrictive. I believe
if you're a good teacher, you can take a bad textbook and use it.
There's an old saying that a good student isn't hurt by a bad
teacher. Well, I don't think a good teacher is hurt by a bad text or
a text that's not quite suited to her purposes and goals. . . . I can
go into the classroom and introduce any kind of materials I want to
over and above or in support of this text, and I do that. So I really
don't find it restrictive.

When asked if she would like to see any changes in the Department's
policies and practices related to the teaching of writing, Ann indicated that she
would like to have additional autonomy in some areas but more guidelines in
others. As she explained,

I'd like greater flexibility in certain kinds of policies. I would like
to see us doing a lot fewer kinds of writing and really emphasizing
revision. . . . What I would really like to see us do is put some
teeth behind the word "quality," and I would like to see us have
mandated assessment because I think our grades are exceedingly
inflated. So I wish that there were some clearer grading guidelines
for the part-timers. I wish that there was a component in logic for
our students. So much of what they say is obvious and mindless,
and sometimes teachers believe, "Well, let the students come in
and discuss things because this makes for a nice classroom
environment." Discussion occurs, but often what happens . . . is
that the students share ignorances. They don't share ideas. So, I'd
like to see some more emphasis on quality.
When asked if she had ever requested that the Department adopt a particular textbook or suggested that it purchase a particular piece of equipment or type of supplies for use in its traditional classrooms, Ann said that she had never requested equipment or supplies, but had served on and made suggestions to textbook committees.

Teaching Writing in the Writing Center’s Computer-Enhanced Classrooms.

When asked what is it is like to teach English 111 in the Writing Center’s computer-enhanced classrooms, Ann indicated that teachers must use the same text and master syllabus used in the English Department’s traditional classrooms. When asked if she had ever requested that the English Department or Writing Center purchase a particular piece of hardware or software, Ann replied that she had not and said that she does not feel knowledgeable enough to do so. When asked if she would like to see any changes in the English Department’s or Writing Center’s policies or practices related to teaching writing with computers, Ann said that she would like to use a different textbook in her computer-enhanced classes, but does not feel this is possible. Because of the large number of part-time instructors and the high cost of textbooks to students, Ann believes the Department needs to maintain a common textbook for all sections of Freshman composition classes.

When asked to describe the kind and amount of support the English Department and Writing Center provide for her computer-enhanced writing
classes, Ann indicated that while teachers receive some technical, computer-related support, they do not receive enough. Commenting on the technical support currently provided in the Writing Center, Ann said,

Except for transferring files to a disk, we do not get any. We get hands-on help, like having a tutor come in when a student jams up a printer or messes up a file. But, for example, they don’t check to see if the paper in the printers is in the right place. I’m going to find that out when I get into the classroom and then I call a tutor which takes up class time. . . . Perhaps the lab just doesn’t have enough help. If a teacher is walking out and another teacher is walking in, perhaps tutors don’t have enough time to do that. But as far as pointing us toward computer-related journals or keeping us abreast of software, zero.

When asked to describe what kinds of additional technical support she would like to have available, Ann replied that she does not feel knowledgeable enough to make major recommendations, perhaps because she has been given so little technical support or education. She did cite one aspect of the Writing Center’s classroom operations that interferes with her teaching:

One of the problems in reproducing the students’ papers is that they are draft quality. I cannot even xerox it well. Often I have to retype the paper if I want to use it as an example because it’s not NLQ [near letter quality]. . . . [Jessica] has the software set so that it only prints draft. So I can’t even reproduce student work and put it on a transparency because overhead transparencies require pretty good copy quality.

When asked to describe the amount and kind of non-technical, pedagogical support the Department of English or the Writing Center provide for her computer-enhanced writing classes, Ann indicated that she receives little or no non-technical support and would like to be given more:
We need a great deal of that. . . . I wish that there was much more teacher education about computers and composition and what's available . . . and I don't know whether there will ever be a real interest in that. I don't even know what the English Department chairperson's philosophy is . . . I think that we need more education and support available if we want to get more teachers involved, but, for example, I don't know if there's any movement to ever bring part-timers into teaching in the lab. We probably could and should because some of our part-timers would enjoy the challenge. Yet in department meetings I've heard the tenured faculty say, "Never. Never will you get me in the lab." So are you going to honor that resistance or are you going to make the Writing Center experience more of a requirement? Currently it is volunteer, but if we open up participation, especially to part-timers, we'll certainly need more education and . . . support available.

Ann has taught all her computer-enhanced sections of English 111, including the section observed in this study, in Writing Center Room 3 (Figure 1). When asked to evaluate the arrangement of this classroom, Ann replied,

I wish the configuration was a wrap around rather than the current column arrangement. In other words, if we had a wrap around where the teacher stood in the center of the room, the lab would be more efficient.

She explained that the current arrangement makes lecturing somewhat difficult and having class discussions awkward because there is so little space and students are cut off from one another by having the computer workstations in the middle of the room.

When asked to evaluate the hardware and software available in the classroom, Ann said that she likes the NCR PCs and has never had any particular problems with them. She said that the Epson dot matrix printers would also, "be fine if they were set to produce letter quality, which they can do."
Ann also believes that having the computers equipped with two sizes of floppy disks is helpful because it helps prevent students from confusing the word processing program disks with their data disks. When asked if she would like to see any changes or additions made to the classroom's hardware, Ann said, that while she lacked the expertise to suggest specific changes, she would prefer equipment where I could stand up in the center of the class and type examples of student work and have it projected onto the students' computers... instead of me going in with an overhead transparency... I'd like to be able to take a student writing problem, type it, and project it onto an overhead. Now there's no way for me to do that unless I load it onto everybody's disk myself, or I go and create the example, which is what I've generally done, and provide them hard copies, and they get in little clusters around their machines and... discuss it. I give handouts more than put files onto students' data disks and ask the students to print them out. I could go to the Writing Center staff and ask them to transfer it. To me it's not time efficient because the lab manager requires twenty-four hours of lead time for transfer to students' disks. I also give students a hard copy to take home because I think it's important that they have it as a reference rather than saying, "It's on your disk at school." The student is not going to have the disk at home. So a new configuration could provide these [capacities].

Commenting on the Center's word processor, *PC Write Standard*, she said, "I don't know a great deal about what's available in the way of simple word processors. I'm not quite sure what thinking, what philosophy went into the selection of the software that we use. I have absolutely no idea."

**Goals and Pedagogy for Computer-Enhanced English 111**

Ann feels that her philosophy and goals for teaching composition are the same for her computer-enhanced English 111 classes as they are for her
traditional English 111 classes. Discussing her goals for English 111, Ann explained,

I look for quality in students' writing. I am not so much of the mind of the self-esteem school. I will say, "This is not good. This is not college level writing." I do tell my students that what my grade really reflects is their ability in my class and my assessment of their ability to continue in English composition.

On her syllabus, Ann explains that her computer-enhanced English 111 class "emphasizes prewriting, drafting, and thesis development through basic patterns of exposition," and its objectives are

to empower students with the confidence to write effectively and correctly for a variety of audiences; to experience writing as a way of thinking and a way of producing new knowledge; and to understand and practice writing and rewriting.

The syllabus also explains that the course teaches students "to compose coherent, audience-directed themes and to use a word processor," two "important skills in the age of information."

While Ann does not believe teaching with computers has changed her philosophy or goals in her English 111 classes, she believes that the presence of computers in the classroom has changed the climate of her computer-enhanced classes:

Students at workstations or little carrels changes the climate in the classroom by making students much more on task all the time. If students sit there waiting for ... a class to begin, they chat and gossip. Whereas my students in the writing lab are going to gossip less with each other. They come in and start using the computer. They often arrive fifteen minutes early, and they begin to compose. When I walk into the lab, usually students are already typing away. ... So, as far as getting the students to actually spend more time at writing, the computer does that.
Ann reported that the most significant change computers have made in her teaching is that computers have decentered her classes and led to more "interaction between students who help each other." She also reiterated that students spend more time composing during classes and added that she does more one-on-one instruction in her computer-enhanced classes than in her traditional classes:

I don’t believe it is specific to computer technology, but the one-on-one tutoring that you’re allowed to do by having students in a writing situation is helpful. If I give free writing time in a . . . regular classroom, students often are not writing. So this change is indirectly related to the computers. When students sit before a computer, there’s something compelling about that screen and that little blinking light. They do write.

When asked to describe her teaching strategies, Ann indicated that students in her classes spend some class time composing almost every day and sometimes spend most of the period writing. She regularly assigns homework exercises, in-class exercises, and readings from the textbook, but does not give quizzes based on the readings. Frequently she will conduct a class discussion of a model essay or exercise displayed using the overhead projector. She requires students to have a draft of each of their themes peer-edited and reserves class time for this purpose. She said that while she organizes students into groups to work collaboratively on in-class assignments "a few times a quarter," most collaboration among students happens more informally as students consult with one another while using the computers to write. She observed that collaborations frequently begin as students help each other with printing or using
the word processor but often develop into relationships in which students consult each other about their writing. When asked to describe the role of the computer in her pedagogy, Ann emphasized that students in her classes use computers only for word processing, and she does not use computers to teach writing.

Commenting on how computers are used in her classes, Ann explained,

I don’t believe that I have any knowledge of nor have I ever instructed nor have I ever been given any instruction in really what I would consider computer-aided instruction. I teach students to write their papers on a word processor. That’s all. They just learn to use the particular word processing program that we have bought for this course. Pretty much everything else is traditional in the lab.

Assessment of Computer-Enhanced English 111 and Reflections on the Computer in English Studies

When asked to describe the three or four most important advantages of using computers in her writing classroom, Ann indicated that the major advantage is that students are more willing to revise and edit their writing when composing on the word processor. She believes that because they are more willing to revise their papers when composing on computers, students in her computer-enhanced classes learn to use supporting evidence in their essays more effectively than students in her traditional classes. As she explained,

When I point out to them that they are vague . . . and I say, "Go ahead and use an example," they are much more willing to expand because it is easier to add the supporting evidence rather than keep the generalizations they initially write. I can say, "Look. Can you see that this is a really high level of generality?" And I’ll say, "These three sentences go together. Here’s a space break in here," and I’ll hit the return to create a space. "Can you type in two sentences that would support that generalization? Here’s another
sentence that's generalized. Would you supply something?" These easy ways of using the word processor help them provide supporting evidence.

Other advantages Ann mentioned were the students' access to spelling checkers, additional time spent working one-on-one with students as they write, smaller class sizes, and more legible student papers.

When asked to describe the three or four most important disadvantages of using computers in her writing classroom, Ann indicated that the major disadvantage was the students' tendency to become "too absorbed" in the computers:

Some of them believe that composing in class is all they should do. So they should not consider the classroom as being only composing. I had to tell the students the other day, "Turn off your machines and listen. . . . I believe I need to do more in the classroom than I do, that students end up running the class too much themselves. That's number one. Then, another problem is too often their goal appears to be to turn out a product. They do too little application of the textbook to their own process of writing, so some make few tangible improvements in analyzing the weaknesses in their writing. They spend more time getting their draft onto the disk and printing than in learning to improve their themes.

She listed students' limited keyboarding skills and lack of time outside of class to use the computers as other significant disadvantages. Ann believes that while lack of keyboarding skills leads some students to become frustrated while using the word processor, using the computer to compose offers some advantages even to students who have poor keyboarding skills:

For some students who laboriously write and write so slowly, the fact that they can type and print . . . is a help. Even if they're just typing with two fingers, they can perform better than in writing by hand.
Commenting on the problem of limited access to computers outside of class, Ann explained that she thinks this is a difficulty experienced more often by commuter students at institutions such as MCC than by students at more traditional universities. As she explained,

Our students are at a disadvantage as opposed, I think, to a student at . . . any major university where most of the students live on campus. My students, eighty-percent of whom work off campus, have little time to come back and use the Center when it’s open for them.

Ann enjoys teaching in a computer-enhanced classroom and will continue to teach sections of English 111 using computers. She believes that MCC’s other freshman composition courses could and probably should be taught using computers but asserts additional software and faculty training would be required:

We don’t have any software to teach our students how to use notes, how to do works cited, superscript, subscript. PC Write isn’t a good one to use for our English 112 course. I know that with PC Write Standard now it’s much easier to do superscript and subscript, put headers on pages and all of that, but I believe we should have different software. . . . I think the computer-enhanced classroom would be ideal for collaboration, to discuss the pros and cons of arguments, if you have split screen, but learning to use this approach would require faculty instruction. I don’t know if there is not a willingness to put the money in or perhaps faculty wouldn’t do it.

When asked if she would like to use computers in any of the other courses she teaches, Ann said she wasn’t certain, and explained,

I don’t know. I was thinking about my vocabulary course. . . . I don’t use a workbook type of approach. Whereas if you were teaching vocabulary employing the workbook method common in some college [vocabulary] courses and put all that workbook information in the computer or bought a package, it would work.
But I'm not convinced a workbook approach is best, so I don't I want to do that, not yet.

Description of Materials from Ann's English 111 Class

Ann submitted eight items which she distributed in her English 111 class during Spring Quarter, 1992: the course syllabus, two single-page PC Write Standard reference guides, two short essays, a copy of a newspaper editorial, and two exercises, one a sentence chart and the other a paragraph revision exercise (Appendix C). The PC Write Standard reference guides were created by Jessica, the Writing Center Manager for distribution to students using the Center.

The syllabus is two pages long. The first page provides information about the course such as a brief course description, the course objectives, the required textbook, the grading scale, descriptions of assignments and requirements, and policies on attendance and using the Writing Center. The required textbook, the St. Martin's Guide to Writing, third edition, includes a two page section on "Writing with a Word Processor." Students complete four themes, a final essay examination, and a number of homework exercises. The themes are based on assignments from the St. Martin's text and ascend in value from twenty-five to one hundred points. The syllabus explains that the values are weighted because students are expected to develop their revision and editing skills and improve their writing as they progress through the course. Students are informed that they are expected to use the Writing Center's computers, and they are encouraged but not required to complete their themes on the computers. They are also advised that some of their writing, such as brainstorming, invention, and
editing, will be completed outside the Writing Center. The second page of the syllabus is a schedule of activities, assignments, and due dates. Themes are due during the third, fifth, seventh, and tenth week of the quarter, and peer editing of the students' drafts is scheduled for at least part of one class day before each theme is due. Readings and activities from the textbook are assigned for almost every class meeting and include chapters about writing aims, such as "Taking a Position," the aim of the first assigned theme, and about the writing process, such as "Editing for Style."

The two essay handouts are on the same general topic and accompany theme assignments. The first, "The Death of Benny Paret" by Norman Mailer, is a narrative which describes the boxer Paret and his final prizefight; it was distributed during the second week of class and accompanied theme assignment one, describing a memorable person. In the second essay handout, "Who Killed Benny Paret," Norman Cousins discusses Paret's death in the ring and gives his position on its cause; it was distributed during the fifth week and accompanied theme assignment two, taking a position, and theme assignment three, writing about causes. Ann explained that the purpose of using two themes on the same subject was to demonstrate how writers adapt material to their audience and purpose.

The first exercise, a sentence graph, was completed during the sixth week of class (E1, Appendix C). During class Ann instructed students to use the graph to describe each of the sentences in "The Death of Benny Paret," listing its
number of words and identifying it as a simple, compound, complex, or compound-complex sentence. Students completed the exercise individually as homework then discussed their answers as a class during the following class meeting. Ann explained that this exercise was given to demonstrate the role of sentence variety in creating and holding an audience's interest. The second handout was a revision exercise given as homework during the sixth week of class (E2, Appendix C). It presents a short narrative paragraph and instructs the students to "study the story and then write it over again in a better way." In class, Ann also directed students to embellish the story by adding paragraphs and a conclusion with a moral.

The final item, a single-page editorial from *Newsweek*, was used during a lecture-discussion about arguing a position held during the eighth week of class. The editorial argues for welfare reforms as a solution to the problems of the underclass in America.

A listing of the exercises assigned in Ann's English 111 class is provided in Table 2.

**Observations of Ann's Computer-Enhanced English 111 Class**

Ann's computer-enhanced English 111 class met on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 4:00 until 5:15 p.m. in Room 3. The section was listed as an evening class in MCC's quarterly course bulletin and had an enrollment of eighteen students. During my observations, I acted as a participant-observer. During lecture/discussions, I usually sat at the empty workstation at the front of
Table 2: Writing Exercises Assigned in Ann’s English 111 Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>list arguments for and against a position in two columns</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise 1</td>
<td>use a sentence graph to list and identify the sentences in an essay by sentence type</td>
<td>written, homework, reviewed in-class</td>
<td>paper/pen, whiteboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence combining</td>
<td>combine simple sentences to make compound and complex sentences</td>
<td>oral, in-class</td>
<td>overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise 2</td>
<td>revise a short story by improving sentence structure and adding details</td>
<td>written, homework</td>
<td>paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample editorial analysis</td>
<td>analyze the arguments in a magazine editorial</td>
<td>oral, in-class</td>
<td>overhead, whiteboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial analysis</td>
<td>select an editorial and analyze the arguments it presents</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student position papers</td>
<td>analyze the arguments in sample student position papers</td>
<td>oral, in-class</td>
<td>overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-arguments</td>
<td>write counter-arguments to the position taken in sample student essays</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the assignment. The classroom (Figure 1). At other times, I circulated freely around the classroom and occasionally spoke with students and helped them as they wrote. I observed Ann's class during the sixth and eighth weeks of the quarter.

**Summary of Observation One, Class One.**

At 3:56, three or four students were already working at computers. Other students sat talking among themselves. Two stood at the back leaning against the wall. At 3:59 Ann arrived and stood next to the overhead at the front. Some of the students in the room were either from a prior class or open lab, and they began to leave as more students arrived for class. Fourteen of the eighteen students enrolled were present at this class meeting.

At 4:00 Ann instructed the students to load a file called "Position" from their A drive. She told them to answer the questions in the file and print two copies, one to keep and one to turn in at the end of class. Standing near the overhead projector, she orally reviewed the directions and questions contained in assignment instructs students to take a position on an issue and list the arguments for and against their position side-by-side in two columns. After making this assignment, Ann took attendance. At 4:07 she began to circulate and return themes.

For most of the next hour, Ann circulated as the students worked individually on the assignment. She moved from student to student, discussing their papers as she returned them and checking the students' responses to the
day's assignment. Most conferences lasted five or six minutes. The students were having difficulty creating columns using the word processor. I asked one student if there was a column feature available. She didn't know and checked a reference sheet which lists no column function. This student decided to make her lists one at a time so that one appeared below the other. Most other students created side-by-side lists—but not without some difficulty overcoming the word processor's wrap-around function. Students occasionally helped one another with their assignments and with technical problems, especially those associated with overcoming the wrap-around feature. They tended to consult with students both beside and behind them. As Ann circulated around the room, she initiated consultations more frequently than the students. I overheard one student asking Ann if she could list the pros and cons one after the other instead of in columns. Ann said that was fine.

At 5:10, standing at the front printer station, Ann called for attention. She passed around a sentence graphing assignment due at the beginning of the next class and briefly gave instructions for completing it. Many students continued to work as she spoke.

By 5:12, students were printing out their assignments, turning them in, and leaving. At 5:14 six students had left, and Ann was conferencing with a student about her assignment. At 5:15 the remaining students left the classroom after printing and turning in their assignments. At 5:16, Ann gathered her things and returned the disk boxes to Room 2 as she left.
**Summary of Observation One, Class Two.**

At 3:55 eight students were present. Three were discussing the assignment due for today. One was getting a printout and four others were seated at workstations using their computers. At 4:02 two more students arrived. At 4:05 Ann and another student arrived; eleven students were now present. Ann asked one of the students to write his sentence graph on the board. As he began to write, the rest got out their own graphs. Standing near the front printer station, Ann led a discussion of the graph, asking questions and soliciting answers. She got responses from six students. Based on the students’ answers, she corrected several errors made by the student who had written his graph on the board. At 4:20 a student who had left the room a minute or two before returned. After going over all the graphed sentences, Ann briefly discussed the importance of sentence variety and wrote, "Idea follows form" on the board. At 4:25 Ann displayed an overhead which, as she explained, gave some rules of thumb about using long and short sentences. She then told the students that they would be doing an analysis of their next theme similar to the one they had done using the sentence graph.

At 4:30, Ann asked the students to hand-in their sentence graphs. Using overheads, Ann took the class through several sentence combining exercises. Nine students gave oral responses. Three volunteered, but most were called upon. After going through the overheads, Ann passed out E2, and instructed the students to complete it for the next class. She emphasized that, in addition to
improving the sentence structure, they should add details, more paragraphs, and
a conclusion with a moral to the story.

4:45-4:50: Ann directed the students to begin working on their essays
using the computers. As Ann took attendance at the front, the students began
turning on their computers and getting started on their rough drafts. At 4:48,
Ann walked around the room returning the invention assignment they had turned
in during the previous class.

4:50-4:54: At 4:50 Ann put up an overhead called "Purpose" and asked for
the students’ attention. About half the students stopped writing and focused
their attention on Ann and the overhead. Ann reviewed the information on the
overhead; over the course of two or three minutes, most of the students who had
initially continued to work stopped writing and began looking toward the front.
At 4:54 Ann reminded the class that their rough drafts and E2 were due the next
class meeting and instructed them to resume working on their drafts.

4:54-5:16: At 4:55 a student called Ann over for help with a writing
problem and Ann sat down beside the student to help. He had selected a topic
but was not certain it was the kind of topic Ann wanted to see. Ann indicated
that it was a good topic, but might be a little broad, and suggested a way of
limiting it. The room was fairly quiet except for the keyboards clicking and the
voices of students as they talked with their neighbors as they worked. At 5:10
Ann was walking around the room looking over students’ shoulders at their
screens. By 5:12 the students were beginning to print, turn in their disks, and leave. By 5:16, all the students had gone, and Ann prepared to leave.

**Commentary for Observation One, Classes One and Two.**

Both classes had a mix of whole class activities (short lectures, teacher-led discussions, and procedural functions such as explaining assignments, and giving directions) and individual computer work sessions. Although both classes began with a whole class activity, in one case giving directions and in the other, a short lecture/discussion, otherwise there were no predictable patterns or intervals between whole class and individual activities. All whole class activities were led by Ann as she stood near the whiteboard or overhead/priner station. In general, the students’ energy and attention levels seemed higher during individual work sessions than during whole-class activities. The computers tended to compete for the students’ attention during whole-class activities, especially when these followed individual work sessions. During the post-observation interview, Ann indicated that she sometimes asks students to turn off their computers when she feels she needs their full attention.

Student-teacher consultations tended to be writing-related as opposed to technical (hardware/software) or procedural (assignment formats, due dates, etc.) and generally lasted four or five minutes. Technical consultations tended to be shorter, one or two minutes, and were more frequently student-student than student-teacher. I observed only four or five short writing-related consultations between students. Most technical consultations tended to concern creating
columns or obtaining printouts. Students tended to interact with peers sitting both beside and behind them. I saw little if any interaction among students from opposite sides of the room. Students also seemed to come and go fairly freely, occasionally leaving their workstations or the classroom and then returning after short intervals. During the post-observation interview, Ann indicated that students feel much more free to move about the room or leave in the Writing Center than in her traditional classrooms.

The students seemed to know only enough about the software to write and print their papers using a simple format—no special format features such as headers, footers, or hanging indents and few text enhancements such as italics or underlining. However, after a little frustration mixed with trial and error, many were able to create two columns of text in response to the "Position" exercise completed during class one. Ann explained that she had based the assignment on an exercise in the textbook and had not considered the difficulty students might have in creating columns using the word processor. She felt most students completed the assignment fairly easily by creating the columns through inserting spaces and carriage returns by or writing their lists one under the other.

**Summary of Observation Two, Class One.**

When I arrived at 3:56, four students from Ann's class and one student using a computer during open-lab time were present. Two of Ann's students were working at the computers; two others chatted. At 4:00 the open-lab student left and seven more students arriving for class got their disks from the
case at the front and took seats at workstations. As several of these students began turning on their computers, Ann arrived and placed her things at the front printer station.

At 4:01, Ann began to address the class, reminding the students that each of them was to have brought along a sample editorial. She said that she also had brought a sample and gave a student near her a stack of handouts to begin passing around the room. Two or three students continued to type. As the stack of handouts made its way around the room, Ann explained that after she read the editorial aloud, she wanted the class to discuss it based on their reading of the chapter in their texts on argument. At 4:08 as she began to read, at least one student continued to type, but most students followed along. The editorial discussed welfare reforms and the problem of the underclass in America.

At 4:11 Ann finished reading the editorial and asked the students to save any work they had begun on the computer and stop typing. At 4:12 she displayed an outline of the editorial on the overhead projector and began a lecture/discussion about the piece's argument. Referring to the overhead, Ann and the students analyzed the claims and evidence in the editorial paragraph by paragraph. Ann recorded their observations on the whiteboard. The students were attentive, and several seemed to be taking notes by hand. Both the number and length of comments made by Ann were greater than those of the comments made by students. Except for one unsolicited comment, the students
spoke only in response to direct questions. At 4:33 Ann began a mini-lecture on the theory of "the culture of poverty" advanced by anthropologist Oscar Lewis.

At 4:43 Ann concluded her mini-lecture and instructed the students to begin analyzing the arguments used in the editorials they had each brought to class. She directed them to print their work and turn it in along with their editorials before leaving. As the students began working, one asked for clarification of the assignment, and Ann went to his workstation for a short consultation. By 4:51, all the students were working quietly at their computers, and Ann was circulating about the room. At 4:57, Ann sat beside a student, and they discussed the student's sample editorial. The consultation lasted about four minutes. While students occasionally spoke to one another, there were no sustained conversations. At 5:02, Ann was talking with another student about his editorial. At 5:03, two printers began to work. By 5:04 Ann had taken a seat beside another student, and they were discussing the student's analysis. At 5:05 a student handed his paper to Ann and left. At 5:07 Ann, standing beside the student with whom she had been talking, reminded the class of the assignment for the next meeting. Most students continued to work as she spoke. At 5:10, Ann was circulating around the room, looking over students' shoulders as they worked. A few students were moving about the room, collecting their printouts and placing their assignments on a stack near the front before leaving. At 5:12 six students remained. By 5:20 four students continued to work. At 5:23 Ann
and two students left; two students remained. They had arranged to bring their assignments to Ann's office later.

Summary of Observation Two, Class Two.

At 4:02 Ann arrived. Twelve students were present; except for one who was entering something at her keyboard, they were chatting or sitting quietly. At 4:03 Ann called the class to order and began a short lecture describing their next assignment, a proposal. At 4:08 Ann passed out a handout containing three examples of positions students had taken in their last essay. At 4:12, after explaining what features position papers and proposals have in common, Ann asked the students to point out the arguments given in the samples. Three students voluntarily commented on the first example. At 4:14, Ann directed the students' attention to the next example. While discussing this example, the students volunteered three responses and gave seven responses based on comments or questions from Ann. At 4:22, Ann asked the students to look at the third example. She asked two questions and received two answers about this item.

At 4:24 Ann directed the students to "get on their computers" and write up counterarguments in response to one of the examples. From 4:25 until 5:15 Ann circulated around the room helping students as they wrote. Several students asked Ann for help constructing their arguments. These conferences tended to be longer than those in previous class meetings; most lasted seven to ten minutes. Virtually all conferences were directly related to the assignment. At
4:40, a student asked me for help with her counterargument; I worked with her until 4:52. At 4:52, another student asked for my help, and I spent the next five minutes conferring with him.

At 5:05 a student printed and turned in his assignment. In the next few minutes, several other students began printing and placing their work on a stack at the front printer station. By 5:12, most of the students had turned in their assignments and left. One of the students I had helped was having difficulty getting a printout, and asked me to help. The page breaks were incorrectly placed. I realigned the paper in the printer and the student printed again. This time the page breaks were placed correctly, but the print was very light. The student pointed out the poor quality and asked if I knew how to make it darker. Ann approached and looked at the printout. She indicated that she could read it and, and after pointing out that this was a problem caused by having the Writing Center's software set to draft quality, told the student not to worry. At 5:16, the three of us left the room.

 Commentary for Observation Two, Classes One and Two.

Like the classes during my previous observations, these classes contained a mixture of teacher-led lecture/discussions and individual computer work sessions. As before, the computers tended to compete with Ann for the students' attention during lecture/discussions. During one discussion, Ann asked the students to save their work and stop typing. During this discussion, several students took notes by hand. The discussions were led by Ann who controlled
their pace and direction and contributed the most comments. During the computer work sessions, Ann circulated around the room helping students with their assignments. Almost all her consultations were related to writing rather than technical concerns, although the students tended to ask more computer-related questions when they began to print. Technical consultations tended to last only a minute or two while writing-related consultations often lasted up to ten minutes. My own conferences with students followed the same pattern. As before, the students' energy level seemed higher during the computer work sessions than during the lecture/discussion periods.

Teacher Case Study Two: Nancy

Profile and Context

Nancy is an associate professor in the Department of English at Middleton Community College. She earned a B.A. in English in 1958, and her M.A. in English in 1960. She also completed the course work and written exams for her Ph.D. and had begun work on a dissertation examining William Thackeray's prose style before Vanity Fair. After she began teaching at MCC, she decided to forego completing her doctorate because she felt it offered no direct advantage to her as a community college teacher.

Nancy has taught writing for twenty-seven years: one year at the university where she received her M.A., four years at the university where she conducted her Ph.D. studies, one semester at a midwestern high school, one year at a California community college, and twenty years, one of them part-time, at MCC.
She has taught all the courses in MCC's Freshman English, business writing, and technical writing sequences. She has also taught courses in writing fiction, the contemporary and British novels, mass communications, and MCC's two course survey of British literature. Nancy has taught writing using computers for four years, all at MCC. In addition to her work as a teacher, Nancy is also a creative writer; her creative work is mainly short fiction. In Spring Quarter, 1992, Nancy's teaching schedule included the computer-enhanced section of English 111 I observed, as well as two sections of English 113 and one section of creative writing.

During the fifth week of the quarter, I met with Nancy in her office for approximately two hours to discuss her non-teaching experience with computers, her teaching experience with and without computers, and her knowledge and beliefs about teaching writing and about teaching writing with computers. Many of my questions followed up responses Nancy had provided on the pre-interview questionnaire (Appendix D). I met with Nancy again near the end of the quarter to share a written summary of my observations and ask additional questions based on what I had observed.

Introduction to Computers and Range of Experience with Computers

Nancy began using the computer "five or six years" prior to this study when her husband brought a computer home and she decided to try using it for her creative writing. She noted that at about this same time, MCC's Department of English was developing a computer-equipped writing lab and said that this
also motivated her to experiment with word processing. Nancy indicated that she "quickly saw the advantages" of word processing. Although she described *EasyWriter*, the first word processing program she tried, as "a perfectly horrible program," she still "liked it better that handwriting or typing" and was soon using it for most of her writing. Nancy now uses computers for writing fiction and creating course syllabi, course notes, letters, and "various plans and lists." Short lists and student grades are the only kinds of writing which she rarely uses the computer to produce. Nancy does not use the computer for any non-writing purposes.

Nancy is satisfied with her knowledge of computers and computer skills for her personal, non-teaching purposes. All of her computing experience has been on IBM-compatible systems. Her first home system was an IBM XT with a CGA (color graphics adaptor--i.e., low resolution, color) monitor, and an IBM dot matrix printer. The home system she now uses is an IBM-compatible 386SX, with a VGA monitor, an Epson near letter-quality dot matrix printer, and a mouse. She said that she is "starting to get used to the mouse," but still doesn't like it very well. In the classroom she uses IBM-compatible 286-based NCR computers with VGA monitors and Epson dot matrix printers. After using *EasyWriter* for a brief time, Nancy began using *PC Wriie* and now uses *PC Write Standard*, the upgraded version of this word processor that is used in all of MCC's computer-enhanced English classes.
When asked how she came to use this particular hardware and software, Nancy said that her husband began using IBM-compatible hardware because it was what he used at work, and she used it "because it was available." She has never seriously considered any other hardware. She explained that she began using *EasyWriter* because "someone in my husband's department gave him that program" and switched to *PC Write* because she was "using it in class and lab, and it seemed easier to use the same thing in both places." Nancy said that she learned to use computers "on her own and through in-service training." As she explained, "When I learned *EasyWriter*, I sat down in front of the computer with the manual in my lap and learned what I needed. It didn't take too long, even though I wouldn't recommend *EasyWriter*." Nancy was introduced to *PC Write* through a workshop sponsored by her department. She found *PC Write* "very easy to learn" and indicated that the workshop "was a helpful introduction."

Nancy has not examined other word processors or used any other types of software except for a DOS shell program (i.e., a menu-driven program for accessing DOS commands) and directory manager on her home system, although she plans to spend some time learning *Word Perfect* and *Windows* since she now has this word processor and computing environment available at home (her husband uses them) and feels they might be helpful for her writing. She has no interest in other sorts of software or computer uses:

I want to learn *Windows* and since we have it, *WordPerfect*. My husband is taking a course in *WordPerfect*, and he has the text which is a teaching kind of text. I think I'll probably at least start to learn *WordPerfect* this summer. If I decide that it's not going to
be that great an improvement over *Standard* [the version of *PC Write* she currently uses], I probably won't go on with it. . . . The only kinds of programs that I probably would be very interested in would be writing programs or word processing programs that would be a lot better for some reason or maybe directory managers that are simple to use.

**Attitudes and Beliefs about Computers and Writing**

Nancy said she enjoys word processing because she is able to revise as she writes, to keep multiple versions of documents, and to have easy and quick access to her documents. She also feels that she has more "fun" when writing with the computer than when composing with pen and paper or using a typewriter. As she explained,

> It's a lot more fun to write on the computer than it is with pencil or typewriter. I can play around with it. If I don't like something, I can scrap it and start something else. I can keep multiple versions if I want to, and I just like having the knowledge that once I've typed it in, if I want to leave it that way I can. If I don't want to, I can change it. It frees me up a great deal.

When asked to complete the sentence, "I don't like writing with computers because," on the pre-interview questionnaire, Nancy had written, "This sentence doesn't apply. I really like writing with the computer." When asked about this response, she explained, "I really do like it. . . . I suppose I don't like not being able to pick it up and take it with me all the time, but I could get a laptop."

Nancy believes that word processing has increased her output and changed her writing process. She feels that she revises more and describes herself as a more fluid writer:

> I do a great deal more revising, probably, and I've always been the sort of writer who wanted the first word to be right before I put
down the second word, which is a very slow way of doing things. With the computer I've been able to force myself out of that mold, to force myself to just write nonstop. I do write a great deal more because physically I'm a slow writer with pencil. I'm reasonably fast with a typewriter, but I'm slow with pencil, so I really like the feeling of freedom that I can do it however I want to, and I can keep all sorts of backup notes and lists and other files.

Sources and Assessment of Knowledge about Teaching Writing

On the pre-interview questionnaire, Nancy rated the degree of importance of six items to two aspects of her knowledge about teaching composition: her general knowledge about teaching composition and her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. For each aspect, each item was rated as either very important, important, not very important, unimportant, or not applicable (Table 3). During our first interview, Nancy discussed the significance of these items and described the differences between their contributions to her general knowledge about teaching composition and her knowledge about teaching composition with computers.

Nancy rated the contributions of her colleagues and associates and her teaching experience as "very important" to both her general knowledge about teaching composition and her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Nancy considers her colleagues and associates particularly significant in terms of her knowledge about teaching writing with computers because "that's where my initial start up toward using the computer in the classroom came."

Nancy explained that she was first introduced to teaching writing with computers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues/Associates</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coursework</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Coursework</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journals</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Not Very Inpt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Conferences</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
through a workshop conducted by her colleague Margaret. Nancy regards this training as extremely important:

That initial training certainly set me up to be able to do it [teach writing with computers], so as far as I'm concerned, that's the most important, although I was already doing some writing on the computer at that time.

Nancy also rated her teaching experience as "very important," commenting only, "I think that's probably pretty self-evident. We all learn the most by doing."

Nancy rated her graduate and undergraduate coursework "important" in terms of her general knowledge about teaching composition and "not applicable" to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. About the contribution of her coursework to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers she remarked, "It's not applicable because it didn't have anything to do with computers." Discussing the contribution of her graduate coursework to her general knowledge about teaching composition, Nancy said that although she took only one course specifically about teaching writing, she considered her graduate coursework important because:

Even though I usually was not studying how to teach writing, I was still focused mostly on prose writing and studied that very intently. So I think . . . I gained a wide knowledge of varieties of style and varieties of ways of writing. The dissertation that I started working on was one on Thackeray's prose style before *Vanity Fair*. I think it gave me, even though that wasn't what I was thinking about focusing on at the time, both a broad and a deep knowledge of writing itself and from that I've been able to extract a lot of information, a lot of principles that a lot of my students come back later and say that they found useful.

Commenting on the contributions of her undergraduate coursework, Nancy said,
In my own freshman English courses . . . I had an excellent instructor who was already kind of focused on process, not to the degree that people are now, but he was a very good instructor for helping us to understand what we were doing and to understand style. So I started out my college career, even though I wasn’t an English major at the time, developing an interest in writing.

Nancy also rated the remaining two items, professional journals, and workshops and conferences differently in terms of their contributions to her general knowledge about teaching composition and her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Nancy indicated that she reads both *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* occasionally. Commenting on the contributions of these journals to her knowledge about teaching composition in general, which she rated as "important," Nancy said,

I don't necessarily read all of the articles all of the time. I read as much as I can which is sometimes quite a lot and sometimes not at all. But the ideas that come up in those journals and the theoretical articles are useful for helping me to place what I'm doing within a context, to see whether something that I'm doing is probably not very profitable or profitable.

About their contribution to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers, which she rated as "not very important," Nancy said, "I don't think there have been a lot of articles on computers and composition in those journals. I think there are other journals that do focus on computers, but I haven't read them."

Nancy rated the last item, workshops and conferences, "very important" to her knowledge about teaching composition in general and "important" to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Discussing the
importance of this item to her general knowledge about teaching composition, Nancy said,

Going to . . . mostly CCCCs and NCTE conferences, I have found along the way that each time I go to one of those major conferences, I come back with knowledge or suggestions that cause me to rework one or more courses or assignments, and I've found some of those suggestions extremely important. For instance, in English 112, I went to the Atlanta conference, the CCCCs, four or five years ago and went to a session on writing the research paper and writing argument both of which fall into our English 112 class. . . . I went to a session where they talked about the argumentative research paper and a variety of ungraded parts that could go along with it, and I came back and reorganized my class and I've been happy with it ever since. Since then, two or three other people in the Department have used what I was doing to reorganize their classes.

Nancy explained that she considers workshops and conferences less important to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers because until just recently there weren't very many computer-oriented sessions. Now I went to . . . CCCCs in Cincinnati this year, and I did go to two or three computer sessions. Unfortunately, most of those sessions focused on networked classrooms, and although we have that capacity, we're not hooked up to the network, and so some of the things that sounded great to me that I would love to try to do would require that the computers be networked.

Nancy is "very comfortable" with her knowledge about teaching writing both with and without computers. She pointed out that aside from the one course taken while she was in graduate school, she has had no formal training in the teaching of writing, but added,

My knowledge about teaching writing, as for many teachers of my age, does not really stem from formal training because I was a literature person in my master's and in my Ph.D. work. . . . However, I do write, and I like to write, and studying literature obviously involves you in the study of writing. And so . . . I think I
am well-trained. I have read books and articles, obviously, but much of it I have come to through my own private ways.

Speaking specifically about her knowledge about teaching writing with computers, she said, "I think it's probably adequate. My computer skills are certainly not extremely developed, but I think they're adequate for the level that I'm teaching. I don't know beyond that since I've not tried it."

Beliefs about Teaching Writing with Computers

How Computers are Used in Writing Classrooms.

Nancy feels that the most frequent and important use of computers in writing classes is for composing texts. As she explained,

I think the most prevalent and certainly the most important use is obviously for composing, to do the writing at that point, directly in the classroom. I think students do more composing in the classroom with the computers than without them.

She added that she thought the use of the computer during the revision process was "second most important [next to composing] on the computer itself because there's the possibility of inserting, moving, and all of those things that people are reluctant to do when it means retyping a whole paper or recopying."

Commenting on the benefits of using the computer to teach writing, Nancy said,

Introducing students to the composing process with computers makes certain things a little easier for them, perhaps. The invention process, the revision process, the editing process, although revision is more important, are all things that the computer does very well and can make easier for students, as it does for other writers as well.
Beyond using the computers for composing, revising, and editing, Nancy added that she believes that computers can also, but less frequently, be used in writing classrooms to understand additional information in some kinds of exercises that might be suitable. . . . I've seen presentations on . . . interactive kinds of work where computers are used to present a poem, for example, where you have a variety of readings and interpretations and materials that the student can call up, depending on which section he highlights. I suppose that could certainly be done to help a student to understand better what comparison and contrast is, for instance, or what coherence is.

Nancy indicated she found it difficult to describe how computers are used in writing classes because she had little to base her answers on beyond her own teaching experience and commented that there "are probably many other uses which I haven't mentioned."

**What Writing Teachers Who Teach with Computers Should Know About Computers and About Computers and Writing.**

Nancy was hesitant to offer her opinion about what writing teachers who teach with computers should know about computers, what computer skills they should have, and what they should know about computers and writing. When asked to describe, based on her knowledge and experience, what knowledge of computers and computer skills writing teachers who teach with computers should have, she replied,

That's a little bit difficult for me to say because I came into it through a back door without any training, and I don't have any formal training to date. I have plenty of training in teaching writing; I don't have formal training in using the computers. I have taught myself with the aid of manuals and books and people's
advice... but I don't have a lot of training, and I don't think... a teacher really does need very much because the focus is still on the writing itself. You're still teaching English composition and the computer is a tool... I don't know just how useful formal training would be since I don't have it. And I'm fairly comfortable in the computer classroom and always have been. My students appear to like it, and they certainly do as good a job as my students in the other classrooms, so I don't see a necessity for any formal instruction.

When asked to describe what knowledge of computers and writing teachers who use computers to teach writing classes should have, Nancy responded,

As long as the teacher knows enough to help the student use the tools that are available, I don't think the teacher needs a great deal of additional knowledge or computer skills. On the other hand, training in a course that might be set up to show an instructor the variety of different things that could be done might be very useful. I'm sure I don't do some things that I would do if I knew that I could.

The Effects and Potential Effects of Computers on the Teaching of Writing.

When prompted to discuss the most important effect computers have had on the teaching of composition so far, Nancy explained,

From my point of view, just from the point of ease, it's easier for me to grade the papers. They come in a form that's easier to deal with. For the student, I think, it's the flexibility in the writing process. The students haven't seen the possibilities before, and now they do. Revising is easier because they can cut and paste. Editing is easier, spell checking, and so on. But I'm not sure that the student gets all that in eleven weeks.

When asked if these are the most important potential effects, Nancy replied,

I think that the flexibility in the writing process is. Students are more receptive to writing as process. They tend to write more and revise more with computers, although many students are actually frightened when they see the computer, especially people who are
beyond their twenties and thirties. They tend to be fearful that they’re not going to be able to deal with this technology. They tend to be the most enthusiastic later on. So, I suppose as students become more familiar with computers and are exposed to them more and more before they come to use them in a writing class, they’ll adjust more quickly and benefit from the experience and the flexibility more.

Assessment of the Teaching Environment: Instructional Support, Academic Freedom, and the Classroom Environment

Teaching Writing in the English Department’s Traditional Classrooms.

Nancy is satisfied with the amount and kind of support for her teaching furnished by the Department of English and the College. When asked to describe this support she said that the Department provides funds for faculty members to attend conferences each year and indicated that the teachers’ offices and the classrooms are well-maintained and supplied. She mentioned that the Department holds an in-service workshop each year.

When asked, “What is it like to teach English 111 in a traditional classroom in the Department of English at Middleton Community College?” Nancy described the teaching environment as being "quite flexible but with initial restraints." As she explained,

Since we’re a community college, and since students can transfer among courses in the first week or so, and since the Department needs, obviously, a large number of part-time instructors, to retain some control over what’s taught, there is an initial restraint. Everyone uses . . . the same basic text for classes, but . . . the full-time faculty are all free to choose their own readers. There is restraint in the sense that we have a master syllabus which identifies the kinds of writing that ought to be taught in 111, 112, 113.
Beyond these restrictions, however, Nancy said that she has complete freedom to select materials from the textbook, bring in additional materials, and determine the teaching methods she uses. Commenting on this freedom she remarked,

I have quite a bit of freedom to focus in ways that I want to focus. . . . When I first taught here, assignments tended to be "Write a definition paper" or "Write an example paper or a comparison-contrast paper." And there is enough freedom within the Department that if I wanted to do it that way, I could still do it that way. I don't do it that way any longer, but there is a wide range of what people do, I think, within our department, and as long as an individual is focused on getting the best writing possible out of the students, it's a personal choice of how you want to go about doing that.

When asked if she would like to see any changes in the Department's policies or practices related to the teaching of writing or to any of the restrictions she described, Nancy responded,

I suppose the only thing that I would really change is, I'm not even sure that I would change this, but let's say in an ideal situation for me, I would change the necessity of using the same textbook. . . . I like the textbook that we use . . . but I can imagine textbooks that are a lot better, that would be tailored to exactly what I want to do in the classroom. But I'm not so sure that I would make that choice, or that I would change that condition of our department if it were up to me to do it . . . because I think that there is a perfectly legitimate reason for keeping the textbooks the same from course to course.

When asked if she has ever requested that the Department adopt a particular textbook or suggested that it purchase any particular piece of equipment or type of supplies for its traditional classrooms, Nancy said that she has served on committees for choosing textbooks "two or three times" and that she once wrote a proposal requesting a computer for the Department office.
Teaching Writing in the Writing Center's Computer-Enhanced Classrooms.

Nancy describes teaching writing in the Writing Center's computer-enhanced classrooms as "pretty much the same as [teaching] in the traditional classrooms." As she explained,

We all use the same software, and we all use the same text that's used in the regular classroom. So, it's set up pretty much the same. . . . I have control over what I want to do within the classroom. There are constraints in terms of books, and course information, and software, but they're not constraints that I find illogical, and they're not constraints that bother me.

When asked if she would like to see any changes in the English Department's or Writing Center's policies or practices related to the teaching of writing with computers, Nancy said that there is nothing that she feels "any great desire" to change, but suggested that while she feels the current textbook "works perfectly well," she would like "to try to find a text that's more geared to the computer classroom." Nancy has never suggested that the English Department or the Writing Center purchase a particular piece of hardware or software or requested any other materials or supplies for use in the computer-enhanced classrooms. She said she is "beginning to think about suggesting that we do use the network," but added that she is "not quite sure what all that would require."

When asked to describe the kind and amount of support the English Department and Writing Center provide for her computer-enhanced writing classes, Nancy characterized the "day-to-day" support for her teaching as very good and explained,
In terms of solving technical problems . . . I think we get very good support. I don’t think that I’ve ever had an instance where nobody was available to come in to help with any problem I couldn’t solve myself.

Nancy gave a less positive assessment of other aspects of the support available.

Discussing other kinds of technical support, she said,

Technical support in terms of previewing software . . . is lacking. There is not any kind of ongoing program of famili arizing us with new software that’s available or what given software will do. It’s the same thing for hardware. I don’t know that the school’s budget would be inclined toward adding hardware anyway, so I don’t know what kind of problem that is, but I would like to have more support in terms of becoming familiar with the software. I don’t mind going in and examining it myself, but I’d like to have some sense of what to examine.

Nancy added that although she "hasn’t been particularly distressed about it," she would like to see either the English Department or the Writing Center provide more non-technical support such as workshops on computers and writing pedagogy:

I don’t think we really have a great deal of support in that area. I think we really could do more . . . . We have had things from time to time—[Margaret’s] workshops, for instance, and we had another workshop, an in-service. It was someone who came in from outside, someone the Department brought in. It’s been quite some time ago, and I can’t remember who it was, so it hasn’t been ignored, but it hasn’t been focused on.

Teaching Writing in the Writing Center’s Computer-Enhanced Classrooms.

Nancy is teaching the computer-enhanced English 111 class involved in this study in Writing Center Room 1 and has taught classes in the past in the Writing Center’s other classroom, Room 3 (Figure 1). Nancy likes the
arrangements of both rooms, although she finds having the computers around the perimeter and tables in the middle as they are in Room 1 more conducive to group work. Discussing the arrangement of Room 1, Nancy remarked,

> It's funny because when [the English Department chairperson] first described how he wanted to configure that classroom, I wasn't very sure that I would like it, and when I found out that I'd been assigned to it after teaching in [Room 3] for a long time, I was hesitant. But once I began to teach in that configuration, I was very well pleased with it. I like it quite well because the students can move around. It seems to me they have a more independent situation. They can move back and forth between the computer and the seats at the tables. If I want to lecture and I really want them to pay attention, I make them sit at the tables away from the computers and I can address them very easily. They're all out there in the open. If some of them want to be working with each other on a paper, they can work at a table. Others will be working at the computers at the same time. It seems to me that it's a really efficient, flexible set up for that.

Describing the disadvantages of this arrangement, Nancy added,

> What I don't like about the classroom is that there is really no place for me. The students are more important, as far as I'm concerned, as far as having a comfortable situation, but I have no place to put anything and I have no computer to work with. . . . I really have to come in and put my stuff down a table and make sure there are no students sitting at that particular place. That kind of thing is a nuisance, but that's about all.

When asked to comment on the configuration of Room 3, Nancy replied,

> In [Room 3] there is some place for me to put things which is fine. There still is no computer for the instructor. I was perfectly happy in [Room 3] . . . but in [Room 3] the students are always at the computers. . . . For instance, if I wanted three or four students to read their papers to each other as a group and comment, then they have to pull their chairs away and find some place where they can cluster without crashing into somebody who's sitting at a computer. It's just not as good a room for group work as [Room 1] is.
Nancy indicated that she has no trouble adapting to whichever room she is teaching in and said that she uses the same assignments and teaches her classes "basically the same" way in both classrooms. When asked if she would like to have any changes made to either room's arrangement or non-computer equipment, Nancy said, "A teacher's desk in [Room 1] would be nice, but there's no space for one."

When asked to comment on her experience using the hardware and software available in Rooms 1 and 3, Nancy replied,

As far as the hardware configuration goes, I don't think there are any real problems. The students don't need to have their own printers. It works out perfectly well to have people share printers, so I'm happy enough with the hardware... I like PC Write Standard. I haven't had very many problems. Every once in a while I'll come up with something where somebody's hit somie button, I don't know what, and I'm not quite sure what to do about it, but the tutors are always available to help. I don't really experience any great degree of frustration with it.

Nancy is particularly happy with the ease and rapidity with which students can learn the PC Write Standard software:

As far as I'm concerned the software's greatest advantage is that I can train even students who are unfamiliar with computers to get in and out and write within an hour, and I think a software that allows you to do that is probably the most important thing because I don't want to teach the software. I want to teach writing.

She also commented on the simplicity and flexibility of Standard's pull-down menu system and its built-in thesaurus and spell checker:

I also like Standard because it has the pull-down menus and students who are a little bit adventurous very quickly learn to use that. Other students are still asking me in the middle of the quarter, "How do I save that?" You know, that kind of thing, but I
think the PC Write Standard software is pretty easy to use and it's flexible enough that students who want to move things and use spell checkers and thesauruses have that opportunity.

When asked if she would prefer to use other hardware or software if given the opportunity, Nancy was a bit uncertain:

I think I'm satisfied. Now the reason I'm hesitating is, I guess, that I don't know enough about other hardware to say that something would be better and the same really goes for software. I know that there may be software packages that are better in some ways, but I'm not sure there's software that I'd be happier with for students who don't necessarily have the same backgrounds.

**Goals and Pedagogy for Computer-Enhanced English 111**

Nancy believes that her philosophy and goals for teaching composition are the same for her computer-enhanced classes as they are for her traditional classes. She explained her philosophy by saying,

What I want to see from the student . . . when he leaves this class is an ability to organize, an ability to at least recognize errors in standard English and an ability to have at least some sense of how to go about correcting them. I realize they're not all going to be gone by the time the student leaves 111 or even 113, but at least that the student is starting to focus on the idea that clarity is important and that standard English contributes to that clarity of communication.

She believes that students sometimes come into her classes feeling that they are poor writers, that they have nothing to write about, and that they cannot learn to write. Overcoming these attitudes is another major goal. As she explained,

I also want the student to have a sense that he or she does have a voice, does have something to say, and that the content of a paper is affected by that voice and should be affected by that voice. I want the student to start to feel in control of his or her own writing process, and I want the student to know . . . early in the quarter, really, that writing is a process, that there are techniques by which
you can learn to gather materials to write with, that he or she probably does have something worth saying and can develop the skills. I see too many students who come in and say, "I can’t write. I know I’ve always been a bad writer. I can’t do this." I don’t want a student to go out of the class feeling that way. So I suppose that’s my general philosophy, and I don’t think using computers has much to do with that.

Nancy reported that the biggest change computers have had on her teaching is that she "can focus on the writing problems of individual students more than leading general class discussions." She said that her students use the computers for composing nearly every day and do much more writing in the classroom than in her traditional English 111 courses. As she explained,

I don’t think there’s really a day that goes by in class where we don’t actually use the computer. Now there might be some students who don’t use it on a given day, but somebody in class is using it every day. So, using the computer for word processing, for composing in the classroom, is a very important part of the class . . . and having computers there makes it easier to get students writing. There seems to be a greater sense of immediacy, and a greater willingness on the part of the students to write in the classroom.

Nancy emphasized that because students do more writing in the classroom, she finds it easier to teach writing as a process:

Since I’m there on the spot, I can work with the students as they work through a paper . . . I don’t like to just stand and talk about theory or show them examples. I like to be able to work with individual students on problems they’re having because the general things you can say about writing, even the specific things you can say about writing, don’t necessarily address the particular problem a student is actually having. . . . It seems to me that the writing instructor’s most valuable time is spent working with that student so that the student can see it [a writing problem] to identify it the next time, can see that there are multiple ways of solving a problem. Maybe I can help a student recognize a problem before
it becomes a problem. I can tell that student, "Maybe this first paragraph isn't the way you want to focus this piece."

When asked to describe her teaching strategies, Nancy emphasized that the class is organized so that students spend time writing in class every day and said that much of the instruction she provides takes place during one-on-one conferences as students work on their papers. She requires four themes based on assignments from the *St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, the textbook for the class, and indicated that she has students complete some of the readings and exercises provided by the text in conjunction with these assignments. She also requires students to complete six paragraph assignments over the course of the quarter and explained that she created these assignments specifically for her computer-enhanced classes. She uses them to replace some of the theoretical instruction that she does not have time for in her computer-enhanced class and to help students learn to use the word processor. As she explained,

I developed those paragraph assignments in order to . . . introduce them and focus them on the modes and on the readings in the text, but also to encourage them, because they [the assignments] will be on their disks, to compose on the computer and tell them that they can. If they're not comfortable trying to compose a whole paper on computer, they can certainly compose a paragraph on computer. And so, I push them in that direction that way.

Nancy said that these assignments also help accommodate the structure of the class hours and compensate for the different rates at which students complete their other assignments. She puts all six paragraph assignments on her students' disks at the beginning of the quarter so that students can work on them at their own pace. Students can turn in the paragraphs as they finish them, and all six
must be turned in by the last day of class. Beyond the paragraph assignments
and the exercises from the text, Nancy indicated that she uses much less direct
instruction than she used in the traditional classroom and commented,

I think I like to let my students move in their own directions. I
have a concern about over-directing them because one of my goals
is that they be able to control their own writing ultimately because
there isn't always going to be somebody there to help them. So,
mainly I want them on the computers and writing.

When asked to describe the role of the computer in her pedagogy, Nancy
said that she uses the computer for teaching the composing process and
reiterated that the word processor PC Write Standard, along with its built-in spell
checker and thesaurus, is the only software she uses in her classes. Nancy said
that she finds the computer helpful in teaching the processes of invention,
revision, and editing, as well as in instructing students about matters of style and
syntax. She indicated that she uses the computers to teach students the writing
process primarily by having them use the computers to write and assisting them
as they work. She described her approach by saying,

I find the computer is helpful because . . . when I am working with
a student who is having a problem with a paper, we can try out a
variety of possible ways of fixing it. If it's simple enough, we can
try it out right on the screen. I can suggest to the student that he
or she try it, and I can talk about how they have the possibility of
moving text and inserting and all of that. I can show them a whole
lot more easily on the computer screen because I can actually do it
and then take it away again if that seems reasonable, than I can
working with a piece of paper where I can just say, "Well, right
here you need to do something." The student can see it right away
and make the change easily, and I think that makes a difference
with some students.
When asked if she uses any specific techniques or exercises to teach students to compose using the computer, Nancy replied that, other than the paragraph assignments she uses to help them become comfortable with word processing, she does not. Referring specifically to teaching invention and revision, she said that while she requires only final drafts to be completed on the computer, most students do much of their drafting on the computer and added,

When they do the exercises from the St. Martin's, they may or may not work on the computer. I encourage them to do it on computer and many of them do, but some of them are not comfortable doing it on computer. ... Although I've had quarters where I've insisted that they do all their composing on the computer screen, lately I've been letting them, I guess the ones that are kind of desperate, do more composing on paper in the early stages of composing, and I think I would like to tighten up on that. ... So some of them do their drafts in longhand, but I won't accept a paper in longhand.

When asked about teaching students to use the computer for editing, she noted that she requires students to run PC Write's spelling checker on their papers before submitting them and encourages students to use its thesaurus to improve their vocabulary and word choice. Commenting on her approach to teaching vocabulary and word choice, she added,

That's something I really need to work on in terms of using the computer to assist because I don't use the computer very much. The computer has a thesaurus, so we can work on vocabulary, and I do have them do that from time to time, but I tend more to work on it one-on-one.

Besides teaching the writing process, Nancy also uses the computer to encourage collaboration and conferencing among students. Nancy described how the computer makes student collaboration and conferencing easier by saying,
Before they turn a paper in . . . I want them to show their papers, one way or another, to at least two other students, and then I want a written comment of some sort from each of those students which goes home with the writer of the paper but then gets turned in to me along with the paper when the final version gets turned in . . . . What I want the students to do is respond as an audience might respond, as a reader of a magazine might respond. "Is it interesting? Is it clear?" The computer makes this peer editing easier because the printouts are clear and legible and students can get multiple printouts if they want to. They're not hampered by handwriting. . . . The students in that class also tend to help one another more as they work. They look on the screen with each other or they get copies.

Nancy added that she feels the computers would be much more helpful in supporting student collaboration and conferencing if the classroom were networked so that she could send texts to students and they could send texts to one another on-line.

Assessment of Computer-Enhanced English 111 and Reflections on the Computer in English Studies

When asked to describe the most important advantages and disadvantages she experiences when using the computer to teach writing, Nancy reiterated several of the ideas she expressed while discussing her pedagogy. The advantages she listed were the students' increased awareness of writing as a process and willingness to revise; her ability to intervene when students have problems or questions while writing with the computers in the classroom; and the ease of responding to neatly printed, legible copies of students' texts. When prompted to describe the disadvantages, she said her major concerns were the reluctance of some students to compose on the computer and the loss of lecture
and discussion time because of the need to give students opportunities to work on the computers during class. She also noted that some students become more interested in manipulating the computers than in writing, but indicated that this is not a significant disadvantage:

We do get students who are so delighted with the computer that they want to play with the computer to the detriment of their writing; they'd rather look and see what the computer can do next. But it's not very many and that's not a major concern.

When asked to comment on the reluctance of students to compose on the computers, Nancy explained that since students do not know they will be using computers when they register for the class, some students are intimidated by the computers and prefer not to use them. She said most students overcome their fears after a few weeks, but observed that

Every once in a while a student will get very frustrated. . . . The students who do this, not only probably don't know how to touch type, but they're just not comfortable. They keep feeling as if they're going to hit a key and do something terrible, or they're going to be so slow that they just won't get finished. I have one this quarter, and she's a good student. She is becoming a little more comfortable, but she is still not really comfortable with it. . . . I feel bad that that's getting in the way of the student's progress. They don't usually complain to me a lot. I've never had a serious problem with that once three or four weeks of the quarter have gone by, and I'm not having a serious problem with it right now either, but I hate to see the student placed in that position. I don't really know that there's anything to be done about it.

When asked to comment further on her concerns about the loss of lecture time, she remarked,

My major concern is probably the business about not being able to cover material. I sometimes walk out of the computer class at the end of the quarter thinking, "Did I cover enough? You know, is
this person going to be unfamiliar with some terms when he or she gets to 112 [the next course in the sequence], not going to understand certain things that seem basic to the course just because there's not been that much time to discuss it in much detail?

She said that balancing the need to "cover material" with the need to allow students to write and provide them with time to use the computers in class is often a frustrating experience for her:

I suppose every teacher of everything has some mental concept of how much needs to be covered, and what's frustrating is that there are times when I go into the classroom thinking, "Well, I'm going to cover this. I'm going to cover two modes" or ... "I'm going to work with them on two or three article examples or reading examples from the text," and then I get in there, and very often they're already writing when I walk in, which is one nice thing. They're usually involved in it when I walk in the class and I like that. They're not sitting around saying, "Well, what should we do next?" But at the same time, then I feel reluctant sometimes, if they're really working hard, to interrupt them and say, "Well, now we're going to do something else. You can't write." So, it's a pull back and forth. What do I need to cover? How much time can I give them to write?

When asked what effect the loss of this instruction has, Nancy said,

It's kind of hard to tell. I don't really notice that it has an enormous effect on the students' writing, but again I'm looking at writing over a period of eleven weeks ... and so, it's very hard for me to evaluate whether there are any real differences in what the student has learned in one class or the other.

Another problem that Nancy alluded to during our interview was the desire of some students to compose their papers outside the classroom. As she explained,

Students sometimes write their assignments on their computer at home or where they work, too. I discourage it primarily because I've found problems in the past with students who want to go home
and do it and then there really isn't anything they need to be doing during class, but also they're certainly not getting any benefit from having the teacher available while they're doing their composing.

Nancy enjoys teaching English 111 in a computer-enhanced classroom and would like to try teaching other writing classes using computer, but she is not sure she would like to teach all her writing classes using computers all the time:

I don't teach any writing classes that I can't see some advantages for using computers, so I'd like to try the computers in other classes. But I'm not sure I'd say I'd do this for the rest of my life only in the computer classroom. I'm not sure I wouldn't say that either. I would like to try.

Nancy would not choose to teach her literature classes using computers. As she explained,

I know there are computer programs which students can use that give them a wealth of information about particular works and so forth, but because of the time constraints on the students and on me, I don't think that the computer would be useful enough to me in a literature classroom that I would go that way.

**Description of Materials from Nancy's English 111 Class**

Nancy submitted five items which she distributed in her English 111 class during Spring Quarter, 1992: the course syllabus, printouts of the six paragraph assignments which she puts on the students' disks, two handouts and an exercise (Appendix D). The syllabus is three pages long; the first page provides standard course information such as Nancy's office hours, the prerequisites for the course, and policies on attendance and withdrawal. It also lists the textbook, *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, and sets forth the following course objective: "To develop composition skills by learning to: Construct a unified, coherent, well-
developed, and correct essay centered upon a single thesis." In addition, it provides information about the tutorial assistance available through MCC's Tutorial Services Office and the Writing Center and describes the services offered for handicapped students. The second page is an outline and schedule of the daily activities for the course. The final page is an assignment schedule.

The printouts of the paragraph assignments contain general instructions for completing the assignments and a separate prompt for each of the six required paragraphs. The general instructions inform students that they are to write a "well-developed" paragraph of between one hundred and one hundred and fifty words for each of the six prompts and that their work will be evaluated "primarily on content and organization" but that "clear and correct expression will also count." The instructions also explain that the paragraphs should be turned in as students finish them and that all paragraphs must be completed by the last day of class. The prompts ask students to respond to readings from their textbook and direct them to compose their paragraphs using the traditional modes of composition. In the order in which they are numbered the prompts direct students to use exemplification, process analysis, definition, classification, causal analysis, and comparison-contrast.

Of the two handouts submitted, the first is a ten-page "Introduction to PC Write Standard Word Processing" that was written by another instructor in the English Department who uses it in his own classes. Nancy distributes this handout on the first or second day of class to help students familiarize
themselves with the software and begin using the computers to compose their
diagnostic essays. It includes information on "booting" the computer, loading the
PC Write Standard software, and performing basic tasks such as opening,
formatting, saving, and printing document files. It also explains how to access
the spelling checker and thesaurus. Nancy prefers this handout to the two-page
reference sheet complied by the Writing Center because it discusses more
functions and provides more detailed explanations. The second handout,
"Verbs," was distributed in the eighth week of class, day one of the second week
I observed. It defines weak and strong verbs and passive voice and suggests that
students can make their writing "livelier" by avoiding weak verbs and passive
constructions. It also includes four examples of sentences "needing to be
rewritten because of weak verbs or passive voice."

The proposal exercise was distributed during the eighth week of class, day
two of the second week I observed. It presents a problem and directs students
to work in groups to propose a solution. It also asks students to answer six
questions, "on paper or on the screen to be printed," about the problem and
their proposed solution. Nancy gave me this exercise on the day it was done in
class and indicated that she had created it "on the spur of the moment" the
previous night.

A listing and brief description of the exercises assigned in Nancy's class
appears in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 1</td>
<td>write a paragraph using exemplification</td>
<td>written, in or out of class</td>
<td>computer or paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 2</td>
<td>write a paragraph using process analysis</td>
<td>written, in or out of class</td>
<td>computer or paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 3</td>
<td>write a paragraph using definition</td>
<td>written, in or out of class</td>
<td>computer or paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4</td>
<td>write a paragraph using classification</td>
<td>written, in or out of class</td>
<td>computer or paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 5</td>
<td>write a paragraph using causal analysis</td>
<td>written, in or out of class</td>
<td>computer or paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 6</td>
<td>write a paragraph using comparison-contrast</td>
<td>written, in or out of class</td>
<td>computer or paper/pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>revise sample sentences using &quot;lively&quot; verbs</td>
<td>oral, in-class</td>
<td>handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>propose a solution to a problem</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>paper/pen or computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations of Nancy's Computer-Enhanced English 111 Class

Summary of Observation One, Class One.

Nancy's computer-enhanced English 111 class met on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 12:30 until 1:45 p.m. in Room 1 of the MCC Writing Center (Figure 1). My first observation of the class was on Tuesday of the sixth week of the quarter. During the classes I acted as a participant/observer. I would sit at one of the tables in the center of the room for the first half-hour or so of each class, then circulate around the room for the remainder of the class. I interacted freely with the students, both asking and answering questions about their writing and their use of the computers.

At 12:30, fourteen of the nineteen students enrolled were present. As the class began, twelve students were seated at computer workstations; two sat at tables. When Nancy arrived at 12:35, many students were already working at the computers. As they worked, Nancy, standing by the table nearest the door, took attendance and answered a student's question about one of the paragraph assignments.

At 12:39, still standing at the table, Nancy called for attention, gave additional instructions for one of the paragraph assignments, and then began to discuss the current reading assignment from the textbook. The reading described the basic features of position papers, the type of paper called for in the students' next assignment. As Nancy spoke, eight of the students who had been seated at workstations moved to nearby tables. The students were generally attentive, but
did not seem enthusiastic. Nancy highlighted some points from the reading, then directed the students to turn to the section in their texts which describes invention and research activities for the position paper. Nancy discussed the section briefly, suggesting that students might want to try some of the activities "that seemed useful" to them, and wrapped up her lecture.

At 12:57, the students began working on their essays again. Six of the students who had moved to tables from the computer workstations returned to the computers to resume their writing. One of these began getting a printout. Of the remaining students, one was seated at a table writing with pen and paper, and the rest were at tables editing printed copies of their drafts. Still standing by the same front table, Nancy answered a student question. By 1:06, all students were composing or revising at the computer workstations. Although the students were completing their assignments individually, they appeared to be paired off. Five pairs worked "loosely" together, occasionally consulting with one another about both technical and writing-related issues, as well as exchanging casual chit-chat. Four students at the workstations used the copy holders; the rest seemed to prefer holding their drafts or textbooks on their laps or squeezing copy onto the limited desk space beside their monitors. At 1:10, one student who had used the spell checker and gotten a printout was consulting a dictionary to look up some words the spell checker couldn’t identify. Another student seemed stuck in a menu. She looked at me and shrugged her shoulders. I suggested the escape key, which we had trouble locating on the NCR keyboard. After a little
searching, we found it and it worked. As the students worked, Nancy circulated; she appeared to be looking for something to do. At 1:21, a student complained to Nancy that the "computer won't do anything." Nancy went over to help and taught the student how to use the spell-checker. By 1:30, several students had gotten printouts and exchanged papers. Except for one student who seemed to be writing a paragraph assignment, the students were seated at tables peer editing one another's papers.

By 1:39, the students were preparing to leave. As they left, they turned in their papers.

**Commentary:** Several students were already working when Nancy arrived. The routine seemed to be "come in, get disks, begin working whether the teacher is there or not." I asked Nancy about the tendency for students to work in pairs that I observed, and she said she had noticed it, too, but had not suggested or intentionally created it. For the most part, the students worked independently during the workshop portion of the class. Nancy circulated around the room looking over the students' shoulder as they wrote, but the students seemed to need, or at least to want, only occasional help, usually technical assistance with some function of the word processor or printer. Overall, the students seemed relatively comfortable with the word processors, but one expressed frustration and several had small problems like getting stuck in a menu or trying to figure out where to re-align the printer. Nancy was usually able to help students overcome these problems in less than a minute. About twenty minutes of class
time was spent in lecture mode; the remaining fifty-five minutes were workshop-like. Except for informal, ad hoc consultations, the students worked individually on their papers. Students did, however, formally exchange and comment in writing on one another's drafts. As assigned, each student received handwritten comments from two other students.

Summary of Observation One, Class Two.

When I arrived at 12:22, five students were already present. Two of these had turned their computers on; one sat at a table; one sat at a computer with disks inserted but power off; and another inserted the program disk and turned on a computer, then sat at a table nearby. By 12:26, three students had begun working on paragraph assignments using the computers. Two others discussed their assignment with one another, then switched into a technical discussion as one explained to the other how to call in an assignment file. At 12:30, students continued to trickle in. The room was silent except for keyboards clicking and the occasional brief technical consultation between students.

When Nancy arrived at 12:38, fourteen students were present. Seven were working on computers; the rest were seated at tables reading from their texts. Standing by one of the tables at the front, Nancy took attendance. At 12:40, Nancy began a mini-lecture/discussion on the position paper. Students were focused on their textbooks for the most part. Five of those who had been seated at the computer workstations moved to tables as Nancy began to lecture. One student still seated at a computer workstation took a moment to enter some
text, then returned her gaze to her textbook. During the lecture, Nancy asked some questions about the day's reading assignment and called on students for responses. She got oral responses from four students. As she talked, the students were attentive but not too involved; the energy level was rather low. At 1:00, Nancy began discussing the specifics of the current assignment and giving directions for the day's class work. All students were paying attention to Nancy and several wrote down the directions.

At 1:08, the students began working individually and Nancy circulated among them. Seven students worked on computer; the rest sat at the tables using pen and paper and reading from their textbooks. From 1:08 till 1:10, Nancy answered short, mostly technical questions about word processor functions from several students. Students seemed to be working in pairs again, and along with the clicking of the keyboards, the murmur of conversations between students filled the room. At 1:15, Nancy answered a student's question about his topic and sat beside him for a short consultation. After a moment, two students stood nearby waiting as Nancy continued talking with the student. After a minute, Nancy turned to answer their questions about the assignment, then continued talking with the first student. The two students who had had questions returned to work at their computers. At 1:22, Nancy discussed a topic choice with another student. After a very brief exchange, she moved down the row of students for three more short (about one minute) consultations about the day's assignment. At 1:25, Nancy gave a student a quick technical tip about how to
perform a word processing function, then conferred with a student who was working with pen and paper. He had not asked for help and after a brief consultation, Nancy continued to circulate. At 1:38, a student printed out a file and turned off her computer; Nancy had now consulted with each student at least once. Most consultations were about a minute long, but a few lasted four or five minutes. At 1:40, Nancy was trying to help a student get a printout, but couldn’t get the printer to work. She stepped into Room 2 and returned with a technician who moved the switch on the printer selection box, and the printer began to work. Nancy had already tried the same adjustment, but it hadn’t worked for her. I don’t know what the difference was. The whole process took about two minutes. By 1:43, students were beginning to pack up to leave. Four students had gotten printouts. At 1:45, most students were leaving; some seemed to be staying behind to continue working during open lab time.

**Commentary:** The class had three phases: an informal work/chat session before Nancy arrived, a lecture, and a workshop session. During the twenty-nine minute lecture, most students were attentive and moved away from their workstations to a nearby table to follow along in their textbooks or give their full attention to Nancy. During the workshop session, Nancy consulted with each student at least once, usually for only a minute or so. All consultations were with individual students. Occasionally, a student called Nancy over or approached and requested a consultation, but for the most part, Nancy circled the room, consulting with each student as she came to his or her workstation or
seat. At times, when the students seemed to be working effectively on their own, Nancy appeared almost at a loss for something to do. Three or four students chose to work on a paragraph assignment rather than the rough draft assignment made at the beginning of class, and four students remained at the tables the entire class. The rest used the computers to compose for at least part of the class session.

**Summary of Observation Two, Class One.**

I arrived at 12:20, and twelve students from Nancy's class were present and working on computers. During the hour before Nancy's class, open lab time was scheduled in the classroom, and two students not in the class continued to work on the computers. A technician helped one of these students get a printout and explained that the student would have to leave at 12:30 because the room was going to be used for a class.

Nancy arrived at 12:30 and asked the two students using the room for open lab to leave. She took attendance and at 12:38 called for the students' attention and asked them turn to a section in their texts called "Reading a Draft with a Critical Eye." Most students remained seated at a workstation, but opened their textbooks on their laps and faced Nancy. Two moved to worktables, and two others opened their textbooks and held them on their laps but continued looking at their screens and entering text. Nancy reminded the students that before they turned in their essays they were to have them peer edited by at least two other students. Nancy directed the students to use the
editing guidelines and marks found in their text as they read one another's essays. As Nancy talked, several students resumed writing at their computers. By 12:45, five of the twelve students were using the computers to write or edit while Nancy talked.

At 12:46, Nancy passed out a handout on verbs and passive voice (Exercise 1, Appendix D). Standing by the worktable nearest the door, she told the students that she was going to ask them to use the computer to apply the principles from the handout when revising their drafts and then reviewed the handout's suggestions for choosing "lively verbs" and avoiding passive constructions. As she went through the examples of "bad" sentences, she attempted to solicit revisions from students, but got only a couple of responses; most students nodded in agreement when Nancy supplied a revision and asked them if they could see how it was better than the original. At 12:58, Nancy asked the students to move their cursors to the top of their files and explained how to do this using one of the function keys. After a minute, all the students had their cursors in the correct position, and Nancy guided them through the process of using the search function by looking for the word "was." She explained that they could use the search function to help them spot passive constructions and "weak" verbs like forms of "to be" in their writing, and suggested that they try it while revising their drafts.

At 1:02, Nancy directed the students to resume revising their essays. A student who had been editing on the computer while Nancy talked, immediately
began printing out his essay. Nancy returned a paragraph assignment to a student who had completed it incorrectly and had a brief discussion about what the student had done wrong. At 1:04, Nancy was circulating around the room passing back graded assignments. After the graded assignments were handed back, Nancy returned to the table from which she had lectured and surveyed the room. After a minute, she went across the room to help a student with a technical problem, then returned to stand by the table. Most students were working independently at the computer workstations; two had exchanged handwritten drafts and were reviewing one another’s essays. At 1:10, another student called Nancy over for help with a technical problem. After spending less than a minute helping the student, Nancy faced the center of the room and announced, "When it’s marked pink, F5 will remove the marking." Nancy circulated around the room, looking over students’ shoulders at their screens. At 1:12, she reminded the students to run the spelling check program before turning in their papers, then went to help a student who was motioning for her to come to her workstation. This same student had had an earlier technical problem and now seemed to be having trouble getting out of a menu screen. Nancy helped the student get back to her document. By 1:15, five students had printed out their drafts, and Nancy reminded the students to read the next chapter in their texts if they had finished their drafts and completed their peer reviews. One student moved to a table and began reading her textbook. Nancy returned to the front table and surveyed the room. By 1:22, four students were sitting at
worktables; two reading their textbooks and two going over printed drafts of papers. At 1:23, a student called Nancy over to her workstation, and they discussed one of the paragraph assignments. The student wanted to write the paragraph with paper and pen. Nancy asked her to try using the computer again, and the student, after commenting on her "computer ignorance," agreed. At 1:28, Nancy was circulating around the room asking students about their progress, answering questions, and making sure students remembered that they would need to have their drafts peer edited. At 1:39, a student printed out a paper, gave it to Nancy, and left.

At 1:40, three of the remaining students were printing their essays. After removing their papers from the printers, they turned off their computers, returned their disks to the box, and gave their printed papers to Nancy as they left. By 1:43, all the students had turned in their papers and gone.

Commentary: This class had the same phases as the previous classes: an informal work/chat session at the beginning, a lecture period lasting about a half an hour, and a workshop session which comprised the remainder of the class. The twelve students present for class were all working at computers before Nancy arrived. Although they gave Nancy their attention when she began her lecture, about half of them gradually resumed working as she talked. Nancy was not able to generate much student participation as she went over the "Verbs" exercise, but several students did evidently attempt to follow her advice to use the word processor to locate "to be" verbs and passive voice in their writing
because they asked for her help while trying to use the search function. Most of
the consultations I observed Nancy having with students were short and
concerned technical problems with the word processor or printers or procedural
questions about the assignments. The consultations about students’ writing which
I observed, perhaps because students were preparing the final drafts of their
papers, were also short and involved questions about mechanics and diction. At
least two students had written their drafts by hand and had them peer edited
before typing their final drafts on the word processor and turning their printed
essays in.

Summary of Observation Two, Class Two.

When I arrived at 12:30, ten students were present: three were working at
the computers; one was sitting at a computer but had not begun to work; and
the others sat at tables chatting quietly. One of the students working at a
computer asked me to help her load the file containing the topic for "Paragraph
Assignment Two" from her disk. This was the same student who had asked
Nancy for permission to write her paragraph by hand on Tuesday. Consulting
the student’s PC Write Standard reference sheet, I helped her bring up the file.
After the file was displayed on her screen, she copied the assignment onto a
sheet of paper and turned off her computer.

At 12:35, Nancy arrived and took attendance. Then, standing beside the
table nearest the door, she asked for the students’ attention and directed them to
turn to the section in the textbook called, "Basic Features of Proposals." Nancy
reminded them that their next paper would be a proposal. Referring to statements from the text, Nancy gave a short lecture on the elements of proposal writing. Four times during the course of the lecture, she directed a question about something from the text to a student and got a short response. At 12:45, a student left the room; she returned at 12:47. Otherwise, the students focused their attention on Nancy during the lecture. The four students seated at workstations had turned their seats to face her, and the rest sat at the tables watching Nancy or following along in their texts. Nancy concluded the lecture by directing the students to look over the invention exercises provided in the text and "do as much of it as seems reasonable" as they begin to work on the assignment.

At 12:54, Nancy passed out an in-class exercise on writing proposals (Exercise 2, Appendix D). She explained that in order to familiarize them with the kind of problem solving they would need to use in their proposal papers, she had prepared an assignment that she wanted them to complete today in small groups. After reviewing the instructions on the handout, she explained that they could complete the exercise on the computers or on paper and instructed them to "turn yourselves into groups of at least three people."

The students quickly formed three groups. Two of the three groups completed the exercise without using the computers. One of the two non-computer groups discussed whether they wanted to move to a computer before beginning the exercise, but after a few seconds of discussion, chose to remain at
the table where they were seated. After a couple of minutes spent discussing the problem in the exercise, one group moved to a computer and began composing their response. Nancy stood in the front watching the groups as they worked for a few minutes, then sat at a worktable. At 1:13, the group working at the computer printed out their response, gave it to Nancy, and chatted quietly as they set up their computers and began to work individually on the first drafts of their next paper.

At 1:14, the two groups seated at tables were continuing to work on the exercise. Nancy was seated at the table where one of the groups was working but did not participate in their discussion. At 1:16, Nancy went over to help one of the students who had begun working at a computer. It was the same student I had helped at the beginning of class. She was trying to load another paragraph assignment and asked for Nancy's help. Nancy helped her bring up the file, then returned to the table where she had been seated. When she returned, the group working there turned in their exercise and prepared to work individually. One student from the group sat down at an empty table and began reading her textbook. Another turned to discuss her topic with Nancy. The third left the room, but left her things behind. At 1:24, Nancy and the student continued to discuss the student's paper topic. Of the four students working on computers, one, the student who Nancy had helped bring up a paragraph assignment, was entering her handwritten paragraph into the word processor. One was editing a file using corrections from a printed copy of her text. One was entering text
from handwritten notes, and two were entering text without notes. At 1:27, the remaining group finished the exercise and asked Nancy if they needed to enter their work into the computer. She said they did not, and they began moving to computers and preparing to work individually. One asked Nancy a question about the assignment.

At 1:28, the student who had asked me for help earlier asked me to help again. I helped her bring up the assignment file she wanted, and she began composing the assignment using the word processor. Nancy had called a technician in to help with a printer problem. The technician fixed the problem, and the printer began to work. At 1:30, I noticed that the student who had left earlier had returned. Nancy was talking with her at a workstation. She was not feeling well and after printing out something, she left. At 1:40, Nancy was helping a student use the search function of the word processor. Eight of the ten students still present were working on the computers. At 1:41, the student who I had helped with loading files, told me that she was "giving up." She had copied the assignment and was going to work on it at home and then enter it into the computer later. At 1:44, the students began getting ready to leave while Nancy sat at a table reading a student's draft with the student looking over her shoulder. At 1:45, the students began leaving. Four had printed out their work before turning off their computers. At 1:46, the last student left, and Nancy followed.
Commentary: This class departed slightly from the three phase pattern of the previous classes. Like the other classes, it began with an informal work/chat session followed by a lecture/discussion period and a workshop session. However, unlike the previous classes, the workshop session was divided into two parts, a period of group work and a period of individual work. As before, the students were generally attentive but displayed little energy or enthusiasm during the lecture/discussion period. The energy level rose only slightly as the class moved through the group and individual workshop periods. The students created their working groups quickly, seemed to be comfortable with the assignment, and seemed to work well together. Nancy said she does not use a lot of exercises, group or individual, and explained that she created the exercise because she had found that students often had trouble with coming up with problems and solutions for their proposal papers. She intended the exercise to help them understand the kind of thinking they would need to do for the paper. During the individual period of the workshop session, at least four students opted to work on paragraph assignments rather than on their proposal papers. Nancy's consultations during this class seemed about equally divided among answering procedural questions about the assignment, helping students with technical problems related to the computers, and helping students with their writing. She had one conference with a student about the student's paper topic which lasted for almost ten minutes.
Analyses of Two Case Studies of MCC Teachers

In this section I address the following questions about teachers in this study:

1. What knowledge about computers and computer skills do the teachers possess and how did they acquire their knowledge and skills?

2. What do the teachers know and believe about computers and writing and how did they acquire their knowledge and beliefs?

3. How do they use their knowledge about computers, computer skills, and their knowledge and beliefs about computers and writing in their computer-enhanced writing classes?

I have divided my analyses of each teacher’s case study into two parts. The first part focuses on questions one and two. The second part examines question three. However, while I have used these questions as a framework for ordering my analyses, the questions are interrelated and the two parts of the analyses inevitably reflect their mutual influences.

The study asked two other questions about teachers:

1. To what extent are the teachers’ goals and practices consistent with those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach?

2. How have the teachers adapted their goals and practices to those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach?

While I touch indirectly on these questions as I analyze the two teacher case studies, I have reserved a direct discussion for the next major section of this chapter, "Cross-Analysis of the MCC Case Studies."
While I analyze the data from each teacher's case study separately, the teachers share several assumptions which underlie and circumscribe my individual analyses and conclusions. First, both teachers choose to teach writing with computers; they are not required to do so. They both enjoy and believe that they benefit from writing with computers themselves, and they both believe that their students enjoy and benefit from using computers in their classes. The primary advantages these teachers believe computers offer in writing classes are the same: students are more willing to write in class where the teachers can intervene and assist them as they write; students are more willing rewrite and revise their work because emending texts is easier when writing with computers; and the students' work is more legible, has a more polished, professional appearance, and is easier to share. Second, both teachers consider all matters related to the computer components of their classrooms primarily the responsibility of Jessica, the Writing Center Manager. Their own attitudes and actions are shaped by this assumption. Finally, both continue to teach writing and other English classes in traditional classrooms. In any given quarter their computer-enhanced writing classes are only part of heavy teaching and administrative loads. These assumptions and conditions form the background of the scene in which the individual analyses I am about to present constitute the foreground and should be considered implicit correlatives to my observations even when I do not note them explicitly.
Ann's Knowledge, Skills, and Beliefs

Ann's experience with computers is restricted to the MS DOS systems she uses at home, in her office, and in the Writing Center. She uses computers only for word processing, and uses two simple word processing packages, *Professional Write* and *PC Write Standard*, for her writing and in her classes. Her only formal computer training came through the computer workshop offered to MCC writing faculty shortly before the Writing Center opened. She reported that her experience in this workshop was not a good one, and she was not confident about her knowledge of the Writing Center's hardware and software even after this training. Although after four years Ann is now "more comfortable" teaching in the Center, she is still not secure in her knowledge of the Center's hardware and software, and her computer skills, which she describes as "minimal," do not enable her to adapt readily to even minor changes in its hardware or software.

When Jessica introduced *PC Write Standard*, an upgraded version of the same word processor Ann had been using for over three years, Ann reported that she had difficulty learning to use the package. Even after Jessica went through the new features with her personally and gave her an updated reference guide, Ann erased one of her document files and could not recover it.

Although based on my observations, Ann's knowledge about computers and computer skills are minimally adequate for helping her students create the short, simply formatted documents that compose the bulk of the work in her English 111 class, on a very practical level, her limited knowledge and skills
hamper and interfere with her teaching and affect her interactions with students in her computer-enhanced writing classes. Ann does not look for ways to solve problems related to hardware and software which she experiences in her computer-enhanced classes on her own. Instead, she relies on the expertise of Jessica, who may or may not understand and respond to her needs. Ann described several difficulties she experiences because of the lightness of the draft quality print produced by the printers in Room 3. Because the printouts students make are produced in draft quality, Ann cannot create dittoed handouts and overhead transparencies from printouts turned in by her students. When the ribbons on the classroom's printers become slightly worn, she cannot make good xeroxed copies from these printouts. Ann knows no way to overcome these problems on her own. While the software is set to default to draft quality, using only the software's on-line documentation and the one-page reference sheets Jessica provides to teachers and students, I discovered that I could obtain enhanced text quality from within PC Write Standard without changing its default settings. For example, if Ann wanted to create a transparency from a student's essay, rather than retyping the essay or simply foregoing the activity she planned to do with the essay as she does now, she could call the student's file into PC Write Standard, use the edit function to mark the entire text, insert an enhancement code, and print the file in enhanced, near-letter quality mode. She could also instruct her students to follow this procedure before printing their texts whenever she or they feel they need higher quality print. In this instance,
Ann's limited computer skills clearly prevent her from utilizing one of the basic advantages of teaching in a computer-enhanced classroom—the ease of producing and sharing neat, legible texts. While Ann was generally able, often through trial and error, to help students with problems related to *PC Write Standard* when they directed them to her, most of the technical consultations I observed in her classes were between students. Students sought Ann's help on matters related to software or hardware rather infrequently, perhaps because she is unsure of her skills and does not project confidence in her ability to assist students with their problems.

Perhaps more important than the effects just discussed are the limitations Ann's knowledge and skills place on her ability to influence decisions at the program level that impact how she can use computers in her classes. Although Ann and her students use computers only to compose and print texts, when I asked her to describe the ways in which computers are currently used in writing classes, along with indicating that computers are often used to communicate and to collaborate, she mentioned that computers are frequently used in with tutorial programs "which help students as they go through the writing process and help them with invention." Ann indicated that she believes such packages, not word processing alone, are the most important use of computers in writing classrooms. However, despite the fact the MCC Writing Center has no instructional programs available in its classrooms, Ann indicated that she has never suggested that the Center purchase this or any other kind of software or equipment.
because she does not consider herself "knowledgeable enough" to do so. Therefore, even though Ann believes that computers might be most useful in writing classes when used as a tool for teaching students about the writing process, she is constrained by her lack of knowledge and skills from exploring this option on her own and even from urging that it be explored by the Writing Center. For example, Ann indicated that *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing*, 3rd edition is accompanied by an instructional program which Ann thinks might be quite helpful and would like to examine. However, Ann has not pursued this option both because she considers ordering the software Jessica's prerogative and because she must depend on Jessica to configure the software for MCC's equipment and to teach her to use it.

Ann's limited of knowledge about computers and computer skills also do not enable her to adapt her knowledge about computers and composition to her own instructional context and use it in her teaching. Although she indicated that she generally learns more from immediate, hands-on instruction, her limited knowledge of computers and computer skills seem to intensify this aspect of her learning style. Ann has read scholarship related to computers and composition, but, unlike the scholarship she has read on other aspects of composition theory and practice, she has not found ways to apply what she has learned about computers and composition to her computer-enhanced classes because the information is too abstract. Authors do not frame their discussions in a way that makes transparent to Ann how the ideas or teaching strategies they advocate
would work in Ann's classroom. Ann has found software demonstrations at conferences informative. However, while these "hands-on" experiences have added to what she knows about "what's being done and what's available," like what she has read about computers and composition in journals and books, they haven't affected her teaching. Her level of knowledge about computers and computer skills are such that unless information comes to her ready to use with the hardware and software available in her classroom, she is unlikely to attempt to adapt it to her classes. Just as we saw with the her use of PC Write Standard, rather than exploring on her own, Ann depends on Jessica for instruction, and by default, for leadership—even though Ann acknowledges that Jessica has not provided as much information and training on computers as Ann wants or needs.

Ann is troubled because she has not educated herself more about the uses of computers in composition. Perhaps because she has extensive formal education, a doctorate of arts, and knowledge of the scholarship in composition theory and practice which she can apply in her traditional writing classes, she is concerned that she does not bring a similar background in computers and composition to her computer-enhanced writing classes. Given her administrative duties as Director of MCC's Honors Program coupled with the demands of the three classes she teaches each quarter, Ann has a limited amount of time to devote to professional development and has thus far spent her time on needs which she perceives as more urgent. Since as Ann herself pointed out, there is little encouragement or reward for innovation or faculty development at MCC,
Ann has only her desire to learn more and her own sense that she ought to know more about computers and composition to motivate her to acquire this background.

**Ann's Goals and Pedagogy for Computer-Enhanced English 111**

Although Ann has taught English 111 in the Writing Center for four years, she has not fully adjusted to teaching in a computer-enhanced classroom. She is more confident of her ability to train and help students to use the Center's hardware and software than when she first entered the computer-enhanced classroom, but she has not consciously or very successfully integrated computers into her teaching.

In her computer-enhanced classes, Ann uses an approach that includes in-class composing and one-on-one instruction combined with frequent teacher-led discussions of models and techniques accompanied by practice exercises. Some exercises involve the whole class and are completed orally. Others are given as homework or as in-class work and are assigned to be completed individually in writing. Although neither she nor her students used computers to accomplish any of the exercises involving the whole class, in the four classes I observed Ann asked students to complete four exercises in writing, three in class using computers (Table 2). Therefore, although Ann indicated that she does not teach with computers and students use computers only to write themes, since these exercises are one of the pedagogical techniques she uses most often, Ann does, at least indirectly, teach with computers. In fact, completing writing exercises,
not composing themes, composed the bulk of the work for which students used computers in during the classes I observed (Table 5).

Ann does think of word processing features in terms of their usefulness in teaching writing. She suggested that if *PC Write Standard* had a split screen function, it could be useful in teaching argumentation because two sides of an issue could be displayed at once. However, perhaps because she does not think of herself as "using computers to teach," she does not seem to take the benefits and special conditions of the word processing environment into consideration when she decides which exercises students in her English 111 will use computers to complete and which they will not. She also does not consider how to adapt these exercises to the word processing environment. When assigning the "Position" exercise, Ann did not foresee the difficulty students would have creating side-by-side lists using *PC Write Standard*. While the students were able to complete the exercise, they were visibly frustrated and the energy and time they devoted to overcoming the wrap-around feature distracted them from the purpose Ann intended the exercise to serve. If Ann had revised the directions supplied with the assignment only slightly, she could have eliminated much of the frustration her students experienced. Conversely, although Ann cites its capacity for simplifying revision as one of the benefits students gain from using word processing, she did not take advantage of the opportunity to have students complete Exercise Two, which asks students to revise and rewrite a story, using word processing. Instead she gave students a handout and directed the them to
Table 5: Characteristics and Chronology of Activities in Ann’s English 111 Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approx. Mins. By Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>CL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Directions</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing/Criticuing Assignments</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Oral Ex./Modeling</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Sm. Grp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Sm. Grp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approx. Mins.</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
complete the exercise at home where they would not benefit from using the computer to complete their revisions. If Ann consciously evaluated the features of the word processing software her students use and was more aware of how she used computers in her teaching, she could use computer technology to meet her pedagogical goals more effectively.

As I analyzed the elements of Ann's case study, I discovered that to a large degree the benefits Ann attributes to having her students produce their work using word processing compete with her perceptions about her role as a teacher and the needs and abilities of her students. First, while Ann appreciates the fact that her students are more willing to revise their work using the word processor and believes that students benefit because she spends considerable time engaged in one-on-one instruction in her computer-enhanced classes, she worries that using computers has replaced teaching and learning in these classes. She is concerned that students think that "composing in class is all they should do," that their goal is only to "turn out a product," and that they do not apply what they learn from their textbook to their writing. Consequently, since Ann has not consciously discovered ways to use computers to teach and believes computers (at least as they are made available to her in the Writing Center) can be used only for composing, she is not satisfied with the amount of time she devotes to instruction in her computer-enhanced classes and concludes, "I need to do more in the classroom than I do." By this she means, "Students need to
spend less time using computers and more time learning from me in my computer-enhanced classes."

A related tension Ann experiences in her computer classes involves the locus of control in the classroom. On the one hand, Ann describes the "decentering" of her computer-enhanced classroom as "wonderful." She values the computer because it "puts some responsibility onto the students," and she believes "students should become participants in their own education." Similarly, she believes that computers can lead to more interaction and collaboration among students in writing classes and believes that because collaborative writing reflects "real world" writing, teaching students to write collaboratively is particularly important at community colleges such as MCC which prepare students for "real world" jobs. In fact, Ann assigned no collaborative writing in her English 111 class, and I observed no group work or other structured student interactions among students. Although students did spontaneously interact with one another in the classes I observed, their interactions were much more frequently questions about using *PC Write Standard* or operating the printers than exchanges of ideas about writing. Therefore, although Ann considers encouraging collaboration and granting control and responsibility to students positive in the abstract, she does not emphasize collaborative work and is hesitant to grant students control and responsibility in her classes because she suspects that her students lack the fundamental knowledge and skills necessary to contribute to their own education: They "share ignorances" and "much of what
they say is obvious and mindless". As she implied in her evaluation of the Writing Center's hardware, software, and arrangement, in Ann's preferred computer-enhanced writing classroom, she would be firmly in control. She would teach from a computer workstation located in the center of the classroom and would use the computer to display models, demonstrate strategies, and lead students through the writing process. As she currently teaches, she believes that she has yielded too much control to students who "end up running the class too much themselves."

In 1988 John Olsen reported a study of four middle and secondary school teachers who use computers in their classes. Olsen argued that we cannot understand how teachers use computers without considering both the instrumental and expressive aspects of their teaching. Drawing on the work of psychologist R. Harre, Olsen defines instrumental teaching acts as those which are aimed at practical ends, the processes and strategies which are causally linked to learning. In other words, instrumental teaching acts are "what we normally attend to in studying the influences of teachers on the outcomes of classroom activity." Expressive teaching acts, on the other hand, convey messages about how a teacher wishes to be seen by his or her students and peers. As Olsen points out, using a computer in a classroom is more than just helping students to learn—it is "a way of saying something about the kind of teacher one is." Although Ann clearly believes that students benefit from using word processors to write, she has not found the computer-enhanced classroom to
be a comfortable place to teach and has not searched for ways to integrate computers with her pedagogy. Furthermore, many of the benefits she assigns to having computers in her classes seem to conflict with her basic beliefs about the need to structure and direct her students' learning. Therefore, I do not believe Ann's decision to teach in the Writing Center is fully or even primarily explained by the instrumental advantages she gains. I have concluded that Ann's choice is inspired at least as much by expressive as by instrumental purposes. Ann uses computers because she wants to be seen and wants to see herself as progressive, innovative, and open to new ideas. She likes to be able to say, "I'm flexible enough that if I see new strategies that are good, I'm going to want to adopt or adapt them." Consequently, even though she is not confident of her computer skills, has not discovered ways to integrate the software and hardware available to her with her pedagogical strategies and goals, and must compete with computers for her students' attention, she continues to teach in the Writing Center because it enhances her image of herself as a teacher.

Nancy's Knowledge, Skills, and Beliefs

Nancy's computing experience is limited to the MS DOS-based systems she has used in her home and the MCC Writing Center, the only systems which have been readily available to her. The software she has used with these systems has also been determined by what was most readily accessible, even when what was accessible was not necessarily what was desirable. For example, she used
*EasyWriter*, the software which came with the first computer she used, even though she felt it was a "perfectly horrible program."

Nancy uses computers only for word processing, and her knowledge and skills are limited to this application. Like many people, Nancy has acquired her skills mostly on her own and on an "as needed" basis. She learned to use her first word processing program by placing the software manual on her lap and discovering what she needed to know as she went along. Her only formal computer training and introduction to the use of computers in writing instruction was the in-service workshop offered to MCC teachers when the Writing Center first opened and one other in-service workshop sponsored by the English Department around that same time.

Nancy's knowledge about computers and computers skills are sufficient to support the ways she and her students currently use computers. During the classes I observed, Nancy was able to answer most of her students' technical questions and solve most hardware- and software-related problems quickly and efficiently on her own. Technical matters did not consume a large part of Nancy's time and were not a major distraction for her, although mastering the word processing software seemed to be a difficult and frustrating experience for one of her students and Nancy was somewhat concerned about this.

On the other hand, Nancy's knowledge of computers and computer skills affect her ability to evaluate the full range of possible uses for computers in her classes. Because her practical knowledge and skills are restricted to word
processing, she has almost no personal experience with which to judge or project the usefulness of other applications. When asked to list the ways in which computers are currently used in writing classes, she focused on purposes associated with word processing (composing, editing, revising) and, except for mentioning "interactive kinds of work where computers are used to present a poem" which she felt might be used in writing instruction, overlooked other applications, such as desktop publishing, demonstrations, or electronic conferencing. Nancy's conception of how computers can be used in writing classes is also reflected in the reasons she cited to explain why she would not choose to use computers in her literature classes. She does not see computers as potentially useful in her literature classes because these classes focus on reading rather than writing texts, and she sees the computer almost exclusively in terms of its function as a tool for text production and transcription.

Nancy's limited knowledge and skills also affect her ability to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the MCC Writing Center's hardware and software. For example, when asked if she would prefer to use other hardware or software in her classes if given the opportunity, Nancy was hesitant to offer an opinion and indicated that she did not feel that she knows enough to judge whether or not hardware and software that would better meet her needs is available. She thinks, however, that she is satisfied. But even when she thinks she might not be satisfied, she is hesitant to suggest changes. After attending presentations at a CCCC's conference which discussed networked writing
classrooms, Nancy is "beginning to think about suggesting that we do use the network" but "is not quite sure what that would entail."

Even if Nancy had knowledge about and was skilled in using computers for applications other than word processing, she might not choose to do so in her classes. As I will discuss in the next section, she is quite satisfied with her computer-enhanced classes as she currently teaches them. And even if she did want to use computers for other applications in her classes, she might not be provided with the hardware and software necessary to facilitate doing so. However, her ability to choose among and argue for the best applications for computers in her classes is constrained by the narrow scope of her knowledge and skills. Without practical knowledge and basic skills in the range of applications for which she could use computers in her classes, she cannot effectively exercise her own professional judgement and relies on the judgements and choices of others, primarily Jessica.

Like her knowledge of computers and computer skills, Nancy's knowledge about computers and writing has come mostly from her own experience and the MCC training workshop, sources that were not only readily available, but also readily accessible. Like most of what she knows about teaching writing in general, most of what she knows about teaching writing with computers she has learned "through her own private ways." Experience has been her primary teacher. But while experience has made the most significant contributions to her knowledge, Nancy considers three other sources of knowledge "important" or
"very important": her colleagues and associates, professional journals, and workshops and conferences.

While Nancy considers her colleagues and associates "very important" to both her general knowledge about teaching writing and her knowledge about teaching writing with computers, the contribution of her colleagues and associates is basically limited to the basic instruction in using MCC's software and hardware imparted by one colleague who conducted the individualized workshop Nancy attended when MCC's Writing Center first opened. Nancy's colleagues and associates have not had a continuing influence on her knowledge about teaching writing with computers. She does not share ideas with them or seek their help and advice, and she knows little about how they actually use computers in their classes. A word processing reference guide is the only contribution a colleague has made to Nancy's computer-enhanced English 111 classes.

Two other sources of knowledge, her reading and her experience at conferences, also merit discussion. Both have been continuing sources for what Nancy knows and believes about computers and writing, but neither has significantly influenced how she uses computers in her classes. Nancy indicated that the journals she reads most often, College Composition and Communication and College English, publish articles on computers only rarely. Although she is aware of journals that focus on computers and composition, she does not read these journals either regularly or occasionally. Nancy's comments about the
contributions of conferences to her knowledge about teaching writing in general and about teaching writing with computers suggest why she has not sought out these journals or other books and articles about computers and writing. When discussing the importance of journals to her general knowledge about teaching writing, Nancy noted that reading these journals helps her "place what I'm doing within a context, to see whether something that I'm doing is probably not very profitable or profitable." On the other hand, Nancy has not found the knowledge of computers and writing she has acquired from journals and conferences, sources outside her local teaching context immediately helpful because she sees this outside information in contrast to rather than in the context of her current teaching situation.

While Nancy reports that she always learns something which she can apply to her teaching in the traditional classroom when she attends a major conference, she found conferences less useful for her teaching with computers both because they have had, at least until recently, few sessions which focus on computers and because the sessions on computers and writing which she has attended seemed unrelated to her teaching context. For example, she reported that she attended two or three sessions on teaching writing on computer networks at a recent conference and indicated that while she would like to try some of the ideas and strategies discussed, she could not do so because MCC's classrooms are not networked. Applying knowledge about networked writing classrooms to her own teaching would require that she adapt it to MCC's non-
networked computer-enhanced classrooms—there are, for example, techniques such as "musical computers" exercises which can be used to approximate on-line conferencing in non-networked classrooms. However, none of the factors in Nancy’s teaching environment encourages her to attempt to adapt her "outside" knowledge to her own teaching context. Her limited knowledge of computers and computer skills and her limited knowledge of computers and writing supply her with few resources and the view of computer-enhanced writing promoted by MCC’s Writing Center implicitly discourages using computers for things than transcribing and producing short texts and provides little support for innovation. Finally, as I have already pointed out and will discuss in the next section, Nancy’s goals in her computer-enhanced writing classes and her satisfaction and success with her present use of computers create little need for her to change her current teaching praxis.

Nancy is aware of her limited knowledge of computers and how computers are used in writing classrooms. When asked to describe ways in which writing teachers use computers, she said that she found listing the various uses of computer in writing classes difficult because she had only her own experience to rely on and indicated that there are probably many uses which she is unaware of. At the same time, she is not very concerned about her degree of knowledge and does not view limited computer skills and limited knowledge of computers and applications of computers in writing classrooms as significant problems for her or other writing teachers who use computers. While education
and training related to computers and writing might be useful, they are not necessary because "writing is still the focus." Nancy acknowledges that she would probably use computers in her classes in additional ways if she was aware of the full range of possibilities, but the same factors which mitigate against adapting knowledge from outside sources about how computers are being used to teach writing to her own classes also constrain her from seeking new knowledge.

Nancy's assessment of the effects and potential effects of computers on the teaching of writing are also circumscribed by her own experience and teaching context. She sees the most important effect for teachers in the area of evaluation; grading papers is easier when they are neatly printed. For students, the most important effect is the ease of text production; students will write more and enjoy writing more because composing, revising, and editing is easier when using word processing. In the future, students will become more familiar with computers before taking a computer-enhanced writing class, and they will benefit even more. She also mentioned increased student collaboration as a benefit of using computers in her classroom but did not list this among the most significant effects. This is consistent with the focus on composing as an individual act within her pedagogy, as I will discuss in the next section.

Nancy's Goals and Pedagogy for Computer-Enhanced English 111

Nancy's discussion of the teaching environments within the English Department's traditional classrooms and in the Writing Center indicates that she is generally satisfied and comfortable with both settings. Although both contexts
differ somewhat from her "ideal," since both generally support her personal brand of process-centered writing philosophy, she has been able to successfully adapt her pedagogical strategies to her circumstances without great difficulty.

Nancy is generally pleased with the support given to teachers in both the traditional and computer-enhanced writing classrooms. The availability of hands-on technical assistance with the Writing Center’s hardware and software was especially important when Nancy first began to teach in MCC’s computer-enhanced classrooms and continue to contribute to her comfort and her confidence in her ability to teach effectively in these classrooms. During my visits to her classes, I observed that, when needed, this assistance is both readily available and dependable. While Nancy would like other kinds of support for her computer-enhanced teaching, such as more opportunities to examine software and more Department-sponsored workshops on computers and writing, consistent with her observations about what knowledge and training teachers need, she does not place a high priority on these concerns.

Nancy’s comments about the arrangements of the Writing Center’s classrooms and the hardware and software available in the classrooms indicate that she is also quite satisfied and comfortable with these aspects of her teaching environment. The arrangement of the classroom has little impact on Nancy’s teaching. She noted different advantages and disadvantages for the arrangements of the two classrooms, remarking on the absence of a designated place for the teacher in Room 1 and the difficulty of conducting group work in
Room 3, but she indicated that she teaches "basically the same way" in both classrooms. Ease of use is the aspect of the hardware and software with which Nancy was most concerned, citing the ability of students to learn PC Write Standard quickly and easily as one of the features she liked best about the software.

Nancy indicated that her philosophy and goals were the same for her traditional and computer-enhanced classes. Her comments about her philosophy and goals reveal a mix of beliefs and practices. Nancy views writing primarily as a communicative act, places great emphasis on recognizing and correcting errors that could interfere with communication, and includes instruction in the modes. She also considers writing as a process which can be taught, teaches strategies for invention and revision, stresses the need for each student to discover his or her own "voice," and believes that each student has "something worth saying." Nancy's teaching methods include whole-class, presentational-style lecture/discussions and individual writing conferences during in-class workshop sessions. The ratio of lecture/discussions to workshop sessions in the classes I observed was about 1:2 (Table 6). Her assignments include paragraphs focused on the traditional modes and essays focused on writing aims such as taking a position or proposing a solution. The paragraph assignments she created herself; the essay assignments are drawn from the St. Martin's text. She uses few grammar or other skill-based exercises, and when she uses rhetorically-based exercises, such as exercises from St. Martin's which allow students to practice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approx. Mins. By Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>CL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Directions</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing/Critiquing Assignments</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Oral Ex./Modeling</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Sm.Grp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Sm. Grp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approx. Mins.</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Peer Editing
invention or revision strategies, these are suggested to students rather than required of them. She neither encourages nor discourages students from using computers to complete these exercises. Although she encourages informal consultations among students and I observed many of these, Nancy includes little structured group work and no collaborative writing assignments in her classes. I observed only one group exercise. I also observed only one instance in which Nancy explained a strategy for using a word processor function to enhance their composing processes to the class (she demonstrated how they could use the search function to spot passive constructions in their essays). Except for one other occasion when Nancy reminded students to "always" run the spell checker before turning in their essays, Nancy did not suggest rules or generalizable strategies for using word processing. Instead, the instruction Nancy provided about using word processing functions occurred "ad hoc" during one-on-one conferences with students.

Adapting to MCC's computer-enhanced classrooms was relatively easy for Nancy. Both the hardware and software supplied by the Writing Center and the arrangements of its two classrooms support the individual student composing that is key to Nancy's own philosophy and her pedagogy. For Nancy, moving to the computer-enhanced classroom was largely a matter of addition rather than adaptation or integration. Teaching in MCC's computer-enhanced classrooms resolved an existing tension between her beliefs and teaching practices. Although she believes in the importance of process-based instruction and
considers one-on-one conferencing the best way to provide this instruction,
Nancy indicated that she finds it difficult to get students to write in her
traditional classes. She has discovered that the presence of computers largely
solves this problem because "there seems to be a greater sense of immediacy and
a greater willingness on the part of students to write in the classroom." I found
much evidence of this willingness during my observations. Students regularly
arrived for class early and began writing using the computers on their own, and
they seemed eager to resume their work when interrupted by Nancy's arrival and
the short lecture/discussion with which she began her classes.

However, while teaching in a computer-enhanced environment eased this
tension between Nancy's beliefs and her teaching practices, it also intensified
tensions between conflicting beliefs and created a new problem for her
pedagogy. While she believes in process-based instruction, she also sees
composition as a course that requires her to "cover material." When students
suddenly became more willing to spend time writing in her classes, she was faced
with a choice between giving students time to compose and covering traditional
content by explicating models and teaching the modes. Nancy attempted to
address this problem by creating the paragraph assignments through which she
hopes to teach students the traditional modes of composing and focus their
attention on the models in the text. These assignments help Nancy "cover" this
material, and by providing an opportunity for students to practice word
processing skills and compensating for different rates at which students complete
assignments while composing in class, also helped her address several new difficulties which emerged in the computer classes. However, while the paragraph assignments have solved some of Nancy's pedagogical problems, they have not resolved the contradictions within her beliefs. Consequently, while she is not convinced that the loss of direct instruction in the modes and other traditional concerns has any detrimental effect on her students' writing, the struggle to balance allowing students time to compose and allowing herself time to cover material remains a major concern in her computer-enhanced classes.

In brief, Nancy did not search out the computer. She began using computers for her own writing as well as her teaching because the opportunity to use computers had come to her—at home, when her husband brought a computer from work and at school, when MCC created its writing center. On the other hand, she did not hesitate to take advantage of these opportunities when they presented themselves. She soon became convinced of the computer's effectiveness as a writing tool for herself as well as her English 111 students and settled into a pattern using computers in her classes that has remained basically unchanged. Computers have become essential to Nancy's own writing and have filled the space she discovered for them in her pedagogy because they make it easier for her to read and evaluate students' texts, make it easier for her to engage students in writing in her classroom, and make it easier for her students to produce, manipulate, store, and share their work.
Cross Analyses of the MCC Case Studies

In this section I analyze the relationships among the goals and philosophies of the MCC Writing Center’s faculty developers, its Manager, and the MCC teachers. The first part of this section analyzes the extent to which the teachers’ goals and practices are consistent with those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach and examines the ways in which they have adapted their pedagogies to the those of the writing program. The second part compares the case studies of the two MCC teachers.

Comparison of the Goals and Philosophies of the MCC Writing Center’s Faculty Developers, Its Manager and the MCC Case Study Teachers.

A high degree of disparity exists among the goals and philosophies described by the participants in the MCC Writing Center and teacher case studies. In general, the goals and philosophies of the faculty developers and the teachers were consistent with one another while those of the Writing Center’s Manager differed from those of the other participants. The faculty developers and the case study teachers were generally in agreement about the benefits students and teachers receive from using computers in writing classes, while the Writing Center’s Manager’s opinions in this area differed from those of the other participants. The activities I observed in Ann and Nancy’s classes were influenced and somewhat circumscribed by the goals and philosophy of the Writing Center’s Manager who to a large extent controls the software and hardware with which they teach as well as the arrangement of their classrooms.
The disparity among the goals and philosophies of the participants in the MCC case study contributes significantly to the dissatisfaction evident among the faculty members.

As I concluded in the "Analysis of the MCC Writing Center Case Study," the goals and philosophies of the Writing Center’s faculty developers and the Writing Center’s Manager were quite different. In addition to providing access to computers for writing, peer tutoring, and writing classes, John and Margaret’s objectives for the Writing Center included providing computer training and information about computer-enhanced composition to faculty, assisting faculty in developing ways to use computers in their classes, supporting the development and production of teaching materials using computers and other media, and encouraging writing-across-the curriculum. The overall purpose of these services was to support and enhance process-based writing instruction at MCC. In contrast, Jessica described a different and more limited set of goals: introducing MCC students to computer technology, helping students improve their attitudes about writing and revising through access to word processing, helping students to improve their writing through peer tutoring, and training students in the use of computers and word processing. Although the objectives Jessica outlined are not incompatible with Ann’s and Nancy’s philosophies, objectives, or classroom practices, the objectives described by John and Margaret are more consistent with the classroom and professional development goals Ann and Nancy indicated that they would prefer the Writing Center to support. For example, although
both Ann and Nancy considered introducing students to computers and word processing benefits associated with their computer-enhanced writing classes, neither considered these primary objectives of using computers in these classes. Furthermore, consistent with John and Margaret’s first and second objectives, both Ann and Nancy indicated that they would like to receive more computer training and more information and support related to teaching computer-enhanced composition.

John and Margaret’s beliefs about the ways in which computers can be used in writing instruction were also more congruent with Ann’s and Nancy’s beliefs and practices than Jessica’s were. Within the process-based pedagogy John and Margaret envisioned, computers could be used to help instructors individualize instruction and, most importantly, to allow instructors to guide and teach students as the students compose. In contrast, Jessica viewed the computer primarily as a tool for transcribing and editing texts rather than as a tool for enabling teachers and tutors to assist and instruct students as they compose. For example, Jessica discourages tutors from using computers during tutorials, preferring that they work with students using printed copies of the student’s texts. Within their classes, both Ann and Nancy intervened and assisted their students as the students composed on the computers. In fact, both cited the increased time spent devoted to composing in class as a major advantage of using computers in their classes. Furthermore, both would like to expand or change the ways they use computers in their classes. Ann would like to have the
capability to use computers to model writing strategies and display writing samples on-line for her students; Nancy would like to experiment with teaching strategies used in networked writing classrooms. Clearly, like John and Margaret, Ann and Nancy believe that computers can support writing instruction by enabling teachers to assist and instruct students as they compose as well as by motivating students through simplifying text production and transcription.

The differences between the goals and philosophies of the MCC faculty developers and teachers and those of the MCC Writing Center's Manager have had a significant and negative impact on computer-enhanced composition at MCC. Given Ann's and Nancy's relatively limited computer skills and knowledge about computer-enhanced composition, Jessica's more limited goals for the Writing Center and her more narrow conception of the role of computers in writing instruction were serious pediments to their ability to develop and enhance the pedagogies of their computer-enhanced writing classes. Although Nancy did not indicate a high degree of dissatisfaction, both she and Ann indicated that they would change or add to their uses of computers if given the time, training, and equipment to do so. Since Jessica's goals and philosophy for the Writing Center indicate that she is not likely to provide these resources, the limited impact of computer-enhanced composition on writing instruction at MCC is likely to continue and the developing frustrations and sense of dissatisfaction of John, Margaret, Ann, and Nancy are likely to increase.
Cross Analysis of the Case Studies of the MCC Teachers.

Ann and Nancy had similar profiles and computer backgrounds. Both had taught a variety of writing and English courses at MCC for many years and had taught English 111 using computers for three and four years, respectively. Neither had had any other teaching experience using computers. In addition, neither had used computers for any purpose other than word processing, and both had begun using computers for their personal writing partially because they were aware that MCC was developing a computer-enhanced writing center.

Ann and Nancy gained their computer and word processing skills through using computers on their own for writing, with the help of friends or family, and through the training workshop provided to faculty shortly before the Writing Center opened. Given this background, both Ann and Nancy had difficulty evaluating the full-range of potential computer applications in their classes and neither felt knowledgeable enough to fully evaluate or make recommendations about the hardware and software available in their classrooms. Although both felt that they would like to use or experiment with ways of using computers in their classes other than those they were currently employing, neither was knowledgeable enough to investigate teaching strategies that would require changes in hardware and software on their own or, to a lesser degree, to make recommendations to Jessica. In addition, Ann’s limited computer skills and knowledge of computers interfered with her ability to use computers to enhance and support her current teaching strategies.
Although Ann and Nancy had similar computer training and computer-
enhanced teaching experience, they had different opinions about how much
knowledge about computers and about computer-enhanced composition is
needed by writing teachers who teach with computers. In addition to knowing
the hardware and software that they will teach with "absolutely well," Ann
indicated that teachers should know about other software and hardware options
and about teaching strategies that have been developed for computer-enhanced
composition. Ann felt teachers should receive education and training in these
areas through specialized courses and workshops. In contrast, although she felt
such training could be helpful, Nancy did not believe writing teachers require
formal training in order to use computers effectively in their classes because "the
focus is still on the writing itself." Their differing opinions in these areas can be
accounted for by the different levels of comfort and success in their computer-
enhanced classes and their different amounts of formal training in composition
studies. Ann was less satisfied with both her skills and integration of computers
into her pedagogy than Nancy and, in general, considered formal study and
training in composition studies more important for writing teachers than Nancy
did.

Ann and Nancy assigned similar ratings to items contributing to their
general knowledge about teaching writing and their knowledge about teaching
writing with computers. Neither considered their graduate or undergraduate
coursework important to their knowledge about teaching composition with
computers, although Ann, who completed a D.A. in composition theory in 1983, considered her graduate coursework important to her general knowledge about teaching composition. Both also indicated that professional journals were important to their general knowledge about teaching composition, but unimportant to their knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Neither read journals specifically related to computer-enhanced composition. In addition, both indicated that workshops and conferences were either important or very important to their general knowledge about teaching composition, but relatively unimportant to their knowledge about teaching composition with computers; although Nancy rated workshops and conferences important to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers, she explained that her rating was based primarily on a single conference that she had just attended. Although they found the information about computers and computer-enhanced composition interesting, they had not found it very useful because they had not discovered ways to apply it to their local contexts. Both rated the contributions of their colleagues and associates "very important" to their knowledge about computer-enhanced composition, but both also indicated that these contributions were mainly limited to the training and suggestions they received from colleagues shortly before and after the Writing Center opened. Their comments indicate that there is not a strong sense of community among the teachers teaching computer-enhanced composition at MCC.
Although their responses were not identical, Ann and Nancy's assessments of the advantages of using computers in their writing classes were similar. Their responses indicate that they receive both practical and pedagogical benefits from using computers in their classes. Both cited their students' increased willingness to revise when writing with computers and additional time spent working with students as they write as pedagogical benefits. In addition, Ann mentioned smaller class sizes and the availability of spelling checkers as advantages. Ann also believes that she can teach students to use supporting evidence more easily when teaching with computers. On a very practical level, both cited more legible student papers as a significant advantage.

When asked to describe the disadvantages of using computers in writing classes, both indicated that loss of instructional time as a problem. Ann was concerned that her students become "too absorbed" in using computers and "consider the classroom as being only composing." Similarly, Nancy worried that she spent too little time "covering material." These responses indicate that while Ann and Nancy consider the increased time students spend writing in their computer-enhanced classes an advantage, they have not been able to reconcile this advantage with their conceptions of their role as teachers and their sense of what a writing class should include or "cover." Both also considered students' lack of computer or keyboarding skills as disadvantages. The problems Ann and Nancy and their students experience due to the students' limited experience and skills in these areas are no doubt exacerbated by the fact that the sections of
writing classes taught in the Writing Center are not designated as computer-enhanced in the course bulletin, so that students are unaware that they will be using computers in these sections.

Although Ann’s and Nancy’s assessments of the teaching environment in MCC’s traditional classrooms were generally positive and quite similar, their assessments of teaching in the Writing Center were somewhat different. Ann indicated a need for additional support in several areas. For example, she felt that additional supplies, such as printer ribbons, and technical support were needed in the Writing Center’s classrooms. In contrast, Nancy described the classroom maintenance and "day-to-day" support for her teaching as "quite good." Their differing opinions in these areas may be due to the differ kinds of support required by the teaching strategies they use; as I will discuss, their pedagogies and the content of their classes are quite different. On the other hand, both Ann and Nancy indicated that they would like to have more support in areas like previewing software and learning about ways of using computers in composition classes.

Ann and Nancy indicated that their teaching philosophies and goals were the same for their computer-enhanced writing classes as for their traditional classes. However, their philosophies, goals, and teaching strategies were quite disparate. Consequently, their composition classes and the ways in which computers were used in these classes were quite dissimilar.
Ann's teaching philosophy reflected beliefs associated most closely with socio-epistemic rhetoric. She indicated on her syllabus, for example, that she wanted her students to "experience writing as a way of thinking and a way of producing new knowledge." The teaching strategies which she described and which I observed in her classes were, drawing on George Hillock's classification of teaching modes, primarily environmental (141-147). Her description of her teaching was consistent with the activities which I observed in her classes. As Table 5 shows, writing exercises and teacher-led modeling accounted for about sixty-seven percent (202 of 302 minutes) of the class time I observed, compared to composing essays and paragraphs which accounted for only about nine percent (27 minutes). Of the remaining class time, about seventeen and one-half percent (53 minutes) was devoted to presentational-style activities (lecturing and giving directions) and about seven percent (20 minutes) was spent reviewing assignments.

In contrast, Nancy's teaching philosophy reflected a mixture of beliefs associated with expressive rhetoric and traditional rhetoric. The teaching strategies which she described and which I observed in her classes were consistent with her philosophical beliefs and included a combination of the teaching strategies associated with Hillock's natural process and presentational teaching modes. For example, as shown in Table 6, Nancy's students spent about fifty-two percent (145 of 279 minutes) of the classes I observed composing essays individually or responding to another student's essay, activities associated
with natural process instruction. Nancy devoted about thirty-three percent (93 minutes) to presentational-style activities (giving directions and lecturing). The remaining class time, 49 minutes or about seventeen and one-half percent, was devoted to oral and written exercises.

Although students used computers in Ann’s and Nancy’s classes exclusively for word processing, because of Ann’s and Nancy’s disparate beliefs and goals and the different teaching strategies they employed to meet these goals, the writing tasks which students used computers and were quite distinct. Although, as Ann indicated, students spent a significant amount of time using computers for word processing in her classes, most of this time was devoted to completing writing exercises rather than to composing essays. In contrast, students in Nancy’s classes used word processing almost exclusively for composing essays and paragraphs. Therefore, while Nancy did not attend much more to the special requirements of the word processing environment than Ann, since the assignments Ann gave her students were more structured and specific, Ann’s students tended to have more difficulties following the directions and using word processors to meet the requirements Ann set for her assignments. In addition, although both Ann and Nancy indicated that being able to intervene as students compose and to provide more one-on-one writing instruction to students were significant advantages of teaching with computers, the nature of their interventions were somewhat different. Consistent with the teaching modes each teacher tended to employ, Ann’s interventions occurred mainly within the
structured, writing exercises she assigned while Nancy’s usually took place within the broad parameters of her essay and paragraph assignments. In addition, when Ann assigned writing exercises, she directed students to use or not to use computers to complete the assignments. In contrast, Nancy more often suggested that her students complete particular invention or revision tasks and suggested that they complete these tasks using computers. In short, Ann’s students’ uses of word processing were more structured and more teacher-directed than were Nancy’s. My observations of Ann and Nancy’s classes indicate that while computers may decrease the amount of teacher-centered activities within writing classrooms, computers do not necessarily lead to student-centered classrooms.
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CHAPTER IV

Excellence Through Community: Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature at Center State University

Although the case study of the computer-enhanced composition program at Center State University (CSU) which follows depicts a program in which the role computers has evolved from "glorified typewriters" to a broadly defined "text manipulator." Although computers are used effectively to support the teaching of writing within CSU's computer-enhanced composition program, the program also reflects some of the practical difficulties of integrating theory and practice when introducing computers in composition and literature programs. Overcoming most of these difficulties, CSU has successfully created a computer-enhanced composition program which supports the notion of writing as a collaborative, meaning-making activity and fosters a sense of community within the program.

In the sections which follow, I trace the evolution of CSU's computer-enhanced composition program. As in Chapter 3, I begin by discussing the history and development of the computer-enhanced composition program at CSU. After describing and analyzing the program, I present case studies of two teachers who teach within the program. Finally, I analyze the relationships between the program and the case study teachers, examining how the program administrators' goals relate to those of the teachers and how the teachers have adapted their
goals and pedagogies to the program.

The University

Center State University is a large, comprehensive research institution located in a medium-sized Midwestern city. Including its four regional campuses, CSU enrolls over 50,000 full- and part-time students and has over three thousand faculty members. The University has a selective admissions policy and most undergraduates are traditional college students originating from within the state, yet the CSU student body, partly due to its sheer size, is quite diverse. While minority students represent about only about seven percent of the total enrollment, students come from all fifty states and many foreign countries. Roughly twenty percent of graduate students are international students. Most students live in campus dormitories or in private housing in the neighborhoods surrounding the University.

As a comprehensive university, CSU offers over two hundred courses of study in programs ranging from agriculture to the humanities that lead to degrees from the associate (offered at the regional campuses) to the doctorate. In addition, CSU has professional schools of law, optometry, dentistry, medicine, and veterinary medicine. Among the "distinguished programs" CSU cites in its promotional literature is the English Department's "nationally recognized program for computer-assisted instruction in composition."
Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature at CSU: An Overview

Computer-enhanced writing instruction at CSU is provided by the Department of English through its Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature (CEWL) Program. Courses offered through the CEWL Program include: the University's three basic writing courses (Eng. 050, 060, and 110W); first-year composition, including honors sections (Eng. 110, the standard course, and English 111, an alternate course which includes literature); seven varieties of an intermediate essay writing course (Eng. 367); and upper-division courses in informative, critical, research, business, and technical writing (Eng. 301, 302, 303, 304, and 305). The Program also supports introductory courses in poetry, fiction, and drama (Eng. 260, 261, and 262). Since its inception in 1987, computer-enhanced instruction in the English Department has expanded each year, and a significant portion of the sections of several of these courses are now taught using computers every quarter. For example, the CEWL Program provided twenty of the eighty sections (25%) of English 110, three of the twelve sections (25%) of each of English 301 and 305, and five of the fourteen sections (35%) of English 110W offered during Spring Quarter, 1992. In addition to these courses, sections of English 111, Honors English 110, and English 367 were also offered through the CEWL Program during Spring Quarter, 1992. In all, the CEWL Program provided instruction for thirty-one sections during Spring Quarter, 1992. Although these courses have no prerequisites other than those generally required for the course, sections of courses offered through the CEWL Program are designated as
computer-enhanced in the master schedule of classes, so students enrolling in the sections are aware that they will be using computers in these classes. Although faculty members occasionally teach in the CEWL Program, since the courses offered through the Program are usually assigned to graduate teaching associates at CSU, most of the teachers involved in the Program are graduate students. For example, during Spring Quarter, 1992, only one regular faculty member, a non-tenured assistant professor, taught in the CEWL Program. All teachers in the CEWL Program have at least one year of experience before entering the Program, and overall, teachers in the CEWL Program average between two and three years of teaching experience.

CSU began offering computer-enhanced composition classes in 1987 with one computer-enhanced classroom (Room A) equipped with a combination of twenty Macintosh Plus and SE model computers and has since added four additional classrooms, three Macintosh and one IBM (Rooms B, C, D, and E). All five classrooms support both classes and open lab access for CSU students. While the classes supported are limited to those offered through the CEWL Program, during open lab hours any CSU student may use the classrooms/labs for any academic purpose. Although the classrooms belong to the CEWL Program, which has primary responsibility for determining how they are equipped and utilized, day-to-day maintenance for the classrooms and supervision during open lab hours are provided by CSU's Academic Computing Office (ACO) and billed to the CEWL Program at an hourly rate.
The classrooms, with the exception of one Macintosh classroom, Room B, have computer workstations around the perimeter and several small tables in the center (Figure 2). Room B, a very large classroom, has computer workstations on one side of the room and several small tables on the other (Figure 3). The workstations are placed along three walls and in a row down the center of the room forming a square on one side of the room. The space in the center of the square is empty. In all rooms, the computers rest side by side on tables with little space beside the machines for resting copy, writing by hand, or propping a book while reading. Therefore, most non-computer work takes place at the tables in the center of the rooms. In addition, each room has either a chalkboard or whiteboard and an overhead projector. No lectern or teacher's desk is provided, although three rooms have stations set aside for lab monitors which are generally not used by students and which teachers sometimes designate as their own station for working during class sessions.

Three of the Macintosh classrooms—Rooms A, B, and C—adjoin one another and are divided by collapsible partitions which can be opened during open lab hours or to allow team teaching and joint class sessions. Room B is equipped with twenty Macintosh Pluses, while Rooms A and C each have twenty Macintosh SEs. The three rooms operate on separate local area networks (LANs) served by Macintosh SE/30s using Appletalk networking hardware and Appleshare networking software. The software provided for student use—MacWrite II, MacPaint, and MacDraw—is accessed through the networks. The network software
FIGURE 3: CEWL Classroom B
allows users to access files from the server and send files to the server or other workstations. Each room is also equipped with four Apple ImageWriter II dot matrix printers; Rooms A and C also each have a laser printer.

The fourth Macintosh classroom, Room D, was created in 1990 using funds from a grant for the study of collaborative writing and is designated as a collaborative classroom (Figure 4). Room D has twenty-one Macintosh SE workstations operating as a LAN with the same network capabilities described for Rooms A, B, and C. To facilitate collaboration and to support the needs of upper-division writing classes, four of these workstations are equipped with Radius monitors which can display a full page of text. One workstation, located at the front near the file server, is reserved for the lab monitor during open lab hours and is sometimes used by teachers during class sessions. Room D has four ImageWriter IIs and one laser printer. The software, accessed through the file server, is MacWrite II, MacPaint, and MacDraw II.

The IBM classroom, Room E, has also been designated as a collaborative classroom (Figure 5). It is equipped with twenty-one IBM PS/2 workstations served by a Compaq 386-based computer using Ethernet. One workstation, positioned near the Compaq file server, is used as the lab monitor’s station during open-lab hours or sometimes by the teacher during class sessions. Each PS/2 is equipped with a VGA monitor, a mouse, and a hard drive. The software, Word for Windows and a paint program, is accessed from the hard drives rather than from the network server. The network primarily allows sharing of the classroom’s
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FIGURE 4: CEWL Classroom D
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FIGURE 5: CEWL Classroom E
three laser printers. Accessing and sending documents or programs through the network is possible, but because the Compac file server is not fully IBM compatible, accessing and sending documents must be done outside the network software using DOS commands and is therefore somewhat cumbersome and more difficult than in the Macintosh classrooms.

Besides these classrooms, the CEWL Program also provides hardware and software in the offices of the Department's writing program's administrative staff, in the offices of the teachers who teach in the CEWL Program, and in the CEWL Program office. The writing program secretary and the writing program staff each have a Macintosh workstation. Graduate teaching associates teaching classes in the CEWL Program are assigned (five or six per office) to designated CEWL offices equipped with computers, either Macintosh, IBM, or both, and ImageWriter printers. All CEWL teacher offices operate on LANs for printer sharing. The CEWL Program office, besides several Macintosh and one IBM workstation, has a laser printer, a scanner capable of converting scanned text into word processing documents, and software including database and desktop publishing packages used for administration, research, and in-house production of flyers and other Program documents such as a collection of student writing done in the Program published twice each quarter.

In addition to the equipment and software permanently assigned to the classrooms and offices, the CEWL Program also has two overhead-type screen projectors and the software program Aspects available for use in classes. The
screen projectors are compatible with only the Macintosh platform, but IBM-compatible projectors are available from another campus office. *Aspects*, which can also be used only in the Macintosh environment, allows real-time sharing of documents and is designed to facilitate collaboration among writers. Using *Aspects*, students can view and edit either the same or separate documents simultaneously, discuss ideas and send messages to one another, and save their edited documents and messages for future use. The CEWL Program owns twenty copies of *Aspects* which can be used in any of its Macintosh classrooms.

**The Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program: Alec, the Coordinator**

Since its creation, the CEWL Program has been directed by Alec, a full-time coordinator who holds a non-faculty, non-tenure track administrative appointment within the Department of English. As the CEWL Coordinator, Alec is responsible for managing day-to-day operations; selecting and training teachers; scheduling classes; hiring Program staff; selecting and purchasing hardware, software and other materials; and managing the Program's budget. Alec also oversees the Program's involvement with other departments and programs, coordinates and helps conduct the Program's research projects, promotes the Program within and beyond the University, and represents the Program in the community and at local, national, and international conferences.

Alec is assisted in these tasks by five graduate student administrative assistants, each with a twenty-five percent appointment. Each assistant is assigned a specific responsibility or responsibilities. For example, during 1991-92, the
CEWL Program assistants had the following responsibilities: two were responsible for coordinating different CEWL Program research projects; one maintained and updated the CEWL Program library and resource bank; one was responsible for desktop publishing; and another helped to develop a new CEWL-supported course. The CEWL Program also employs an undergraduate student worker. In addition, several faculty members act as consultants for the Program, helping to conduct research and to develop and coordinate CEWL-supported courses.

I met with Alec in the CEWL Program office on two occasions and asked him about the Program and his involvement in it. I also asked him to clarify and comment upon some of the data I had gathered from several notebooks of information about the Program that had recently been compiled for an external review of the rhetoric and composition program. Alec and I met for approximately an hour and a half on each occasion.

Alec began his career at the University as a graduate student in 1982, teaching freshman composition as a teaching associate while working toward a Master's degree in English. After completing his M.A. in 1984, Alec was admitted to CSU's doctoral program in English. During his doctoral coursework, Alec's main area of study was modern composition theory; he is currently completing his dissertation. During 1984-1986, Alec was an administrative assistant to Scott, the Director of Writing.

Alec's vita indicates that he is an active professional. He has published three articles since 1989, all related to computers in composition, and since 1985
has made over twenty conference presentations on topics ranging from computers in English studies to folklore. Many of these presentations reported findings from research developed and conducted in the CEWL Program. In addition to these activities, he has conducted several software demonstrations for a national software developer and has participated in leading workshops on computers in the humanities for teachers at two high schools. He has been a member of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) since 1983. Since 1985 he has also been a member of the NCTE’s local affiliate, and has chaired the affiliate’s special interest group on composition and computers since 1988. He joined the Modern Language Association in 1992, and has been affiliated with the Apple Research Consortium for Higher Education Support since 1990.

Alec feels his background in composition theory and his experience in teaching composition have greatly influenced the approach he has taken as Coordinator of the Computer Project and CEWL Program:

My job description is looking for or was looking for someone with a background in rhetoric and composition and administrative experience. There was no requirement of a computer background, and I think because of that, the Program has made the strides, taken the direction it has for sure. I do a few workshops each year where I go off to talk to high school teachers or talk to college teachers or whatever about the Program and how to integrate computers into the program. A couple things that are key. Every student must have a computer. Sharing just doesn’t work. Teachers also need a machine in the classroom and in the office as well in order to do their own work, in order to involve themselves with their students’ work. Most important, the computer can’t be the focus either physically or philosophically of the course. Even in the course that [a faculty member] and I have proposed, which is a critical theory class that is going to use the computer as a means to investigate ideas of meaning, textuality, and authorship, the computer and the
software, yes, they are going to be very central, but they're going to be central as ways of investigating these larger theoretical issues not as ends in themselves.

Creating a Computer-Enhanced Writing Program: CSU's Computer Project


The idea for creating a computer-enhanced writing program at CSU did not come from within the Department of English. In fact, it did not come from within the University. In Autumn 1986, CSU was contacted by Apple, Inc., which urged the University to compete for one of the grants the corporation was sponsoring to develop innovative computer-enhanced programs within university settings. Wishing to capitalize on the opportunity, the University administration, because of the Department of English's highly-rated and internationally recognized rhetoric and composition program, approached the Department and suggested that it develop and submit a proposal. Because the Department felt computer-assisted writing instruction would complement and enhance its process-based instructional philosophy, the Department agreed with the suggestion, and Scott, the Director of Writing, began drafting a proposal for a computer-enhanced freshman writing program that would become known as "The Computer Project."

While Scott is a nationally recognized composition scholar, he had no special interest and no experience in computers and composition before undertaking this project. However, he was assisted from the beginning by Alec, then a doctoral candidate in the Department. After the Project was funded, Alec was named Coordinator and soon became largely responsible for its day-to-day
operation.

Working together, Scott and Alec drafted and submitted a proposal in just three weeks. In a little over a month, the University received word that the proposal had been funded, and the Department of English would receive hardware and software worth over $300,000. The original grant consisted of thirty-five Macintosh Pluses, forty Macintosh SEs, twenty-one ImageWriter II printers, twelve hard disk 20s, seventy-five sets of MacWrite, and miscellaneous support equipment and software. As it began, the Computer Project included the Department's freshman writing course, English 110, and had three objectives: to teach English 110 in a computer-assisted environment, to research the use of computers in teaching freshman composition, and to evaluate and develop materials and software for teaching freshman composition using computers.


Even in the early stages of the Computer Project, Scott and Alec had a firm idea of their philosophy and primary objective. They wanted their computer-assisted classes to reflect and enhance the process-based instruction used in CSU's "traditional," non-computer-enhanced English 110 classrooms. As it was described in an article which appeared in the Department of English's Autumn, 1987, newsletter,

The writing program's basic position is that students who produce multiple drafts of a paper tend to improve their writing skills. In the computer-assisted writing program, students use the word-processor as a sophisticated pencil and paper to facilitate limited and extensive
revision during the process of planning, drafting, and revising. Our
classroom-labs allow students to focus on the act of writing itself by
producing multiple drafts for any paper. During scheduled class
time and later during lab hours, computers provide students with
abundant opportunities to work with language as a fluid medium... . In such an environment, multiple drafting is no longer a tedious
chore, but a challenging and productive process.

The Computer Project was pilot tested in ten English 110 classes during
Spring and Summer Quarters, 1987. During the preceding Winter Quarter, the
Project Team—Scott, Alec, and two graduate student assistants—developed a
detailed computer-assisted English 110 syllabus (Appendix E). Because the
Computer Project classes would be taught by instructors who had no previous
experience teaching a writing class using computers, the syllabus included day-by-
day descriptions of assignments and classroom activities that would take advantage
of computers within the Department's process-centered writing curriculum. In
addition, the syllabus also included guidelines and suggestions designed to help
teachers to introduce their students to the computer environment as quickly and
efficiently as possible. This segment of the syllabus, called Macstruction, has been
gradually refined and expanded and is now a twenty-four page reference guide
published by the CEWL Program and available directly to students from a local
copy center and to teachers to include as part of their course packets for English
110 and other CEWL-supported courses.

After selecting the five graduate teaching associates who would be teaching
the Computer Project classes during Spring and Summer Quarters, 1987, the
Project Team created a training program for them. As described in a summary of
the Computer Project written by Alec in 1987, the training was "intensive":

The team members met with the instructors, as a group and individually, to ensure that each new "Macintosh" teacher was expert in the operation of the Macintosh, fully conversant with the Writing Program's overall teaching philosophy, and expert in the implementation of the "Macstruction." The initial training sessions focused on the first few weeks of the course and the importance of establishing an efficient, yet caring, environment, where 110 students would not be inhibited by the potentially threatening nature of the microcomputers themselves.

In addition to creating a syllabus that would both reflect the Writing Program's process-based pedagogy and take full advantage of the opportunities offered by computers, the Project Team also wanted to configure the classroom in a manner that would facilitate the student interaction that they considered an integral part of their philosophy. They decided to place the computers around the perimeter of the room so that while students had free and immediate access to the machines, they also had free and immediate access to one another. With the computers around the edges, the center of the room remained available for small and large group discussions and activities, as well as reading and writing by hand. The advantages of this configuration were described in a report on the Project during Autumn 1987:

The design of this classroom is unique, enabling the teachers to retain the strengths of our modern "process-drafting" syllabus, while taking full advantage of the Macintosh computers. Unlike traditional computer writing labs, where the computers are spread evenly throughout the entire classroom area, dominating the room, ours has twenty Macintosh computers along the outside walls, freeing the large central area of the room for four student tables in order to facilitate full-class recitation, small-group discussions, and individual writing.
This report also pointed out:

Having the computers situated around the perimeter of the room emphasizes their role within the operation of the class; the computers in this classroom-lab are available for the teacher to use as she sees fit, but at all times they are in the background, as tools and never as the substance of the class.

In addition to developing the syllabus and designing the classroom, Alec and his graduate assistants also analyzed and reviewed many different kinds of software packages during this time (Appendix E). The word processing packages they examined were *MacWrite* (the package they were using in their pilot classes), *Microsoft Word*, and *WriteNow*. All three are full-function, "mass-market" word processors rather than specialized classroom packages. The Project Team felt the simple, icon-based structure of *MacWrite* along with its ruler-based formatting and simple cut and paste editing features made it the superior choice for first-year writing classes. Both *Microsoft Word* and *WriteNow*, while basically variations of *MacWrite*, were more powerful and, consequently, more complicated and more difficult to learn. Using *MacWrite*, students could learn the operations necessary to write within the word processing environment in just one hour, an advantage which the Computer Project Team considered very important because of CSU's ten-week academic quarters.

The team also reviewed other types of software packages, but did not find any of them appropriate for their purposes (Appendix E). About editing and style software they wrote:

Generally, the editing and style software that now exists is either too elementary (too basic-writing oriented) or too prescriptive (too
current-traditional-paradigm oriented) to support the writing- and student-centered drafting philosophy and pedagogy that forms the core of our writing program.

The programs they examined were *PROSE Instructor, Tools for Writers, MacProof*, and *MacLightning*, a grammar-spelling checker. They also reviewed the invention program *Think Tank*. While they were somewhat impressed with *Think Tank* and found it interesting and potentially useful, they ultimately decided against using the program and expressed the following concern:

Generally, we find ourselves facing a dilemma when we consider the invention programs now available. Our dilemma comes when we are forced to decide whether it is more practical to teach our students a variety of invention techniques, such as brainstorming, clustering, freewriting, Burke’s pentad, and the journalistic questions, or to spend class time introducing them to a single software program that would allow them to invent towards a topic only while at a computer terminal. Our fear is that such an approach could tie them exclusively to the computer for the purposes of invention, stranding them for writing beyond English 110, throughout the University and across the curriculum.

*MacWrite* remained the only program used in the Computer Project’s English 110 sections.

In the ten pilot sections of Computer-based English 110, written evaluations were collected from both students and teachers. Students also completed pre- and post-responses on the Miller-Daly Test of Writing Apprehension. The results of the Miller-Daly test showed that the students had grown in confidence during the course. The course evaluations and journals completed by teachers and students indicated that students were more proficient at drafting and revising their papers, that they were more likely to revise, and that they enjoyed writing more. Several
teachers also noted an increased willingness to write in class and a sense of "unity" and community among students in their Computer Project classes. For example, one teacher commented,

Students seemed to sense that the room was a lab in which work was to be done—and they were eager to work at the computers whenever possible. . . . The table set-up probably had an even more profound effect than the Macs on the classroom experience. Because students could easily see and talk to each other, a sense of class unity seemed to develop. I think this was the first 110 class I have taught in which students called each other by name and spoke directly to each other (rather than always to me) during discussions.

The instructor questionnaires and journals also revealed that the Project experienced some technical and logistical problems during its first few quarters of operation. For example, in response to the prompt "Describe a time when you felt frustrated with the hardware or software in your English 110 classroom-lab," eight teachers commented "Every time we used them." Other comments related to technical aspects of their classes included the following:

"Straighten out the [MacWrite II] disks or ditch’em. . . . Students aren’t paying for hassles."

"But in practice, until the bugs are worked out of [MacWrite II], or we return to a one-disk application, the computers get in the way of teaching."

"Please consider an organized program of providing TAs with student assistants at least at the beginning of the quarter."

". . . particularly if the technology does not provide a distraction by failing to work."

"More campus facilities are needed for this."

The teachers’ expressed similar frustrations in their journals, but they also
indicated that they realized that Alec and the Project Team were aware of the problems they were experiencing and were attempting to alleviate them. For example, one teacher commented:

The first week was pure hell. The kids hated the two disks and spent more time switching them back and forth than they did writing. This, of course, went on all quarter, whenever we used the Macintoshes in class—which is one reason we seemed to avoid using them. . . . But you know all about the disk problems, and that's been solved now, so what good would it do for us to harp on that? Besides, we're very happy now--about the networking, we mean.

However, despite their frustrations with the technical problems, the teachers’ overall assessments of the Computer Project, like those of their students, were overwhelmingly positive.


The Computer Project underwent several changes coming into its second year of existence. Scott, who had become involved with the Project because of his position as Director of Writing and his status as an established scholar, became less involved in the hands-on operation of the Project and assumed a more strictly advisory role as Alec became more established and more confident in his position as Project Coordinator. The Project also began to expand.

Because of the positive responses to the pilot sections, Scott and Alec, with the support of the Department, expanded the Computer Project to sixteen sections of English 110 in Autumn, 1987. To accommodate the expansion, two rooms adjacent to the original lab were renovated during Summer Quarter, 1987, and added to the Project’s classroom-lab pool. These classrooms were equipped
with Macintosh computers and ImageWriter printers using additional funds from the Apple grant and were arranged in basically the same configuration as the original classroom. Additional computers and printers were also placed in the teachers' offices so that all teachers in the Project would have access to computer equipment.

The Computer Project’s research agenda was also expanded and formalized. The Project Team administered pre- and post-instruction versions of the Miller-Daly Test and collected both student and teacher evaluations in all sixteen Computer Project sections and in sixteen matched control sections of "regular" English 110. In addition, the Team began to conduct long- and short-term case studies of student writers and to experiment with different pedagogical strategies, planning to vary the ratio of conferencing to lecturing and the number of papers assigned, as well as to experiment with different team teaching configurations. CSU also became a participant in a research project involving sixteen other universities. The purpose of the research project was to evaluate the impact of computers on student writers and develop "showcase" computer-based instructional materials. Therefore, while the Computer Project continued to evaluate existing software, it also began to become involved in software development. Working with a well-known software company, the Team planned to produce a Macintosh word processor especially for use in freshman writing classes. The Project, in conjunction with CSU's Center for Teaching Excellence, also began developing a second project, a computer-assisted sentence combining
package using the authoring software Course of Action.

The Computer Project continued to grow quickly, and as it established itself within the Department and the University, it also became increasingly well-known beyond the University. In 1988, Apple, Inc. named CSU an official "Demonstration Site" for integrating computer technology and writing instruction, and several universities and public school districts within and beyond the state asked CSU for guidance in creating their own computer-enhanced composition programs. The Computer Project Team also continued to plan for the Project's future growth and expansion. The Project's short-range plans called for the number of Project-supported sections of English 110 to increase from sixteen in 1987-88 to twenty-four by Spring Quarter, 1989. Long-term plans called for the Project to support computer-enhanced instruction in the University's basic and upper-division writing courses. To support this expansion and enhance the capabilities of the Project's classroom-labs, the Project's "wish list" for 1988 included networking for the existing labs; the creation of five additional labs; an additional laser printer; vertical monitors for two of the five new labs; additional computers and printers for the offices of teachers in the Project; additional equipment such as scanners, graphics tablets, and overhead-type screen projectors; and additional software such as desktop publishing and spreadsheet software (Appendix E).
The Computer Project Becomes The Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program.

In Winter Quarter, 1988, the state Board of Regents invited two consultants from outside the University to critique CSU's Computer Project. The evaluation took place in February, 1989. The consultants' based their report on documents submitted by the state's Board of Regents, the University, and the Computer Project Team and on observations made during a two-day site visit. The major conclusion reached in the report was that the Computer Project was an extraordinarily successful project, one that results in improved attitudes about writing and increased skill on the part of students, and one that fosters an energetic and enthusiastic community of teachers committed to innovative pedagogical approaches and excellent teaching.

Among the strengths singled out in the report were the "vitality within the community of instructors involved in the [Computer] Project," the quality and pedagogical soundness of the Project's process-based model syllabus, the "challenging, questioning attitude" represented by the Project's research agenda, and the knowledge and enthusiasm displayed by Alec as Coordinator. The report concluded that the Computer Project should be expanded to include the majority of English 110 sections and extended to include additional writing courses planned in the University's newly revised and expanded undergraduate curriculum.

However, the report also described challenges faced by the Computer Project. Foremost among these was overcoming the Project's "isolation:"

We consistently observed during our visit that the Project is an isolated subset of the first-year composition program (English 110),
itself a subset of the English Department at [CSU]. Although the Vice Chair for Rhetoric and Composition and the Chair of the Department of English are all fully aware of the Project’s activities and accomplishments, they do not participate in it regularly or systematically. The Director of Writing was instrumental in designing the project, negotiating the initial funding, and in implementing it initially, but he does not participate in day-to-day supervision of the Project. The current leaders of the Project... are not included in decision-making processes that have a direct bearing on the Project and on the future of writing in the undergraduate curriculum at [CSU]....

The Project’s isolation within the English Department is exacerbated by the fact that few regular, tenured, or tenure-track faculty teach first-year composition courses, with or without computers.... As a result of this isolation, the Project’s successes have not affected the English Department as a whole, and have certainly not affected other units outside the Department, even though the potential for emulation exists across the undergraduate curriculum. We consider this situation unfortunate, indeed.

The consultants recommended several changes in the Computer Project to overcome the Project’s isolation and enhance its effectiveness. First, they advised that a tenure-track faculty position be added to the Department and suggested that this individual could coordinate both the Department’s Writing Center and the Computer Project as part of his or her duties. They also recommended that the Computer Project expand to include upper-division writing courses and noted that this would provide more opportunity for tenure-track faculty to become involved in the Project. Finally, they suggested an enriched research agenda and more outreach and articulation with other programs and units within and beyond the University.

Shortly after the consultants’ visit, the Computer Project Team began to act on these recommendations as well as to implement other planned changes in the
Project. It was about this time, 1989, that the Computer Project became the Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program.

The Expansion of the Program’s Mission and The Evolution of a Philosophy for Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature.

When the Computer Project was created, it was conceived of exclusively in terms of English 110, first-year composition. In just two years, however, its scope and mission were extended to include the entire undergraduate writing curriculum as well as several undergraduate literature courses (Appendix E). Commenting on the computer program’s rapid development from the Computer Project into the CEWL Program, Alec said,

The computer program kind of fell into our laps in the English Department . . . and when we got it, we weren’t thinking about what it had the potential to become. . . . I think it has really grown much larger than anyone ever expected it to as quickly as it has. . . .

Alec added that despite the Program’s rapid and rather unexpected growth, it has, however, expanded in a "directed, controlled way."

The CEWL Program’s five-year plan (Appendix E), created in 1989, is evidence of such direction and control. The plan was developed by Alec, working closely with the English Department’s Vice-Chair for Rhetoric and Composition. One of the plan’s goals called for CSU, by academic year 1994-1995, to become the first major university to deliver all freshman writing instruction in a computer-enhanced environment. The plan also called for the Program to begin offering basic, intermediate, and upper-division writing courses. According to the plan, by academic year 1994-95, the CEWL Program would offer all sections of first-year
writing, 20% of English 367 (intermediate writing) sections, 50% of English 302 (critical writing) sections, all English 304 and 305 (business and technical writing) sections, and a significant percentage of sections of basic writing courses. To support this expansion, the plan included teacher training and development workshops coordinated through the Writing Center, expansion of the Writing Center's computer capabilities, and the addition of a tenure-track associate professor to direct the Writing Center. The addition of nine new computer classrooms was planned to accommodate the expanded course offerings. As of Spring 1992, the CEWL Project was unable to meet all of its objectives, primarily because of space and budget constraints. Alec is not optimistic about achieving the goals set out in the plan because "there's no way of predicting where the budget is going." However, despite some budgetary setbacks, the CEWL Program continues to develop new goals and research agendas.

While the growth of the Program and the further expansion called for in the five-year plan were spurred in part by the Program's success in English 110 and by the recommendations of the outside consultants who had suggested that the Program incorporate writing courses beyond the freshman level, these developments were also being fueled and consciously guided by an evolving philosophy. A report on the Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program prepared in 1991 described the Program's objectives as follows:

The general position of the Program is that students who produce multiple drafts of papers tend to improve their writing skills and the quality of their writing. Since its inception, the primary objective of the computer-enhanced writing program has been to help students
become more effective writers by exposing them to the ways in which the computer can alter and enhance their writing processes. The undergraduate writing curriculum and the Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature component of that program seek to challenge students to consider the ways in which language and writing are used within particular disciplines or to reach specific ends.

When asked if the objectives or philosophy of the Program had changed since this statement was written, Alec replied,

Basically, the primary objective of the computer-enhanced writing program is to help students become more effective writers by exposing them to the ways in which the computer can alter and enhance their writing processes. I think that the only thing I would say in addition to that is that our new direction has gone rather than just to enhance the instruction, really to complicate student thinking about what is a text, what is an author, and where does meaning reside within the text. . . . I think that would be a new direction, a new objective.

Commenting further on this change in direction, Alec said,

I think that we're beginning to see ourselves as a program that has an identity unto itself and has a philosophy. I mean, we began with the whole idea of planning, drafting, and revising, and the whole idea of the student-centered classroom and active learning and this type thing, which are all philosophies which have . . . remained the mainstay of what we're doing in the classroom, even as we bring in new courses. I mean, we now have basic writing. We also have Introduction to Fiction, Introduction to Drama, Introduction to Poetry, [an assistant] and I are working on a project that really looks at multimedia as well, and also the thing that [an English Department faculty member] and I are doing with bringing hyper-text into the classroom to complicate the students' thinking about what is textuality, meaning, and authorship—those things really are the Program making connections to the other theories that exist around.

Alec stressed that connecting the Program to current research and theory beyond the area of computers in composition and literature has become an important goal because
The research that's being reported in computers in composition and literature . . . seems very narrowly focused . . . in the sense that the people doing the research, the researchers, don't seem to have a sense of connections between their work and other work in English studies, and that seems to be a problem. What we're trying to do is we're trying to keep that broader view. We're trying to not only acknowledge our connections to literary theory, for instance, but really to play on those connections, bring them to the forefront . . . We're dealing a lot with collaboration, playing around with that whole idea of authorship. We're playing a lot with, you know, the visual text. This fluid thing on the screen . . . This computer thing throws into chaos the traditional sense of a text as a printed artifact that comes letter after letter, line after line, word after word . . . [because] that's not necessarily the way things work any more. So we're trying to involve our students in becoming more active readers, more active writers, and more active thinkers through the course. The computer then becomes a tool to that end, which I think is a broader end than we considered in 1986.

When asked about a characterization of the computer as "a fast pencil" in an early description of the Program, Alec was surprised by the characterization and emphasized that this view has changed significantly:

We've gone beyond the idea of the computer as a glorified typewriter to the computer as a text manipulator and that's "text" very broadly defined and "manipulator" very broadly defined.

**Software, Hardware, and Classroom Arrangements.**

Alec is very pleased with the Program's current hardware, software, and classroom arrangements, although he is disappointed that space and budget constraints will prevent the Program from fully implementing the five-year plan drawn up in 1990. When I asked Alec to describe how the CEWL Program selected its hardware, he indicated that since the CEWL Program's first three classrooms (Rooms A, B, and C) were created with hardware supplied through a grant from Apple, Inc., there was no discussion about whether the Macintosh or
MS DOS platform would be selected to equip them. However, the Program's fourth and fifth classrooms (Rooms E and F) were created using grants from the state's Board of Regents and the decision was made to equip one of them, Room E, with IBM PS/2s. Alec said that this decision was primarily based on the need to serve students better:

[The Vice-Chair for Rhetoric and Composition] and I both talked about that [creating an MS DOS-based classroom]. We both agreed. I realized that as a program we couldn't be single-based, but we also weren't serving our students. There are things that the IBM will allow certain students to do that a Mac won't and vice versa. The icon-based system, whether in the Macintosh or IBM environment, eases access, but there are some students who are much more comfortable with a DOS environment, and therefore, we needed the flexibility to be able to go that direction if we wanted to.

Alec added, however, that the decision was also influenced by other considerations:

[Non-Apple vendors] knew that we were very firmly entrenched in Macs and were very concerned about the fact that [according to the five-year plan], you know, all students on campus were going to be introduced to the Mac in their freshman year. Marketing-wise, it was very important for IBM to get on campus. So it was a political thing—once [the Vice-Chair] and I had made a decision that we needed to deal with what our students needed.

I asked Alec who, besides the Vice-Chair for Rhetoric and Composition and sometimes members of the higher administration, is involved in making hardware and software selections, and he explained that

For the most part, hardware and software decisions are made by me, actually what to purchase, what not to purchase. If we're looking at a particular software package, then there's also a need to involve students as well as people in my office in doing the evaluations, taking a look at it, seeing what they think of it, this kind of thing, and then they will make recommendations, and very often they will actually walk me through what they see as limitations and problems
or strengths of a particular software. If it's something outside of our realm, like say, when we first went to the IBM environment... I relied on people out of Academic Computing, out of the College of Humanities. For hardware choices, I work with [the Academic Computing Office], College of Humanities.... We’ve worked with CTE [CSU’s Center for Teaching Excellence] and their audio-visual specialists and also their instructional technology people, as well, to give us recommendations. We've also worked with hardware and software reps from the companies.... So it’s a mix of people within the Program and people outside the Department and the University.

Alec also explained that software is usually classroom tested on a small scale before being adopted program wide.

In Summer Quarter, 1992, the CEWL Program will begin testing a new version of MacWrite, called MacWrite Pro, and may also test a new version of Microsoft Word. Alec feels the CEWL Program needs to have a word processor which has an easily learned interface, but which also has advanced capabilities both because the Program now serves a wide range of courses and because students are becoming more experienced and sophisticated computer-users:

When we first began the Program we found, when we would do an informal survey at the beginning of the quarter, asking our students how many out of a class of twenty had ever used a computer before, how many had used a Mac before, back in '87, maybe two out of twenty had used a Mac. Maybe three out of twenty had ever used a computer before. Now we’re finding—we ask that same question of our classes in 1992—that ninety-five percent, you know, eighteen or nineteen, have used the computer before, and of those eighteen or nineteen probably sixteen or seventeen have used a Mac before.... And some of those computer users... typical freshman at seventeen, eighteen years old, it’s not unusual for them to have two, three, four years of experience, as much sometimes as eight or nine years of experience. For some of these students the word processor has become the medium in which they write.

Summing up his comments, Alec emphasized,
MacWrite II allows us to do all ... the formatting we need for a 304 or 305, our business and tech writing classes, allows us to play around with formatting for, let's say, an introduction to poetry or fiction class, a critical writing class. It allows us to deal with ... this theoretical chaos that's going on right now in terms of textuality, meaning, and authorship, and yet, allows our basic writers also to come to the electronic arena, come into the technologized world.

According to Alec, MacWrite II has become the University's standard Macintosh-based word processor and is available in every campus Macintosh lab, partly because the CEWL Program introduces over fifteen hundred student writers to it each year.

When I asked Alec how the Program selected Microsoft's Word for Windows for use in the IBM classroom, he explained,

First, the University is hoping at some point in the near future to be able to create on the entire campus a similar interface. The icon-based system is going to be able to do that. ... So that was one reason. The second is that money and development in the big companies, whether hardware or software, is going into the Windows environment. ... That seems to be, by every indication, the future for DOS-based computing. It's going to be a Windows environment. So we want to keep the University and also the students going in that direction.

When I asked Alec about the paint and graphics programs available in the CEWL Program's classrooms, he said that these programs were added primarily to accommodate the needs of upper-division writing classes in which students often create complicated, sophisticated documents such as technical reports and résumés. MacPaint and MacDraw were selected based on the recommendations of the CEWL Program staff and the faculty course directors in charge of the upper-division classes. Alec mentioned that he was having trouble finding a stand-alone graphics program for the Program's IBM classroom because most graphics
programs are part of integrated spreadsheet and data base packages: "The concern is that in order to get to the drawing element within it, you need to be teaching the spreadsheet as well, and there's just no time."

Alec also discussed *Aspects*, the conferencing software recently purchased by the CEWL Program. From its inception, the computer-enhanced writing program at CSU emphasized student-interaction. For example, the Computer Project's 1988 wish list indicated that "in the best of all possible worlds" the CEWL Program would have "full networking among all machines and printers" so that students could view a document on all machines simultaneously, revise a document simultaneously, and observe on their own screens as another student revises his or her document (Appendix E). While CSU's computer-enhanced writing classrooms were networked almost from the beginning of the Computer Project, none of them had the software needed to allow the kind of student interaction and collaboration Alec envisioned. Consequently, Alec is very excited by the potential for interaction and collaboration *Aspects* offers. As Alec described it:

*Aspects* is really the first true collaborative software for the Macintosh. It's really pretty amazing. . . . You can literally see the changes as they are being made in live time. And there's a chatbox element to it so that you can discuss the document [while] outside the document as well. Now it has a graphics program; it has a paint program; it has a draw program, and a word processing program built in. But you can import and export text from *MacWrite II*, which is how we use it.

While the Program currently has twenty copies of *Aspects* which can be used in any of the Macintosh classrooms, by the spring of 1992, the software had not yet
been used by many teachers. Alec hopes to have the software available on the
Program's Macintosh LANs by Autumn Quarter, 1992, and believes that once the
software is on the network, more teachers will use it.

Based on evaluations of software conducted early in the Computer Project,
the Program chose to rely on software such as word processors, paint programs,
and communications software rather than on text analysis, invention, or other
instructional software. When asked about this focus, Alec indicated the Program
plans to continue this direction and explained that he does not believe the
technology is currently available to create truly viable computer-based instruction
for literature or composition:

Remember the language labs where they had headphones hanging
from these steel bars above their heads? That's how we learned
foreign languages, not by communicating. . . . A lot of the CAI
software, things like style checkers and grammar checkers, what
they're terming student-focused or student-driven software is really
not much more than the language lab with students tied to these
little metal poles. They're "dumb" programs; the computer has no
idea what the student has written. Whether you're writing about the
issue of abortion or an abortion which you might have had or
whether you're just dealing with whether a pitbull would make a
good pet, it gives you the same responses. There's a problem here
in terms of letting that be the focus of instruction in the computer
room. What we need is artificial intelligence, if we're going to go
with something like truly interactive CAI. If we're going to go with
a computer that is going to go through the motions of asking
students about their topics, the computer needs to be able to
respond directly and intelligently to what the student gives as an
answer to a prompt, as opposed to, "Oh, that's really interesting.
Now tell me two things that characterize it."

In addition to increasing the number of its classroom-labs, adding an IBM
classroom-lab and adding software to its labs, the CEWL Program has also
acquired some additional kinds of hardware. Much of this hardware was added so
that the Program could better meet the needs of the upper-division writing classes it had begun supporting. For example, while the Computer Project began with ImageWriter II dot matrix printers, the CEWL Program now has at least one laser printer in four of its five classroom-labs. Alec said that the laser printers were added to the classroom-labs because they are quicker and allow students to produce more professional-looking copy, something which Alec considers important, especially in the upper-division classes.

You usually can’t do a résumé or a cover letter or even a technical report which has diagrams and such on an ImageWriter. It takes too long. You get poor quality, and the visual impact is so important in those upper-division writing classes.

In addition to the laser printers, the Program also added four full-page vertical monitors to Room D, one on each side of the room. Commenting on this decision, Alec said,

Since it’s a collaborative classroom, we’ve added full-page monitors so students working on collaborative projects work with full screens. Students who are doing projects which require more delicate or complicated or intricate document design, say for 304 or 305, business and tech writing classes, those students can also see what would be a page wysiwyg [what you see is what you get].

In addition to the laser printers and vertical monitors, the CEWL Program has also purchased overhead-type screen projectors for use in the classroom-labs and new equipment for the Program office. Alec said that the screen projectors haven’t been used as much as he anticipated. He explained that upgrades to the equipment in the CEWL Program offices were needed because the Program’s requirements had outgrown the capabilities of its original equipment. Both the office’s ImageWriter printers and its computers have been replaced:
In the office we also have a laser printer. It's the only printer we have. The machines in our office . . . have all been replaced in the last two years, and the machines from here have gone out to the [teachers' offices] because what we do in terms of administration, in terms of desktop publishing, in terms of visuals for the Program, for the Department, for the University, but also for national exposure, we really needed faster machines. We needed stronger machines. We needed machines that would allow us to do some of the memory hogging stuff like HyperCard, StorySpace, or Pagemaker.

Alec also mentioned another recent purchase, a scanner capable of creating text files usable with the Program's word processors, and reported that it has been particularly helpful for creating teaching materials and for assembling data for the Program's research projects.

Besides software and hardware, I also asked Alec about the arrangements of the CEWL Program's classroom-labs. Of the Program's five classroom-labs, four are arranged in basically the same way with the computers around the perimeter and tables in the center of the room (Figure 2). Alec said the Program began with this arrangement because it fit in well with the Writing Program's process-centered pedagogical philosophy and has continued with it because teachers in the Program have generally been pleased.

The fifth room, Room B, was originally arranged in the same manner as the other CEWL classrooms, but is now arranged in a variation of this basic design. As Alec explained,

What we heard about [Room B] was that it was too big. We never hear that from teachers! But they [the teachers] thought it was too big and that the students could be isolated. . . . Teachers raved about [Room A] and [Room C]. Because they were tiny, it forced their students together. It forced the community to gel more quickly.

Since the room accommodated most of the CEWL-supported basic writing
courses, Alec rearranged the room based on the recommendations he received after talking at length with several teachers, including the Director and Associate Director of the Basic Writing Program. As Alec described it, the new arrangement created three workspaces for every student (Figure 3). The computers were arranged along three walls and in a central row which divided the room into two areas; the computer workspace was on one side and a second workspace with tables and a chalkboard for writing, discussions, and group meetings was on the other. A third area for group work and conferencing could be formed by placing chairs in the center of the computer workspace. Alec said he was a bit concerned about the new arrangement at first:

When we first created this room . . . my concern was, we've got three workstations, but what we've done is we've separated [the second area] from the computer. But the feedback we got from the teachers was that they liked it. For that group of students [basic writers], they liked the idea . . . . That you literally had to get up, move back through this little passageway back into the writing space. Because in their everyday lives, writing was not part of it, and this was a way of bridging that gap, of making writing an event, of making writing somehow special, but also giving [students] a place where they could spread things out and work.

Alec added that the Program had once experimented with a different classroom arrangement when Room D was first created. Because Room D was designated as a collaborative classroom, its computer workstations were initially placed in four pods. Because the pods physically located students in four groups, it was felt that this arrangement would facilitate collaboration. However, the arrangement proved to be too restrictive, and after only two quarters the computers were moved to the perimeter of the room to allow teachers and
students the flexibility to create more or larger groups and interact more freely.

When asked to describe any problems or difficulties the CEWL Program has had with its software or hardware, Alec said that the Program experienced its most serious software and hardware difficulties when the IBM classroom was first added. The problems were caused by incompatibility between the non-IBM file server and the IBM laser printers. While Alec feels that the problems with the printers have now been corrected, he explained that students report that they need more access to the Windows environment used in the CEWL Program's IBM classroom:

The problem is, even though it was recommended to us to go with the Windows environment, there are only two Windows labs on campus, and ours is one of them. . . . What we basically are finding is that the University has been much slower in making a transition to a Windows environment either in new space, new labs, or in renovation of old space, old labs because of budget.

Other than these difficulties, and the delays in implementing changes caused by budgetary constraints, Alec feels that the CEWL Program has had very few serious problems with software or hardware.

**Upcoming Changes in the CEWL Program's Software, Hardware, and Classrooms.**

While the Program will almost certainly not be able to meet all of the goals outlined in its current five-year plan, Alec is eagerly anticipating three changes that will allow the Program and its students to extend beyond the walls of its classroom-labs. One of these is the addition of e-mail capabilities to the Program's existing classrooms. Alec feels e-mail capabilities will enhance the Program's instruction by allowing students to share ideas and projects and to
access library resources and on-line data bases from the classroom. He hopes e-mail will be available by Autumn Quarter, 1993. Two other changes Alec is looking forward to are the implementation of a "mobile classroom" using laptop computers and the creation of a multimedia cart.

Students involved in the "mobile classroom" project will be loaned a laptop computer which will become theirs for the term. Alec is particularly excited by the potential of the "mobile classroom" to reach non-traditional and marginalized students:

These are students who are returning to school, students who have lives the rest of the week who can only take a class and get to campus on Saturday. The other problem [the mobile classroom could address] is the students who are really at a distance from the University or students who... have other responsibilities who can't get back onto campus to use the labs between regularly scheduled class meetings. This can be a way of extending that lab to them as well.

Explaining how the "mobile classroom" could transform the Saturday English 110 class in which it will be implemented in Autumn Quarter, 1992, Alec commented,

Class only meets one day a week, so it's very difficult to create for the students a sense of a community of writers. With a modem, what the laptop will do is allow students to send their papers in. They'll be able to conference with one another. They'll be able to do all those things during the week. It will really completely change what that Saturday class is like. Right now, the bulk of that Saturday has to be spent working on drafting. It becomes almost exclusively peer responding... [The laptops] will allow the class to become something where, you know, you can deal with critical thinking, you can deal with critical configurations and complications. You can give students something of the experience the other students can have, like with collaboration.

If the "mobile classroom" is successful in the planned English 110 Saturday section, the concept can serve as a model for expansion into other classes:
We’re hoping . . . in the next couple of years, if the portable lab works with the Continuing Ed. students, to add another portable lab for use by either the [community center downtown] or the University campus extension center, so we can actually get out in the city, make that connection with students who are disenfranchised. You know, try to empower those students, try to bring those traditionally at-risk students into what would be a 1990s classroom.

Alec is also excited about the "media cart" the CEWL Program has been working on in conjunction with CSU's Center for Teaching Excellence:

Now we’re also in the process of creating what we’re calling a multimedia cart which will have on it a computer, a laser disk, a CD ROM--the audio and visual technology necessary to create multimedia modules but also to project and present them. It will be on a cart that we can move to any room within the Program or beyond the Program. And that really is our reason for doing it, beyond the Program.

Initially, the media cart will be used in the Program’s Introduction to Drama course, English 262, and critical writing course, English 302. Alec has been working closely with one of his graduate assistants to develop a new syllabus for English 262. He hopes that the new syllabus and the multimedia cart will help students experience drama more fully in the class:

As we see it, the big problem with introduction to drama classes . . . is that drama too often in traditional departments of literature is taught as a novel with stage directions, and there’s a lot more to it than that. What that approach does is to completely eliminate the whole idea of performance. And what we want to do is put performance back in . . . The other thing that seems to be missing is the whole idea . . . of an audience. When you see a play performed, it’s a completely different experience from reading a play lying in your bed when you’re bored and kind of skipping over the stage directions. It becomes a dialogue and it becomes a dialogue which, in a lazy sense, becomes very flat. And what we want to do is put the richness back in the act of reading.

Alec believes the new approach may "complicate students’ thinking about drama as text": 
We want to really complicate the whole idea of what is performance. What do you do in a drama class with a piece of drama that has no text? With a kabuki piece? And we want to complicate the students’ thinking about "What is drama?" and "What is the place of drama?" and "What is the idea of text?" What this new class will do is to force an expansion of the text. What do you do with a performance piece, a happening, the kind of thing which has a few props, but then it occurs and it doesn’t actually have a text? There’s also some produced, written professional drama, plays that are actually collaborative acts between the author, director and characters, players, where they together work out, "What will this text look like? What will this performance look like? What do you do with that?" Basically, it’s extending the whole complication of meaning, author, and text which is de rigueur in contemporary critical theory.

Alec anticipates that the multimedia cart will eventually be used in a number of different English classes and said that two faculty members have already expressed an interest in developing ways to incorporate its use in their courses:

We’re looking at doing more and more and more with multimedia. . . . We’ve got [a faculty member] who may well teach a graduate seminar in the classroom next fall in folklore. [Another faculty member] really is waiting for us to get our multimedia up because she wants to move her film class into our environment. I mean, that’s her area, film and literature. She wants to bring her film class in. She does really, really exciting work.

Alec indicated that two primary motivations led to the "mobile classroom" and media cart projects, one coming out of necessity and the other out of philosophy. The practical consideration was the lack of space which was precluding other proposed expansions of the Program. While the five-year plan drafted by the Program in 1990 calls for the Program to expand the number of its classrooms from the current five to fourteen by the 1994-95 academic year, almost no classroom space is available for renovation. As Alec explained,

We’ve heard rumors that space may become available again in 93-94 . . . and it may be that we can expand again. The problem is we
really are kind of partial to space in [the English building] because it's so much more convenient for security purposes but also for administrative purposes. You know, if I or somebody on my staff had to run across campus every time a machine went down or a teacher or a student needed help, it would be a major hassle.

The philosophical motivations were also important. First, the CEWL Program was interested in using computer technology to explore the nature of textuality, an interest reflected in the Program's Introduction to Drama class. There was also the Program's growing emphasis on reaching non-traditional students, an emphasis reflected in the Program's recent move into basic writing courses. As Alec explained,

What we're finding is that, I mean, studies have shown that [nontraditional] students, especially basic writers, are not only challenged because they don't have the experience in writing, or with English language whether it's verbal or reading or writing or whatever it might be, you know, what we consider academic writing, but they're also challenged because traditionally they don't have access to technology. When computers first came into education, they came into the honors programs because those were "the students who deserved them." So when we [the CEWL Program] made our move into basic writing a year and a half ago, two years ago, it was really . . . a major step for us. It was a very important step, a very necessary step, but we went pretty early in terms of universities nationally.

Alec summed up his description of the media cart and "mobile classroom" projects by commenting,

What we're doing, basically, is we're expanding the Program. When the Program began, it was not only an administrative and theoretical unit, it was also a geographic unit. . . . Our move now seems to be to expand the geography without expanding space. The multimedia cart will allow us to take computing out of our classrooms into any classroom at the University, any English classroom at the University. The portable lab will allow us to extend beyond even the University or city bounds.
Selecting, Training, and Supporting CEWL Program Teachers.

Although the CEWL Program's teaching staff has from time to time included individuals from all ranks, the majority of its teachers are GTAs (graduate teaching associates). Alec "handpicks" teachers for the staff from among the large number of GTAs teaching in CSU's writing program. Before being selected to teach in the CEWL Program, all GTAs must have at least one year's experience teaching composition, usually English 110, in CSU's traditional classrooms. Alec estimated that as a group, GTAs in the CEWL Program average between two and three years of experience teaching composition.

Alec feels that the quality of its teachers is one of the CEWL Program's greatest strengths. In a description of the Computer Project written in 1989, Alec commented,

Part of the enthusiasm our teachers show for the Computer Project stems from the fact that, as Computer Project teachers, our teachers know they have been formally recognized as "good" teachers. We pick the best teachers based on teaching observations, grade evaluations, and performance evaluations from students and peers and tell them they're "good" and "special" right from the beginning.

Although the teaching staff has expanded from the five teachers involved in the initial Computer Project pilot classes to as many as forty-five teachers during the CEWL Program's busiest quarters, Alec continues to screen GTAs carefully before accepting them into the Program. When asked if he considers any criteria or characteristics besides those mentioned in the description above, such as teaching style or computer experience, Alec replied,

I think I look for good teachers first. I guess when I define "good teachers," I look at teachers who are comfortable in the classroom, teachers who are self-confident about what they're doing, who are
driven, who are willing to take risks, but who all the time have the students and the students' learning foremost in their minds. That's probably the key. So in that sense I guess I am also interested in how their philosophies line up with the Program's philosophy, this very general student-centered, active learning focus. You know, the whole idea of the classroom as a community, the whole sense that there is going to be some decentering of authority in the computer classroom and that the teacher will be able to handle that, will be comfortable with that.

Commenting specifically about computer experience, Alec added,

Computer experience is something which I really don't look at. It's possible that when I actually make assignments of teachers to particular classrooms or particular courses, I may then look at experience. Once a teacher has been accepted into the Program, I'm interested at that point in whether or not he or she has used a Mac or an IBM before. We've found that it's a little easier to work in the IBM classroom if a teacher does have some sort of a DOS background. It's not necessary, not mandatory at all, but sometimes it will be easier for them.

In addition to carefully choosing teachers for the CEWL Program, Alec also tries to promote quality teaching in the Program by providing his teaching staff with training and support. Each year the CEWL Project conducts a workshop, originally two hours and now three days long, just before the fall term begins. Alec explained that because the Program includes only experienced GTAs who are familiar with the Writing Program's administrative requirements, the CEWL Program's workshops focus on "real teaching." When asked to describe the content of the workshops, Alec used the 1991 workshop as an example:

Last year we spent the first half-day building community--what would be the purpose of the workshop, who were we as a group, what were we as a group, how was teaching going to be different bureaucratically in the CEWL Program than it was before a teacher came into the Program... That night there was a party at my house, still trying to build that community idea. The second day... we taught computer in the morning and the afternoon we focused on-- with teachers sharing experiences--what were really innovative,
exciting, fun, effective, efficient . . . ways of integrating the computer into the classroom in terms of teaching suggestions, strategies, and so on. . . . Day three we began with collaboration. Dealing with theoretical issues. Having teachers talk about their experiences, having students talk about their experiences. . . . In the afternoon we began with about two hours, and next year it will become almost a half day, talking about the special needs of special populations. . . .

After that we then went into . . . for a couple hours, three hours, what are good teaching practices that may or may not relate to the computer, things that work in the classroom, innovative ideas used at all the levels, whether you’re looking at basic writing, whether you’re looking at freshman comp, whether you’re looking at Intro to Fiction or Intro to Drama or informative writing, critical writing, business writing, technical writing, or whatever. We went the whole gamut, really focusing on teaching as something separate from the computer.

Alec emphasized that the training workshop concentrated on teaching, not computers per se, and added, "The computer focus was about three hours total as far as learning the nuts and bolts of the technology." Alec plans the workshops with the help of his staff using feedback from teachers. He mentioned that he had recently asked CEWL Program teachers for suggestions about what to include in next year’s workshop and was reminded that the 1991 workshop had included a former CEWL Program student:

She went for forty-five minutes in a really exciting way, fielding questions from teachers wanting to know how she felt about collaboration, what were the problems, what were the concerns, this kind of thing. She did a terrific job. . . . It was real important for us to have that student perspective.

Throughout its existence, teachers in the CEWL Program have received several kinds of support. Alec recalls that a supportive environment and a sense of community among the teaching staff were important aspects of the Program from its beginning:
When we put together the Program in '87 there were five teachers. We were all in one office so we lived and breathed together, very close knit, lots of sharing of ideas, lots of sharing of recommendations. . . . It wasn’t unusual for me or for one of the other teachers to be in a class other than their own almost every class meeting.

As the Program and the teaching staff have increased in size, Alec has tried to maintain a strong sense of community and a high level of mutual support and respect among the teachers. For example, after the Program created its collaborative classrooms, Alec and the teachers involved in the collaborative classes met regularly for several quarters to discuss their ideas and concerns. The primary continuing vehicles for building and maintaining community are the yearly workshops and the Program’s weekly newsletter. Alec indicated the newsletter has become a popular and important avenue of communication among the CEWL Program and teaching staff:

It serves two purposes. . . . Originally the purpose . . . was to save on duplicating costs. It would be a one-page thing . . . and it would take the place of the three or four or five memos that might go out from the office each week. . . . We’re hoping and we’re planning for next year that [the newsletter] will also include teaching ideas, teaching suggestions, questions, and this kind of thing, which we already did somewhat this year. . . . So I think that’s . . . the most important purpose it’s serving right now. I talk a lot about community. You know, we try to do it in the training workshop. We try to maintain it within the Program so that people have a sense of identity, a sense of the fact that this is a group of people who are really concerned about teaching, a group of people who like each other and are willing to ask one another questions about teaching, what goes on in the classroom, what to do with all those issues of teaching and scholarship and whatever. And [MacWeekly] has taken on part of that role as well. . . . It’s also become almost a lampoon which comes out every week, looking at the Program, dealing with issues within the Program, dealing with issues among the staff . . . . It has become very humorous. This past year we ran a whole series of critical theory trading cards. . . . It’s connecting us
beyond a very narrow rhetoric and comp or a very narrow computers and writing or a very narrow computers and literature program because that's not who we are.

Besides the weekly newsletter, the CEWL Program also distributes an idea packet approximately once per quarter. Alec explained that the idea packets have existed in various forms since the beginning of the Program, although the focus has changed somewhat:

Now the focus is on teaching ideas. When we began the Program . . . the big unknown was the computer and what we basically did was the teachers would distribute among themselves . . . the handouts they were using with their students to help the students to learn the computer. That became formalized into a reference guide, and the reference guides are distributed. They are kept in the labs. A lot of teachers will actually distribute them as part of their course packets. . . . We upgrade it to make sure it's accurate each time . . . we add something in terms of hardware or software to the classroom. So now the idea packets focus more on teaching than on the computers. Sometimes they sort of compile things that have appeared in [MacWeekly], too.

When I asked Alec about the common syllabus that was created by the Computer Project Team, he indicated that syllabus is no longer in use:

[The common syllabus] was used for about a quarter or maybe two quarters. It was used . . . because the computer was so new to all of us, our sense was that we all kind of needed a crutch to rely on. The reliance on that loosened over the next two years until we got to the point where we were handing it out saying, "Look in particular at the first week to see how the computer is integrated . . . . You know the class. You're here because you're good teachers, but this is our way of giving you advice about how the computer can be introduced. . . ." We're at the point now where we hand out no model syllabi. What we do in the training workshop is we get feedback and input from a variety of different teachers teaching a variety of different ways and they talk about those so that each person coming into the Program then is able to integrate and embrace . . . what they feel are the best things for them as a teacher.

The Program also supports teachers by providing them with equipment and
supplies in their offices and a resource library in the CEWL Program office. Alec considers providing teachers with computers and printers in their offices very important:

It's kind of a perk of the Program but it's also there for the creation of class materials. Teachers need computers to create stuff for the class, but also to work with students, you know, in conferencing or whatever.

Alec explained that the resource library contains a combination of hardcopy books, journals, and articles, and on-line resources. All the materials are catalogued in a data base so that they can be accessed by title, author, or subject.

When asked how teachers use the library, Alec explained,

People, when they are making up general exam lists or master's reading lists, will use it. People will use it as a resource for their own individual research. This summer I think it's probably going to get a lot more use than it's gotten in the past partly because [a member of the English Department's graduate faculty] and I are teaching a graduate level class on theories of computing in English Studies, and I think that we'll have students using it. We are going to be using it tomorrow as we're making up the course packet as well.

Alec said that the autumn workshop, MacWeekly, the idea packets, the equipment supplied in their offices, and the resource library are now the primary formal means for supporting and communicating with and among the teaching staff. He plans to add monthly brownbag workshops on topics such as computers and literature, multiculturalism and educational diversity, and collaboration. He noted that teachers in the CEWL Program also have many informal opportunities to share ideas and concerns. For example, since teachers in the Program share offices, teachers in the same office interact almost daily. Some teachers have also created small study or discussion groups in which they get together to talk about
their interests on an informal basis. Alec anticipates that these sorts of informal communication among teachers will be facilitated if e-mail capabilities are added to the classrooms and teachers' offices in the fall of 1992 as planned.

**Relationship to the English Department and Its Faculty, the Writing Center, and Other Programs.**

Although the CEWL Program is part of the Department of English, its place within the Department is somewhat unclear. When I asked Alec how the Program fits into the Department's structure, he remarked, "That raises a really complicated question." Although part of the English Department, the CEWL Program has its own budget and receives external funding through grants from the state's Board of Regents and other agencies. Within the Department, Alec works most closely with the Vice-Chair for Rhetoric and Composition, but also works directly with the Chair of the Department, and, particularly since the Program has expanded beyond English 110, with the Vice-Chair for Undergraduate Studies.

The Program's nebulous place in the Department is reflected in the report of the consultants in 1989 and in remarks made by members of the English Department's faculty in a self-study completed in 1992 (Appendix E). Both documents note that the CEWL Program is isolated and not well known to the Department's faculty as a whole. Alec agrees that the Program is somewhat set apart and suggests,

The real reason why there's a separation, this nebulous nature of our existence, is because nobody knows what to do with us... As I described it, Apple came to the University, the University went to the College, the College came to the Department and said, "We think you should do this." It wasn't the other way around. ... Suddenly, you've got this $300,000 budget item and you're not even
sure what it is. Five years ago in the Department of English, there were some computers, but I'm not sure at that point that every faculty member in the Department had a computer on her desk or his desk. And now they do. Five years ago, there were a handful of computer labs on campus. We were probably the first in the Humanities. So that was the process originally, you know, why we were set apart. We then were linked immediately to rhetoric and comp which set us apart. And then for so long we taught basically writing classes, which kept us in rhetoric and comp. We are also set apart because the bulk of our teaching is . . . 100 level and 300 level writing classes—all taught by TAs. So, again, we're separated from faculty. That's the reality that I think the self-studies reflect.

However, Alec believes the Program is now becoming more visible and more available to faculty teaching in all areas and at all levels within the Department:

Now . . . we're beginning to move into literature, into other areas where people are seeing more of us. In the fall . . . [a tenured faculty member, a graduate assistant], and I will be doing a presentation for the entire faculty on what can be done in terms of instructional computing. [The tenured faculty member] will talk specifically on how 302 [critical writing] can exist in the computer classroom. [My graduate assistant] and I will be talking about the bigger issues of how the computer can be used in any classroom. . . . Since we've been working on the multimedia and the Intro to Drama class, we've talked to a variety of professors . . . from a variety of levels, and people we spoke to seemed very, very interested. People we spoke to are also very interested in their teaching and that seemed to go hand and hand. People who are concerned about teaching seem to have a sense that computers can help it.

I asked Alec whether he invites faculty members to teach in the CEWL Program or whether they come to him and he replied, "It's been a combination." He also mentioned that several faculty members, course directors for the 300-level writing classes and the head of the basic writing program, are currently involved with the CEWL Program as consultants:

We have more and more faculty involvement as consultants, really, to the CEWL Program. . . . So even though they aren't directly assigned to the Program, they are very interested in and take it upon
themselves to assist with development, direction, you know, as consultants.

When asked about the CEWL Program's relationship to the English Department's Writing Center, Alec said that they are completely separate programs, and he was unsure exactly how much computer equipment and software the Writing Center owns. However, he added that the CEWL Program and the Writing Center cooperate as much as possible:

We work as closely as possible with the Writing Center. [The Writing Center's Director] and I have worked closely in the past. . . . There were about two years when we actually shared part of a staff member. The person had an appointment here and also in the Writing Center. Because of the budget situation the last couple of years, we've had to eliminate that position.

Alec explained that problems with the budget have also made coordinating their efforts more difficult because the Writing Center has been unable to purchase additional computer equipment:

Next year, their plans in the Writing Center are to really increase what they've got. They would love to add three or four or five or six or ten more machines so that they can make use of the computer in the tutoring environment. I've been over there for a couple of staff meetings and talked about how a tutor can use the computer when he or she is working with a student. And they do encourage students to bring disks with them and occasionally they actually will go to the computer. But because they don't have the facilities--two machines and thirteen tutors, eight of whom may be tutoring at the same time--they can't rely very heavily on the computer because it's some other place outside of the tutor's cubicle. So we're trying to coordinate, but, again, it comes down to a budget problem.

As Coordinator of the CEWL Program, Alec also works closely with areas outside the English Department, especially the College of Humanities and the Academic Computing Office. Alec explained, for example, that he relied on recommendations from the staff in the College of Humanities when selecting
software for the Program's IBM classroom and has also been working with them as they prepare to add e-mail connections to the offices in the English Department, as well as the classrooms in the CEWL Program. Alec said that he drew heavily on the expertise of the Academic Computing Office [ACO] when putting together the classrooms when the Computer Project first began and still depends on the ACO to maintain the CEWL Program's equipment and staff the classrooms during open-lab hours:

That was a decision we made at the beginning of the Program because basically we had to. At the beginning of the Program, I didn't know enough about the whole technology to maintain the labs. So at that point we turned the monitoring of the labs during homework time over to [ACO] which took care of all the public sites on campus-- monitoring, making sure they're staffed, making sure they're troubleshooting, maintaining supplies, and that kind of thing. It has really reduced what I have to do in terms of some of the administrative nightmares. I don't need to worry about hiring people to do that. I don't need to worry about making sure they show up on time. I don't need to worry about supplies.

However, while the arrangement with ACO seems to be convenient and generally satisfactory, Alec remarked that he did not completely agree with the ACO's decision to use a Compaq computer as a file server in the Program's IBM classroom, a decision which led to the printer glitches experienced when the classroom was first used.

Alec explained that from time to time he also works with other areas or offices on specific projects. Recently, while developing the "mobile classroom," he has worked with the Office of Continuing Education, which plans to use the "mobile classroom" in one of the English 110 classes it funds. He has also been working very closely with instructional designers and educational technologists
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In 1990, as the CEWL Program expanded to include courses other than freshman writing, it also expanded its research agenda. After the Rhetoric and Composition Program received a grant to study collaborative writing and the two collaborative classrooms, Rooms D and E, were created, the Program became involved in several projects which investigate collaboration. Some of these projects are studies being conducted by graduate students. For example, one dissertation project examines collaboration among basic writers and high ability freshman writers in the computer environment. Alec is very excited about another study of collaborative writing being conducted at a national level:

We’re just getting involved in a program with about ten other schools. It will hopefully be funded by FIPSE [the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education]. [One of my graduate assistants] and I are going to a conference in the winter; then in the spring we’ll be teaching a course based on the conference where we’ll be establishing collaborative groups in upper-division writing classes . . . where the collaborative groups will be, say four or five members, but only one of those members will be here at [CSU]. The others may be at University of Chicago, University of Michigan, may be at Stanford, may be at University of Miami, may be at Cornell, may be at, wherever. So these students will actually be working together totally on-line.

In addition to participating in these investigations of collaborative writing, the Program has begun research into the influence of different platforms, Macintosh and IBM, on the attitudes of student writers and the quality of their writing.

Although many of these research projects are on-going or just beginning, in a summary of the Program’s research written in 1989, Alec described the preliminary results as "very positive" and reported that he and his staff had presented their results and their work-in-progress at numerous conferences. While describing the research during our interview, Alec indicated that the research data
have already been used to improve the Program, and, as an example, explained how the Program has used the teachers' evaluations and journals:

Teachers doing their first quarter in the Program are asked to keep a journal about their experiences. . . . We say, "Use your experience in the classroom, and now your new experience in the computer classroom, and do some sort of comparison." People look at how are things different from before, that kind of thing. We use those journals when we're making up our training program for the teachers to give them a sense of what . . . other teachers have experienced in the Program, within the environment, within the computer classroom.

Excerpts from the journals kept by the teachers and students are included in Appendix E.

Although no major software projects have been completed, the Computer Project and the CEWL Program have also been active in software development. In 1987, the Computer Project staff began work on an on-line handbook for the Macintosh called *MacFidditch*. The Program's design plans indicate that *MacFidditch* was intended "solely for academic purposes" and would feature simplified, pre-set formatting, the ability to display texts sentence by sentence to facilitate proofreading, and an on-line spelling checker and grammar handbook (Appendix E). When asked about *MacFidditch*, Alec explained that the project was reconceived as a word processor and eventually abandoned:

We've basically stopped working on that. We didn't see it as being where the direction of either the Program or English Studies, or composition theory was going or should be going. It was basically an on-line, student-driven handbook, but it was a handbook. I mean, it was intensive grammar.

Another software development project which the CEWL Program began and later discontinued used the authoring software *Course of Action*. Although some
materials, including a sentence-combining program, were developed, Alec explained that the project was discontinued as the Program had shifted its focus to *HyperCard*. When I asked Alec to describe the Program's current software development efforts, he said,

> We've moved into doing work with *HyperCard*, doing work with hypermedia. Now... the bulk of our multimedia development is being done with CTE [the Center for Teaching Excellence]. We're doing the conceptual work and working with CTE who is doing the technical. That seems to be our new direction.

Publishing student writing done in its computer-enhanced classes is another project the Program has maintained in various forms since the Computer Project's beginning. Called *The Best*, the publication originally consisted of the best pieces of student writing done in the Program (Appendix E). As Alec explained,

> When we did [*The Best*], we collected twice a quarter from the classes what those teachers or the classes decided was the best paper that had been written to that point. We did it twice.... My staff and I, which was then two people, ... read through them all and ranked them. And we would print ... two, maybe three complete essays. At that point we were only 110 and it went back out to all the computer classes. It also was used as a PR outreach kind of thing. It went to other administrators within the University, within the Department, and beyond.

Alec said the content and the name of the publication have changed:

> Even before we changed the name, the philosophy had changed. We were concerned about the competitiveness of [*The Best*].... About two years ago, we decided ... anybody who submitted would get printed. We still kind of limited it. We only wanted, say, one submission per class at that point. In order to handle that kind of bulk, because at that point we're looking at thirty to forty classes, thirty to forty pieces, ... we really had to reduce being able to use the full essays. Very often our call will say, "We're looking for a page." Sometimes we'd be more specific. We'd say, "We are looking for an introduction. We're looking for a such and such. We're looking for a journal."
Alec said that as the Program's course offerings have expanded, the publication has become very eclectic:

We've gotten to the point now where, as we've expanded the Program, we've got everything from basic writing right on up through technical writing. . . . We still collect submissions . . . totally voluntarily. Probably between a half and maybe two thirds of the teachers in the course of the quarter will submit something from their class. Again, it's pieces, but it's become a really interesting mix of pieces now, as we've added these new classes. . . . We have illuminated text that we put in. We have polyglossic texts, texts which actually talk to one another.

Assessments of the CEWL Program and Computers in English Studies

Alec is proud of the accomplishments of the CEWL Program and gives much of the credit to its staff and teachers. As he explained, "When I talk about the strengths of the Program, I talk about the strengths of the teaching which goes on in the Program." Alec also believes that the Program has benefitted from having the support of the University's higher administration and the Department, particularly the Rhetoric and Composition Program.

Commenting on the role of administrative support at the college and university levels, Alec explained that having administrators who understand the Program's special requirements is important and used the Program's need for larger classrooms as an example:

It takes a lot less room to line the students up in rows of bolted chairs. . . . When I renovate a classroom for twenty in a computer-supported environment, I need to remove from the classroom pool, a classroom of between sixty and eighty. So that gives you a sense of ratio. It's almost 4 to 1. When you put students at tables . . . it takes up room. You need to be able to move in the classroom. Chairs need to roll so that students can move from workstation to workstation so that students can deal with one another. The whole idea of the students talking in class has to, I think, remain central in
the computer-supported classroom. Otherwise, there’s the risk of
the computer becoming isolating.

Within the Department, Alec feels the support of the Vice-Chair for Rhetoric and
Composition has been particularly important:

[The Vice-Chair] with her contacts, with her energy was able to
connect Rhetoric and Comp and, consequently, Computer-Enhanced
Writing and Literature with other fields at the University, with other
offices at the University, but also beyond the University. When...
[the collaborative writing] grants came through, the CEWL Program
benefitted greatly. ... [The] collaborative teaching environment was
totally computer-supported, which means the bulk of that grant, not
just the $100,000 to set up the lab, but also the bulk of the energy in
that grant, came to the Program. So, of course, my relationship with
[the Vice-Chair] has been very important.

Alec believes the greatest challenges he has faced in creating and managing
the CEWL Program have been working within the University’s bureaucracy to
obtain funds and space for the Program. He added that staffing has never been a
problem and explained,

Very often I talk to people from other programs and they say that
personnel has been a problem. Personnel hasn’t been a nightmare.
Handpicking teachers makes a big difference. Maintaining the
Program as a community helps a lot . . . because we work together
as colleagues as opposed to creating . . . within our own program
some sort of a bureaucratic nightmare. I mean, I am as likely to be
crawling on the floor fixing a cable as our work-study assistant in the
classroom is.

When asked if there were any areas in which he feels the Program has
been less successful than he had anticipated, Alec answered,

In terms of shortcomings, weaknesses, problems, I would like to
move more quickly and, I think, more energetically into the
introduction to literature courses. Again, space is a problem. To
add more sections in that area means cutting sections somewhere
else. And while I want to . . . [support literature courses], I think
I’m concerned about cutting basic writing, a group of students who
are marginalized and have been marginalized for years and are now
finally getting a chance to use the computer. Students in our advanced writing courses now have the ability to play with desktop publishing. To play with document design and the importance of the whole rhetoric of document design is more a reality to those students, I think, than it is without the computer.

Alec also feels that the somewhat isolated status of the Program within the English Department and the limited involvement of faculty in the Program have been problematic issues, but are gradually being addressed:

In terms of other weaknesses, more faculty involvement in teaching classes is needed, I think. Yes, we’re teaching... low-level undergraduate writing classes. Faculty don’t teach those. Faculty who have taught in our classrooms have been really excited about it, though, are really excited about it. The only other problem may well deal with that whole nebulous issue. The nebulous issue causes problems with the bureaucracy... but it also cuts us some breaks there. We’re now making that move to involve, as we move into more mainstream classes, more faculty. It’s also the things we’ve been dealing with as a department. You know, are we mainstream or are we peripheral? And of course, the major and the literature courses are mainstream and everything else is peripheral. I think we’re beginning to make those connections as well. As I said before, the Program is more than just a geography now. It’s more than five classrooms and what happens in those classes. We’re looking to extending beyond those five spaces. We have become a theoretical program as opposed to a program which is defined by its technology. I think that’s the direction we’re going.

When asked to describe the two or three areas in which the Program has been most successful, Alec replied,

As I said before, when I’m talking about the Program, what I’m really talking about, I think, is the teaching that takes place in the Program. I think the students leaving the Program have a really strong sense of themselves as students and a strong sense of themselves as writers. I think that’s a really positive strength. I think that what we’ve done with collaboration either within our classes or between our Honors 110 classes and basic writing classes is really exciting in terms of the future of education. I think collaboration is really key. And we seem to be doing, in terms of English studies, more collaboration than most places. Yes, our students in engineering, our students in business are doing it all over
the place, but it doesn’t seem to be happening in English classes here or anywhere, partly because of class size. I think when we reduced our classes from twenty-four students to twenty, we increased the quality of our instruction twenty fold. Some of the upper-division literature classes, the Intro to Fiction, Intro to Drama, Intro to Poetry, the classes that are not taught on computer are up to forty-five students. For us, it’s a class of twenty. Students can talk to one another. Students can do a lot more in terms of critical thinking and group interpretation, and manipulation of text because of the computer and because of the class size. That’s three.

Although only asked to name three, Alec could not resist discussing another successful aspect of the Program:

I think that at all levels, maybe to get one more in, I think that at all levels our students have a broader sense and possibly a more critical and more realistic sense of what a text is because they watched it flip around on the screen. I think they have a better sense that a text changes and should change and it’s okay for it to change and that people’s input can directly influence what gets said on a screen and what then gets printed out on paper.

Relating this achievement to the CEWL Program’s future, Alec added,

This is the direction we’re heading now, extending students’ thinking about texts, complicating students’ thinking about texts. This relates to collaboration. It takes us into literature. It takes us into critical theory. It extends the Program in all these directions that are related and should be related. It’s central to what we’re about now and to what we will be about in the future.

Analysis of the CSU Program Case Study

I began this study with four questions related to the program case histories:

1. What goals did the programs’ developers and administrators hope to meet through developing computer-enhanced writing programs?

2. Have these goals changed or evolved, and if so, how?

3. How successfully have the programs met their goals?

4. How do the programs’ goals relate to those of the teachers who teach within them?

In my analysis of the CEWL Program’s development and operation, I have
concluded that the Program has been successful in meeting its initial goals and has created new goals in light of its evolving view of the potential for computers in English studies, the changing needs of its students, developments in hardware and software, and concerns about the Program's insularity.

Knowledge and Authority: The Computer Project and the CEWL Program

Prior to Apple Computer's invitation to apply for a grant, CSU's first-year writing program did not include projects related to computer-enhanced writing instruction. Instead, the reputations of the University and its composition and rhetoric program drew computers into CSU's English Department. Scott, the faculty member who became principal investigator for the Computer Project, had no prior experience with computer-enhanced composition instruction, and although Alec had expressed a strong interest in computers before CSU applied for the Apple grant, he had limited experience with the technology. Scott's strengths were his knowledge of composition theory and instruction and his experience in research and writing program administration. Alec's greatest assets were his knowledge as a doctoral candidate in composition theory, his experience teaching writing and directing a writing program as Scott's assistant, and, perhaps most importantly, his great enthusiasm for the Project.

Scott and Alec's lack of computer expertise was not an impediment as they developed their proposal for the Computer Project. Scott's extensive knowledge of composition theory and practice and his experience in writing grants and directing research enabled him, with Alec's assistance, to write a successful proposal for the Project in just three weeks. Once the Project was funded, Scott
and Alec depended on CSU’s Academic Computing Office (ACO) and representatives from Apple to provide the technical help they needed to implement their ideas. From the beginning of the Computer Project, the Project’s and CEWL Program’s relationships with the ACO have been generally quite successful: the ACO was able to give Scott and Alec the help they needed to get the Computer Project off the ground and because the ACO is responsible for everyday maintenance of the Program’s classrooms/labs, Alec has been able to direct his energies toward assisting teachers in the Program, coordinating research, and developing new CEWL-supported classes. Consequently, even though he and his assistants now have more than enough knowledge and skills to operate the classrooms/labs on their own, Alec continues to contract with the ACO for day-to-day maintenance and for supervision of the CEWL Program’s classrooms/labs during non-class hours.

Nevertheless, as the Computer Project began, learning to operate and teach students to operate the Macintosh computers and MacWrite software was a major challenge facing Alec and the Project Team. Alec and his graduate assistants acquired their knowledge of computers and computer skills on an ad hoc basis as they prepared the Project’s model syllabus and developed training materials for the other teachers who would participate in the pilot study. The emphasis they placed on introducing the computer into classes in the syllabus and training materials reflects the importance they placed on their concerns about the technical aspects of the hardware and software, which they feared could intimidate
both students and teachers. However, Alec recalled that he and Scott required teachers to use the model syllabus for only about two quarters, so early anxieties about the technical aspects of computers and the abilities of teachers and students to adapt to them seem to have been overcome rather quickly. Alec also recalled that the Team's efforts to develop computer skills and devise strategies for teaching and using word processing in their classes contributed to the sense of community that developed among teachers in the program and, along with its commitment to research, laid the ground work for the CEWL Program's continuing emphasis on training and supporting teachers, encouraging and facilitating exchanges among teachers, and promoting innovation and experimentation. These benefits almost certainly outweigh any early "growing pains" experienced by the Program owing to a lack of technical expertise. In fact, there are few indications that the Project was severely affected by its leaders' limited technical expertise. Surveys conducted by the Project and journals kept by teachers during the first few quarters of the Project indicate that most teachers felt adequately prepared to use and teach with the Project's hardware and software and had confidence in Alec and his Team. Although these surveys and journals indicated that technical problems were a major source of frustration among teachers and students, they also indicated that teachers believed that Alec and the Project Team were providing adequate technical assistance and that Alec was aware of problems with the hardware and software, understood their causes, and was working to correct them.
Scott and Alec's knowledge of composition theory and practice governed the approach to computer-enhanced composition instruction reflected in the Computer Project. They adopted word processing because they believed it would encourage students to see language as a fluid medium and facilitate the drafting process by making writing, particularly the element of revision, less "tedious." The arrangement they chose for their computer-enhanced classrooms illustrates that they regarded the computers as tools to help them realize pedagogical goals rather than as an end in themselves. The supporting role computers currently play in the CEWL Program is reflected in its annual training workshop. In the fall 1991, workshop, discussing the "nuts and bolts" of the Program's computer hardware and software accounted for only about three hours of the three day workshop; the balance of the time was devoted to discussing ways of using computers in classes, general teaching strategies, and the needs of special populations.

Goals for the Computer Project

Scott and Alec began the Computer Project with three clearly stated, written objectives: to teach English 110 in a computer-assisted environment, to research the use of computers in teaching freshman composition, and to evaluate and develop materials and software for teaching freshman composition using computers. The Project data clearly demonstrate that each of these objectives has been achieved. I believe the Project's initial success resulted from the incorporation of computers into a theoretically sound pedagogy which had already been accepted and had proven successful at the institution; the support and special status the Project granted to its participating teachers; and the enthusiasm
of Alec and the Project Team. The Project's subsequent success resulted from the sensitivity of the Projects' leaders, particularly Alec, to the teachers' needs and concerns, its ability to modify its hardware and software to meet these needs and concerns, and the presence of goals which caused the Project to continuously examine its operations and outcomes. The complementary nature of the Computer Project's goals was clearly an important factor in its success.

In order to enhance the Project's likelihood of successfully teaching English 110 with computers, Scott and Alec selected only GTA's with at least a year's previous experience teaching English 110 in traditional classrooms, chose only teachers whose teaching evaluations demonstrated their teaching skills and commitment to teaching, and provided them with extensive training and support. Being provided with extensive support and training, being identified as "excellent" teachers, and being made part of a community of pioneers undoubtedly contributed greatly to the teachers' overwhelmingly positive evaluations of a teaching environment with which they initially reported many frustrations. In fact, some teacher and student journals reveal that, at least during its first few quarters, the Project may have succeeded as much in spite of as because of its computers (Appendix E). Some teachers speculated in their journals that having smaller classes and teaching in rooms where students could sit facing one another at tables may have contributed as much to their favorable experience teaching computer-enhanced English 110 classes as the computers themselves. Indeed, most of the negative comments about these classes were directly related to the
computers. Teachers mentioned numerous difficulties owing to malfunctioning printers and program disks and the cumbersomeness of procedures required to load *MacWrite II* and print files using computers equipped with only a single disk drive. Teachers were also frustrated by complaints from students who frequently found themselves forced to use the limited number of computer labs available on campus at odd hours and reported waiting up to three hours for access to computers. When asked to "Describe a time when you felt frustrated with the hardware or software in your English 110 classroom-lab" on surveys conducted during the first two years of the Project, almost twenty-nine percent of the participating teachers indicated they were frustrated "every time" they used computers in their classes. Nevertheless, according to the same surveys, almost all teachers were, in the words of one teacher, "sold on computers in comp." While the teachers were without doubt "sold" on the promise of computers, they were also likely swayed by the reality of smaller classes, more open classrooms, their "special" status as Project teachers, and the support, determination, and enthusiasm displayed by Alec and the Project Team.

The response of the Project Team to the early concerns expressed by teachers illustrates the complementary nature of the Project’s goals. Although student and teacher surveys were conducted as part of the Project’s research objective, the surveys clearly helped the Project identify and respond to the concerns and frustrations of its teachers. The Project was able to ease many of the teachers’ frustrations by expanding the number of its classrooms/labs to three
and networking the classrooms/labs so that program disks were no longer needed and the printing process was simplified. Since other new labs were opened on campus during this same period, by the middle of the Program's second year, many of the early technical and access problems reported by teachers had been solved. The Project's research on the effects of using computers on students' attitudes toward writing may also have reduced the teachers' concerns about their students' transition into computer-enhanced instruction. The Project's student surveys repeatedly indicated that despite their complaints, students enjoyed and believed they benefitted from using computers. Since the results of the Miller-Daly test administered by the Project also showed that students grew in confidence in their computer classes, these results and the Projects' student surveys may have helped offset some of the teachers' concerns about the frustrations experienced by students in their classes.

Like the goals of the Computer Project, the teaching, research, and software development goals of the CEWL Program are mutually supportive. Under Alec's direction, the CEWL Program's philosophy has begun to regard the fluid context for composing created by the computer as distinctly different from the more linear textual environment of paper and pencil. The "fast pencil" concept which reflected the Computer Project's early conception of the word processing environment as a quicker and neater version of the paper and pencil environment has been replaced by a more complicated and sophisticated view of the computer as a "text manipulator" with both "text" and "manipulator" very
broadly defined. This re-conception of the composing environment emerged accompanied by an increasing emphasis on connecting the Program to areas outside composition, particularly literature and critical theory. The impetus for extending the Program beyond composition was partly philosophical and partly practical. Philosophically, the area of computers and composition as a whole was becoming more theoretically oriented, and like many other computers and composition researchers in the late 1980s, Alec saw a need to move beyond purely pedagogical questions and begin to examine how computers change or can change the nature of texts and authorship. This movement is reflected in the new goals and philosophy which the CEWL Program has assumed and in its increasing emphasis on supporting basic writing, collaborative writing, and literature classes. Supporting these classes has also helped the Program begin to achieve one of its other goals—involving more faculty, since there are more faculty involved in developing and coordinating upper-division writing and literature classes and more faculty who teach these classes.

While the Program’s emerging agenda for "complicating students’ thinking" about textuality and authorship, has helped the Program to include more faculty, this new goal has also created tension within the Program, forcing Alec to balance the Program’s original mission of supporting first-year writing with the desire to support classes in areas which reflect its emerging goals and research interests such as poetry, drama, and basic writing. This tension has been exacerbated by space and budgetary limitations. However, it is also being reduced somewhat by
the creation of the media cart and the "mobile classroom." The creation of the "mobile classroom" illustrates an important shift between the Computer Project and CEWL Program. Within the Computer Project, objectives were oriented toward technology. For example, the primary goal of the Project was to "teach freshman composition using computers." Within the CEWL Program, however, new objectives have emerged in response to theory and the perceived needs of the Program and its students. For example, the "mobile classroom" was developed not because the Program wanted to teach writing using laptop computers, but because the Program saw an opportunity to use laptop technology to help a marginalized group of students experience a classroom situation more like that of "mainstream" students. In short, while the Computer Project set out to "see what computer technology can do for student writers," the CEWL Project sees what needs to be done and seeks technology to meet these needs.

Case Study of CSU Teacher One: Brian

Profile and Context

Brian is a graduate teaching associate in the English Department's Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program at Center State University. He earned a B.A. in English in 1990, and expects to complete his M.A. at CSU in Spring Quarter, 1992. Brian's areas of special interest are nineteenth century American and British Literature, contemporary women's fiction, and critical theory. Brian will remain at CSU to begin work toward a Ph.D. in Autumn Quarter, 1992.

Brian has taught writing for two years, both at CSU. During his first year
of teaching, Brian taught English 110, CSU's freshman composition course, in a traditional classroom. In Spring Quarter, 1992, he was completing his third quarter of teaching computer-enhanced English 110 in CSU's CEWL Program. Brian reported that he has had no other teaching experience, and confirmed that the English 110 class I would be observing was the only course he was teaching during Spring Quarter.

During the fourth week of the quarter, I met with Brian in his office for approximately two and one-half hours to discuss his non-teaching experience with computers, his teaching experience with and without computers, and his knowledge and beliefs about teaching writing and about teaching writing with computers. Many of my questions followed-up responses Brian had provided on the pre-interview questionnaire (Appendix A)

Introduction to Computers and Range of Experience with Computers

Brian indicated he began using computers for writing in his freshman year of college and has now been using computers for six years. However, his first experience with computers left him unimpressed:

I had a computer programming course in high school wherein we used Commodore computers. . . . The only way we had to save then was on cassette tapes . . . and there were a lot of problems. . . . It was slow, and it just didn't seem to be worth the trouble, so I didn't give it much consideration. But after he became comfortable with the computer, he was convinced of its usefulness: "I was slowly starting to realize that I could cut out a large section of the process, the tedium of writing by hand, and then copying, and then typing that. I could just start composing right on the computer." Brian added, "Now I don't
touch a typewriter, unless I have to fill out an application for something."

Brian uses computers for almost all his writing, for playing games, and for conducting library searches. He listed course syllabi, class activities and handouts, department memos, personal letters, academic papers, conference papers, and course papers as the kinds of documents he writes. Brief notes to himself and intimate notes and letters were the only kinds of writing which he rarely uses the computer to produce.

Brian is satisfied with his knowledge of computers and computer skills for his personal, non-teaching purposes, although he would like to learn more about networks and electronic communications:

I would like to know more about networks in order to improve my teaching. . . . Also, my next goal is to learn how to mainframe. I guess it's called mainframing. You get a modem and you hook up into a bunch of resources. . . . I love the idea of doing library research from my apartment.

On the pre-interview questionnaire, Brian indicated that although he has had limited experience with other systems, such as the Commodore he used in his high school programming class, most of his computing experience has been on IBM's and IBM compatibles. The system he now owns is an IBM compatible; at his office he uses an IBM and, occasionally, a Macintosh. Brian listed Word Perfect 5.1 as the software he uses regularly in his writing and indicated that he used to use Multimate Advantage II.

During our interview, I asked Brian to discuss how he came to use this particular hardware and software. He said that he is not certain why he chose to use IBM compatible hardware, but, commenting on his preference for IBM's over
Macintoshes, he added,

I'm an IBMer. I hate Macintosh with a passion, and I'm not even sure why. . . . I just feel limited by the icon driven software where you have to do things its way. . . . I'd much rather have a keyboard and get into DOS and use it. If I run into any problems, I can usually rewrite stuff or just tailor make things to my own needs. I feel I can do that better on an IBM.

Commenting on *Word for Windows*, the word processor he uses in his teaching,

and his preference for *WordPerfect* Brian remarked,

Now IBM is also going to a *Windows* environment, which I'm not convinced has all the bugs worked out of it yet. There are still problems. It's slow. It eats up a lot of space on the computer. A lot of programs aren't compatible. The Microsoft *Word for Windows* is a pretty good software package. . . . I can use it and get around it fine, but . . . you ask it one thing, and it gives you some more options, and you have to select the options, and maybe you don't want to do exactly what it tells you, but you have to go through its set of hoops. I don't like that. So, for me, the IBM, specifically *WordPerfect*, is a freer, more versatile package that allows me to do things as quickly as possible.

Brian said that he learned to use computers "through the school of hard knocks" and indicated that his primary sources of knowledge about computer hardware and software have been friends and the process of trial and error. Because he was, and still is, a student and for a long time could not afford to purchase his own computer or software, Brian often used hardware or software that was available from friends, at work, or at school. Frequently, he used "pirated" (illegally copied) software which came with no manual or instructions and sometimes would not work properly. Consequently, he learned to experiment and to expect and prepare for a certain number of bugs and their resulting frustrations. Brian said his approach to learning to use computers and software has carried over into his teaching:
I still approach computers that way today. I don’t refuse to look at a manual, but I’d rather work with someone on a computer. "Who do I know who uses this already?" and "How can I pick his or her brain to figure out how to use this particular application?" So, mainly, I think the best way to learn about the computer is just to get on the thing and start messing around with it. And that’s how I teach in the classroom.

Attitudes and Beliefs about Computers and Writing

Brian said that he enjoys writing with computers because word processing enhances his drafting and revising processes, allows him to organize his writing, and makes storing and reproducing his writing easier. When asked to complete the sentence, "I don’t like writing with computers because," on the pre-interview questionnaire, Brian responded "not applicable." About this response, Brian said, I really thought about it, and I can’t think of anything beyond... it becomes tedious when you’re having repeated technical failures, and then I hate to work on it. But failures don’t happen too often, so to be honest, I can see no reason, personally, not to use computers with writing, especially now since the technology is so advanced.

Brian believes that word processing has changed the way he writes and made writing a more pleasant experience:

I think I’ve sort of conflated a lot of the early stages of writing into one exercise because now I don’t mess around with early drafts any more. I seem to be able to compose it right there. But also I’ve gotten away from the pen/paper scratching, scribbling, drawing arrows syndrome that can cause great madness and confusion. Writing is less foreboding for me. It’s less frustrating. ... I feel much better about thinking, "Hey, I’m going to go home and turn on my computer and work." Whereas before thinking about having to get a pad of paper and pencil and start writing or work on a typewriter was just horrifying. ... Knowing I’m going to work on a computer, I’m more enthusiastic about writing.
Sources and Assessment of Knowledge about Teaching Writing

On the pre-interview questionnaire, I asked Brian to indicate the degree of importance of six items in terms of their contributions to his general knowledge about teaching composition. In a separate question, I asked him to rate the same items in terms of their contributions to his knowledge of teaching composition with computers. Each item was rated as either very important, important, not very important, unimportant, or not applicable (Table 7). During our interview, I asked Brian to discuss the contributions of these items and account for differences between their importance to his general knowledge about teaching composition and his knowledge about teaching composition with computers.

Brian rated the contributions of three items to his general knowledge about teaching composition and to his knowledge about teaching composition with computers as "very important": colleagues and associates, workshops and conferences, and teaching experience. Commenting on his rating of his colleagues and associates’ contributions to his general knowledge, Brian said,

I always have to realize that I’m learning, I don’t know it all, and these people have experience that I haven’t had. So, I can draw from them. They give me sample exercises, paper types, ways of dealing with . . . certain types of students, ways of conferencing, on, and on. So, probably the most important [contribution] has been interaction with my colleagues and our discussions of our problems and triumphs. . . .

Brian feels that the contributions of his colleagues and associates are probably even more important to his teaching in the computer-enhanced classroom than to his teaching in the traditional classroom. He explained that he and his officemates all began teaching with computers about the same time and have often helped one
Table 7: Brian’s Ranking of Items Contributing to His General Knowledge about Teaching Writing and His Knowledge about Teaching Writing with Computers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues/Associates</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coursework</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Not Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Coursework</td>
<td>Not Very Impt.</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journals</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Conferences</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
another while learning to use the CEWL Program's hardware and software and developing teaching techniques for their computer-enhanced classes.

Brian also rated conferences and workshops as "very important" to his knowledge about teaching composition both in general and with computers. Brian explained that when responding to this item on the questionnaire, he was thinking of in-house workshops given by CSU's English Graduate Student Organization and by the CEWL Program staff. He feels that these workshops are very important because they deal with issues specifically related to the CEWL Program and they allow CEWL teachers to share their ideas and experiences. Brian said that he tries to attend these in-house workshops whenever they address a subject of interest to him but doesn't always have time.

The last item which Brian rated as "very important" to his knowledge about teaching composition in general and with computers is teaching experience. Brian feels that in both cases experience is definitely the most important of the six items. Commenting on its significance, he remarked succinctly, "The more you do, the more you learn from your mistakes and triumphs. It's that simple, really."

Brian rated three items differently in terms of their contributions to his general knowledge about teaching composition and his knowledge about teaching composition with computers: his graduate coursework, his undergraduate coursework, and professional journals. Discussing the contribution of his graduate coursework, which he rated as "important" to his general knowledge, Brian said that the most useful course was the seminar on teaching composition required of all graduate teaching associates. Brian explained that while this seminar has now
been overshadowed by his teaching experience, he considered it important because it gave him the background and confidence he needed to begin teaching.

When asked to comment on the contribution of his graduate coursework to his knowledge of teaching with computers, which he rated as "not very important," Brian explained,

I can share with my students the basic underlying principles and experience of writing and how I use the computer to produce my own work from those classes, but my coursework has not taught me how to teach in a computer-enhanced classroom.

However, he added, that he hoped to take a graduate course on computer-enhanced composition offered during the upcoming summer quarter. He said he was excited about the course and felt it would be very useful.

Brian also discussed the contributions of his undergraduate coursework, which he rated as "not very important" to his general knowledge about teaching composition. He indicated that while his undergraduate work was important as far as allowing him to share "basic writing experiences" with his students, it was not nearly as important as some of the other categories. Brian explained that he rated his undergraduate coursework "unimportant" to his knowledge about teaching with computers

... because, again, I didn’t ever take a course where there was a computer in it. There wasn’t a wonderful teacher who gave me ideas about how to use a computer in the classroom. I wrote papers for those classes using computers, but none of my writing classes or teachers gave me any hints about how to use the computer to enhance the writing experience.

While Brian indicated that reading professional journals has been "very important" to his knowledge about teaching writing in general, he considers his reading only
"important" in terms of its contribution to his knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Brian reads *The American Scholar* occasionally and *PMLA* "fairly" regularly and said that he considers these journals "very important" to his general knowledge about teaching composition because "... they have people who share their experiences in the classroom, theories of writing, and those sorts of things." Discussing his lower rating of the contribution of his reading to his knowledge about teaching composition with computers, Brian indicated that he had not read many books or articles about computer-enhanced composition, but explained that he had adapted some of the more general ideas he had read about to his computer-enhanced classes. Brian added that while doing research for a conference paper he is preparing, he has recently been reading some books that deal with computer-enhanced composition and the impact of electronic text on theories of authorship, meaning, and textuality. The conference paper will discuss one of the classroom activities I observed in Brian's English 110 class (Appendix C, Exercise 4).

Brian assessed his general knowledge about teaching writing as "adequate" because he is "getting good results and the students seem to be responding positively, and they seem to be leaving the classroom with a greater awareness and understanding of their own writing." However, Brian feels he is less knowledgeable than his fellow teaching associates who specialize in composition and wishes he could learn more about the practical and theoretical aspects of writing instruction. As he explained,
Because I'm in literature . . . my focus has been on literary theory and historical aspects, and not so much on writing, so when I talk with people who are in rhetoric and comp, and I get into a discussion about writing, they seem to have a far greater theoretical grasp of the teaching of writing and the history of the teaching of writing, and the application of that writing in the classroom. I say, "Wow, they're doing some really neat stuff that I would like somehow to incorporate into my classroom," but I just don't have the time or resources right now to deal with that.

Brian is "very comfortable" with his knowledge about teaching writing with computers:

I think we had a tutorial in the beginning which only really introduced us to the computer, but I was already familiar enough with computers that my technical knowledge and experience made up for it. And in terms of using the computer in the classroom, yes, I'm very comfortable with it. I'm as innovative as I possibly can be, and I'm trying to push the computers to as much potential as I see them having. So, yes, I'm very comfortable with what I'm doing in the classroom.

Beliefs about Teaching Writing with Computers

How Computers are Used in Writing Classrooms.

Brian believes the most prevalent and important use of computers in writing classrooms is to teach and enhance the processes of drafting and revising.

As he explained,

The most frequent [use of computers in writing classrooms], I think, is learning the drafting process on the computer because I think it's easier to convince students that drafts are necessary when they are easy to do. It is extremely difficult to convince people who write with pen and paper that drafting is crucial to the writing process. But once you've written a text on the computer, instead of re-writing, all you have to do is add to or delete or rearrange the text, and students seem to like that idea.

Brian believes using the computer as an instructional medium through exercises that allow students to manipulate texts, experiment with style, and explore the nature of textuality is an important, but less prevalent use of the computer in
writing classrooms:

I think instruction, such things as taking advantage of electronic text and . . . writing exercises, are facilitated. They can download something off the network and then manipulate it right there, instead of, again, having to have a handout, look at the handout, then retype it, or try to scribble or make marks somewhere.

Brian also feels the computer is used to facilitate and enhance collaboration. In contrast to these uses, he believes that the computer is too frequently used in writing classrooms as "a glorified typewriter" and characterized this use of the computer as "a waste of time."

What Writing Teachers Who Teach with Computers Should Know About Computers and About Computers and Writing.

When asked to describe, based on his knowledge and experience, what knowledge of computers and computer skills writing teachers who teach with computers should have, Brian explained that he was not sure, but added,

Because my philosophy of teaching holds that the teacher should learn along with the students, I believe they need to have a minimum familiarity just for practical purposes. . . . You can't have an effective class exercise if something starts going wrong, and the teacher doesn't know how to correct it. So, I would imagine there's a minimum, and I don't know what that minimum would be. In the very least, an introductory course, a seminar of some sort, introducing the teacher, saying, "Here's the computer you're using. This is the software. Get to know it before you try to explain it to the student."

When prompted to describe what knowledge of computer-enhanced composition and the uses of computers to teach writing teachers who use computers to teach writing should have, Brian said,

At this point, I'm just looking at more the technical, hands on "This is how to use a computer." Then, to tell you the truth, I don't think the teachers necessarily have to have a knowledge of the relationship between computers and writing, but they need to have
the curiosity and ability to discover that relationship and share it with the students. Any good teacher, given a particular classroom and a particular purpose, will try to accomplish those goals as creatively and effectively as possible. That's the type of drive the teacher needs with computers... an interest in computers, an interest in writing, and an interest or an investment in trying to make those two connections.

The Effects and Potential Effects of Computers on the Teaching of Writing.

Brian believes that the most significant effect computers have had on the teaching of writing so far has been to increase the emphasis on writing as a process and to contribute to an ongoing shift within the discipline toward process-centered writing instruction. When asked if he believes emphasizing process is also the most important potential effect, Brian replied,

The greatest potential, what I see happening now and what I find most exciting, is to emphasize individuality, self-motivation, these sorts of issues as a teaching technique. Related to that is the decentering of the authority of the teacher. The teacher... can envision him or herself as not so much this body of knowledge to be dumped into a receptive student, but as a coach or facilitator, or as someone who's encouraging the individual student to discover things on his or her own. I think the computer has a wonderful potential to do that.

When prompted to describe how the computer creates these effects, he explained,

I find I come in and one, the tension is turned away from the teacher to the computer screen, and then... that screen becomes a mirror or reflection of the mind, and so it's that person engaging with his or her thought process as it's electronically represented on the screen.... Sometimes... the bell will go off and traditionally papers are going into bookbags... but sometimes the bell will ring and they're still click clacking away. So that's exciting to see. Or, I need to explain something to them... and I'm jumping up and down trying to get their attention because they're so absorbed in their work. That's an exciting thing.

Brian feels that some teachers may find teaching in a computer-enhanced
environment "frightening" because they want to remain the center of authority in the classroom, but believes

... that attitude and the type of teaching process that goes along with that attitude ... is outdated, passé and not as effective a technique as encouraging independent thought, independent exploration, and de-emphasizing the teacher's authority.

Assessment of the Teaching Environment: Instructional Support, Academic Freedom, and Classroom Environment

Teaching Writing in the English Department's Traditional Classrooms.

Brian responded to the question "What is it like to teach English 110 in a traditional classroom in the Department of English at Center State University?" by indicating that he enjoys teaching in the Department's traditional classrooms and is comfortable with the amount and kinds of support for his teaching he receives. When asked to describe this support, he said that the English Graduate Organization and the Writing Center hold informal workshops and brown bag sessions several times each quarter. He also mentioned the support given by other graduate students and the required graduate seminar on teaching composition. In addition, he said that he will be taking advantage of the Department's policy to provide funds for graduate students to participate in local and national conferences when he presents the paper he has been preparing this quarter. Brian feels that the classrooms are generally well-maintained, equipped, and supplied.

Brian is especially satisfied with his freedom to determine, within very broad parameters, the content and activities of his classes and the teaching materials he will use. Brian said he has never suggested any changes in the
Department’s policies as they related to teaching composition and never requested that the Department adopt a particular textbook or suggested that it purchase any particular piece of equipment or type of supplies for its traditional classrooms. When asked if he would like to see any changes in the Department’s policies or practices related to the teaching of writing, Brian replied that he has no specific changes in mind, but questions the use of topic- or issue-oriented teaching in freshman writing courses.

**Teaching Writing in the English Department’s Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program.**

When asked to respond to the question "What is it like to teach English 110 in the Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature Program at Center State University?" Brian described his experience as "a dream." He is generally pleased with the amount and kinds of support the CEWL Program provides for his teaching, and when asked to describe this support, he cited the workshop given each Autumn by the CEWL Program staff. Commenting on the CEWL Program staff, Brian said,

They're very good for giving you pedagogical support, ideas, freedoms to do what you want, but I think that they're still somewhat limited, basically because they're trying to figure it out themselves. . . . So each year they learn from the teacher's experiences. They have us write journals, and unfortunately, not too many people do the journals, but the group is trying to learn as much as possible about the potential of computers in the classroom and share that with each other. . . . In terms of pedagogy they're not apathetic, and they're very encouraging and supportive, and they're curious about the field.

In addition to the support provided by the CEWL Program, he mentioned the workshops given by English Graduate Organization and the Writing Center, but
added that these were usually "more general rather than related to computers and writing."

Brian said that he enjoys basically the same freedom to determine course content and classroom activities and to select teaching materials for his computer-enhanced classes as he had for his classes in the traditional classroom, but added,

The only limiting thing is your choice of software. You're going to use the Macintosh and whatever they use on the Macintosh, and then on the IBMs you have to use Word for Windows--that's the only program. I wish I could use WordPerfect like I want, but I can't.

When I asked Brian if there were any changes he would like the CEWL Program to make to improve the support it provides for teachers, he responded that he would like the CEWL Program to give teachers more software options, upgrade the network in the IBM classroom, give teachers more training on how to use network hardware and software, and provide better technical support. As he explained,

If we [teachers] know more about the network, we can then start to discover its potential in the classroom. Now, the Macintosh labs, I understand, their network is rather established, and it works wonderfully. The IBM lab... is a year old or maybe two years old, so there are a lot of problems being worked out, and since the [Computer-Enhanced Writing and Literature] staff doesn't have the technical expertise, we're relying on some other department that handles... the computer issues, and trying to coordinate between those two can be problematic. So, if I could change something, it would be enhancing the technical support.

When asked if he had ever suggested any changes in the policies of the CEWL Program as they relate to his teaching or requested that the Program adopt a particular textbook or purchase a particular piece of equipment, computer hardware, or software, Brian replied,
I requested that they use WordPerfect, or at least give us . . . the opportunity to use WordPerfect, and I had explained to them that it's completely compatible with Windows, so it can be done. I also requested that they get an overhead adapter [screen projector] for the IBM. They have one for the Macintosh, and now I'd like to have one that I can use in the IBM lab, so that . . . I can beam a student's screen up on an overhead and use it for instruction. That would really be incredible.

Brian said that while neither request has been granted, he believes the CEWL Program staff is responsive to his input: "They're trying to do what they can, given their monies, given their other projects that they're having problems with.

It's a tough situation, I know."

Teaching Writing in CEWL Classroom E: Arrangement, Hardware, and Software.

Brian is teaching his computer-enhanced English 110 class in the CEWL Program's IBM lab, Room E. He has taught all his computer-enhanced classes in this room. Brian described the design of the room, the computers around the edges and worktables in the middle, as "brilliant" because you can do your group work, collaboration, discussions, peer responding in the middle, and when you want to do your [individual] work, you can get away from that, go off on the edges . . . and become self-absorbed. In that way, it helps implement the decentering of authority. So, I think that's beautiful. It's perfect.

When asked if he would like to have any changes made to the room's arrangement or non-computer equipment, Brian said that he would like to have a more durable whiteboard. He added, however, that his problems with the whiteboard would be eliminated if he had access to an overhead screen projector. He also noted that he writes on the board less frequently in his computer classes than he had in his traditional classes.
Brian likes the IBM PS2s with which the room is equipped, although he feels having only a single floppy drive is inconvenient and believes adding an additional floppy drive would make saving and backing-up their work easier for students and create fewer "hassles" for him. However, Brian's biggest complaint about the room's computer equipment is with the network. Brian wasn't sure whether the problems he and his students have experienced are with the network's hardware or its software, but complained that "network glitches" have created "major havoc." As he explained,

The instructor can't load things on the network, but if it does get loaded onto the network, students can't pull it off the network. That's been the main problem. At first, there were also a lot of problems getting the printers to work properly, but that's been corrected.

Brian feels that these problems have been compounded by the ACO's and CEWL Program's approach to solving them:

When something goes wrong, they try to do just one little thing, instead of, "Okay, let's look at the entire networking system and what's wrong with it." They do it individually, symptomatically, and you end up just putting patches on problem areas instead of correcting them.

Brian also reported that he and his students have had problems with Word for Windows, the word processing software which is available in the room, and feels these may be related to problems with the network or with the Windows operating system:

Word has problems saving and backing up, and I don't know why. Every so often, it will save information as a series of asterisks ... or, randomly, it will decide that it has a disk error, or it can't recognize your document for no apparent reason. Just these ... bizarre, random glitches will happen, and it's incredibly frustrating. I don't know if that's a problem with Windows, because of all the bugs I've
looked at, or the combination of Windows and networking. I don’t know, but it happens, and it’s incredibly frustrating.

Brian said that in response to these problems, he has included in his syllabus a detailed procedure for students to follow when saving and backing-up their work. Despite the problems he has experienced while teaching with it, Brian considers Word for Windows a good word processor because it’s user-friendly and can be taught quickly. He said that he would prefer to use WordPerfect, but also indicated that he would probably need to spend more than the one week he spends introducing students to Word for Windows teaching WordPerfect to students.

Goals and Pedagogy For Computer-Enhanced English 110

Brian’s primary goal in teaching computer-enhanced English 110 is helping students to become "more capable thinkers and more comfortable writers." He described his philosophy by saying,

I want them to become more aware of their writing process and of themselves as writers and how writing and critical thinking are related. I’m not the authority. I am more familiar and I have more experience with writing, but writing, I feel, is more individualized. It can be a group collaboration if the students know the topic, but I look at writing as choices, and I’m here to advise them on some of their choices, and it’s up to them, given a certain goal in mind, to make the decisions in writing. I don’t want to tell them how to write things. It’s up to them to discover how . . . to write.

Brian believes writing is a political act, but doesn’t feel a freshman writing class should focus on political or social questions. As he explained,

There are political questions involved in, "Okay, who’s deciding what options they’re given to choose from?" These are things I would love to talk about, academic discourse, different types of social discourse, among other things. Again, I think that . . . in freshman composition, that’s not the place for it, even though I like to talk about it.

Brian indicated that his goals and philosophy in his computer-enhanced
English 110 do not differ from those he had had in his traditional English 110 classes, but he believes that teaching with computers makes them easier to achieve:

I think it was more difficult to decenter my authority when I didn't have the computer in there. I just feel either I'm better at it now, or I really feel that the computer has allowed me to shift the focus away from me as teacher and focus more on the act of writing itself. . . . We're doing something with writing all the time with the computer there, and it was just more difficult to try to do that when they worked less at the computer.

In the course syllabus, Brian describes the structure of his computer-enhanced English 110 as a "workshop." When asked to discuss this structure, he explained that students do some form of writing in-class almost every class meeting. He also said that students develop their own paper topics, frequently discuss their papers in small groups, do peer editing, and work on collaborative exercises, although none of the three required course papers is done collaboratively. Brian feels these activities contribute to his goal of decentering his authority and added that he tries to keep lecturing to "an absolute minimum."

Brian indicated that he uses the computer as a word processor in his class to "teach process" and said that students use word processing every day. As he explained,

They're always on the computer writing, either on an essay, on their particular draft, or at whatever stage of their writing process that they're in at that moment. They'll have a workshop session where they'll do some peer responding, and then they'll hop on the computer and get to work on it. So, in that sense, they're always doing word processing. . . . Word processing is very important.

Brian said that he teaches the writing process with the computer by having students use the computer during every stage of writing; he requires all rough and
final drafts to be completed using the computer. The word processor *Word for Windows* and its built-in spelling checker are the only software Brian uses in his classes.

Although Brian's syllabus states that he does not require invention notes to be done on computer, he said that he encourages students to use the computer for invention and commented,

You can do prewriting, brainstorming, freewriting, focused freewriting, focused brainstorming. You can do everything except clustering, and really, brainstorming is a type of clustering. So, I encourage them to do that on the computer. With clustering . . . I'll have them do their clustering on a piece of paper; then they do their vignette on the computer. The vignette . . . is like a freewriting that you do as you look at the cluster.

He also pointed out that he tells students that invention can take place . . . throughout the writing process. If you get stumped, or if you want to develop your ideas, you can sit down and do a brainstorm, or something, so you can still do invention throughout the writing process, and the computer is a superior tool for that.

Brian said that he introduces students to invention techniques such as freewriting and brainstorming using the computer during the first two weeks of the course. Although Brian said that these are the same invention techniques he taught in the traditional classroom, he commented,

I'm trying to not be limited by just . . . computerizing the exercises. I'm trying to show them how they can then link that, continue, go a step beyond. They're not just using the computer to be using it. What I try to do when we have it on the computer is to show them that when they do that freewrite, they can save it as a freewrite, and they can go back to it when they want to write that exploratory draft. They can cut and paste significant components of their freewriting, and then beam it over to another document, and then work directly from those things instead of having to rewrite the text.

Brian reported that his students seem to generate more ideas when freewriting
and brainstorming using computers than when using pen and paper.

Brian said that he tries to teach students early in the quarter how to use the capabilities of computer when revising their essays. He has students do one or two exercises during the first two weeks of the quarter which call for them to revise a sample paragraph using the computer. He described the exercises and their goals by saying, "We talk about what is a good paragraph, and how you structure paragraphs. I give them a sample pathetic paragraph, and they'll manipulate it on the computer, making changes and such." While the main purpose of the exercises is to focus students' attention on paragraph structure and help them evaluate what makes a good paragraph, Brian also uses the exercises to introduce students to the insert, delete, cut and paste functions of the computer. Brian said that other than these paragraphing exercises, he teaches revision only by engaging students in writing and commented,

I think that's the best way to teach revision, instead of having them work on somebody else's draft. . . . You know, like, "Here's a sample segment from someone's early draft. How would you change it?" I find that unproductive. . . . They use the computer for drafting . . . but at the same time, it's teaching them how to revise.

Besides revision, Brian uses these paragraph exercises to teach students to use the computer when editing their papers. Brian said that although he doesn't specifically teach grammar and mechanics with or without the computer, he feels that when completing the paragraph exercises students learn to use the computer to make "local, editing-type changes." He emphasized that "students quickly realize how wonderful the computer is for correcting mistakes." Brian encourages students to use Word for Windows' spelling checker and teaches them how to
access it at the beginning of the quarter when he introduces the word processor.

Brian feels spelling checkers are helpful because knowing that you have that option later, you don’t have to feel like you have to get your words spelled correctly right now. I can just whip through on that computer and if I misspell something . . . it doesn’t matter because I can get it later. So that’s why I consider it an important thing because it relieves some of that pressure. But . . . it’s important only to use it at the very end because . . . what’s the use of correcting spelling in a section that might not even ever be used in your final draft? So, how I teach the writing process, spelling and grammatical errors, while important to the writing, are something that you deal with in the last part when you go from your second working draft to the final.

Brian also uses the computer to focus students’ attention on stylistic concerns and has put several exercises from the Richard Lanham text he uses into Word for Windows files. The students do three exercises during the course, one after each essay; none of the exercises is graded or collected. One exercise (Appendix C) asks students to revise eight awkward sentences using principles from Lanham’s text. Brian has the students complete the exercise working in small groups, each clustered around a single computer. He feels that students learn more from the exercises when doing them with computers because they can try out different answers and discuss and complete the exercises in groups more easily.

Assessment of Computer-Enhanced English 110 and Reflections on the Computer in English Studies

When asked to describe the most important advantages he experiences when using the computer to teach writing, Brian reiterated several ideas he had mentioned while discussing his pedagogy, stating that he can "teach writing as
process" more effectively using computers, that students "seem to generate more information" when freewriting or brainstorming using computers, and that "revision, global changes in organization and language used, is enhanced using cut and paste commands." When prompted to discuss the disadvantages he experiences, Brian mentioned that besides "frustrating computer glitches," the biggest disadvantage was the students' notion of the sanctity and authority of the printed page. As he explained, when

...you laser print something out, it looks professional. It looks like you're reading it out of a book, and it's that notion of ... published as authority, and, "This thing looks published, so it must be good, and why should I change? I don't want to change this. It's perfect." So there are some exercises where I have them rip their draft in half. But even on the computer screen, that thought comes up. It looks gorgeous on that ... high resolution, VGA screen. You don't want to change anything. So I think that's an impediment of the computer. But, I just try to remind them over and over that it's not a finished product. It's still on-going, you can still expand ... but I think that is somewhat of an obstacle.

Two other problems Brian alludes to in the syllabus are students' desire to use other hardware and software to complete assignments and their tendency to use limited access to computers and computer error as excuses. In the syllabus, Brian explains that all drafts, rough and final, "must be completed with the IBM Word for Windows software (or some other program which is compatible with Word for Windows)." He warns students that although CSU has only two labs with Word for Windows available, their classroom and one other room, no late work is accepted and "disk crashes and closed or full computer labs are not acceptable excuses for late papers." When asked to discuss the requirement that all drafts be completed using the computer, Brian said that underlying this requirement "is the
pedagogical stance of trying to teach them to use the computer as more than just a typewriter." He explained,

A lot of students still want to write text on a piece of paper and type it in. They feel more comfortable that way... envisioning the writer as sort of this scribe. That's the sort of the image I had. So, I'm trying to get them to reenvision what writing is. It's hard for them to get away from this idea of pen and paper... but once they break through that, I think, they become freer to develop their ideas. They become more comfortable with it and they seem to enjoy writing a little better.

Discussing the requirement that students use only Word for Windows or compatible software, Brian said,

They [students] procrastinate or they have something to do, so they use a friend's laptop word processor or they run to their dorm lab or the library, which are predominantly Macs, and they use it. I don't want them to do that simply because since we do so much work in class on their document, and in writing as process, we want to pull-up what they have so far, make changes, and manipulate it. We can't do that with incompatible software... Word for Windows has a conversion option... so I get into that, but mainly, I leave that in there just as a possible option... I discourage it because it wastes time. I've had one person who was familiar enough with computers to do it quickly, and it didn't cause problems.

Brian remarked that he tells students who own Macintoshes to switch to a Macintosh-supported section if they would like to use their own equipment and warns students that since they may have limited access to Word for Windows-equipped labs, "procrastination will kill you." He added that he believes that limited lab-access is a "minimal problem" because he provides students with a lot of in-class time for writing. Brian said that while students sometimes use computers as a convenient excuse for late or incomplete assignments, he reported that he hasn't found this to be a difficult problem. Commenting on the Draconian warning against using computer-related excuses in his syllabus, Brian added,
Now, I'm more relaxed than this. . . . You have printers that go kaput on them, and I just tell them if that is a legitimate thing, have the lab monitor write a note saying the computer was down so that I can excuse them. But what ends up happening is that it's really easy for someone not to finish their work and say "Oh, computer error." I'm not going to tolerate that. The [CEWL Program] staff backs us up on that. They actually encourage us to do that.

One other point Brian addressed while discussing the disadvantages of using computers in English 110 was the need for students to have keyboarding skills. Brian noted that students who lack good keyboarding skills have "big problems" and explained,

Since I do a lot of work in the classroom and since it's required that all drafts be done on the computer, it can take them a long time to produce that work, and if you end up worrying about typing . . . it means you lose a lot of what you're trying to say. So, yes. I think if you can't type, it slows you down, and I think it's counter-productive. He encourages students who lack keyboarding skills to "rethink" staying in the class.

Despite these problems and disadvantages, Brian said that his transition to the computer-enhanced classroom was not a difficult one and indicated that he would choose to teach all his future writing classes using computers if given the option. Although he would like to continue teaching writing with computers, Brian is not apprehensive about the prospect of returning to the traditional writing classroom and believes that he could use some of the things he has learned from teaching with computers:

I think I would continue to decenter my authority, even though it would be harder without computers. I'd also continue to emphasize the drafting process although we might not spend as much time on in-class writing. I think I'd still try to do the collaborative kinds of exercises and those would probably take longer without the computer, so that would maybe even out . . . and I'd encourage
students to use computers even if we didn’t have them as part of the
classroom.

Brian also feels very strongly that computers should be used in other sorts
of English classes. He is particularly excited about the potential of computers in
literature classes:

There are a lot of things that you can do with literature on the
computer. . . . I have ideas about how the computer can be used as
a tool to teach literature and to teach writing about literature,
introducing the idea and discussing the idea of textual authority and
how electronic texts completely denature that authority in the sense
that "Shakespeare wrote this and it has to stay that way." No. You
can take a Shakespearean sonnet and completely remake it if you
wanted to. And that's a very interesting theoretical consideration
that the computer allows you to discuss. With electronic text, what
happens to authorial intention? What happens to textual authority?
You can emphasize the phenomenon of your reading and the
dialectic between reader and text. There are all sorts of things that
you can do to illustrate and discuss and explore with the computer
and electronic text and the manipulation of text. Definitely
electronic text and theories of electronic texts break open a whole
new conception of What is writing? and What is literature? and
Who has access to it? and Where does meaning lie? and all these
types of age old critical issues. The computer helps us explore them.

Description of Materials from Brian’s English 110 Class

Brian required three textbooks in his English 110 during Spring Quarter,
Hacker; and *Revising Prose*, third edition, 1992, by Richard Lanham. The course
packet was compiled by Brian and consists primarily of short readings (ranging
from James Joyce’s short story "Araby" to a humorous essay by columnist Dave
Barry). It also contains assignment descriptions, topic ideas for the three required
essays, and excerpts from Frank O’Hare’s *A Writer’s Work*, the Department’s
suggested English 110 textbook. *A Writer’s Reference* is a handbook and *Revising*
Prose contains exercises and suggestions for improving one's prose style.

Brian submitted thirteen items distributed in English 110 during Spring Quarter, 1992: the syllabus, a diagnostic exam, four handouts, three exercises adapted from Richard Lanham's *Revising Prose*, and four additional exercises (Appendix C). The seven-page syllabus lists the required texts and materials, provides the dates when essays and assignments are due, and describes the required formats for assignments, the course's content and purpose, the Departmental grading standards, and the class policies. It also explains the functions of the Department's Writing Center and the Ombudsman and provides their hours, campus addresses, and phone numbers. The diagnostic exam, created by Brian and handwritten on the first day of class, provides students with a topic and instructs them to "write the very best essay you know how."

Of the four handouts, two discussed class requirements. One of these is a student-teacher conference appointment sheet. The student-teacher conferences were scheduled for the Mondays before the second working draft of each paper was due. Another handout describes the required format and content for journal assignments and explains the grading procedure that will be used to evaluate them. Brian submitted two other handouts. One describes the procedure for saving and backing up work on the classroom's hardware and software. The other is a two-page handout titled "Helpful Hints: the Later Stages of the Drafting Process." Among the hints are a reminder that all drafts must be completed using *Word for Windows*, a warning to plan ahead because computer lab space is limited and late papers are not accepted, and a reminder not to rely exclusively on the
computer to check for spelling errors. This handout was distributed during the seventh week of the quarter; the others were distributed during the first and second weeks. All were provided to students in hardcopy.

The three exercises adapted from Lanham’s *Revising Prose*, exercises RP1, RP2, and RP3, were completed during the fifth, sixth, and seventh weeks of the quarter, respectively (Table 8). For each exercise, Brian asked the students to form groups and then loaded the exercise file from his floppy disk onto the groups’ hard drives from which they accessed it and completed it using *Word for Windows*. Brian also had hardcopy answer sheets for each exercise which he made available to students who wanted them. RP1 was taken from chapter one of Lanham’s book and asked students to revise eight awkward and wordy sentences "taken from actual prose examples" using Lanham’s "Paramedic Method." RP2, taken from chapter two of Lanham, called on students to revise a short paragraph using the Paramedic Method. It asked students to pay special attention to "the shape and rhythm" of the sentences in order to enhance the paragraph’s coherence and readability. Students were advised that while they may want to revise the sentences separately, they should be careful not to change their meanings within the context of the paragraph. They were also instructed to "to make use of the cut/paste, delete, and insert functions which the computer provides . . . thus making revision a more pleasant and effective task." RP3 was taken from chapter three of Lanham and is another paragraph revision exercise. To complete the exercise, students were told to "consider what makes a coherent paragraph" and again instructed to pay special attention to "the shape and rhythm"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RP1</td>
<td>revise eight awkward/ wordy sentences</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP2</td>
<td>revise a paragraph to improve coherence and readability</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP3</td>
<td>revise a paragraph to improve coherence and eliminate wordiness</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>revise an excerpt from a draft of a student paper</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>read a short tale involving a moral dilemma and decide who is most guilty</td>
<td>oral/ written, in-class</td>
<td>handout, whiteboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>consider lyrics from two songs and to decide what the songs say about love</td>
<td>written/ oral in-class</td>
<td>handout, audio cassette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>write an ending to a James Thurber fable</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the sentences in order to make "the paragraph come to life" and advised that while they may want to revise the sentences separately, they should be careful not to change their meanings within the context of the paragraph. For this exercise students were asked to "take advantage of the computer's ability to manipulate text electronically" by moving sentences around and deleting unnecessary wording "a la Lanham's Paramedic Method." Brian said he asks students to share and discuss their responses as a class after they complete each of the exercises. Brian submitted four other exercises, E1, E2, E3, and E4, which students completed in-class during the quarter (Table 8). E1 and E4 were distributed in the same way as the Revising Prose exercises and required students to work in groups using a computer. E2 was distributed in hardcopy and completed individually using pen and paper. E3 was distributed in hardcopy and completed individually using computers. Brian asked students to share and discuss their responses as a class after each of these exercises. E1 presents students with an excerpt from an early draft of a student paper and asks them to revise it. Students are instructed to "read over the paragraph and discuss possible changes with the members of your group" and advised to think about "having and placing a clear topic sentence," "ordering supporting details," using "appropriate transitions," and creating "an effective final sentence or two which wraps up the intent or purpose of the paragraph." They are also advised to use the cut, paste, insert, and delete functions while revising. E2, described as a "persuasive exercise," presents students with a very short story entailing a moral dilemma. Students are directed
to read the story, make a list of the characters, decide who is most guilty, and be prepared to defend their choices. The exercise was done during week five as students began working on the second essay assignment, a persuasive paper. E3, completed during week seven, was an introductory exercise to accompany the third essay assignment, an evaluative paper. The hardcopy handout presents the lyrics of two love songs from Andrew Lloyd Weber's *Phantom of the Opera* and asks students to think about what makes a good love song and "jot down a few aspects that you feel should be in a love song." It then instructs them to listen as the songs are played in class and then answer the following questions: "Do you consider these songs to be love songs? Why or why not? If so, which do you like better and why?" In class, Brian told the students to disregard these questions and consider the questions "What do the songs say about love?" and "How do they portray ideas of love?" instead. E4 was also completed during the seventh week of the quarter and distributed as a word processing file. In this exercise students were given an incomplete version of a James Thurber short story and instructed to work in groups using the computer to write an ending for the story. They were also instructed, after writing the ending, to go back over the earlier part of the story and highlight "words, phrases, plots, or sections" which influenced the way they decided to write their ending. Finally, they were told to be prepared to defend their ending. After the students completed the exercise and discussed their endings, Brian read Thurber's original ending aloud.
Observations of Brian's Computer-Enhanced English 110 Class

Brian's English 110 section met on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 12:00 until 1:48 p.m. in CEWL Program Room E; it had an enrollment of eighteen students. During my observations, I acted primarily as an observer. I usually sat at a table near the door. Since the space is quite open, I could observe the entire classroom quite easily from this position. Occasionally, I moved around the room observing and talking with students or with Brian. My first classroom observation was on Tuesday of the fifth week of the quarter.

**Summary of Week One, Class One.**

As students arrived, a few sat at the tables in the center, but most took a seat at a computer workstation. Two students were using word processors, but most were talking in groups of two or three. Brian stood near the technician's workstation at the front discussing a paper with the instructor from the previous class. When class began at noon, fifteen students were present. Brian asked them to get out the assignment due that day and asked for their indulgence while "I get myself together." After spreading several piles of books and handouts on a table, Brian wrote the assignment for the next meeting on the board, asked students to hand-in today's assignment, and took attendance.

At about 12:11, Brian announced that he was going to make another try at using the network and instructed students to move into groups of two or three at a workstation. Students quickly formed four groups with those sitting near them, as if they did this frequently. A student reported a screen problem and, sitting at the technician's terminal at the front, Brian suggested a solution which, apparently,
worked. While seated at the technician's station working, Brian asked students what they thought about the Lanham reading assignment that had been assigned for class and took responses from about five students. Brian gave instructions for pulling up the sentence revision exercise, RP1, and began to circulate to see if students were successfully accessing the file. They weren't, so Brian went from group to group loading RP1 from a floppy. The students were patient and seemed accustomed to the glitch. Little time was lost (maybe three minutes) and the flow of the class seemed unaffected. Prepared for the glitch, Brian seemed only slightly irritated. Later, he told me he had paper handouts also, in case even loading the exercise from his floppy failed. Brian gave the groups directions for completing the exercise and the groups began to work. Brian stopped at a student station and tried pulling RP1 from the network himself. Unable to access the file, he began circulating and helping the groups as they completed RP1.

By 12:21 the groups were working quietly. The students' talk seemed to focus almost exclusively on RP1. Brian circulated from group to group checking progress and making suggestions. At 12:35 he announced that they should try to wrap-up their work in the next ten minutes. Brian approached a group and observed them from over their shoulders. Discovering that they were under the impression that they were to remove all prepositional phrases from the sentences, Brian corrected their misconception and then announced to the class that removing all prepositional phrases was unnecessary and repeated the goals of the exercise. At 12:40 a student arrived late. Brian called the student into the hall for a conference, and the remaining students continued working without
At about 12:46, Brian called for the groups' attention and led a discussion of their responses to each sentence in RP1. Once, as a student began to read a response off the screen, the screen saver wiped the monitor screen clean. "Screen saver," Brian said. The student touched the keyboard and the screen reappeared. As they worked through the sentences in RP1, the groups volunteered revisions and were sometimes drafted. After all the sentences were reviewed, Brian asked students what they thought of Lanham's suggested precepts and if they found them useful. Most nodded affirmatively in response, showing little conviction or enthusiasm. The students' energy levels seemed somewhat higher during the hands-on computer exercise than during the discussion period. Before moving on, Brian discussed the major difficulty students had with RP1, the question of what to do about eliminating prepositional phrases, and explained that some prepositional phrases provide needed information.

At about 1:06, opting not to take the five minute break Brian offered, the class moved on to the next exercise, E2--a short tale involving a moral dilemma to which Brian asked the students to respond. Brian passed out a hardcopy of E2 and went over the directions at the top of the page. Students read and worked on E2 individually. As they worked, Brian told them that a handout with suggested answers to RP1 would be available at the front table after class if they'd like it.

After about five minutes, Brian asked students for their responses to E2 and recorded them on the whiteboard at the front. A somewhat animated teacher-led discussion followed, although it was dominated by only five or six of
the sixteen students present. After the discussion, Brian discussed making a persuasive case and suggested how students could apply what they had learned so far in the quarter to their next assignment. Before dismissing the class, Brian went over the assignment he had written on the board at the beginning of the period. After class was dismissed, two students picked-up the answer sheet for RP1.

Commentary.

Throughout the period, Brian initiated activities and controlled the pacing and segmenting of class time. The students seemed comfortable and accustomed to working in groups in front of the computer screen. In three out of four groups, all members participated extensively; in the fourth, two of the four members were much more heavily involved with a third somewhat involved and the fourth member only slightly involved. Control over participation and discussion within the groups was left to the students. In three out of the four groups, one student controlled the keyboard and entered the group’s responses. In some cases this student acted like a secretary; in others, the keyboarder created an answer and let the group review it and suggest changes. The pattern seemed to change from item to item as well as from group to group, although two groups, the group with two keyboarders and the group dominated by two members, seemed to rely more on the second pattern. During our interview after this class, Brian said that he hadn’t noticed any particular pattern of interaction in the class although he had noticed that the keyboarders tended to be the same students each time.

No group produced a hardcopy of their RP1 responses, and I did not
observe any group saving its work to disk. Brian confirmed that students rarely saved or printed their group work. As Brian circulated from group to group during RP1, most of his attention was devoted to helping students with writing- or subject-related problems such as how to judge when a prepositional phrase is needed and when it can be eliminated. Very little of his time or energy was needed for helping students with technical or procedural tasks or problems.

Although RP1 could have been part of any writing class, access to the word processor did seem to make the exercise easier for students to complete and facilitated group work because of the ease of text manipulation and increased legibility. In the group that I observed closely, students attempted more than one revision on some, but not most, of the sentences. Using the computers demanded more preparation from the teacher. Brian, who had already experienced problems with the network, came prepared to "deliver" the exercise through three formats: network, floppy disk, and hardcopy.

Summary of Week One, Class Two.

Thursday's class began much as Tuesday's did. More students were seated at tables at the beginning of this class. Six were seated at work stations, but none were working on anything yet. Brian had placed a cassette player and some stacks of papers on the front table. He stood near the technician's desk discussing a journal assignment with a student. Soon the discussion included a group of three or four students seated near the front. After a few minutes, Brian announced to the class that he would be returning their previous journals at the end of class and made some comments about his method of grading. Next, he took attendance. A
couple of students arrive late bringing the total number of students present to fifteen.

At 12:04, Brian began discussing aspects of the persuasive essay, the mode for their next paper. Using directed questions, he initiated a discussion of persuasion. He wrote "PACES" on the board and discussed how each letter of the acronym (purpose, audience, code, experience, self) could be applied to the persuasive essay. Students paid attention but showed no enthusiasm. Brian directed students to page 117 in their course packets and again used directed questions to lead a discussion. The students were uninspired and participated only when asked and prodded. One student seemed to be taking notes. The discussion lasted about fifteen minutes.

At 12:21, Brian played the rap song "Freedom of Speech" while students followed along by reading the lyrics from their course packets. The song's beat is intense, and its violent, vulgar lyrics stretch the limits of the First Amendment. As the song played, there was no other sound in the room, and the students stared intently at their texts. When the song was finished, Brian asked the students what they thought about it and a discussion followed. The energy level had increased only slightly despite the provocative nature of the song. Five students made comments. After about five minutes, Brian redirected the discussion toward a reading from the course packet that arguing against the relative value of rap that had been assigned for this class. Brian asked them to point out any logical fallacies they spotted and got little response. A student asked Brian to explain the term "logical fallacy" again, and Brian did. What little energy the rap song had
created had dissipated. Brian redirected the discussion again, asking them to consider another article from their packets. Brian attempted to lead a discussion, but the students seemed not to have read the assignment. Brian redirected the discussion to a Dave Barry article from the packet. Brian asked who Dave Barry is, and the students said they had never heard of him. One reacted to Barry’s humorous piece as if it were a serious editorial, but most just didn’t seem to have read it.

At 12:59, Brian responded to a question about what kind of topic would be appropriate for their next paper. He asked if there were questions and then asked if they’d like a break. The students declined the break, and Brian explained that the rest of the class would be spent discussing their proposed topics in small groups. Brian wrote four items on the board for them to consider in relation to their topics: "So what? Cliche? Interested? Is there an opposing view, an audience?" The students quickly formed groups by gathering around the table nearest to them. The groups seemed to consist of pretty much the same individuals as Tuesday’s except that two of Tuesday’s smaller groups had formed one larger group.

Brian spent a few minutes writing the assignment on the board, then began circulating among the three groups. After about five minutes, the largest group indicated it was done. Brian, without pressing them to continue the group work, directed the students to hop on the computer and start doing some brainstorming. One student had forgotten to bring his disk, and Brian suggested that he do a clustering exercise with pen and paper. Five other students indicated they wanted
to brainstorm on paper also. Brian said clustering on paper was okay; otherwise, he’d like them to use a computer. By 1:18, only one group was still talking. From the other two groups, five students were working on the computers, four were still talking in pairs, and one was talking to Brian. The energy level seemed to go up as students moved to the computers and began working, and a lot of conferencing was going on between adjacent students. One student who had missed several classes was getting help with the word processor from a student nearby.

By 1:26, all students except one were working on computers. Most had generated at least a screen full of text—some in list form, some in paragraph form. Except for the voices of Brian and the student he was currently conferring with, the only sound was the click-clack of keyboards. The student who forgot his disk remained at a table. Brian turned on the tape player and light, pop music played softly. The students didn’t take any visible notice. Brian wrote some brainstorming questions on the board for the students to ask themselves to help them get started. At about 1:38 Brian told the students to start wrapping up and went over the questions on the board. He dismissed them, reminding them to pick-up their journals on the way out. By 1:42, most students had turned off their computers and left. One was printing out his work, and another stayed behind to discuss his journal grade with Brian. With that problem resolved, the class ended.

Commentary.

This class had a very low energy level. Even the purposefully inflammatory rap song "Freedom of Speech" produced only a mild reaction and moderate level of participation in discussion. The students seemed to display a higher level of
energy and commitment, if not enthusiasm, when working at their computers than at any other time. Brian said that this behavior is typical of this class, and added that while he does believe that students in his computer-enhanced classes are usually motivated by the computer, this class is also "a very grade-conscious bunch, so they always perk-up and get more active whenever they're working on something that might affect their grade."

Several students quickly moved from group discussion to individual work at the computer, although a few expressed a preference to invent using pen and paper. When asked about the students' desire to do invention with pen and paper, Brian said that he "really encourages" them to invent on the computer, so they can edit and insert their notes into their papers. As students worked on their papers, some informal conferencing occurred among students seated at adjacent or nearby workstations as well as between pairs of students seated at tables, although the discussions at the workstations often tended toward technical or procedural matters rather than the writing assignment itself.

Summary of Week Two, Class One.

At 12:00, Brian had not yet arrived. All but two of the sixteen students present were seated at workstations. There was little conversation; most were reading and although five students had their computers on, none were actively working on a file. At about 12:05, a teacher who had been working at one of the computers announced that Brian would be late and instructed them to get into their groups and "begin their 1A responding." The students gathered around worktables in three groups, one with six students, a second with four, and a third
with five. One student remained at a workstation. The teacher moved to the small table near the technician’s desk and surveyed the room as the groups worked. The students in two groups were talking; those in the third were reading essays. At about ten after the hour, a student arrived and joined the group of four students. Brian arrived soon after and talked with the teacher, who then left.

At 12:12 Brian, standing at the front, reminded the students to use the criteria questions in their packets to evaluate each other’s essays and gave them some oral reminders of things to look for. He told them each paper should be reviewed twice and each reviewer should provide one page of comments. After the peer reviews, they were to move to computers and begin revising. The room was stuffy and Brian turned on the two air conditioners, which were quite noisy. Brian put his materials on the table near the front, and a student quickly approached for a consultation about his grade. At about 12:26 the first consultation concluded and another student approached. After a couple of minutes, the student returned to his group, and Brian took attendance and then began working on something at the technician’s computer. After about five minutes, Brian got up and went over to a workstation to help a student with a technical problem. The student had created his file at home with a different version of Word for Windows and it wouldn’t come up.

At 12:42, a student left. Still standing near the workstation of the student with the file problem, Brian told the groups to switch reviewers if they hadn’t already. After consulting briefly with one of the groups, Brian returned to the technician’s computer and continued working. All the students but one were
working in groups at tables. At about 12:48 the teacher who had left returned and sat next to Brian, and a student from the group of six began working on a computer. After a brief discussion with Brian, the teacher left. Still seated at the technician’s workstation, Brian told the groups that when they had finished the second review, they could either get a third or move to computers and begin revising. After the announcement, students began moving to computers, and Brian put some notes from a previous "Mock Grading" exercise on the board. By 1:00, twelve students were working on computers. Four students remained at worktables.

At about 1:02, standing at the whiteboard, Brian began discussing the "Mock Grading" exercise results. As Brian gave a mini-lecture, about half the students stopped working to listen. After about ten minutes, Brian passed out a handout titled "Helpful Hints: The Later Stages of the Drafting Process." He spent a few minutes pointing out and discussing passages from it as he paced through the worktable area. Three or four students continued to type, but most paused while still facing their screens, giving Brian at least partial attention. By 1:15, Brian was lecturing from near the whiteboard, and several students had returned to typing.

At 1:18 the mini-lecture ended, and Brian wrote an assignment on the whiteboard. As he wrote, a student approached. They conferred, then walked back to the student’s computer together. The student was having a technical problem, and Brian teased him about being "computer retarded." All students except one were now working on computers. At 1:21 a student got a printout,
and Brian was giving technical help to another student while a second student looked on. After a few minutes, the technical consultation seemed to have turned into a writing consultation. Two students were reading each other's hardcopy and exchanging comments. The printer worked almost silently and the same student who printed earlier got another printout. Two students near me talked quietly and Brian continued to consult with one of the two students who were having technical problems. The dominant sounds were the roar of the air conditioning and the soft click-clacking of keyboards.

At about 1:30, Brian went to help another student with a technical problem, but seemed at a loss. He took the student's disk to the technician's computer where he pulled up the file. Everything seemed to work fine, and he returned the disk to the student. Standing near the technician's computer, Brian instructed the students to either save, print, or both and suggested both "just in case." Several students asked about an extension of the due date for their papers. After a brief class discussion, Brian granted the extension. At 1:38 Brian dismissed the class, and most students left. Two students remained at computers as they saved their work, then left.

**Commentary.**

As in the previous classes, the students' degree of interest and energy levels seemed much higher when they were working on the computers than during other parts of the class, although a few students were very engaged during the peer responding session. Most students paid only minimal attention while Brian discussed the "Mock Grading" exercise and went over the handout on revision.
Many resumed working before he finished lecturing. Brian said since he had written the information on the board, the students knew what he was talking about, so he let them decide for themselves whether it was important for them to give their full attention to him or not. Somewhat surprisingly, given the focus of this class meeting, Brian's consultations with students tended to involve technical aspects of the computer and procedural issues of the class rather than the students' writing.

**Summary of Week Two, Class Two.**

Sitting on the small table beside the technician's desk, Brian talked with a fellow teacher as the students sat at tables chatting. At 12:04 Brian wrote an outline of the activities for the day along with the assignment for the next class on the whiteboard. He asked if anyone was ready to turn in the assignment today; no one was. He then asked if they had any questions or problems; they didn't. After reminding them that the paper would be due at the beginning of the next class, he asked if anyone needed to see him after class. Otherwise, he explained, he would be leaving campus to work at home. One student arranged to see him after class.

At 12:07, sitting on the edge of the table near the technician's desk, Brian delivered a very brief lecture describing their next essay assignment, the interpretive paper. He told them he wanted them to apply the writing strategies they'd learned so far to this assignment. At 12:09, Brian directed the students to "hop" on a computer and bring up the word processor while he set-up an audio tape. A student gave him a piece of sour candy and Brian made a face. As students called-up their software, Brian started E3, a handout with the lyrics to
two songs from *Phantom of the Opera*, around the room. After everyone had a
handout, Brian announced that he was going to play the songs he just passed out
and started the tape. Realizing that the students were having trouble hearing,
Brian turned off the air conditioners. The tape instantly became much more
audible; the sound of the computers’ humming was faint compared to the AC’s
loud roar. Brian sat on the table near the technician’s desk as the students sat at
their workstations following along with the lyrics on their handouts.

At 12:18, the first song finished playing, and Brian asked the students to
write for ten minutes about what they think love is for the Phantom, instructing
them to refer to the lyrics as they wrote. As the students wrote their responses,
Brian took attendance. At about 12:20, Brian went to the technician’s desk and
began working on the computer. As the students continued to write quietly, Brian
printed out a copy of the next exercise and handed it to me. After a few minutes,
Brian told the students that they had three minutes left and got up to look at a
copy of the CSU student newspaper that lay on a worktable.

At 12:26, Brian directed the students to stop typing. The students had
produced text ranging from a few lines to more than a full screen. Seated on the
small table, Brian announced that he was going to play the second song and
instructed the students to respond to it, keeping the first song in mind. As the
second song began to play, a few students continued typing for thirty seconds or
so. When the song ended, Brian gave the same directions as before, this time also
directing them to compare the two songs. While they wrote, Brian played the
"Prologue" to the *Phantom*. As the students wrote, Brian sat on the small table.
When the "Prologue" ended, Brian stopped the tape, and the students continued typing. By 12:37, about three students had stopped writing and sat staring at their screens. A fourth was using cut and paste to move, or perhaps delete, some text.

At 12:40, Brian asked them to stop typing and asked for a volunteer to read what he/she had written. There were no volunteers, so Brian called on a student. After the draftee read his text, three students volunteered to share their interpretations of the first song. Brian, seated cross-legged on one of the worktables, asked the students how these interpretations differed. After about ten student comments, Brian began recording some of their ideas on the whiteboard. He summed up their responses and, referring to their comments, gave his own interpretation. Although Brian led the discussion, the students were involved and offered comments willingly. At 12:52, Brian directed the discussion to the second song. For the most part, the same students gave responses. Concluding the discussion, Brian asked if the music helped reinforce their interpretations. One student said yes; the rest were silent. Brian described the music for them and, commenting that he was "kind of forcing it" on them, said that they didn't have to talk about it. He then gave his own interpretation of the music, summed up what he wanted the exercise to illustrate, and pointed out that sitting down at a computer and freewriting on two or three questions can be a good invention technique.

At about 1:06, Brian began the next exercise, E4—adding a new ending to a James Thurber fable. He instructed the students to form four groups around computers and explained that he was going to give them a story minus its ending
and wanted them to reach a consensus about how the story should end and then write an ending. He asked them to be sure to save their work so he could use it in the conference presentation he was preparing. After giving the instructions, Brian went around the room and loaded E4 onto the groups' computers from his floppy disk. The procedure took about four minutes. When each group had E4 displayed on its screen, Brian recapped the instructions and told them to take fifteen minutes or so to write about a "paragraph length" ending. As the groups began to get started, Brian circulated, stopping to discuss each group's ideas. After about five minutes, all the groups were talking. The conversations were fairly animated and involved. Brian allowed the groups to work on their own, but when one group was silent for a few minutes, Brian prompted them with some questions about the story. In one of the groups, a student propped her feet by the monitor. As in previous group exercises, one student in each group seemed to have control of the keyboard. As they worked, the students were animated and involved in the exercise. Brian strolled around the room, stopping to help whenever a group seemed to be stuck. At 1:22, Brian turned the air conditioners back on, and their loud clamor filled the room. Brian went to the front table and began working on something. One group told Brian it had finished. Brian said, "Okay," continued working, and members of the group relaxed and browsed through copies of the student newspaper. At 1:27, Brian asked the remaining groups to wrap it up. After about a minute, one of the groups called over to Brian and asked if they should print their work. Brian told them to print, but
reminded them not to erase their file.

By 1:33, the groups had all finished, and Brian asked a student from one of the groups to read the groups' ending. After the student finished, Brian asked them why they chose that ending, and they cited the story's beginning. Brian turned to the next group and repeated the process. He then asked the remaining groups if they had similar interpretations, and they said they did. Brian explained how the cues in the text that would make some interpretations "better" than others and pointed out that members of some groups sometimes had to argue for their interpretations using evidence from the story. After this brief lecture/discussion, Brian told them that the story had been written by humorist James Thurber and read the original ending aloud.

At 1:40, Brian asked for questions, reminded the students about the assignments and paper due the next class, and dismissed the class, reminding them once again to leave their computers on so he could retrieve their endings. After the students left, Brian saved each group's ending to his floppy disk.

Commentary.

The students seemed more involved and interested during this class than during previous meetings. More students offered comments during the discussion that followed E2 than during any discussion in the previous three classes. They seemed especially engaged during the group exercise. Most groups were rather noisy, and they willingly shared their endings with one another. Brian feels that this exercise went well "after they got into it," and believes that it "got them thinking about meaning, and who makes meaning, and . . . the dialogue between
writer and reader."

Case Study of CSU Teacher Two: Julie

Profile and Context

Julie is a teaching associate at Center State University. She earned a B.A. in English in 1989 and an M.A. in English from C.S.U. in 1991. Currently working toward her doctorate, she is specializing in narrative theory and composition theory.

Julie has taught writing for three years, all at C.S.U. During her first year, she taught freshman composition (English 110) in a traditional classroom. For the past two years, she has taught freshman composition and Informative Writing (English 301) in Center State’s Computer Enhanced Writing and Literature (CEWL) Program. While teaching in the CEWL Program, she has also held a part-time appointment as an administrative assistant to Alec, the CEWL Program Coordinator. Her administrative duties include providing technical assistance with hardware and software to teachers teaching in CEWL Program classrooms, producing documents for the CEWL Program using desktop publishing, and participating in and helping to conduct a CEWL Program research project on collaborative writing. Julie reported that she has had no teaching experience other than her three years teaching writing at C.S.U. and confirmed that the English 301 class I would be observing was the only course she was teaching during Spring Quarter, 1992.

During the fifth week of the quarter, I met with Julie in the CEWL Program office for approximately one hour and fifteen minutes to discuss her non-
teaching experience with computers, her teaching experience with and without computers, her knowledge and beliefs about teaching writing with and without computers, and her experience and duties as a CEWL Program assistant. Many of my questions followed-up responses Julie had provided on the pre-interview questionnaire (Appendix F).

Introduction to Computers and Range of Experience with Computers

Julie has used computers for her own writing for about five years. Her first experience using the computer to write came when she occasionally used her roommate’s Tandy computer as an undergraduate. After a friend urged her to visit the college’s new computer labs, she also wrote with a Macintosh using Microsoft Word. Julie really enjoyed writing in the labs. As she explained,

I used to go there because they had these really beautiful new labs and free laser printing. They were all carpeted and they had these great machines, so that’s when I really started using computers, Macs, because they [the college] made it so wonderful.

Julie uses computers for almost all her writing and occasionally for creating graphics. She listed course syllabi, personal letters, academic papers, posters, and other publications such as newsletters and the CEWL Program’s quarterly compilation of student writing A la Carte, which she compiles using the desktop publishing software Pagemaker, as the kinds of documents she writes. Brief notes or memos and first drafts are the only kinds of writing which Julie does not regularly use the computer to produce.

Julie is satisfied with her knowledge of computers and computer skills, and although she would like to learn more about computers, she does not consider finding out more about computers or developing additional computer skills a
priority. Julie listed the hardware and software which she has used on the pre-
interview questionnaire and indicated that she has had experience with both the 
MS-DOS and Macintosh platforms. In addition to the Tandy and Macintosh 
models she used as an undergraduate, she has also used an IBM clone and 
Macintosh Classic, Plus, and SE/30 models. Her present home computer is a 
Macintosh Classic, and her present office computer is a Macintosh Classic. Julie 
listed MacWrite II, Pagemaker, and Superpaint as the software she uses regularly 
for her writing, and indicated that she has also used Microsoft Word, Wordstar, 
and HyperCard. When asked if she preferred either platform, Macintosh or MS-
DOS, to the other, she explained:

I really like the Mac, but I don't think it's so much better than an 
IBM. I'm not one of these really competitive IBM types. I could 
probably be happy with an IBM if I had one, but since I have a 
Mac, I really like it. . . . My old IBM compatible had a brown 
screen and gold type or something like that, and I thought that was 
horrible, and my roommate in college had a Tandy that had a dark 
green screen and neon green type. So I think my assessment is 
partly based on the fact that I hated the screens. I like using the 
mouse, but I could certainly do word processing without it.

Julie learned to use computers for writing on her own as she composed 
using her roommate's Tandy and later as she wrote using the Macintoshes in her 
undergraduate institution's lab. She recalled that the Macintoshes and the 
Microsoft Word software in the lab were "very easy to learn." Her first formal 
introduction to computers and word processing came through the CEWL Program 
as she prepared to teach her first computer-enhanced composition class.
Attitudes and Beliefs about Computers and Writing

Julie enjoys writing with computers because she feels computers make revising easier and because she likes the appearance of her documents when she creates them using computers. When asked to complete the sentence, "I don’t like writing with computers because," on the pre-interview questionnaire, Julie responded, "I don’t have a laptop. I wish I always had my computer with me."

When asked about this response during our interview, Julie explained that she found the question difficult to answer because she couldn’t "think of anything very negative to say."

Julie does not believe writing with computers has changed her writing process but does believe that they have made writing easier for her:

I think my writing process now is the same as my writing process was before I started using computers because I didn’t start using them until my junior year in college, and I think my process was probably pretty well established. I use the same process but use the computer to make it easier and faster.

Julie described her writing process by explaining,

Usually I do my invention or first drafts with pen and paper, and I usually end up putting that into the computer, so it sort of looks like an outline. . . . Then I leave a lot of blank space, and print it out, and I use the pen and paper, and then I put that into the computer. Sometimes I’ll do that about twenty times in a row. I’m sort of leaving spaces and adding things in and changing things around. And usually as I’m writing a draft, I start at the beginning every time because I feel that I have to make everything as perfect as I can as far as I can get through the paper.

Sources and Assessment of Knowledge about Teaching Writing

On the pre-interview questionnaire, I asked Julie to indicate the degree of importance of six items in terms of their contributions to her general knowledge about teaching composition. In a separate question, I asked her to rate the same
items in terms of their contribution to her knowledge of teaching composition using computers. Each item was rated as either very important, important, not very important, unimportant, or not applicable (Table 9). During our interview, Julie discussed the contributions of these items in more detail.

Julie considered the contributions of her colleagues and associates and her teaching experience "very important" to her general knowledge about teaching composition and to her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. Although Julie feels that her colleagues and associates have always been significant influences on her teaching, she believes that they became even more important when she began teaching in the CEWL Program. As she explained,

I like teaching in a program like this [the CEWL Program] that provides a smaller group of colleagues that you're working with. . . . You feel more intimacy within the Program and you have more of a chance, especially since we have a one week training workshop at the beginning of the year, to talk to other people, get to know them, understand their pedagogies, understand neat things that they do with computers in their classrooms, and so on. I mean, I think it's always been pretty important for me to talk to my colleagues about teaching, and that's probably one of the things that has had the biggest influence on my own teaching, but I would say it's just even easier in this program, the computer program, because of the way it's set up.

Similarly, while Julie feels that her teaching experience has made the most important contribution to her teaching both with and without computers, she believes that it has been especially important for her in the computer-enhanced environment:

The more you do it the easier it gets, especially with the computers. . . . I think students feel more comfortable in a computer environment if they have a teacher who feels comfortable with the computers, and so, the more times you've taught in the computer classroom, the more disasters and tragedies and computer problems
you've seen, and so the more you're able to solve. . . . The first time you see a student lose a document you might think, "Oh! Gone forever!" and the second time you see a student lose a document, you might just click on the menu and find it because they've opened a new document on top of it, and they think it's gone forever, but it's really not. And if their document is gone forever, at least you've handled it before.

Julie rated the contributions of her graduate and undergraduate coursework differently in terms of their importance to her general knowledge about teaching writing and her specific knowledge about teaching writing with computers. Julie said that she considered her graduate coursework "important" to her general knowledge about teaching writing because of the seminar she took on teaching writing that is required of all beginning teaching assistants at C.S.U. and because she is currently enrolled in a composition theory course. She indicated that she considered her graduate coursework "not applicable" to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers because she had not taken a course dealing with the subject. She added, however, that she would be taking a course on computers and composition the next quarter and was "really looking forward" to it. Julie rated the contribution of her undergraduate coursework as "not very important" to her general knowledge about teaching writing and "not applicable" to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers. She said that she took only literature courses as an undergraduate and explained,

I learned techniques from the way professors taught me, but not specifically about composition. I didn't even take a freshman comp course, so I might have learned as much from my philosophy professor, my math professor, my econ professor, or whomever.
Table 9: Julie’s Ranking of Items Contributing to Her General Knowledge about Teaching Writing and Knowledge about Teaching Writing with Computers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues/Associates</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coursework</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Coursework</td>
<td>Not Very Impt.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journals</td>
<td>Not Very Impt.</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Conferences</td>
<td>Important.</td>
<td>Very Impt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Julie considered the contribution of professional journals as "not very important" to her general knowledge about teaching writing and "unimportant" to her specific knowledge about teaching writing with computers. On the pre-interview questionnaire, she reported that she "browses through several journals at the library occasionally, mostly those related to nineteenth century literature."

When asked to describe the contributions of her reading during our interview, she explained,

This quarter I'm taking my first comp theory course, and I just started reading journals like *College Composition and Communication* and *College English*. . . . I think they're . . . something that I'm going to get into with my general exams. Composition theory is going to be one of my areas . . . but it just hasn't been something I've focused on up to now because I have focused mostly on literature.

Julie rated the contribution of the remaining item, workshops and conferences, "important" to her general knowledge about teaching writing and "very important" to her knowledge about teaching writing with computers.

Commenting on these ratings she said,

I was referring to the CEWL training workshop held at the beginning of the year. The first year that I taught in this program, it was really important for me to learn a lot of new stuff. The second year I helped plan it, and I learned a lot from my colleagues, so I really think it's important and useful.

Julie indicated that she found it difficult to access her general knowledge about teaching composition separately from her knowledge about teaching composition with computers. As she explained,

I only taught for three quarters before I started teaching in the computer classroom, and the first two quarters that you teach here you have to use [the writing program's suggested] syllabus and textbook. So my third quarter I tried to do different things, and I
made a course packet. I really... enjoyed doing it, but it was really only one quarter. I've been teaching for two years in a computer classroom, so I think that's part of my formation as a teacher, so it's sort of difficult for me to separate my knowledge about teaching writing from my knowledge about teaching writing with computers.

When asked to access her total knowledge about teaching writing, with or without computers, Julie replied, "I think I'm competent. I think I'm really good with the Macintosh."

**Beliefs about Teaching Writing with Computers**

**How Computers are Used in Writing Classrooms.**

Julie believes the most prevalent use of computers in writing classrooms is for revision. She feels that computers are also frequently used for collaboration and invention. She does not consider any of these uses more important than the others and explained,

I think when computers really become a part of a student's writing and part of a writing class, everything that you do on them is important and that [the computer] just becomes an integrated part of your writing.

**What Writing Teachers Who Teacher with Computers Should Know About Computers and About Computers and Writing.**

When asked what knowledge of computers teachers who teach writing with computers should have, Julie indicated that she feels teachers need "a very basic knowledge." She cited the training provided during the CEWL Program's workshop as an example of the sort of knowledge teachers should acquire:

We have a pretty basic training program for the teachers who teach in this Program and I think it's pretty good. It familiarizes them with the Program, and I think they don't need to know a lot about computers, but they need to know enough to feel confident in the classroom so that if their students run into a problem, they can help fix it.
She added that the need for this basic knowledge is only somewhat mitigated by the availability of technical help:

We have this office right here, and I work in this office, and I'm constantly running down and helping teachers with emergency situations and problems and whatever, but for students who have never used a computer before, it helps them a lot to have a teacher who feels comfortable in a computer classroom.

Julie does not feel teachers who teach writing with computers need any particular knowledge about the relationship between computers and writing, but believes that sharing ideas and pedagogical strategies is "very interesting and helpful."

The Effects and Potential Effects of Computers on the Teaching of Writing.

When asked to describe the most important effects computers have had on composition teaching so far and their most important potential effects, Julie declined to comment, explaining, "I don't know if I've studied the effects enough to be qualified for answer that."

Assessment of the Teaching Environment: Instructional Support, Autonomy, and the Classroom Environment

Teaching Writing in the English Department's Traditional Classrooms.

Julie responded to the question "What is it like to teach composition in a traditional classroom in the Department of English at Center State University?" by reiterating that she had only taught writing without computers during her first year at Center State. When asked to describe the support for her teaching she received from the Department, she mentioned the required seminar on teaching composition and the availability of help from the Writing Program staff. Julie said that she enjoyed teaching in the program and felt she had "a lot of freedom and
support."

Teaching Writing in the English Department's Computer Enhanced Writing and Literature Program.

When asked to respond to the question, "What is it like to teach English 301 in the Computer Enhanced Writing and Literature Program at Center State University?" Julie responded, "It's great." She is pleased with the amount and kinds of support the CEWL Program provides for her teaching, and when asked to describe this support, she listed the training workshop given each fall and the availability of CEWL Program assistants such as herself to help with emergencies and technical difficulties. She reiterated that she feels a great sense of community among the teachers in the CEWL Program and values the support and ideas her peers provide. She also indicated that she has "total freedom" to determine the pedagogy and materials she uses in her classes.

When asked if there were any changes she would suggest to improve the support the CEWL Program provides for its teachers, Julie replied,

I would definitely want e-mail for the labs, and that's something that we're working on for next year. Maybe, *HyperCard*, probably *Pagemaker*. I mean it wouldn't be applicable to every course, but it would be really neat to have it in the lab.

She believes that the Program is "pretty flexible" and responsive to suggestions from teachers, noting that the agenda for the CEWL's yearly workshop is partially determined by suggestions and requests from teachers.

When asked if she had ever suggested any changes in the policies of the CEWL Program as they relate to her teaching or requested that the Program adopt a particular text or purchase a particular piece or kind of equipment,
computer hardware, or software, Julie explained that because she is an
administrative assistant for the Program and works in the same office with Alec,
the Program coordinator, she makes suggestions to him almost constantly:

I pester [Alec] all the time. "How about if we get three more laser
printers?" or "How about if we get System 7’s?" or "How about we
get Pagemaker 5.0?" because we always get literature from hardware
companies and software companies. We’re always expanding and
adding things. Right now we’re looking at MacWrite Pro, for
example, for the labs, and [Alec] and I have been talking with Claris
[the company which markets the software] so, it’s just a constant
thing in our office. We’re always finding out about new stuff first,
and ordering it when we think it would be neat, and we can afford it
and so on. . . . I think most of the stuff I suggested is stuff that we
all think we need. I mean, we can’t afford millions of laser printers
for every lab or for every desk, so some of it is a little out of the
question, but [email] for the labs is something that we want to
incorporate by next fall, and MacWrite Pro is something that we’re
working to get into the labs if we can, so I don’t know how many of
the ideas are mine and how many are ours and so on. It’s just a
constant collaborative, progressive process.

Assessment of the Classroom: Arrangement, Hardware, and Software.

Julie teaches her computer-enhanced English 301 class in Classroom D, the
CEWL Program’s Macintosh-equipped collaborative classroom. When asked to
comment on the arrangement of the room, Julie replied,

It’s neat. The students are excited because they have this great
classroom. There are no bolted down chairs. We have tables where
students can bring drinks and work with each other. We have these
neat machines that make their writing a lot easier and a lot more
fun.

When asked if she would like to change anything about the room’s arrangement
or non-computer equipment, Julie said that she could not think of anything she
would change.

Julie likes the Macintosh SE/30s with which the room is equipped. She
explained that she prefers the Macintosh SE/30s to the Macintosh Pluses available in other CEWIL Program classrooms because the SE/30s are faster and, since they are newer, have fewer problems. She also prefers the Macintosh SE/30s to the IBM PS/2s in Classroom E, even though those computers are also new:

I like the Macintosh as opposed to the IBM just because [the Macintoshes] are "friendly." The students like them. They're easy to use. You can teach students how to use the Macintosh in about an hour and they'll be fine. I have a Mac at home, so I feel more comfortable with them. I just like Macintoshes because I use them all the time.

When asked to comment on the Appleshare network used in Classroom D, Julie remarked,

I don't think people use it as much as it could be used. And there are definitely problems with it. Like if somebody accidently loosens a link, all the machines in line after that one get knocked out . . . but I think it's neat to be able to use a network, and I've used it occasionally in my classes.

Although there are paint and graphics programs available on the network server in Classroom D, Julie uses only the word processor MacWrite II regularly in her classes. Julie likes MacWrite II because she finds it easy to use and teach and feels that it has enough capabilities to produce high quality documents. She believes that sometimes teachers and students who criticize the program just haven't used it or explored it enough to be aware of all the things they could do with it:

I think a lot of people complain about it. They'll say things like, "I don't like MacWrite II because it doesn't have a thesaurus," and it does have a thesaurus. . . . I think it's a good program that can do a lot. There are better programs out there, but it's certainly adequate. . . . I think a lot of times people don't try to play with all those commands. . . . But I don't think it's because the program's poorly designed. I think it's because people develop fondnesses for the
programs that they use, so if someone is familiar with using MS Word and they use it all the time, and they switch to MacWrite, they'll say, "Well, I don't like MacWrite because it can't do this," but they just haven't explored it fully yet because they still are attached to MS Word. I don't think it's only that, but I do think MacWrite II is a really good program.

Julie has also taught computer-enhanced classes in CEWL Program Classrooms A and B. Comparing her experience teaching in classroom D to her experience teaching in these rooms, Julie commented,

I like [D] the best. I've only taught in [A], [B], and [D], and [D] is excellent because it's big enough that you have room to move around, but it's not so big that there's too much empty space. There are four large [vertical] monitors which makes collaboration a lot easier. Students can all see a paper at once a lot easier.... [Classroom D] has four round tables and that makes group work easier. We set up [B] in kind of a different way, I guess last fall, where we had computers in one half of the room and tables in one half of the room, and that works okay... although it's sort of a pain because if you want to have a discussion for part of the class time and then computers for part of the class time, you have to deal with the logistics of moving chairs back and forth and stuff like that. And I also hate that room because it's got Mac Pluses, so that sort of influences my hatred of that configuration. [A] is okay, but it's a little bit too crowded, and I like round tables better than rectangular ones.

When asked if she would like to make any changes to the hardware or software available in Classroom D or add any additional hardware or software if she had the opportunity, Julie said,

I would still have twenty students. I'd have something like a Mac IIci, but I would have at least five [vertical] monitors in my classroom to facilitate collaboration. I would have... MacWrite Pro. I want to play with that a little more before I decide if I want that, but I want something like that. I would definitely want something like Aspects [conferencing software] in my classroom, but I would want it on the network. Right now, the way we have it is you have twenty disks that you can install in the lab if you want to use it. You can't save on it and you can't print, so it's good for creating dialogues between your students, but it would be even better if you
could save those dialogues or print those dialogues and somehow start students on a paper like that. So I would definitely have Aspects with the capability to save and print. Definitely laser printers for everyone. Students hate dot matrix printers. They're so loud and disruptive, and they always get jammed. Maybe two laser printers in the classroom. That would be fine. But I don't need... Superpaint or anything like that.

Julie added that except for her comments about Aspects, most of these changes are just "minor things" or "things we would do if we had an unlimited budget" and emphasized that she is very satisfied with the current arrangement and equipment in Classroom D.

Goals and Pedagogy for Computer-Enhanced English 301

When asked to describe her philosophy and goals in English 301, Julie responded,

When I teach my classes, I try to help my students to integrate their reading, and their class participation or discussion, and their writing skills--and to think critically, and write critically, and to read critically. I want them to integrate those aspects of the writing process, and computers are a tool to help them do that.

Julie feels that her philosophy and goals for teaching writing in the computer-enhanced classroom do differ from those she had when she taught writing in a traditional classroom, but probably because they have evolved as she gained more experience teaching. Laughing, she explained,

My philosophy and goals when I taught without computers were survival. I'd just started teaching, so... learning how to be a teacher was my main goal. So they probably have changed, but not necessarily because of computers.

Julie's English 301 syllabus explains that this class has a significant collaborative component. In addition to stressing that class and group discussion will be an important and regular part of the course, the syllabus informs the
students that two of the four required essays will be written collaboratively. Students were required to sign a "Collaboration Contract" at the beginning of the term specifying that they understood that the course depends on "cooperative interaction between members of each group" and were willing to make a commitment to group work (Appendix F). Near the beginning of the term, Julie assigned students to five collaborative groups in which they would work during the quarter. In addition to discussing the collaborative nature of the course, the syllabus also explains that the course is designed to improve students' expository writing skills by providing opportunities to read and respond to essays, and to compose coherent essays (both individually and collaboratively) related to these readings. . . . The primary goal of this course is to help you to think more profoundly and to write more ambitiously than you have before.

Class time is set aside in the syllabus for discussion every week except week ten. Besides days reserved for discussion, Julie also scheduled class time for "writing workshops" several times during the quarter. Discussing the role of the workshops, she explained,

The students are writing two individual papers and two collaborative papers. When they're working on a collaborative paper, they might have a lot of time in class to work together because I know they need it. It's hard for them to meet outside of class, and they need that time together in class. They might have more frequent computer time when they're working on collaborative papers, and then we might not use them at all for the next two weeks.

Two other regular parts of the class were in-class activities and conferences. The in-class activities were scheduled approximately every other week for the first eight weeks and were loosely divided into "writing assignments" and "exercises."

When asked to describe the assignments and exercises and their purpose, Julie
said,

For the writing assignments, they would write something as a group, print it, and turn it in. . . . The ones I called exercises usually . . . have them use a concept from what we read, or work with a way of reading but I don’t expect them to always to write something or to turn what they wrote in. . . . The purpose of the in-class activities is to get them working, get them inventing, help them revise, help them write.

Individual and group conferences were another important element of the class. On the original syllabus, one day of week six was set aside for individual conferences and one day of week ten was reserved for group conferences. On the revised syllabus distributed during week five, an additional day (a Thursday rather than a regularly scheduled meeting day) was designated for individual conferences. The conferences were used primarily to discuss drafts of specific assignments.

When asked to describe the role of the computer in her pedagogy, Julie said that students use the computer for word processing and explained that she believes that the computers facilitate collaboration in the class. The only software her students used regularly was the word processor MacWrite II, although on one occasion Julie attempted to use Aspects, a package that allows on-line conferencing and collaboration.

Julie considers composing using word processing a very important element of the class. She requires students to complete all drafts, essays, and in-class writing assignments on the computers using MacWrite II and estimates that students use the computer during class for word processing an average of once a week. Julie does not use any exercises or assignments specifically designed to teach students how to use the computer as a writing tool, but does try to help
them learn to take advantage of the capacities of the computer as they compose their papers. As she explained,

For example, I was just talking about ways to use the computer as a more effective tool earlier today. A group of students were working on their paper, and they needed help formatting it. Actually, instead of just telling them how to do it, I just sat down with them and said, "Okay, use this command, and highlight this, and change this" and showed them how to do it. Or I showed another group how to copy something from one disk into a document that's on another disk. That's pretty important. They need that kind of help to use the computer as an effective tool, and it helps to show them on a one-on-one basis.

When asked if she uses the computer for similar demonstrations or modelling for the whole class, Julie indicated that she usually does not and remarked,

I don't need to do that for the whole class, and there's no way that I could keep up with the whole class and all their questions anyway. The only time I would do that is at the beginning of the quarter when I teaching them how to use the computer. I might show them, "Look, here's how you do X." I might do that once, and then they can teach themselves.

Julie considers the computer an important tool for helping students with invention and revision and said that she has several ways that she uses computers for these purposes. Referring specifically to invention, she explained,

Aspects is one way I tried to use the computer for invention. I introduced a collaborative paper, but I messed up the Aspects, so it didn't actually work and I played a musical computers game instead. But what I wanted to do was get my students together in groups using Aspects. I introduced the paper that day, and I wanted them to start talking to each other about their different ideas about how a group could work together on this project.

Julie added that she was particularly disappointed that she was unable to get the software to work because she felt it would have added a useful dimension to the exercise:
It was their first time to work collaboratively on a paper, and so I thought that it would be a particularly effective tool to use because everyone would have an equal and anonymous voice because they wouldn’t necessarily know where the dialogue was coming from, but they could all respond to it. Sometimes the students feel more comfortable saying what’s on their mind at the computer screen than they would actually feel face to face with their group members. We ended up just doing a musical computers exercise instead . . . . I had them all get started and then I had them switch computers within their group and have them respond to what the person before them had written, and so on. I try to think of new ways to get them inventing and starting with their papers and so on.

When asked to describe any other activities or exercises which she uses to teach or enhance invention or revision, Julie mentioned that she had recently used a revision exercise she called "found poetry" (Writing Assignment 3, Appendix F).

Describing the exercise, she said,

I took a poem and distorted it in five different ways. I split my class into groups and had each group work on a unique version of the poem using different techniques that I assigned to them. It was a way of getting them to think about rhetorical choices and the effects they have.

Since Julie does not teach grammar or mechanics in her class, she does not use the computer for either purpose. However, she pointed out that she does expect students to use the spelling checker before turning in their papers and warns students on the syllabus that if they turn in papers which have not been spell checked and thoroughly proofread or which do not have the required format, their grades will be lowered one letter, and the paper will be returned to them to reprint in correct form.

Julie considers the computer essential to the collaborative element of the class and indicated that the computer is used to facilitate collaboration at least once a week, either through in-class exercises or as students compose their
collaborative papers. When asked to comment on the computer's contribution in this area, Julie remarked,

The computer is very important to collaboration. They [students] can exchange disks or they can all look at one thing and revise it together. They can pass the keyboard around and say, "Well, let's look at this and how this changes" or "Look what I came up with. Let's just add this in." You know, they'll just stick another disk in the computer and add in a new paragraph or whatever. It just makes everything so much easier logistically.

Julie also remarked that students find the four vertical monitors in Classroom D quite helpful while working at the computers together:

They [the vertical monitors] are very helpful. I only have four large [vertical] monitors in the classroom now, so there's always one group the can't be on the [vertical] monitor. They would rather have the larger screen because it's easier for everyone to see when they're working together and because, I think, they get a better sense of their paper when they can see a full page at a time.

Julie also considers the computer very important for creating and distributing class materials and for teacher-student conferences. Explaining how she uses the computer to create and distribute materials, Julie said,

I don't use the network or anything like that to distribute class materials, although I could. I meant it's essential for me because I compose things on my computer. I give them hardcopy usually. I don't give it to them on disks or on the network or anything like that, but I like my handouts to look nice.

Commenting on the helpfulness of the computer during teacher-student conferences, Julie remarked,

Usually once a paper in my class I meet with them. I'll meet with them individually when they're working on individual papers and in groups when they're working on group papers. The computer is pretty helpful because sometimes we'll look at something together [on the computer] the way their collaborative groups do.

Although she spends some class time teaching students basic word
processing skills during first-year writing courses, Julie does not devote class time to teaching students to operate the computer or *MacWrite II* during English 301. The syllabus informs students that if they do not know how to use computers or *MacWrite II*, they must attend one of the workshops offered by the CEWL Program to familiarize themselves with the equipment and software they will be using. The syllabus also notes that the *Reference Guide to the Macintosh* compiled by the CEWL Program is available at a local copy center for students who wish to purchase it. The only class time devoted to computer instruction was a few minutes spent teaching students how the network in the classroom works.

When asked if her use of the computer in her classes had changed during the two years she has been using computers in her teaching, Julie replied,

> I don't know if it's really changed or it's just gotten better in that I'm more comfortable with them being there. At first I didn't use the much because I was afraid of what would happen if something went wrong. Now I use them more, and for different activities: group writing, "musical" computer discussions, "found" poetry, and so forth.

**Assessment of Computer-Enhanced English 301 and Reflections on the Computer in English Studies**

When asked to describe the three or four most important advantages and disadvantages she experiences when using the computer to teach writing on the pre-interview questionnaire, Julie listed the students' enthusiasm for using the computers, increased time for revision, and the students' belief that they are "learning more when they learn to use computers, too" as the most important advantages. When asked how the computer contributes to these outcomes, Julie explained,
Well, especially in freshman courses, they want to be college students and use computers, and they feel like it helps their writing. It makes their papers look neat, and they have a lot more time for writing in class, so they feel like they're learning a lot, which they are.

The disadvantages Julie listed on the questionnaire were "computer disaster stories," the inconvenience of the campus computer labs, and the loss of class time because of computer instruction. During our interview, Julie emphasized that she did not consider these to be major drawbacks, commenting, "Those are disadvantages that people talk about. So, yes, they are disadvantages, but they are minor compared to the advantages. I don't consider them that important."

Commenting on the problem of students' access to computers in campus labs and their willingness to use labs outside of class, Julie said,

It's not too bad in the Mac labs, but we teach some courses in an IBM Word for Windows environment and it's a problem there because [the CEWL classroom] is one of only two Windows labs on campus . . . and not that many people have Word for Windows at home. A lot of dorms and apartments have Macintoshes. It's not really that big of a problem, except for commuter students who have weird work schedules and just can't ever be at the labs during lab hours. So we try to always tell them on the first day of class, "Look, if you can't come to the labs during lab times because you're worried that you're going to be attacked on campus or your work schedule won't allow it, or whatever, just drop the class.

Julie believes that few students, perhaps one or two, end up dropping the class.

On the syllabus Julie informs students that they must write their assignments using the Macintosh and MacWrite software. When asked if students sometimes compose or want to compose their assignments in longhand or using other hardware or software, Julie replied,

Yes. On the first day of class, sometimes they'll say, "I didn't know this class was going to be taught on the Macintosh." Sometimes
they'll say, "Well, I have a PC at home, and I want to use that" and I'll say, "Well, take either the courses offered in the IBM lab with *Windows* or just take a regular section and use your own computer." But I tell them on the first day and if they don't want to do that, then they don't have to stay in the class. I tell them on the first day, too, if you can't type, then it could be a problem. But if you can't type and you want to learn, you'll certainly get plenty of practice this quarter.

Julie added that most students have some keyboarding skills and are aware that the class uses computers when they enroll. When asked how many had had a previous writing course taught with computers or had had prior experience writing with computers, Julie estimated that one or two out of the fifteen in her class had taken English 110 through the CEWL Program and almost all had had prior experience with computers.

Julie says she loves teaching English 301 in a computer-enhanced classroom and would like to continue to teach her classes using computers. When asked if she had considered how she might approach teaching writing if she returned to a traditional classroom, Julie responded,

That's my worst nightmare. I don't know. It would be really hard for me to teach the class that I teach without computers. I'd feel lost. I'd really have to revamp my whole class. I'm not sure how I would approach it, really.

Julie also believes other English classes, such as literature or linguistics courses, could be taught using computers and commented, "Yes. I'd teach all my classes using computers. I can't think of any that I wouldn't because writing is always part of English classes."
Description of Materials from Julie's English 301 Class

Julie submitted eighteen items which she distributed in her English 301 class during Spring Quarter, 1992: a collaboration contract; a consent form allowing work produced in the class to be used for research purposes; a collaboration compatibility survey; a schedule listing the addresses and hours of operation of the Macintosh labs on campus; a list of the students' phone numbers; an issue of A la Cante containing work done by students in the class; the original course syllabus; a revised course syllabus; four essay assignments; four in-class writing assignments/exercises; and two handouts which reproduce students' responses to an in-class writing assignment and an in-class exercise (Appendix F).

The original syllabus is three and a half pages long. The first two pages provide standard course information such as Julie's office hours, her home and office phone numbers, a brief statement on the purpose and goals of the course, and the course policies on grading, plagiarism, and attendance. They also list the required materials: Ways of Reading edited by David Bartholomae and Anthony Petrosky, two 3.5 inch computer disks, a good dictionary, and a grammar handbook. Students are also informed that they must complete their assignments using Macintosh computers and MacWrite II software. The revised syllabus is an amended schedule of activities for the last five weeks of class.

Each of the four essay assignments asks student to write an essay drawing on a reading from Bartholomae and Petrosky's Ways of Reading. For Essay One the students were asked to draw on a Paulo Friere essay to describe and "read" an incident from their own education. Although this essay was to be written
individually, the students were encouraged to discuss their ideas in their collaborative groups outside of class and told that one class period would be set aside for them to respond to one another’s drafts. For Essay Two, each collaborative group was assigned to write a five-seven page essay in response to their reading of Ralph Waldo Emerson’s "The American Scholar." Julie suggested two options: to compare the education of "an American scholar" at Center State to Emerson’s vision or to imagine and describe how a modern teacher might encourage an Emersonian use of books. They were also invited to propose other more "creative" topics to Julie. Students were also given two options for Essay 3, which was written individually in response to an essay by Mark Crispin Miller. For one option, students were asked to read a television program or advertisement as Miller might. For option two, students were asked to read a program or advertisement showing how and why they believe Miller’s critical method be wrong or incomplete. Day one of the first week I observed was set aside for students to respond to one another’s drafts of this essay. For the final assignment, Essay Four, students were asked to write a collaborative essay in response to their readings of a Roland Barthes essay. The options they were given for this essay were similar to those for Essay Three. Students could either give a Barthesian reading of something from American culture or provide a reading that revises Barthes and shows where his critical method is incorrect or incomplete. This essay was begun during my second week of observations.

In addition to the four essays, students also completed four in-class writing
assignments or exercises (Table 10). The first, Exercise 1, was scheduled during the first week of class. It required students to revise the first drafts of their essays drawing on their readings of essays by Paulo Friere and Adrienne Rich. The second, Exercise 2, was scheduled during the second week of class. For this assignment, the students were instructed to read and discuss two poems by Adrienne Rich using discussion questions provided by Julie. For the third exercise, Writing Assignment 1, each collaborative group was given a version of the poem "City Limits" by A. R. Ammons and asked to revise it according Julie's instructions. For one group Julie eliminated words from the poem; for another group, she removed all punctuation marks; for a third group, she removed all line breaks. These groups were asked to provide their own words, punctuation marks, or line breaks to replace those Julie had removed. The final group was asked to rewrite the original poem in prose. Each group was also told to provide an explanation for the choices it made while completing the exercise. During the next class meeting, Julie passed out copies of the groups’ responses, Response 1, which they discussed in class. For the final in-class writing activity, Writing Assignment 2, the students watched and responded to an episode of the Simpsons after reading an essay by Roland Barthes. The students responded collaboratively in their groups and Julie distributed copies of their group work, Response 2, which they discussed in class the next day.
Table 10: Writing Exercises Assigned in Julie’s Eng. 301 Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise 1</td>
<td>Revise 1st drafts based on reading and discussion of Friere and Rich</td>
<td>written, begun in-class, completed out of class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise 2</td>
<td>read and discuss 2 Adrienne Rich poems</td>
<td>oral, in-class</td>
<td>handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assign. 1</td>
<td>revise a poem by replacing missing words, line breaks, etc.</td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer, handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assign. 2</td>
<td>Respond to an episode of the <em>Simpsons</em></td>
<td>written, in-class</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations of Julie’s Computer-Enhanced English 310 Class

Julie’s English 301 section met on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays from 2:00 until 3:18 p.m. in CEWL Classroom D. Since the class was designated as collaborative, Julie had divided the students into five working groups, which I designated Groups A-E. Each group was composed of three students.

At Julie’s request, during my six observations of her class, I remained seated at the technician’s workstation near the front of the room and did not interact with the students in any way. During most class sessions, I also did not interact with Julie, except for asking or answering an occasional question when she approached me. However, from my vantage point at the technician’s desk I was able to observe the entire classroom quite well. My first classroom observation began on Monday during the seventh week of the term.

Summary of Week One, Class One.

As I entered the room at about 2:00, Julie was talking to several students very informally. There were seven students present; two were working on something at computer workstations, while the rest sat at tables in the center of the room. At 2:03 two more students arrived, went to workstations, and began working. At 2:05 Julie made two announcements to the class and then discussed the day’s responding session. Since their drafts of Essay 3, the assignment to which the students would be responding, had been written individually rather than collaboratively, Julie asked the students to describe what they were working on so she could put them in working groups based on the similarity of their topics.

After each student described his or her essay topic, Julie suggested three working
groups (Groups 1, 2, 3). As the students began forming groups, one student moved to a workstation in the back and began working alone.

For approximately the next fifty minutes, the students worked on revising their essays. As the groups began working at tables, the atmosphere was casual. Although signs were posted on the wall forbidding food and drinks, I noticed one student had a soft drink. At 2:11 a student arrived late and, after speaking briefly with Julie, joined Group 2. At 2:12 two students from Group 2 began working around a single computer. As the students worked, Julie circulated around the room consulting with groups and pairs of students. Most consultations seem to be related to the assignment rather than technical or procedural matters. As they worked, students periodically stopped to talk with students in other groups or moved to a nearby computer to write for a moment before returning to their groups. Occasionally a student would leave the room and return a few minutes later. As the murmur of the students' conversations mingled with the roar of the two window air conditioners, the classroom became increasingly noisy. By 2:32 the students in Groups 2 and 3 were beginning to move to computer workstations, and by 2:35 half the students were working on computers.

At 2:38 Group 1 broke up and moved to nearby computers while a student from Group 2 sat reading his textbook at a worktable. He was the only student not at a workstation. The classroom was fairly quiet, except for the air conditioners' constant whir. At 2:39 Julie left the room; no one took visible notice. After a couple of minutes, Julie returned and circulated around the room unobtrusively looking over the students' shoulders as they wrote. Finding no one
who seemed to need or want help, she sat down at a workstation near the laser printer and began reading papers from a folder.

At about 2:55 the student who had been reading at a table moved to a workstation while Julie went to consult with a student at a workstation and the laser printer began to print. Suddenly the hum of conversation began to compete with the sound of the air conditioners. By 3:00 students were packing up to leave. As they prepared to go, Julie sat on the technician's desk and reminded them of a reading assignment. As they walked past her, she returned a graded assignment to them. Catching most of them before they left, she solicited volunteers for a CEWL Program survey project. At 3:06 Julie turned off a computer left on by a student while three students remained seated at a table discussing their returned essay. Julie approached the table and discussed the essay with them. At 3:09 the three students left and the class was over.

Commentary.

The atmosphere in the classroom was very informal. For most of the class, the students seemed to control their own activities, deciding how and how much to respond to one another's writing and when to stop discussion and move to computers to begin writing. As the students worked, their discussions shifted periodically between assignment-related talk and casual conversation. After Julie placed students in groups and set the guidelines for the day's assignment, she merged into the flow of the class, moving quietly from group to group consulting, commenting, and answering questions or reading while seated near the front. Most of her discussions with students seemed to be about their drafts.
Commenting on my observation about the signs forbidding food and drink in the room, Julie explained that during classes teachers are free to set their own policies. The signs are posted by the ACO and apply only to open lab time.

Summary of Week One, Class Two.

I arrived at the classroom at approximately 2:00 and found Julie conferring with a student while standing near the technician's desk; the student was requesting permission to leave class early. The room was quiet except for the sound of the laser printer as it printed a student's document. At 2:05 class began; twelve students were seated around three tables. Julie called for their attention and distributed an issue of the CEWL publication A la Carte containing two versions of the poem "City Limits" by A.R. Ammons which had been composed by students in the class in response to Writing Assignment 2 during week four. Calling the students' attention to the poems, Julie said that she would like to contribute some of the class's collaborative writing to the next issue.

At 2:09, after taking a seat at the central table, Julie said, "Let's talk about Roland Barthes" and asked the students to spread out. After repositioning themselves, the students were seated around the outside of the tables forming a rough semi-circle around Julie. The atmosphere seemed relaxed; Julie had a Diet Coke. As a student arrived late, Julie asked for someone to "describe Barthes' project" in the essay they had read. A student responded to her request and a discussion of Barthes began.

The next forty-four minutes of class were devoted to a discussion of Barthes. As Julie directed the discussion, the students were attentive and
involved. During the first thirty minutes of the discussion, Julie contributed twenty-eight questions, comments or summaries of students' comments. Students contributed thirty-four comments or questions. The students' comments were almost always directed at Julie, who summed up, restated, and redirected their remarks. The discussion was not dominated by one student but was also not evenly participated in by all students. There were ten student contributors; but the majority of comments were made by five or six of those students with occasional comments added by the others.

At about 2:36, the discussion became more animated as it turned from French wrestling and striptease (Barthes' subjects) to the American Gladiators, a subject offered by students in comparison to Barthes'. Julie asked the students to read the American Gladiators the way Barthes would and the students suddenly began talking all at once, directing their comments both to Julie and to each other. (Although comments were difficult to track accurately because students were often talking at the same time, I counted twenty-three student comments and seven teacher comments during these twelve minutes.) By 2:48 the discussion had settled down again. Saying that she felt they had skipped over a preliminary definition of Barthes' project, Julie asked the students to return to Barthes and discuss what they thought his purpose was. The discussion became much more teacher-centered during this period. Julie made eight comments, the students seven.

At 2:54, the students began asking Julie questions about the assignment for Friday. Julie announced that she would be bringing in a cultural icon for them to
read as Barthes would, then dismissed the class. The students began talking among themselves as they prepared to leave. The student who had printed something at the beginning of class went to the laser printer and retrieved his document before leaving.

**Commentary.**

 Except for five minutes at the beginning and about ten minutes at the end, the class was devoted to a discussion of an essay by Roland Barthes. Although a bit more formal than the previous class, this class also had a relaxed atmosphere. When it focused on Barthes, the pace and focus of the discussion was controlled by Julie. Most, but not all, students were involved and seemed interested in this discussion. During the twelve minutes that the discourse centered on the American Gladiators, the energy level in the room was very high. The students dominated the conversation and directed their questions and comments to one another. When the discussion returned to Barthes, Julie resumed direction of the discourse. Only one student used a computer during this class, making a printout before the class began and retrieving it from the printer as class ended.

**Summary of Week One, Class Three.**

 As class began at 2:00, Julie returned some assignments. The students looked over their papers and talked quietly among themselves while Julie wheeled a video player and monitor into position near the front center of the room. Julie passed out Writing Assignment 2 and explained the assignment it describes. Standing beside the monitor, she explained that they would be watching an
episode of the *Simpsons* and then reading it as Barthes might. At 2:10 a student arrived hoping to use the lab, discovered a class, and left after apologizing to Julie.

Julie started the video at 2:11 and went to her office to get the group disks the students would be using later in the class. At 2:12 a student arrived late as another advanced the video past the opening commercials. At 2:13 Julie returned and turned up the sound. For the next twenty-one minutes the students watched the video, laughing every few minutes. Julie watched, too—advancing the video through commercials, and laughing along with the students.

When the video finished, Julie commented, "There's definitely a lot that can be said about that in terms of American culture," and passed out the group disks. At 2:33 the groups began their discussions and spent approximately the next forty-five minutes responding to the *Simpsons* episode in their groups. There were two students from Group E whose fellow group members were absent. Julie told them they could work with any of the other groups. Groups A, B, and D moved immediately to workstations. In Group C, one student set up a workstation, then returned to the table with the rest of the group to discuss the assignment. Two groups used workstations with vertical monitors. At 2:35 Group C moved to a workstation, and Group A called Julie to their workstation and asked if they should erase their poetry file. Julie directed them to leave the poetry file and start a new file for the assignment. At 2:36 a student from Group B asked Julie to look at a draft. Julie took the draft, then spoke with Group D which had a question about the assignment. As the groups worked, Julie
circulated. Each group seemed to have one keyboarder who entered text after getting input from the group. At 2:43 Julie stood beside a workstation near the front center and took attendance; she then read the draft given to her earlier.

At 2:50 someone came to the door to report a computer problem in Classroom A. Julie announced to the class that she was going to Classroom A to help. At 3:01 Julie returned and began circulating among the groups. Each observation was brief and silent. At 3:02 Group D asked Julie if she wanted them to make a printout. Julie directed them to print, save the file, and then give her their disk. Before printing, the group discussed which printer to use and decided to use the laser printer. At 3:05 Group A made a printout using the laser printer. Soon after Group A retrieved their printout, a student from Group D rolled his chair up to the laser printer to retrieve the group's document and announced that they had made four copies. "Well, we kept asking it to print," a group member replied and they all laughed. Shrugging her shoulders, Julie laughed with them.

At 3:09 Julie stood near the technician's desk as the groups handed her copies of their work as it emerged from the laser printer. By 3:10 several students were preparing to leave. The groups were turning in both disks and printouts, and Julie reminded Group C that she needed the disk and a printout. Some, but not all, groups or students seemed to have kept printouts for themselves. At 3:11 a student conferred with Julie about writing a letter of application as two other students waited nearby. At 3:14 the student who had given Julie the draft earlier was discussing it with her. Another student who was working on something at a computer interrupted the discussion to ask Julie how to suppress page numbering
on the first page of her document. Julie suggested that she create a title page and then tell the program that she has a title page so it will skip the page number. At 3:16 the student working on the computer got a printout; Julie went around the room making sure the computers were switched off. At 3:17 Julie and the remaining student left.

Commentary.

This class had two distinct segments. The first was spent setting up and watching the video. During the second, the students composed their responses to the video in groups using the computers. Only one group remained at a table to discuss the assignment before moving to a computer. Two of the four groups elected to use the vertical monitors. As in the first class, after the students began working at the computers, Julie circulated from group to group looking over the students' shoulders and occasionally making comments or answering questions. She also spent about five minutes reading and ten minutes helping with a technical problem in another classroom.

Summary of Week Two, Class One.

When I arrived at about 2:03, the students were already seated at tables. Julie had passed out copies of the responses to Writing Assignment 2 written during the previous class. She told the students they should spend a few minutes reading the responses to prepare for the discussion that would follow. As the students read the essays, Julie, seated at the center table, took attendance and spent a few minutes rereading the groups' responses.
At 2:15 Julie asked the students to discuss the essays and compare the readings of the *Simpsons* they represent. The next eighteen minutes were devoted to this discussion. The students did not seem very involved or enthusiastic during this discussion. Most of the students' comments were direct responses to a question by Julie. Julie made fifteen questions or comments and received twenty responses from six student respondents. Seventeen were directed to Julie; three student comments were directed to other students.

At 2:33 the discussion ended, and Julie passed out Essay Assignment 4. Julie read the assignment aloud and the students asked a number of questions about matters such as how long the paper needed to be and when it was due. At 2:38 the students moved into their five collaborative groups (A, B, C, D, and E), and spent the next twenty-two minutes working collaboratively on Essay Assignment 4. All groups were composed of three students, except Group C which contained only two students. As the students began to discuss the assignment in their groups, Julie conferred briefly with Group E and then with Group D. At 2:43 Julie moved to the table where Group A was seated. Their conversation revealed that the students in Group A were struggling to decide how to approach the assignment. Julie listened to their ideas and indicated that she thought they were on the right track.

At 2:50 Julie moved to the table where Group B sat discussing the assignment. Groups A, B, C and E seemed to be working on the assignment. Most of the students in Group D seemed to be engaged in casual conversation; one student from the Group D was working at a computer, perhaps editing a
document. At 2:55 Julie approached the table where Group D was seated and began discussing the assignment with them. The student who had been working with the computer returned to the table and participated in the discussion.

At about 3:00 the students began preparing to leave. As they gathered their things and turned off their computers, Julie asked the students to think about contributions for *A la Carte* and indicated that she would like to submit one item from the class for the next issue. After soliciting the contributions, Julie came to the table where the two Group C students were seated and discussed the assignment with them. By 3:02, only the students in Group C and one student from Group A, who had begun working at a computer, remained. At 3:03 the discussion with Group C concluded and a student from the group began working on a computer. Julie and the other Group C student waited for the two students to get their printouts. When they finished, all four left.

**Commentary.**

Like the previous class, this class was divided into two segments. The first thirty minutes was spent reading and discussing the groups’ responses to the video they had watched the period before. The energy level was lower than usual during this segment. The remainder of the class was devoted to a workshop. The groups spent most of this time discussing the assignment while seated at the tables. Three students worked on something at a computer for a few minutes, one during the discussion period and two at the end of class. As in previous classes, Julie circulated among the groups as they worked.
Summary of Week Two, Class Two.

Seven students were present when I arrived at 1:58. Five sat at tables, while one worked on something using a computer, and another chatted with Julie while standing near the doorway. The student using the computer got a printout and asked Julie a question about her document after retrieving it from the printer. The atmosphere in the classroom seemed very relaxed today. Waiting for more students to arrive, Julie sat on the edge of a workstation near the technician’s desk and continued drinking a Diet Coke. Two students also had snacks. At 2:04 three more students arrived.

At about 2:05 Julie called the class to order, reminded the students that she was still taking nominations for the class’s contribution to *A la Carte*, and began explaining the day’s activity. As she spoke, two more students arrived late. Julie explained that she wanted to have "a different sort of discussion" today. Instead of talking about ideas from the text orally, she directed the students to go to a computer, think of an issue from the reading, and try to discuss the issue by drawing on previous readings from the class. After about ten minutes, everyone would switch computers to read and respond to what the first writer had written. Then, at the end of class, the students would return to their original computer to save and print the file which had been created. Two students asked Julie to clarify the kind of issue she wanted them to write about and a third asked if they needed to save the dialogues to disk. Julie tried to clarify her instructions by giving an example of something they could write about and reminded them to save and print the files at the end of class.
At about 2:11 the students moved to workstations. Three out of the four vertical monitors were in use. As the responding session began, the students seemed to be working in pairs. Each pair was seated together. While one "group" had three students, the middle student seemed to work alternately with the student on either side of her. One student was seated alone. At 2:14 a student’s screen display disappeared and he called Julie over to help. Julie fixed the problem, apparently a bad connection, and talked briefly with the student and the student seated next to him. At 2:16 Julie sat at a workstation and began writing. By 2:17, everyone was entering text. At 2:21 a student turned in her chair and faced the center of the room for a few seconds, then resumed writing. The students talked as they wrote and the noise level was rather high.

At 2:23 Julie finished writing and walked to the center of the room. The student who had faced the center of the room earlier, also got up, and after a brief exchange in the center of the room, Julie directed the student to the workstation where she had been writing and moved to the student’s workstation. At 2:26 other students began switching computers. Julie stopped writing briefly and went over to help the student who had been working alone. After a moment, Julie returned to the workstation and resumed writing. At 2:30 two students began working at a single computer. They read a response together. A minute later two other students approached and read the text. The group found the text amusing and had a brief but animated discussion about it. By 2:33 the group had broken up and taken seats at other computers. At 2:35 a student began reading
Julie's text over her shoulder. At 2:36, Julie reminded the students to continue switching computers. The room had become quiet as students continued entering responses. At 2:37 Julie suggested that everyone change fonts when responding to a text so readers would know where responses began and ended.

At about 2:39 Julie began circulating around the room glancing at students' texts. The computer she had just left was the only one in use which was not occupied. At 2:40 Julie stopped to show a student how to change fonts. At 2:42 a student left the room and Julie began work at the empty workstation. By 2:45 several students had changed places again. The student who had left returned and began working at an empty computer. Students were beginning to talk quietly again.

By 2:48 one student had returned to her original computer and begun reading the responses to her text. At 2:49 Julie returned to her original computer. A student watched Julie as she read the text and they turned to one another and began laughing. They began discussing the text and looking at the textbook together. By 2:50 several students had returned to their original computers and read the responses. At 2:52 two students who had already read the responses on their original computers sat at a table chatting. Two other students soon joined them, but after a moment moved to a computer and began reading a response.

By 3:00 there were many students engaged in conversations. One student asked another if he had written a certain response on one of the computers. Soon several students had gathered around trying to determine who had written the response in question. After a minute or two, the group broke up with the
question unresolved. At 3:04 Julie was discussing a class being offered in the summer quarter with several students. Students were moving from computer to computer and in and out of the room. One returned to the room with a soft drink.

At about 3:08 Julie directed the students to return to their original computers to save and print the texts they had created. She asked them to put their names at the top and turn in the printed copy along with the disks. By 3:10, a crowd had formed around the laser printer. Julie reminded them that the next class would be a workshop day, so they should come with an idea about what they want to write in their essays. As they waited for the printouts, Julie and the students discussed the slowness of the printer. Julie speculated that the slowness was because they all had asked for printouts at the same time, and a student suggested that the printer was having a nervous breakdown. By 3:15 all the students had turned in printouts and left. Most texts were about a single-spaced page in length.

Commentary.

After Julie described the assignment at the beginning of class, the remainder of the period was devoted to a musical computers activity during which students responded to one another's texts. The atmosphere in the classroom was extremely relaxed, but the energy level was quite high. Most students seemed very engaged in the activity. Although the students were writing their responses individually, they seemed to work in pairs, frequently talking and sometimes leaning over to read and orally comment on one another's texts. Occasionally, a
group of students would form and briefly discuss a response. Julie participated in
the responding session and spent most of her time going from computer to
computer reading and responding along with the students. Students tended to
write five or six sentences per response and take anywhere from five to ten
minutes to read and respond to the text at each computer. The students did not
seem to keep a copy of the printouts they turned in for themselves.

Summary of Week Two, Class Three.

I arrived at 2:00 and two members of Group A, three members of both
Groups B and D, four members of Group C, and one member of Group E were
present. Group A and the student from Group E were seated at workstations; the
remaining students were seated in their groups at tables. Julie, standing beside
the center table, told the students that the film Grand Canyon was playing at the
student union. She encouraged them to see the film and think of it in terms of
the reading they had been doing for class. After the announcement about the
film, she reminded them that today was to be a workshop day and said she hoped
they all had ideas for their essays. As the students began talking in their groups
about the assignment, Julie asked for their attention and made another
announcement. Alec, the CEWL Coordinator, would be coming in to take
pictures of the class for a conference presentation he and Julie would be giving
soon. After this announcement, the students resumed talking and Group D
moved into a semi-circle around a nearby workstation.

The remainder of the class, about an hour, was devoted to the workshop
session. At about 2:07, Julie conferred briefly with the student from Group E.
After their conversation, he continued to work alone at a computer. Groups C and B sat at tables discussing the assignment. Group D, clustered around a workstation near the technician’s desk, also discussed the assignment as one member of the group set up the computer. Julie took a seat at the table with Group C. At 2:12 another member of Group D arrived and the group asked him which topic he wanted to write about, tabloid newspapers or the American Gladiators; Julie had moved to a chair near Group A. At 2:15 Julie came over to Group D, told them Group A was working on a topic related to tabloid-type TV shows, and asked them if they had any insights into the topic which they could share since they were writing about a similar topic. Group A came over and talked with Group D for a few minutes. At 2:20 Julie was conferring with Group C. Group A had moved to a table in the back near the workstation where they had been sitting earlier. At 2:23 Julie was talking with Group B and a student from Group D was sitting beside the student from Group E chatting.

At 2:26 Alec entered the room and began taking pictures. Julie talked to Alec for a moment, then returned to work with Group B. As Alec circulated around the room standing on desks and taking photos, the students became visibly self-conscious. At 2:30 Group A returned to the workstation where they had been working earlier. Only Group D was using a vertical monitor. The student from Group E continued to work alone at a computer while Groups B and C remained at tables talking and making pen and paper notes.

At 2:31, Alec left. A student from Group A called over to the student from Group E and asked where his group was. The Group E student laughed
and said, "I thought they were here." At 2:34 the Group E student went back to talk with Group A and Julie joined them. After a moment, Julie and the Group E student moved to the student's workstation and talked. By 2:40 Julie and the Group E student had moved to a table and were looking at the textbook. At 2:42 the Group E student returned to his computer and Julie moved to the center table and began looking through her folder. A student from Group D soon joined her and they talked. At 2:45 Group B moved to one of the workstations equipped with a vertical monitor and began writing. By 2:46 the student from Group D who had been talking with Julie had returned to his group, and Groups D and A were holding a discussion from opposite sides of the room. The conversation was initially about one of the students from Group D, then shifted about something from the student newspaper. At 2:50 the conversation concluded as one of the students from Group D left the room. The Group E student tried to print something, then asked Julie to add some paper to the printer.

At 2:52 Group A collected a printout from the printer and handed it to Julie. Julie chatted with them briefly as they prepared to leave. As they talked, the student from Group E gave his printout to Julie and left. By 2:59 Group A had left. Groups B and C continued to work at their computers. As Group D prepared to leave, Julie chatted with them about their plans for the summer. At 3:04 Julie was sitting at the center table watching Groups B and C as they prepared to leave. At 3:05 Group C moved to the laser printer to wait for their printouts. Each group member took a printout. After receiving the printouts,
they gave them to Julie and left. By 3:07 Group B was also leaving, saying goodbye to Julie as they walked past her on their way to the door. The last student stopped briefly to make an appointment with Julie, then left. After straightening up the chairs and making sure the equipment had been turned off, Julie collected her things and left.

Commentary.
The students spent almost the entire class period working on their essays. The atmosphere was relaxed and informal. One student worked alone and spent most of the period working at a computer. Although one group moved almost immediately to a computer, all the groups spent at least twenty-five minutes discussing their essays before beginning to write. Each group’s activities were controlled by the group itself, although Julie did suggest that two groups working on similar topics discuss their ideas together. Julie spent most of the period circulating from group to group answering questions about the assignment and helping the groups as they selected their topics and began working on their drafts. As during previous group activities, the students’ discussions shifted periodically from assignment-related talk to casual conversation.

Analyses of Two Case Studies of CSU Teachers
This section addresses the same questions asked about teachers in the MCC Case Study. Specifically, these are

1. What knowledge of computers and computer skills do the teachers possess and how did they acquire their knowledge and skills?
2. What do the teachers know and believe about computers and writing and how did they acquire their knowledge and beliefs?
3. How do they use their knowledge about computers, computer skills, and their knowledge and beliefs about computers and writing in their computer-enhanced writing classes?

As in my analysis of the MCC teachers, I have divided my discussion of each CSU teacher's case study into two parts: the first focusing on questions one and two, the second examining question three. As before, while I have used these questions as a framework for ordering my analysis, the questions are interrelated and the two parts of the analysis reflect their mutual influences.

Following the same organization as the MCC Case Study, I have again reserved a direct discussion of the remaining questions asked about teachers (To what extent are the teachers' goals and practices consistent with those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach, and how have the teachers adapted their goals and practices to those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach?) for the next major section of this chapter, "Cross-Analysis of the Case Studies of the CEWL Program and the CSU Teachers."

While I analyze the data from each teacher's case study separately, the teachers share several assumptions which underlie and circumscribe my individual analyses and conclusions. Both teachers were invited and voluntarily chose to teach writing with computers; they are not required to do so. They both enjoy and believe that they benefit from writing with computers themselves, and they
both believe that their students enjoy and benefit from using computers in their classes. The primary advantages these teachers believe computers offer in writing classes are the same: students are more willing to rewrite and revise their work because emending texts is easier when writing with computers; using computers facilitates and encourages collaboration among students; and the students’ work is more legible, has a more polished, professional appearance, and is easier to share. Both also had somewhat limited experience teaching writing in traditional classrooms before moving to computer-enhanced writing classrooms and now teach only with computers. Finally, as graduate teaching associates, in addition to teaching writing classes, they are also taking classes and working toward advanced degrees, activities which place heavy demands on their time and energy. These assumptions and conditions form the background of the scene in which the individual analyses I am about to present constitute the foreground and are implicit correlatives to my observations even when I do not note them explicitly.

Analysis of the Case Study of CSU Teacher One: Brian

Brian’s Knowledge, Skills, and Beliefs.

Most of Brian’s computer experience has been on MS-DOS based systems, but he has used a number of different computers and computer systems, including Commodore, Macintosh, and the Windows-based IBM system with which he currently teaches. Although Brian uses computers primarily for word processing, he also uses computers for playing games and conducting library searches and has had some limited experience with programming. Much of what Brian knows about computers he has learned informally through friends and self-guided
experimentation, and he continues to regard trial and error as the most effective way to explore new hardware and software. Consequently, he is undaunted by new computer systems and programs and is not intimidated or overly frustrated by unexpected results or "bugs." At the same time, he has learned from experience to anticipate computer glitches and guard against them. As he acknowledged, Brian brings the "be adventurous, be persistent, and be prepared" attitude he developed from his early experiences with computers to his classroom—for example, even after previous failures, he continued to try to use the classroom network to distribute handouts, but also brought the same material on floppy disk and in hardcopy.

Brian's knowledge about computers and computer skills are adequate for his teaching needs. He was skilled enough to help his students overcome most of the computer-related problems they encountered during the classes I observed and knowledgeable enough about the hardware and software in his classroom to adapt and create writing exercises designed to develop his students' writing and word processing skills. When Brian encounters problems with hardware or software, he looks for ways to solve these problems either by seeking the help of the CEWL staff (for example, he indicated that he had reported the problems he and his students were experiencing with the network) or on his own (as when he attempted to help a student who had created a document in the wrong version of Word). Although he was unable to use the network to deliver documents to his students, his willingness to attempt to do so demonstrates that he is comfortable in
both the MS-DOS environment in which the network operates and the Windows environment which runs the Word for Windows word processor used in the classroom. Brian's students clearly recognized and appreciated his computer knowledge and skills; although they frequently sought technical help from one another, they turned to Brian when they experienced technical problems which they could not solve on their own or with the help of a peer. The students also seemed to share Brian's willingness to tolerate occasional problems and glitches. For instance, when Brian was unable to help the student who had created his document in the wrong version of Word, the student simply found another way to use the class time and did not seem to become overly frustrated or annoyed.

Brian's knowledge and skills also allow him to participate in and attempt to influence decisions at the program level. For example, although his suggestion has not been followed, he requested that the CEWL Program allow teachers to use Word Perfect rather than Word for Windows in Classroom E. He has also requested that the Program purchase an overhead-type screen projector for use in Classroom E. Brian's confidence in his knowledge about computers and computer skills has allowed him to form an opinion about the source of the problems he and his students have experienced with the network in Classroom E and Word for Windows and to assess the CEWL Program's approach to solving these problems. Although I am not certain if Brian has expressed these views to Alec or the CEWL Program staff, it is clear that he feels secure enough in his technical expertise with computers to evaluate, form judgments, and make
recommendations about his classroom's hardware and software.

Brian's knowledge about computers and computer skills are also adequate to enable him to adapt his knowledge about composition and about computers and composition to his instructional context. Although most of Brian's formal and informal "instruction" in teaching composition with computers has come from workshops sponsored by the CEWL Program or through exchanges with other CEWL Program teachers so that little modification was required to apply the ideas to his own classroom, Brian has also adapted and applied ideas and concepts from sources of knowledge outside his immediate instructional context to his teaching. For example, he indicated that he has applied some of the "more general" theoretical discussions of writing and composition pedagogy he has read in professional journals to his computer-enhanced classes and has used his interest and knowledge of critical theory to create an exercise (Appendix C, Exercise 4) which encourages students to consider the nature of textuality and the impact of electronic texts on authorship and meaning. Brian is confident enough in his status as a teacher-researcher in computers and composition to use this exercise as the basis of a conference presentation.

Although Brian is generally satisfied with his knowledge about teaching writing and about computers and composition, he would like to know more about both areas. For example, he admires the knowledge of his fellow graduate students who are specializing in rhetoric and composition and wishes he had the time to learn more about the theoretical and historical aspects of composition and writing instruction. In fact, despite the fact that composition is not one of the
areas he has chosen to specialize in and the heavy demands his teaching and
graduate coursework must place upon his time, Brian's interest in composition and
his commitment to teaching continue to motivate him to learn more about writing
theory and pedagogy with and without computers. For example, he indicated that
he attends in-house workshops related to teaching writing whenever they concern
a subject of interest to him and his teaching and coursework schedules permit and
intends to enroll in a graduate seminar on computers and composition during
Summer Quarter, 1992. When asked what knowledge of computers and what
knowledge of computers and composition teachers who teach writing with
computers should have, Brian indicated that although he believed they need only a
basic knowledge of computers and the hardware and software they will be using
and no specific knowledge of the relationship between computers and
composition, he felt that writing teachers who choose to teach with computers
should have an interest in making the connections between computers and
composition and the willingness to make an investment in doing so. These seem
to be the precepts which Brian has successfully applied to his own teaching.


Although Brian had only taught composition for one year before becoming
a CEWL Program teacher and has only taught composition with computers for a
little over two quarters, he is already quite comfortable teaching in his computer-
enhanced classroom. While he does not use Word for Windows or the Windows
environment for his personal writing and computing, he is very confident of his
ability to help students acquire basic word processing skills using Word for
Windows and to assist students with technical problems and glitches related to the computer hardware and software in his classroom.

In addition to his proficiency and comfort with the technical aspects of teaching composition with computers, Brian has also integrated computers and word processing into his pedagogy. In his computer-enhanced English 110 class, Brian uses an approach that includes frequent exercises and composing workshops combined with occasional teacher-led discussions of readings and writing techniques. Of the four written in-class exercises I observed, three were completed using computers, two in small groups and one individually. Brian consciously uses these exercises to develop his students' word processing skills and to introduce them to ways in which word processing may enhance their writing processes. For example, Brian included three revision exercises in his 110 class (RP1 and RP2, which were taken from a textbook and were not originally intended to be completed using computers, and E1, an excerpt from an early draft of a student's paper). Brian's decision to instruct students to complete these exercise using computers is consistent with his belief that easier revision is one of the primary advantages computers offer to writers. To focus the students' attention on these advantages, Brian adapted the textbook exercises for the computer by adding directions which specifically instructed students to "make use of the cut/paste, delete, and insert functions which the computer provides . . . thus making revision a more pleasant task" and to "take advantage of the computer's ability to manipulate text electronically." Brian also exhibited an awareness of the
constraints and special needs of the word processing environment. For example, when students were engaged in invention during the second day of my first observation, Brian urged students to complete activities such as brainstorming and listing that can be accomplished easily using word processing using their computers, but allowed students to do clustering, an invention exercise which includes graphic representations such as tree diagrams that cannot be readily produced using a word processor, using pen and paper. Brian's integration of word processing into his pedagogy also went beyond helping students realize the benefits of using word processing to produce texts. During the second class of my last observation, Brian used an exercise, E4, aimed at helping students begin to consider the relationship between reading and writing texts and to examine how the introduction of electronic texts makes more transparent or even alters this relationship. This exercise followed an activity in which Brian had students read and listen to two songs and decide what these songs said about love. Like E4, Brian intended this exercise to focus students' attention on the effects and combined effects of two media, the written word and the musical note. His use of these exercises suggests that Brian is quite interested in and consciously considers the effects of media and attempts to incorporate them into his teaching. It is also consistent with his belief that students should be encouraged to "reenvision what writing is" and go beyond the image of the writer as simple "scribe."

The various elements of Brian's case study are consistent and mutually reinforcing. For example, Brian believes that using computers to enhance the
processes of drafting and revising is the most important use of computers in writing classes. This is consistent with his conclusions about how word processing has affected his own composing processes and with his use of computers during the English 110 class I observed. He also considered using computers as an instructional medium through exercises that permit students to manipulate texts and explore the nature of textuality important; this belief, too, was supported by his classroom practices.

One interesting relationship between Brian's stated beliefs and his practices involves the issues of collaboration/community and independence/individuality. While Brian indicated that he believed computers can be used to facilitate and enhance collaborative writing and incorporated several kinds of collaborative work into his classes, he indicated that he believes the most important potential effect of computers on writing classes is the ability of the computer to "emphasize individuality." While these beliefs may seem, at least prima facia, to be at odds, they both highlight Brian's belief in the ability of the computer to involve students actively in the process of composing texts, either by serving as a medium through which they can interact with others or by helping a student to engage "with his or her own thought processes." Both also stress the role of the student within the classroom and are consistent with Brian's statements about "decentering" his classroom, his stated beliefs about the benefits of de-emphasizing the authority of the teacher, and, for the most part, the pedagogical practices I observed. Although teacher-centered, presentational style instruction was a significant
element of Brian's classes (Table 11), student-centered activities consumed the bulk of the class time during my observations.

In short, Brian has adapted easily to using computers in his English 110 class. While he is not always able to overcome all of difficulties with hardware and software he and his students encounter, his technical knowledge, computer skills, and perseverance have enabled him to adjust quickly to the demands of using and teaching with both an unfamiliar operating system and an unfamiliar word processing package and have empowered him to contribute to decision-making within the CEWL Program. In addition, these skills combined with the knowledge he has gained through CEWL Program workshops and interactions with other CEWL Program teachers, have permitted him to modify his pedagogy to take advantage of the presence of computers within his classroom. Computers have become essential for Brian's own writing and important, if not essential, to his teaching. His enthusiasm for computer technology and success in his computer-enhanced English 110 class suggest that Brian will continue not only to use computers in his teaching, but to seek out and develop new and better strategies for teaching word processing and, more importantly, teaching writing with computers.
Table 11: Characteristics and Chronology of Activities in Brian’s English 110 Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approx. Mins. By Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>CL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Directions</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing/Critiquing Assignments</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Oral Ex./Modeling</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Sm.Grp.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Sm. Grp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Approx. Mins. 85 95 92 105 377

* Includes Sm. Grp. and Indiv. Invention Activities
# Includes Peer Editing
Analysis of the Case Study of CSU Teacher Two: Julie

Julie’s Knowledge, Skills, and Beliefs.

Julie has a relatively wide range of computing experience. She has used both the MS DOS and Macintosh operating systems and many different types of software including word processing, paintbrush, desktop publishing, and hypertext packages. Much of Julie’s knowledge of computers and computer skills were developed on her own as she used computers for her own writing during her undergraduate education. Despite her relatively wide range of experience, most of Julie’s knowledge about computers and particularly her knowledge about computers and writing, have come from her immediate context. For example, the only formal instruction in using or teaching computers which she mentioned was the training provided by the CEWL Program. Other than the CEWL Program’s annual training workshops and her personal experience, Julie’s only other significant source of knowledge about computers and computers and writing has been her colleagues within the CEWL Program. Julie said that she considers the support she has received from her fellow teachers in the CEWL Program very important and indicated that she has incorporated some of the ideas and suggestions they have provided into her teaching. Julie has gained very little knowledge about computers or the relationship between computers and writing from her undergraduate and graduate coursework or from sources outside her immediate context such as professional journals and conferences. Julie anticipates, however, that professional journals will become a more important
source of knowledge for her as she begins to concentrate more on composition theory in her graduate work and to prepare for her doctoral qualifying exams.

Like Brian, Julie is comfortable enough with computer technology and confident enough of her computer skills to adjust easily to changes and additions in the hardware and software she uses in her classes. For example, in just two years she has taught in three different computer-enhanced classrooms with slightly different computers and printers, network configurations, and spatial arrangements, and although she was unable to successfully use the software, she eagerly attempted to use Aspects shortly after the CEWL Program acquired this conferencing software.

Julie’s knowledge about computers and computer skills are satisfactory for her teaching needs. As a CEWL Program staff member, she provides technical assistance to other teachers and is, therefore, probably more skilled than most teachers in the Program. During the classes I observed, she was able to help her students overcome the few technical problems they experienced and to suggest and help the students learn ways to use the word processor to make creating their documents easier. In fact, I observed only a small number of consultations concerning hardware and software in Julie’s class; almost all of the consultations between Julie and her students, and to a lesser degree among the students themselves, were related to writing or to procedural issues like paper formats and due dates. This result might be attributable to Julie’s skill in anticipating the needs of her students and helping them to learn to use the classroom’s hardware and software early in the course, but could also be a function of the quality and
ease of operation of the network (Classroom D has the CEWL Program's newest equipment), of the students' prior experience and skill with computers, or of a combination of these factors.

Julie's knowledge of computers and computer skills are also adequate to allow her to effectively participate in decision-making at the Program level. As a CEWL Program assistant, she regularly helps to evaluate the CEWL Program's hardware, software, and classroom arrangements and makes recommendations in these areas. For example, during Spring Quarter, 1992, she and Alec were investigating the possibility of acquiring an upgraded version of MacWrite for use in the Program's classrooms.

When asked to discuss the use and impact of computers in composition classes, Julie indicated that she does not feel informed enough to do so. She believes that her general knowledge of computers and of computers in composition, while adequate to accomplish her specifically defined pedagogical objectives, is too limited to enable her to make informed statements about the effects of computers on writing instruction. In fact, when asked to list the most prevalent uses of computers in writing classrooms, Julie listed those uses which she emphasizes in her own classes: revision, invention, and collaboration. However, as her statement that she would like to use computers in all her classes whether composition or literature shows, Julie clearly believes and is aware that computers can be and are used in a variety of ways. While Julie expressed an interest in learning more about computers, she does not consider this a priority. This position is consistent with her belief that teachers need only a basic knowledge of
computers and no particular knowledge about the relationship between computers and composition in order to teach writing with computers. Nevertheless, Julie is interested in learning more about computers and composition and indicated that she will be taking a graduate course in computers and composition during Summer Quarter, 1992.

Julie's Goals and Pedagogy for Computer-Enhanced English 301.

Most of Julie's teaching experience has been in the computer environment, and she is more comfortable in this context than in the traditional classroom. As she acknowledges, since she had only a single year's prior teaching experience in traditional classrooms, using computers has been part of her formation as a teacher, and she has come to rely on computer technology both to create and reproduce materials for her classes and to enable and support the teaching strategies she employs. She is, in fact, somewhat daunted by the prospect of teaching writing without computers. For example, she is unsure how she would approach the English 301 class I observed if she were to teach it without computers, and described the prospect of returning to a traditional classroom, hyperbolically, as her "worst nightmare."

In her English 301 class, Julie combines frequent discussions of readings and other materials with workshop-like individual and group in-class composing sessions (Table 12). These activities are supplemented by regular individual and group conferences outside of class time and in-class exercises. Supported by a computer-enhanced classroom designed to foster collaborative writing, Julie has quite thoroughly integrated computers into her pedagogy for this class. Students
most frequently used computers in Julie's English 301 during small group composing sessions. In this context, the computers clearly supported and enhanced collaboration, allowing all group members to view the text as it took shape and enabling all group members to take home copies of the emerging document produced on the laser printer as well as copies of the document on computer disk. In addition to encouraging students to use computers for composing collaborative essays, Julie has adopted strategies and activities such as "musical computers" to facilitate class and group discussions and exercises such as "found poem" to focus students' attention on the nature of the written code and the impact of rhetorical choices. Three of the four exercises and writing assignments Julie used English 301 were completed using computers (Table 10). In all cases, the computers seemed to clearly add a useful dimension to the activity, such as the relative anonymity of the musical computers responding session I observed during the second day of my second week of observations. Julie did not seem compelled to have students use computers simply because the technology was present. Although she requires students to complete all drafts of their essays and all in-class writing activities using computers, her aim is to facilitate interaction and collaboration rather than simply to have students use the computers because the equipment is available. For example, even when students are composing an essay individually, Julie and her students use the computer to support discussion and editing during individual conferences in her office and she encourages the students to use the computers for peer editing during class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approx. Mins. By Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving Directions</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>CL1 5 CL2 4 CL3 10 CL4 5 CL5 5 CL6 17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Oral Ex./Modeling</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>CL1 0 CL2 45 CL3 0 CL4 30 CL5 45 CL6 0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing/Critiquing Assignments</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Exercises</td>
<td>Sm.Grp.</td>
<td>0 0 66# 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>CL1 59* CL2 0 CL3 0 CL4 0 CL5 0 CL6 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Essays or Paragraphs</td>
<td>Sm. Grp.</td>
<td>0 0 0 32 0 60 0 0</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Approx. Mins. 64 49 76 67 50 77 383

*Includes Small Group Peer Editing Activities
#Includes Viewing Video
sessions. During all the classes I attended, the students seemed comfortable using the computers for the writing and classroom activities Julie assigned and eager to do so; they did not require encouragement or prompting.

While Julie had clearly considered the requirements and advantages of word processing in creating her assignments, she did not suggest rules or generalizable strategies for using word processing to the class. As she stated during our in-depth interview, the instruction Julie provided to her students concerning how to use word processing features occurred on an "ad hoc" basis as students composed. In fact, during my classroom observations, I witnessed only two occasions on which Julie assisted students with learning to use specific word processing features. On the first, Julie helped a student suppress page numbering. The second occasion occurred during the musical computers discussion I observed when Julie suggested that the students switch fonts between respondents and then assisted a student in learning how to make font changes.

The computer-enhanced classroom in which Julie teaches supports her teaching philosophy and pedagogy quite well. The physical layout of the classroom and the relaxed atmosphere help Julie create an environment which encourages students to interact with one another and participate freely in class discussions and activities. This environment supports her goal of assisting students in integrating their reading, discussion, and writing skills, and consequently, her goal of helping them to become better, more critical readers, writers, and thinkers. In addition to facilitating Julie in attaining these goals, the ease of operating the classroom's network and software and the convenience of its vertical monitors and
laser printer enable Julie and her students to concentrate their energies on the work of the class rather than on the technical aspects of computing. Beyond the computer-enhanced classroom itself, Julie relies on computers outside the classroom as she designs and creates materials. In these ways, computers have become extremely important, if not essential, to Julie's philosophy and pedagogy. In fact, Julie may be among the first of a new generation of writing teachers for whom the computer-enhanced writing classroom is the writing classroom.

Although she would clearly prefer to teach all her classes in a computer-enhanced environment, if Julie were to return to the traditional classroom, like Brian, she would certainly seek to find ways to adapt the collaborative, student-centered pedagogy she has developed through teaching with computers to this setting.

**Cross Analyses of The CSU Case Studies**

In this section, I analyze the relationships between the Program and the teachers. The first sub-section addresses the following research questions: "To what extent are the teachers' goals and practices consistent with those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach?" and "How have the teachers adapted their goals and practices to those of the computer-enhanced writing program in which they teach?" The second sub-section compares the case studies of the two teachers.

**Comparison of the Goals and Philosophy of the CSU Program and the Goals, Philosophies, and Practices of the CSU Teachers.**

Although the participants in the CSU case study were not in complete agreement, a high degree of consistency existed among the philosophy and goals
of the CEWL Program as described by Alec and the philosophies and goals described by Brian and Julie. In general, Alec, Brian, and Julie also agreed on the sorts of knowledge required of writing teachers who teach with computers, the benefits students and teachers receive from using computers in writing and other English classes. For the most part, the activities I observed in Brian and Julie’s classes also were congruent with the Program’s goals and philosophy as described by Alec, and as I will discuss in detail in the next section, with the beliefs and pedagogies described by Brian and Julie on the pre-interview questionnaire and during my interviews with them; however, Brian and Julie’s were classes were quite different both in substance and quality.

To a large extent Brian and Julie share and participate in attaining the goals of the CEWL Program. For example, one of the major objectives of the CEWL Program is to conduct research into the uses and effects of computers in writing and literature classes. As their agreement to participate in this project demonstrates, Brian and Julie clearly support this goal. Both Brian and Julie also were conducting or participating in research projects in the classes I observed; Brian was carrying out his own project and Julie was participating in a CEWL-sponsored study with Alec. Other evidence of support for the CEWL Program’s goals and projects included Julie’s interest in using and providing contributions to The Best, the Program’s journal of student writing; her solicitation of her students to participate in a Program-sponsored survey; and the
enthusiasm and appreciation both she and Brian demonstrated for the annual workshop and other CEWL-sponsored activities.

Brian and Julie also generally agreed with the "active-learning," "process-centered," "student-centered" pedagogy Alec wishes to promote within the Program. Although Brian's classes included a number of presentational-style, teacher-centered components, student-centered, workshop-like activities were a primary feature of both teachers' classes (Tables 11 and 12). Another aspect of the CEWL Program's goals and philosophy which Brian and Julie shared was its emphasis on exploring the nature of meaning, textuality, and authorship and the impact of computers on these areas. Both Brian and Julie included exercises in their classes designed to focus students' attention on these issues.

There was a consensus among Alec and the teachers in defining the knowledge about computers and computer skills as well as the knowledge about the relationship between computers and composition needed by teachers who teach writing with computers. Alec, Brian, and Julie agreed that teachers needed only a minimal knowledge of computers and computer skills before beginning to teach in a computer-enhanced classroom, but all also agreed that teachers should have a basic knowledge of the specific hardware and software which they will be using if they are to obtain the confidence of their students and insure that the focus in their classes remains on writing rather than the computers. For example, both Brian and Julie suggested that a short workshop, similar to those given by the CEWL Program, would provide adequate training. Alec, Brian, and Julie also agreed that technical assistance should be readily
available. Interestingly, they also agreed that teachers need no or only minimal knowledge of the relationship between computers and composition. Given that the CEWL Program workshops, which are an important part of the CEWL Program and were Brian and Julie's most important sources of knowledge about the relationship between computers and composition, now have less time reserved for discussing the technical, "nuts and bolts" aspects of computers while the time spent discussing ways of using computers in English classes and "real teaching" has been increased, this finding is somewhat surprising. It seems likely that Alec, Brian, and Julie value this knowledge but assume that within a supportive environment such as the CEWL Program, teachers will adopt and develop ideas for using and integrating computers within their pedagogies without first-hand knowledge of scholarship and wider practices within the field. For example, Alec clearly underscored the importance of community, collegiality, and sharing within the Program. Julie, while indicating that she did not believe that teachers need any specific knowledge of the relationship between computers and writing, stated that exchanging ideas and pedagogical strategies is "very interesting and helpful." Brian also stressed the benefits he and other teachers in the CEWL Program receive from sharing ideas and helping one another to develop teaching strategies and solve problems.

In sum, Alec, Brian, and Julie share common goals and hold similar philosophies of teaching and similar beliefs about the knowledge and skills needed by writing teachers who teach with computers. This finding suggests that
Alec has been quite successful in maintaining and, with the qualifications I discuss in the next sub-section, creating within the CEWL Program a "community" that embraces a common philosophy and common goals.

Ways in Which the CSU Teachers Have Adapted Their Philosophies and Goals to Those of the CEWL Program.

Because both Brian and Julie had quite limited teaching experience prior to entering the CEWL Program, it is difficult to determine the extent to which they have adapted their goals and practices to those of the Program. Since they began teaching in the CEWL Program after only one year's experience in traditional classrooms, their experience in the computer-enhanced environment and the training they received through the CEWL Program contributed significantly to their formation as teachers and help to account for the similarity of their goals and philosophies, as well as the consistency between their goals and philosophies and those of the CEWL Program. In addition, CSU introduced computer-enhanced composition instruction in the hope that using computers would enhance and support the process-centered instruction emphasized in CSU's traditional writing program, and as Alec explained, promoting process-based instruction has remained a basic goal of the CEWL Program. Therefore, the similarity between the teachers' goals and philosophies and the consistency between their goals and philosophies and those of the Program are also explained by the fact that both teachers received their initial experience and training in CSU's traditional writing program and the fact that the CEWL Program itself originated from within CSU's traditional writing program and
continues to have the same fundamental purpose: to teaching writing using a process-based, student-centered pedagogy. In conclusion, to a large extent Brian and Julie have not needed to adapt their goals and pedagogies to those promoted by the CEWL Program because the Program's goals and its underlying instructional philosophy have been central to the development of their personal teaching goals and philosophies. This factor, along with Alec's sensitivity to the teachers' needs and concerns and the importance he places on collaboration and community, certainly contributes to the cohesion and unity of purpose within the Program.

Cross Analysis of the Case Studies of the CSU Teachers.

Brian and Julie have similar profiles and computer backgrounds. Both have taught only in CSU's writing program--Brian for two years, one with computers and Julie for three years, two with computers. However, while Brian has taught only English 110, Julie has taught both English 110 and English 301. Both Brian and Julie also have a relatively wide range of experience with computers. Both have used the Macintosh and MS DOS platforms and have used computers for applications other than word processing. They also gained their knowledge about computers and computer skills in similar ways--from their experience using computers for writing during their undergraduate educations, and most of all, from the help and support of fellow CEWL Program teachers and from the CEWL Program's training workshops. With these backgrounds, both were able to operate the computer hardware and software in their classrooms, adapt to changes in hardware and software, evaluate the
effectiveness of the CEWL Program's hardware and software, and make recommendations to Alec in these areas. Their similar teaching and computer backgrounds also help to account for the congruency between their beliefs about the knowledge and skills needed by writing teachers who teach with computers and how these teachers can best acquire their knowledge and skills.

Brian and Julie assigned similar ratings to items contributing to their general knowledge about teaching writing and their knowledge about teaching writing with computers. Both considered the CEWL Program, their fellow CEWL Program teachers, and their teaching experience their most important sources of knowledge in this area. While both considered their graduate coursework important to their general knowledge about teaching composition because of the seminar on teaching composition they had been required to take as GTAs in CSU's writing program, neither considered their graduate coursework important to their knowledge about teaching computer-enhanced composition because none of the coursework they had taken had focused on the relationship between computers and writing. Both also indicated that other than those sponsored by the CEWL Program, workshops and conferences were not important sources for either their general knowledge about teaching writing or their knowledge about teaching computer-enhanced composition. They differed in their assessment of the contributions of professional journals to their general knowledge about teaching writing and to their knowledge about teaching computer-enhanced composition. Although neither read journals related to
composition in general or specifically to computer-enhanced composition, Brian indicated that he reads *PMLA* and found the "more general theoretical discussions" of literature in this journal important to both his knowledge about teaching composition in general and his knowledge of computer-enhanced composition. Given the content of this journal, it seems likely that it contributes to Brian's knowledge of teaching composition at an abstract rather than a practical level, perhaps, for example, by contributing to his interest in the nature of authorship, meaning, and textuality and adding to his knowledge in this area. Julie, who indicated that she occasionally reads journals pertaining to literary studies, did not consider the contributions of scholarly journals important to either her general knowledge about teaching writing or her knowledge about teaching writing with computers. Although both Brian and Julie expressed an interest in learning more about computers and computer-enhanced composition, neither considers this a priority; both are satisfied with their current level of knowledge and skills.

Brian and Julie's assessments of the advantages of using computers in their writing classes differed somewhat. Although they agreed that the ability to revise more easily was a significant advantage, Brian also considered the ability to teach writing as a process more effectively and the tendency of students to generate more ideas important advantages, while Julie mentioned the students' enthusiasm for computers and their belief that they are "learning more" when they learn to write using computers. Brian and Julie's differences in this area
may be more in emphasis than in substance and can be at least partially accounted for simply by the different levels of writing which they taught. Since he was teaching first-year writing, Brian could be expected to spend more time teaching the writing process and to place more emphasis on this aspect of using computers.

When asked to describe the disadvantages of using computers in writing classes, Brian and Julie both cited problems related to the technical and logistical aspects of teaching composition with computers as major drawbacks. Brian mentioned "computer glitches" and the students' desire to use software and hardware other than that available in the classroom as major problems, and Julie listed "computer disaster stories," "the inconvenience of campus computer labs," and the need to devote class time to computer instruction. Brian, in particular, was concerned about students using limited access to campus labs and "computer problems" as excuses. Brian also indicated another significant concern which is not directly related to the technical or logistical aspects of teaching with computers—the tendency of students to regard their neatly printed texts as finished products, and therefore to be less inclined to revise. This concern contrasts with Alec's conclusion that students come to regard texts as more fluid after creating and manipulating them using computers. It may be that students do not tend to develop the understanding Alec alludes to within the ten weeks spent in English 110.

In sum, Brian and Julie clearly believe that the advantages which they and their students experience using computers outweigh the technical, logistical, and
other problems they and their students experience when using computers. Both would teach all of their composition and other English classes using computers if given the opportunity.

Although Brian and Julie’s assessments of the teaching environment in CSU’s traditional classrooms were quite similar and quite positive, their assessments of its computer-enhanced teaching environment were slightly different. Although Brian was generally satisfied with the technical and pedagogical support for his teaching provided by the CEWL Program, he expressed several concerns. Brian feels the software options provided by the Program are too limited; he feels constrained by the requirement that he use *Windows* and *MS Word for Windows* in his classroom and has requested that the Program provide *Word Perfect*, the word processor he uses for his personal writing, in this classroom. Brian has also requested that the Program obtain an IBM-compatible overhead screen projector for use in Room E. In addition, Brian is also somewhat dissatisfied with the Program’s approach to solving the technical difficulties it has experienced with the network in Room E and reported that technical difficulties with the network and *Word* have created "major havoc." Overall, Brian would like the Program to provide more technical training and support to teachers and better support for its IBM classroom. In contrast, Julie was highly satisfied with the technical and pedagogical support provided by the CEWL Program and the arrangement, software, and hardware supplied in its classrooms. Julie’s higher degree of satisfaction may be explained
by the fact that she has always taught in Macintosh-equipped classrooms. Since
the computer-enhanced writing program at CSU began with Macintosh
equipment and Alec has more experience in this computing environment, the
Program, with the help of the ACO, appears to have worked out many of the
early technical problems it experienced in its Macintosh classrooms. The
technical problems experienced by Brian in the Program's IBM-equipped
classroom may be analogous to the early technical problems the Program
experienced in the Macintosh environment. In fact, as Brian reported, Alec and
the ACO have already overcome some of the difficulties experienced with the
laser printer in Room E. Brian's other concerns may be more persistent. The
budget constraints Alec reported make it appear less likely that the Program will
add an overhead screen projector or, even if Alec were inclined to do so,
another word processor to the Program's IBM-equipped classroom. Given its
budgetary limitations, the fact that the Program has only one IBM-equipped
classroom may result in this room being "orphaned" to some degree. For
example, the Program has an overhead screen projector for its Macintosh
classrooms and plans to install Aspects on its Macintosh networks. The
Program's media cart project is also Macintosh-based. Except for the
University's intention to add e-mail capabilities, Alec did not mention similar
expansions planned for the Program's IBM classroom and equipment.

The teaching philosophies and pedagogical goals Brian and Julie
described were similar. Both Brian and Julie indicated that their major
pedagogical goals were to help students become "more critical" thinkers and more proficient writers. Both indicated that they included workshop sessions in which students composed, revised, or responded to essays and completed writing exercises as significant components of their classes. Both also indicated that collaboration was an important element of their classes. However, the teaching strategies they employed to attain these goals and, particularly, the success they experienced with these strategies in their classrooms were somewhat different. Brian indicated that he spent a week at the beginning of the quarter helping students master basic word processing functions, and he devoted considerable class time to writing exercises designed to introduce students to revising and editing using computers. In contrast, Julie expected students who were unfamiliar with word processing or with *MacWrite II* to attend one of the CEWL-sponsored workshops held at the beginning of the quarter and included no exercises designed to develop students' word processing skills or teach them to use word processing more effectively in their writing. These differences can be partially attributed to the different levels of writing which I observed Brian and Julie teaching. I observed Brian teaching a 100-level course which most likely consisted of primarily first-year students. In contrast, I observed Julie teaching a 300-level course which most likely consisted of primarily third- and fourth-year students; I know, for example, that at least two of Julie’s students were graduating seniors. As first-year students, Brian’s students were likely to have had less computer and word processing experience than Julie’s students and
more likely to need the sorts of hands-on instruction and experience Brian attempted to provide. The differences in levels may also help to explain the different attitudes displayed by Brian and Julie’s students. Despite Brian’s efforts to generate enthusiasm and interest and the pyrotechnics he provided, his students were often remained lethargic and unresponsive. In addition, on at least one occasion they appeared not to have completed the readings assigned for class. It is significant to note that they appeared most engaged when working on the computers, although a few students resisted using computers for invention during one class. In contrast, Julie’s students were generally quite active, responsive, and engaged both during computer-workshop sessions and during discussions and other non-computer activities. The different results obtained by Brian and Julie may also be partially attributed to individual differences between these teachers. Julie may have experienced more success because she has more completely integrated her teaching philosophy with her pedagogical practices. For example, while Brian indicated that he considers "decentering authority" and actively engaging students in writing important, his classes contained a significant amount of teacher-centered, presentational-style activities such as giving directions and lecturing (Table 11). Even the writing activities in Brian's classes were more teacher-centered and less student-controlled than those in Julie's classes, although this difference, too, may be attributable to the different levels of classes they taught. The different results Brian and Julie obtained may also be accounted for by the fact that Julie, having taught an additional year, is
simply a more experienced and skilled teacher than Brian. I should also note that I did not examine what is probably the most important indicator of success in these classes, the quality of the writing the students produced.
CHAPTER V
Conclusions and Implications

Overview

The contrasts between computer-enhanced writing instruction at MCC and CSU were numerous. Although some of these differences were attributable to the different natures and missions of the institutions, one a community college and the other a research university, many differences emerged from decisions made by the participants in these case studies based on their knowledge and beliefs about computers, their beliefs about writing instruction, and their understanding of the relationship between computers and writing.

In the first section of this chapter, I analyze the relationships among the goals, philosophies, and practices of the participants in the case studies of MCC's Writing Center and CSU's Computer Project and CEWL Program. In my analysis, I discuss how these factors and their interactions have shaped computer-enhanced writing instruction at these institutions and led to the divergent goals, pedagogical practices, and administrative structures reflected in these case studies.

In the last section of this chapter, I discuss the implications of these case studies for computer-enhanced composition.
Cross Analyses of the MCC and CSU Case Studies

Knowledge and Authority of the Administrators

The computer-enhanced writing programs at MCC and CSU began in a similar way. At each institution, members of the writing programs researched and developed a proposal to use computers to teach writing. In both cases, these individuals' knowledge of composition, not their expertise with computers provided the authority with which they undertook the task of developing a structure for computer-enhanced writing instruction at their institutions. The participants' lack of computer expertise was not a serious impediment at either institution; John and Margaret and Scott and Alec developed proposals for implementing computer-enhanced composition instruction which were consistent with current research and scholarship in the field. However, significant differences between the programs resulted from the implementation of these proposals.

At MCC, due to many of the composition faculty members' lack of experience with computers and their resulting computer anxiety, Jessica, a non-faculty, computer and managerial specialist, became responsible for coordinating and managing the Center. In contrast, at CSU Alec was made responsible for administering the Computer Project and CEWL Program based on his experience teaching composition and administering a writing program; he relied on the University's academic computing office for technical assistance.

As administrators of their respective computer-enhanced writing programs, Jessica and Alec played key roles in the growth and development of
computer-enhanced writing at their institutions. Jessica altered the goals of the Writing Center to reflect her conception, based on her experience as a corporate trainer and manager, of the appropriate goals for computer-enhanced writing instruction at a community college. The result was the shift from the Writing Center which John and Margaret proposed to the word processing lab which the Writing Center had become. In contrast, Alec's concept of the appropriate goals for computer-enhanced writing instruction at his institution were based on his expertise as a writing teacher, a doctoral candidate in English, and a writing program administrator. Given this background, Alec was able to maintain a computer-enhanced composition program at CSU which was consistent with the most current research and scholarship in the field.

Goals of the MCC Writing Center and the CEWL Program

The original goals for the Writing Center at MCC and the original goals for computer-enhanced writing at CSU, although not identical, were comparable and consistent with current research and practice in composition studies. Dissimilarities among the programs' original goals resulted primarily from the different functions of a writing center and a first-year writing program and from the different missions of the institutions. However, differences that emerged as the programs developed were related directly to the contrasting knowledge, skills and beliefs of Jessica and Alec.

When they began the Writing Center and the Computer Project, John and Margaret and Scott and Alec had a similar primary objective: to support and enhance process-based writing instruction at their institutions. They believed
that the computer could accomplish this by enabling students to revise more
easily and produce neat, legible, multiple copies of texts and by enabling teachers
to intervene and to provide instruction as students compose. John and Margaret
and Scott and Alec also emphasized including teachers, either directly or
indirectly, in the creation and management of their programs and assisting
teachers in developing ways to use computers effectively in their classes as major
goals. Although their secondary objectives differed and were significant to the
development of computer-enhanced composition at their institutions, they were
not incompatible and were consistent with the distinctive nature of their projects
and the missions of a community college and research university. For example,
because they were creating a writing center, John and Margaret included using
computers to support individualized writing tutorials as an important goal;
similarly, because of the nature of their funding and their institution’s mission as
a research university, Scott and Alec included conducting research into the use of
computers in first-year writing classes as an important objective.

Both Jessica and Alec altered the original goals for computer-enhanced
composition and, consequently, the roles of computers in their programs. The
changes instituted by Jessica were characterized by a shift in the Writing Center’s
primary goals and a narrowing of the role of computers in writing instruction at
MCC. As it evolved under Jessica’s leadership, the MCC Writing Center
included introducing MCC students to computer technology and providing them
with basic computer literacy and word processing skills as primary goals. Within
the Center, computers were used primarily for transcribing, and to a more limited extent, producing texts, and their use in providing writing instruction was quite limited. In general, this pattern of use held true even within the composition classes held in the Center. For example, even though Ann and Nancy determined the use of computers in their classes, the ways in which they could use computers were constrained by the hardware and software made available in their classrooms. Jessica’s promotion to LASRC Manager indicated that these changes, if they were perceived at all, were regarded positively by members of MCC’s higher administration who from the outset had considered increasing cost efficiency and developing computer literacy at MCC as potential benefits of introducing computers into the writing program.

In contrast, the changes instituted by Alec resulted in the development of additional goals and a broadening of the role of computers in composition instruction at CSU. Under Alec’s leadership and spurred by the report of outside consultants and the Program’s own research, the number and variety of writing classes offered by the Program increased and the Program expanded to include literature classes. In addition, hardware and software were added to allow computers to support such activities as conferencing, collaborating, desktop publishing, and creating hypertext documents more easily. These differences between the goals of the computer-enhanced composition programs at MCC and CSU and the uses of computers which they supported had significant effects on
the character of these programs and were partially the result of Jessica and Alec's different training and backgrounds.

The shifts in goals and the uses of computers within these programs are also related to another difference between the programs. From their beginnings, both the Writing Center and the Computer Project (and later the CEWL Program), were not fully integrated into the administrative structures of the writing programs and English departments which they served; consequently, neither the Writing Center nor the CEWL included a high level of formal faculty participation in its administration.

At MCC, this situation continued and was exacerbated when Jessica was made LASRC Manager. When it began, the Writing Center was linked to the administrative structure of the writing programs it served and was characterized by a limited degree of faculty collaboration, or at least, cooperation. However, as it evolved the Writing Center became increasingly separated from the writing programs it was created to serve and developed an increasingly hierarchical, top-down administrative structure. First, the Coordinator reported to both the Chair of the English Department and the Chair of the Developmental English Section; then she began reporting only to the Chair of the English Department. Finally, when Jessica was promoted to LASRC Manager, she no longer reported to either the English Department or the Developmental English Section. At the same time, means for faculty to participate in determining the direction of the Center were not created. In addition, training and education for faculty was not expanded or maintained, and the collaboration and cooperation among faculty
members which took place when the Center first began was not encouraged and
did not continue. The isolation and stagnation reflected in the MCC case study
were partially the result of the interaction of these factors. Jessica managed the
Writing Center efficiently but seemed entirely unaware of the faculty members' concerns about how well their needs were being met and how effectively the Writing Center was supporting computer-enhanced composition. At the same time, faculty members tended to teach in isolation, sharing neither their teaching strategies nor their technical expertise. Given this situation, the Writing Center failed to reflect the goals and fully satisfy the needs of the faculty and writing programs it served, and computer-enhanced composition at MCC stagnated.

In contrast, CSU's computer-enhanced composition program became progressively more fully integrated into the Department which it served. Alec consciously encouraged web-like administrative and communication structures. For example, while faculty and the graduate students who teach in the Program continued to have very limited formal roles in CSU's CEWL Program, Alec successfully created mechanisms for gathering input from faculty members and GTAs and had begun to involve faculty more formally and fully in the Program as consultants. In addition, he maintained and expanded opportunities for teachers in the CEWL Program to collaborate and to share pedagogical strategies and technical expertise. The vitality and community evident within the CEWL Program were partially the result of the interaction of these factors.
Knowledge, Skills, and Beliefs of the Teachers

The teachers in both the MCC and CSU case studies received their only formal technical training from workshops conducted by the Writing Center or CEWL Program. Most of what these teachers knew about computer-enhanced composition also originated from within their local contexts, either through their own experience teaching with computers, through their colleagues, or through workshops conducted by the Writing Center or CEWL Program. Sources outside their immediate contexts such as professional journals and conferences had had limited impact on their knowledge about computers and computer-enhanced composition, and except for Brian, almost no impact on their pedagogies. Although the teachers were aware that journals and conferences specifically related to computer-enhanced composition exist, they had very little interest in these sources of information. Ann and Nancy found the information which they had obtained about computer-enhanced composition from sources outside their local context inapplicable to their own teaching. On the other hand, Julie and Brian believed the information and training available within the CEWL Program made seeking additional information from outside sources unnecessary or at least a low priority. In addition, with the exception of Ann, the teachers tended to be satisfied with both their knowledge about computers and computer skills and their knowledge about the relationship between computers and writing. They were, therefore, unlikely to pursue additional knowledge and information from outside sources in the future. Consequently,
the absence and presence of faculty development and training and technical and pedagogical support within these programs were critical to the ability of these teachers to develop or even to adapt innovative and effective pedagogies for their computer-enhanced composition classes.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Computers in Composition Classes

The teachers cited many of the same advantages and disadvantages related to using computers in their writing classes. In general, their observations are consistent with what has been reported in the literature. The major advantages cited were the ease of revision, the students' positive attitudes toward writing with computers, the students' increased willingness to compose in class and to revise their texts, and the students' (and teachers') ability to produce multiple copies of clean, legible texts. Disadvantages observed by the teachers included several items related to the technical aspects of using computers: the students' lack of keyboarding skills, computer "glitches" and other technical difficulties, limited availability of computers, and the necessity of devoting class time to teaching basic computer and word processing skills. How the teachers perceived other aspects of their computer-enhanced classrooms seemed to be related to their personal teaching styles and philosophies and to the particular classes they were teaching. Ann, for example, cited the "decentering of authority" as an advantage of the use of computers; however, because this tendency conflicted with her teaching style and her beliefs about the needs of her students, Ann also considered this aspect a disadvantage. Similarly, while Nancy considered the fact that her students seemed more willing to write in the
classroom in her computer-enhanced classes an advantage, she was also troubled because she no longer had as much class time to devote to "covering" content. **Goals, Philosophies, and Practices of the Teachers**

In general, the goals, teaching philosophies, and practices of these teachers reflected the computer-enhanced writing programs in which they taught. **Within the MCC Writing Center**, computers were promoted as a means of transcribing and producing texts. Although Ann's and Nancy's classes were quite different and both used computers to enable them to more easily intervene in their students' composing processes, neither tended to employ computers as instructional tools or to encourage students to examine how computers alter the nature of textuality and the composing environment. In contrast, although Brian's and Julie's classes were also quite different, both used computers to alter the way their students wrote and the way they thought about texts. For example, Brian and Julie used computers to facilitate collaboration and the exchange of ideas; they also invited their students to consider ways in which the computer’s fluid textural environment allowed them to manipulate and compose texts as readers as well as writers. These uses of computers are consistent with the CEWL Program’s goals and philosophy as described by Alec. **The Contexts for Computer-Enhanced Composition at MCC and CSU**

Although I have argued that the stagnation and vitality of these two programs were partially and perhaps largely dependent on decisions made by Jessica and Alec owing to their quite different experience and training, these outcomes also seem closely related to the existing culture from which these
programs emerged and in which they were immersed. As Ann reported, innovation, professional growth, and faculty collaboration did not seem to be highly valued within the writing programs at MCC. The creation of a writing center and the introduction of computer-enhanced composition did not significantly alter this culture, at least not beyond a short "honeymoon" period. In contrast, these qualities existed within the CSU writing program prior to the introduction of computer-enhanced composition (as evidenced, for example, by Apple Computer’s invitation for the participation of CSU’s Department of English in its program). Consequently, the introduction of computer-enhanced composition at CSU did not necessarily lead to a culture of innovation and collaboration but rather added additional opportunities for these activities to occur. In sum, the addition of computers to the composition programs at MCC and CSU seemed to reflect rather than alter the existing cultures within these programs.

Conclusions

Among the conclusions cited by Cochran-Smith, Paris, and Kahn about the effects of the introduction of computers into composition classrooms was the observation that computers tend to alter the patterns of interactions in writing classes and frequently lead to increased interaction and collaboration among students. Although the data gathered from the classroom observations and the teachers in this dissertation tend to support this observation, they also suggest that while computers may alter the patterns of interactions within classrooms and among students, they do not necessarily alter the patterns of interactions within
writing programs. Just as it has been found that students, in the absence of instructional intervention, tend to use computers to support their existing composing processes, the composition programs and the teachers within these case studies tended to use computers to support and reflect their existing philosophies, goals, and practices.

The tendency of these composition programs to use computers to support their existing philosophies, goals, and practices is made more critical by the finding that teachers within these programs depend almost exclusively on their local context for their knowledge about computers, their computer skills, and their knowledge about the relationship between computers and composition. Since the teachers tend to depend on the programs for their knowledge about computers, their computer skills, and their knowledge about the relationship between computers and composition, when the computer-enhanced composition programs did not provide adequate technical training and opportunities for faculty development, these teachers did not acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to critically examine and improve the ways in which they used computers in their classes and to evaluate the computer resources available to them and participate in decision-making at the program level.

Another potential impediment to effective faculty participation in these computer-enhanced composition programs was the separation of the administrative structure of the programs from those of the departments and writing programs which they supported. Neither the Writing Center nor the CEWL Program included faculty in their formal administrative structures. In
fact, both the LASRC Manager and CEWL Coordinator were given the authority to act independently in decisions regarding important aspects of their programs such as software, hardware, classroom arrangements, and program policies. Their decisions in these areas largely determine the teaching environment within the classrooms in these programs. The exclusion of faculty from a formal voice in such matters and the limitations placed on them by the decisions made at the program level were quite different from the relative freedom of choice and participation reflected in the traditional writing programs at these institutions. For example, at MCC teachers must use a common text in their first-year writing classes; however, this common text is chosen not by the Department Chair or the Director of Freshman Writing, but by a committee of faculty members who teach these classes. In contrast, the decision to use PC Write Standard, was made by Jessica, and although she consulted with the Chairperson of the English Department, his involvement was not formally required. The decision not to pursue the possibility of networking one or both of the Writing Center’s classrooms was also made by Jessica, apparently independent of the teachers or administrators in the writing programs. Similarly, although Alec solicited the participation of teachers in the CEWL Program and faculty in the English Department when making many decisions affecting the Program, the involvement and input of teachers and faculty had not been formalized and no provision for faculty input had been made in the administrative structure of the program. In short, faculty within these writing
programs ceded some of the professional rights and responsibilities that have traditionally belonged to them to non-faculty administrators. This finding certainly has important implications for writing faculty and writing programs.

**Widening Contexts: Implications for Computer-Enhanced Composition Studies**

**Generalizing from Qualitative Case Studies**

Although the nature of qualitative case studies is to focus on the particular in order to develop an understanding of a unique and richly complex context, perhaps their value is ultimately in their ability to provide what Derrida has termed differance—the opposite or "Other" from which identity or the "Self" emerges. Therefore, it is from this basis that I draw wider conclusions and implications from these studies, even as I am aware of the dangers of generalizing from a class of two.

In the "Introduction," I addressed a number of factors and issues which contributed to the history and current state of computer-enhanced composition studies. Several of these elements are reflected in the histories and present conditions of the programs examined in this dissertation, including the influence of the computer industry and of what Taylor and Johnsen define as "technological momentum" on computer-enhanced composition programs and the development of a theory of computer-enhanced composition.

**Technological Momentum, the Computer Industry, and Computer-Enhanced Composition Studies**

The influence of the computer industry was explicitly evident in these case studies: Apple Computer, Inc. offered tens of thousands of dollars worth of
Apple products and when IBM was not included in the computer-enhanced composition program at a university as large as CSU, the corporation and its vendors became concerned and pressured the university to create IBM-based labs. MCC entered into purchase agreements with particular vendors that precluded the purchase of equipment from other vendors whose equipment or software might offer more pedagogical advantages unless these advantages could be conclusively proven to outweigh financial considerations. These case studies make clear that when computers are introduced into writing programs, the computer industry also enters these programs and their classrooms directly as well as indirectly through their advertising.

As shown in the CSU case study, the computer industry is quite aware of the sales potential resulting from the use of computers in composition classes. This case study also shows that resisting the influence of a powerful industry is difficult. In "Minimalism, Populism, and Attitude Transformation," Eric Schroeder and John Boe discuss the decision to pursue a "minimalist" approach to computer-enhanced composition at the University of California, Davis, using only "low-end" word processing software and free-standing Macintosh computers. Schroeder and Boe point out that maintaining such an approach is certainly not encouraged by Apple Computer: "Always eager to sell newer, more complex, and more expensive computers and programs, Apple Computer, Inc. does not seem to [encourage a minimalist approach]. One of their brochures explicitly states that computers should have loftier uses than 'wimpy little tasks like one-
page essays" (31). Given the kind of pressure just discussed, it is crucial that faculty and administrators in computer-enhanced composition studies think and act critically when making decisions about how computers will be used in their composition classes. As Richard Lanham has argued, "We will have to decide how technology can be orchestrated into socially responsible patterns of use" (italics Lanham's) (xv). To promote such an approach, computer-enhanced composition studies and programs must be grounded in pedagogically and politically sound theoretical frameworks, for as Cynthia Selfe argues, "We know as a profession that theoretical examination contributes centrally to making our discipline intellectually responsible in a broad social and cultural sense" (119). A Socially-Based Framework for Computer-Enhanced Composition Studies

As discussed in the "Introduction," many scholars, among them Cynthia Selfe, Gail Hawisher, Carolyn Handa, James Strickland, and Deborah Holdstein, have argued for a socially-based theory for computer-enhanced composition studies. Within their collective works, these and other like-minded scholars have outlined a view that aligns computer-enhanced composition studies with socio-epistemic rhetoric and a theory of composing which defines writing as a socially-grounded, meaning making activity and promotes an interactive, collaborative approach to writing which de-emphasizes the authority of the instructor and provides opportunities to negotiate or reinterpret the form and meaning of texts. Many recent scholarly efforts address how technology can be used to achieve these ends within computer-enhanced composition classes (see for example, Marilyn Cooper and Cynthia Selfe, "Computer Conferences and Learning;"
Thomas Barker and Fred Kemp, "Network Theory: a Postmodern Pedagogy;"
Diane Langston and Trent Batson, "The Social Shifts Invited by Working
Collaboratively;" Janet Eldred, "Computers, Composition Pedagogy, and the
Social View;" or Richard Lanham, "The Electronic Word: Literary Study and
the Digital Revolution"). However, although scholars such as these have begun
to argue effectively for a socially-based theory of computer-enhanced
composition and to suggest how this theory might be enacted in computer-
enhanced composition classrooms, I believe that if we wish to use computers
most effectively to promote a social view of writing within our classrooms, we
must also construct our writing programs so that they reflect the values inherent
our theory. The case studies included in this dissertation have several
implications for this argument.

One important implication involves the status of faculty within these
programs. Cynthia Selfe and Deborah Holdstein have expressed concern about
the effect of introducing computers into composition studies on the status of
composition faculty. They point out that conducting scholarly work in the field
of computer-enhanced composition bears important implications for the
professional status of composition faculty and expressed misgivings about how
work such as authoring computer software and serving as developmental
"computer experts" may be evaluated (2). The case studies presented in this
dissertation suggest that the introduction of computers may also impact the
status of composition faculty by restricting their academic freedom through
limiting their ability to determine the content and pedagogies of their classes. In these case studies important decisions about hardware, software, and classroom arrangements which directly affected instruction in these classrooms were made by administrators, not faculty. Clearly, if writing faculty wish to participate fully in decisions which affect what they can do in their computer-enhanced writing classes, then they must become knowledgeable and skilled enough to participate effectively in these decisions. If writing faculty cede the right to determine the materials which they are given to teach with, they may also cede to a significant degree, the ability to determine the pedagogies they can use.

Within a socially-based theory of computer-enhanced composition, inclusivity, not exclusivity should be promoted. For composition programs, this has important ramifications for the background and training appropriate for faculty and administrators. Since these administrators will share responsibilities for decisions which affect teaching within their programs, these administrators must possess more than technical expertise. Therefore, graduate programs in composition studies should expand their curricula to include issues related to computer-enhanced composition in graduate teaching seminars and other courses dealing with composition instruction and theory so that future administrators and teachers will be better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities associated with introducing computers into composition programs. This finding also suggests that computer-enhanced composition studies should reach out to faculty such as community college and part-time teachers who are often marginalized.
Encouraging classroom-based research is one useful approach. In addition, these studies suggest that although computer-enhanced composition studies, as Cynthia Selfe and Deborah Holdstein argue, should include "theoretical, interpretive speculation, as well as pedagogy," discussion of pedagogy is still a necessary and important element of scholarship in computer-enhanced composition.

Another significant implication of these studies involves the administrative structure of these programs. In the "Introduction" to *Writing Centers in Context: Twelve Case Studies*, Joyce Kinkead and Jeanette G. Harris, discussing the importance context in case studies of writing centers, conclude, "It is their environment, academic and otherwise, that most directly shapes them, giving them form and substance and the impetus to define themselves in certain ways" (xv). The isolation and hierarchical organization of the formal administrative structures of these computer-enhanced composition programs imply that the values of a socially-grounded computer-enhanced composition theory as well as the goals espoused by participants within these programs--decentering authority and the inclusion of marginalized groups--are not fully integrated within the programs themselves. If our practice is to inform, reflect, and support our theory, then the administrative structures of these programs should have web-like administrative structures which encourage communication and interaction among program administrators, faculty, and students rather than hierarchical, top-down systems which discourage such interactions. As the CSU program case-study shows, such an administrative structure is not only theoretically sound, it also
helps to promote a climate which supports effective teaching and program administration. In addition, computer-enhanced composition programs should be fully integrated within their supporting departments rather than isolated, components of segregated, compartmentalized composition programs.

Finally, one of the most important implications of these case studies involves the issue of access. In "The Prospects and Consequences of Private Access to Computers," Ronald Sudol points out that one of the results of the introduction of computers in composition programs "is that the material conditions of writing fall under institutional control" (89). He goes on to observe that students who have independent access to computers have a hard choice to make. If they choose the probably superior equipment and the nurturing environment of the university lab, they may not be able to use their own equipment if it has an incompatible operating system or disk size. If they choose the convenience and privacy of their own systems, they may be excluding themselves from the spirit of enterprise and high tech excitement of the computerized classroom. (93)

Sudol's observation is consistent with the practices found at MCC and CSU. The computer-enhanced composition programs at both institutions required students to compose and faculty to teach exclusively with the hardware and software provided by the programs. For example, at both institutions, students who wished to use their own computers or whose schedules did not permit them to use the universities' facilities outside of class were discouraged from using their own equipment and even advised to drop their computer-enhanced composition class and enroll in a traditional class. This finding is particularly
surprising at CSU because of Alec’s clearly evident desire to respond to students’ concerns and needs and to reach out to non-traditional students who may lack access to the university’s labs.

As reported by the participants in the MCC and CSU case studies, students are coming to computer-enhanced composition classes with greater computer experience and expertise and more frequently have access to computers outside the programs’ labs and classrooms. Although providing computers for student use in and outside of computer-enhanced classrooms is certainly one way of insuring that all students have access to this important technology, as more students gain independent access, forcing students to use the programs’ equipment exclusively reduces the opportunity of students, particularly marginalized and non-traditional students, to use computers. For example, Ann reported that many of her non-traditional community college students had access to computers through their jobs. However, since their employers’ hardware and software were unlikely to be identical to that provided by MCC’s Writing Center, they could not fully benefit from their access to computers outside the classroom.

This finding is inconsistent with the values and goals of a socially-based theory of computer-enhanced composition. CSU’s "mobile classroom" project is one possible response to the problem of access. Two other responses have been suggested by Ronald Sudol. Sudol proposes that composition programs develop "generic" word processing classes which address the uses and unique conditions of computer-enhanced composing, but which allow students to write outside of
class using their own equipment. He also argues that computer-enhanced composition programs should attempt to make it easier for students to use their own equipment by providing greater compatibility between the programs' own equipment and whatever their students may be using. To increase compatibility, computer-enhanced composition programs should avoid relying exclusively on a single brand or operating system, should purchase and encourage the use of programs which can convert files from one operating system or word processing program to another, and should provide access to telecommunications programs which can transmit files from the students' computer systems to the programs' and vice versa.

In "Politics, Ideology, and the Isolated Composer," Carolyn Handa argues, "... the computer is not simply neutral. Emerging at a particular period in time, in a particular social context, the computer is a tool reflecting the politics and ideology of both" (161). In composition programs, how computers are used is determined by the knowledge, skills, and beliefs of those who create and teach in these programs. The more these individuals know about computers and about computer-enhanced composition, the more effectively they will be able to use these tools to meet their own pedagogical, political, and ideological goals. Finally, as composition specialists, the more we know about computers, the better we will be able to integrate theory and practice and the more likely it will be that computers are used in our computer-enhanced composition programs to meet ends which are both ethically and pedagogically sound.
APPENDIX A

Materials Distributed to the

Case Study Participants
Program Case Study Cover Letter

March 18, 1992

Name
Institution
Address
Address

Dear:

Thank you for tentatively agreeing to participate in my study of computers and composition programs and teachers. I'd like to present some details about the project so you can better understand my interest and goals in undertaking this inquiry as well as the nature of your own involvement.

The first enclosure following this letter contains an abstract of the project and a brief statement of my credentials to help you understand my interest in this research.

The second enclosure includes a schedule of data collection activities and a list of kinds the materials I will be collecting if they are available. If you are aware of other materials relevant to your program's development, please include them also. The timetable provides a week's window for most activities. So that I can accommodate your needs and preferences, please consider when the best times for our interview and my observation of your program site will be. When I contact and, if possible, meet with you during the first week of spring quarter, we can set-up a schedule. I project that the interview will take about an hour and a half.

The final enclosure is a "Statement of the Rights and Responsibilities of the Researcher and the Participant" which describes the rights and commitments of both the researcher and the participant. I am providing the "Statement" now only for your information. I will bring two copies for you to sign to our first meeting.

I look forward to working with you during the upcoming weeks. Thank you once again for your cooperation. If you have any questions before I call to arrange an appointment, please do not hesitate to call me at (XXX) 253-ZZZZ.

Sincerely yours,

Becky Ertel

Enclosures: Research Abstract and Credentials
Schedule of Activities and List of Materials to be Collected
Statement of Rights and Responsibilities
Research Abstract

Since the introduction of the microcomputer in the late 1970's, interest in the computer as a writing tool has increased rapidly. Many, if not most, college composition programs now offer at least some writing courses which use computers. Currently, computers are used in writing classrooms in at least four ways: as a tool to produce and analyze texts, as a means to instruct, as a channel to promote conversation, and as a medium to disseminate information. To which use the computer is put and for what end is determined by the knowledge, skills, and beliefs of those who create and manage computers and composition programs and the teachers who teach computers and composition classes.

This study is motivated by a curiosity about what computer knowledge and skills writing teachers who teach with computers possess, what these teachers believe about computers and writing, and how they translate their knowledge and beliefs into pedagogy and practice within their classrooms. Specifically, this study involves five broad areas of concern:

1) what knowledge about computers and computer skills writing teachers possess
2) what these teachers believe about computers and writing
3) how they have acquired their knowledge, skills, and beliefs about computers and writing
4) how they integrate their knowledge and beliefs about computers with their knowledge and beliefs about writing
5) how they use their knowledge and beliefs about computers and writing in their teaching

Because teachers who use computers to teach writing often teach within computers and composition programs, the study will also examine the histories, goals, and philosophies of computers and composition programs and analyze how individual teachers adapt themselves and their pedagogies to these exigencies.

The project will therefore involve two kinds of case studies: case studies of two programs and case studies of six teachers, three from each program. The program case studies will involve institutions with very different missions and student populations—a large, research university and a medium-sized, urban community college. The case studies of teachers will include teachers who are teaching different kinds or levels of writing classes and who are described as using computers differently from one another. The methodology for the study is naturalistic; the researcher will not attempt to manipulate or to impose influences upon the programs or the teachers. Methods to collect data will include: collection of documents, interviews, direct observations, and a questionnaire.
Activities Timetable for the Case Histories of Programs 
and List of Data to be Collected on Programs

Activities Timetable

Spring Quarter 1992: Data Collection

Week One (March 30-April 3)
I will discuss information to be collected, make appointments for interviews, 
and arrange site observations with key individuals from the programs.

Week Two (April 4-8)
I will collect program documents.

Week Three (April 13-17)
I will interview key program individuals and make site observations.

Week Ten (June 1-5)
I will collect any additional program data which has become available.

Fall Quarter 1992: Data Review

I will provide participants with a copy of my summary of their program’s case study data for review and comment.

List of Data to be Collected

The following is a list of the types of program documents I anticipate collecting for the program case histories. Other items may be identified during interviews with key individuals from the programs.

Grant proposals
Mission/goal statements
Program descriptions
Position descriptions for staff
Descriptions of teacher training workshops and materials
A list of all equipment
A list of all software
Course lists and descriptions
Common/sample course syllabi
Researcher Credentials

Rebecca C. Ertel

430 Livingston Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45410
(513) 253-1284

Education

1992  Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English, The Ohio State University
      (Specializations in: Composition Theory and Practice, Computers in
      English Studies, and Medieval Literature)

1990-1991  Graduate Coursework, Department of English, The Ohio State
          University

1989-1990  Graduate Coursework, Instructional Design and Technology area,
          Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, The Ohio State
          University

1982-1984  M.A. in English, Wright State University (Specialization in: Teaching
          English as a Second Language)

1977-1982  B.S. in Education, Wright State University (Specializations in:
          English, history, and political science)

Professional Experience

1986-Present  Instructor, Department of English, Theater, and Communication,
              Central State University

1985-1986  Individualized Learning Center Specialist, Sinclair Community
           College

1982-1984  Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of English, Wright State
           University

1982-1984  Assistant to the Writing Center Director, Wright State University

Certifications

Ohio Teaching Certificate
Wright State University TESOL Certificate
Statement of the
Rights and Responsibilities of the
Researcher and the Participant

Researcher:

1. It is the intent of the researcher to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants and participating programs to the greatest extent possible. During the course of the study, measures will be taken to limit access to the data on a need-to-know basis. In the dissertation, all case study data will be presented using pseudonyms.

2. The researcher will present a timetable and description of data collection activities before data collection begins.

3. It is the responsibility of the researcher to contact the participant to schedule interviews, observations, and other data collection activities. The researcher will attempt to accommodate the needs and preferences of the participant whenever possible when scheduling these activities. Once data collection activities have been scheduled, the researcher will make changes only if absolutely necessary.

4. To help insure accuracy and authenticity, the researcher will provide the participant with a draft of the researcher's summary of the participant's case study data for the participant's review and comments. The participant's response to the summary of the case study data may be written, oral, or both.

5. The researcher reserves the right to contact the participant after the data collection (while writing the dissertation) to clarify and supplement information.  
6. Direct quotations from the participant will be used only as necessary to the claims of the study and will not jeopardize the participants in any way. The participant gives the researcher permission to use direct quotations in the case study reports.

______________________________ (participant's signature)

Participant:

1. The participant may contact the researcher at any time during the study at the following number (513-253-1284).

2. Participation in the study is entirely voluntary. The participant may withdraw from the study at any time without justification for that action. If a participant decides to withdraw, he or she must contact the researcher as soon as possible.
All data will be returned to the participant should he or she decide to withdraw.

3. Participants are responsible for providing all data required for the study honestly, thoroughly, and accurately. Because this is a naturalistic study, its validity and reliability depend on the genuineness and completeness of the data.

4. Once data collection activities have been scheduled, the participant must notify the researcher as soon as possible if he or she needs to reschedule an activity.

5. The participant is responsible for obtaining all necessary clearances for observations and informing the researcher of copyright or other restrictions on documents or other data provided by the participant to the researcher.

__________________________

Signatures and Dates

Researcher: Rebecca C. Ertel

__________________________ ________________
(signature) (date)

University Supervisor: Dr. Sara Garnes, Associate Professor of English, The Ohio State University

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand this "Statement of the Rights and Responsibilities of the Researcher and the Participant." I sign it freely and voluntarily.

Participant: ____________________________ (please print)

__________________________ ________________
(signature) (date)

Please return one copy to Rebecca Ertel. Retain the other copy for your records.
Teacher Case Study Cover Letter

March 18, 1992

Dear :

Thank you for tentatively agreeing to participate in my study of computers and composition programs and teachers. I'd like to present some details about the project so you can better understand my interest and goals in undertaking this inquiry as well as the nature of your own involvement.

The first enclosure following this letter contains an abstract of the project, a short description of the data collection activities, and a brief statement of my credentials to help you understand my interest in this research.

The second enclosure includes a schedule of data collection activities and a descriptive list of the materials I will be collecting from teachers. The timetable provides a week's window for most activities. So that I can accommodate your needs and preferences, please consider when the best times for our in-depth interview, my observations of your classes, and our post-observation interview will be. When I contact and, if possible, meet with you during the first or second week of spring quarter, we can set-up a schedule. I project that the in-depth background interview will take about an hour and a half. The post-observation interviews should last only about half an hour or so.

The final enclosure is a "Statement of the Rights and Responsibilities of the Researcher and the Participant" which describes the rights and commitments of both the researcher and the participant. I am providing the "Statement" now only for your information. I will bring two copies for you to sign to our first meeting.

I look forward to working with you during the upcoming weeks. Thank you once again for your cooperation. If you have any questions before I call to arrange an appointment, please do not hesitate to call me at (513) 253-1284.

Sincerely yours,

Becky Ertel

Enclosures:

Research Abstract, Activities Description, and Credentials
Schedule of Activities and List of Materials to be Collected
Statement of Rights and Responsibilities
Description of Data Collection Activities
for Participating Teachers

Participating Teacher Questionnaire

The questionnaire gathers general information about the teachers’ educational background, teaching experience, personal uses of computers, and uses of computers in teaching writing. I estimate participants will spend between one and two hours completing the questionnaire.

In-Depth Background Interview

The in-depth interview gathers detailed information about the teachers’ knowledge of computers, computer skills, and beliefs about the uses of computers to teach writing, as well as the teachers’ goals and pedagogy in their classes using computers. The background interview should last between one and two hours.

Class Observations

The class observations will be used to gather data on the teachers’ pedagogy and classroom practices. Classes will be observed in week long segments in order to better observe the context and continuity of classroom activities.

Post-Observation Interviews

After each week of observation, the teachers will be interviewed and asked to review the researcher’s summary of her field notes. The purpose of the interview and review is to clarify and supplement the researcher’s observations. Post-observation interviews should take less than one hour.

Class Materials

Class materials such as the syllabus, handouts, and assignments will be collected to supplement information provided on the questionnaire and during interviews.
Activities Timetable for the Case Studies of Teachers

Spring Quarter 1992: Data Collection

Weeks One and Two (March 30-April 10)

I will meet with participating teachers to discuss information to be collected, make appointments for interviews, arrange class observations, and distribute the questionnaire.

Week Three (April 13-17)

I will collect the questionnaire and class materials from the teachers.

(The remaining data collection activities, except for the final data collection during week ten, are arranged on two parallel schedules. The schedule for each teacher will be determined during our initial interview.)

Schedule A: Week Four (April 20-24)
Schedule B: Week Five (April 27-May 1)

I will meet with the participating teacher for an in-depth interview.

Schedule A: Week Five (April 27-May 1)
Schedule B: Week Six (May 4-8)

I will conduct the first classroom observations.

Schedule A: Week Six (May 4-8)
Schedule B: Week Seven (May 11-15)

I will conduct the first post-observation interviews.

Schedule A: Week Seven (May 11-15)
Schedule B: Week Eight (May 18-22)

I will conduct the second classroom observations.

Schedule A: Week Eight (May 18-22)
Schedule B: Week Nine (May 26-29)

I will conduct the second post-observation interviews.
Week Ten (June 1-5)

I will collect all remaining handouts, tests, and other relevant class materials.

Fall Quarter 1992: Data Review

I will provide participants with a copy of my summary of their case study data for review and comment.
List of Materials to be Collected from Participating Teachers

For the class that I will observe, I would like one copy of the following:

-- the syllabus

-- the course description (if not included on the syllabus)

-- a list of any supplemental assignments, textbooks, workbooks, or other teaching materials not on the syllabus

-- all handouts given to students

-- all texts, quizzes, and exams

-- all overheads and visual aids (if possible)

If convenient, these materials can be on computer disk. I have access to MS DOS, MacIntosh, and Apple II equipment in either 3½ or 5¼ inch formats. I will exchange blank disks for any disk you give me.

I will collect the syllabus and any other materials you have available during week three. I am especially anxious to collect any materials you will be using during the two weeks I will observe your classes at this time. Otherwise, I will collect them during my first class observation. Any materials I have not already obtained, I will collect during week ten.
APPENDIX B

Materials from the MCC Writing Center's Faculty Developers and Manager
List of Conferences Attended and Publications Gathered by MCC Faculty Developers

Lab Visitations (J = John only/ J & M = John and Margaret)

St. Petersburg Community College (Clearwater Campus)--Summer
Seminole Community College (Sanford, FL)--Summer 85 (J)
Georgia Southern University (Statesboro, GA)--summer 85 (J)
Waycross Junior College (Waycross, GA)--Summer 85 (J)
Community College of Philadelphia--Summer--Summer 85 (J)
University of California at Berkeley--Summer 85 (J)
Wright State University--Fall 85 (J & M)
Purdue University--Fall 1985 (J & M)
Miami University of Ohio--Fall 86 (J & M)

Conferences

Ohio Association of Two-Year Colleges--Fall 85
Midwest Regional Conference on Teaching English in the 2-Year College--Winter 1986, Winter 1987
Writing Centers Assoc.: East Central--Spring 86, Spring 87
Conference on Computers and Writing--Spring 86
Peer Tutoring in Writing Conference--Fall 87

Publications

Writing Lab Newsletter
ACE Newsletter; (Assembly on Computers in English/NCTE)
Writing Center Journal
Computers and Composition Journal
Research in Word Processing Newsletter
Computer-Assisted Composition Journal
Electronic Learning
Creative Word Processing in the Classroom

Books (sorry this information is incomplete)

Writing On-line--Using Computers in the Teaching of Writing, ed. by James Collins and Elizabeth Sommers

Tutoring Writing A Sourcebook for Writing Labs. ed. by Muriel Harris

Computers in the English Classroom: A Primer for Teachers, by Standiford, Jaycox, and Auten (ERIC--NCTE)

Microcomputers and Basic Skills in College--CUNY

Microcomputers and Word Processing Programs: An Evaluation and Critique--CUNY

Computer-Assisted Instruction in Composition: Create Your Own, by Cynthia Selfe
Writing Center Coordinator’s Position Description

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT
(New Position)

WRITING CENTER SUPERVISOR
ENGLISH/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

The Writing Center Supervisor will work with Co-Directors, one each from English and Developmental Studies, and peer tutors to promote and maintain all areas of the Writing Center; computer classroom, conferencing area, and individualized instruction component. He/She will report to the Co-Directors who, in turn, will report to their respective Chairpersons and Deans.

The Supervisor’s primary duties will include the following:

- Recommending clerical/technical staff for the Center.
- Scheduling, which would include reserving computer classroom time for selected classes as well as maintaining open lab hours, and arranging efficient use of the conferencing and individualized instruction areas.
- Publicizing Writing Center offerings.
- Developing procedures for the Writing Center.
- Administering approved procedures for the Writing Center.
- Working with Co-Directors to train peer tutors, conduct faculty orientation and staff development programs, and assist in creating a Writing Resource Bank.
- Maintaining records of Writing Center use.

Requirements:

Bachelor's degree in a Liberal Arts discipline required; Master's degree preferred. A strong commitment to writing in a community college setting is essential. Experience in English composition and knowledge of computer use and applications (especially word processing as it relates to the teaching of composition) are required. Experience in a writing center environment, working with CAI and computer networking desirable.

This is a twelve-month administrative position; salary competitive and adjusted to qualifications and experience.

To apply, submit a letter of application and resume by October 30, 1987, to:

Director of Human Resources
Published in the President's Bulletin of 10/12/87
COMPUTER WRITING CENTER PROPOSAL

Purpose for the Center

1. To assist writers by providing a place where they can get immediate assistance, practice, and analysis of their writing.

2. To facilitate the writing process by using the computer as a technological tool which enhances the intentions of the instructor.

3. To provide the students with automated diagnostic writing procedures which will identify writing weaknesses and strengths.

4. To offer tutorial assistance and an opportunity for the beginning writers to practice through individualized instruction.

5. To make writers familiar with the stages of the writing process via programmed instruction.

6. To sharpen the beginning writer’s ability to question and to resolve problem areas in different stages of the writing process.

Use of the Computer Writing Center

The Computer Writing Center will have four main areas: 1) one room housing twenty-five work stations with computers and four printers for courses selected from both the English and Developmental Departments; 2) one room for conferencing with students about their writing; 3) one room for tutorial, practice or skill development and 4) a storage and supply area.

The target classes to benefit from Composition classes using computers follow: English 111, 112, 113; Dev 075 and 110; Business Communications 121, 122; Literature, and Special Topics.

A net for this classroom environment needs further exploration before a recommendation can be made. The considerations are cost, theoretical basis, and the applications required by the varied target classes. After this Center is established, scheduling will be determined according to the two departments’ needs. Instructors will encourage students from English, Literature or Developmental classes to use the conferencing and tutorial rooms. Students will use these two areas of the Center to work on special assignments requested by faculty in either department. Policies in compliance with [Middleton]’s philosophy will have to be expressed before the Center becomes functional. In particular, Writing Across the Curriculum will provide the catalyst for encouraging content-area faculty to motivate their students to write. The Center would certainly support any WAC projects. Both departments should continue to share responsibility in overseeing, updating, and upkeeping software and equipment in this Center.
Writing Laboratory Classes (Area A) [Approx. six classes per quarter]

A schedule for holding classes should show blocks of about two hours for each class to be in the Computer Writing Laboratory. The Computer Laboratory will also be open at the same times the other two areas of the Center are in operation.

Tuesdays - Thursdays: 8:00-9:40, 10:00-11:40 a.m.
Mondays/Wednesdays/Fridays: 10:00-11:40 a.m.; 12:00-1:40, 2:00-3:40 p.m.
Saturdays: 9:00-12:40 a.m.

Note: Several teaching faculty members have expressed that traditional classroom access (one classroom) should adjoin the Writing Center's Computer Laboratory.

Writing and Tutorial Open-Time (Area B)

Mondays/Wednesdays/Fridays 11:00-2:00 p.m.
Tuesdays - Thursdays: 2:00-4:00 p.m.
Saturdays: 1:00-2:00 p.m.
Evenings: Tuesdays-Thursdays: 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Conferencing Area Hours of Operation (Area C)

Monday - Thursday: 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (10 hours daily)
Fridays: 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (8 hours daily)
Saturday: 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. (4 hours daily)

*Total hours of operation: fifty-two hours a week. This schedule is tentative and should remain flexible in order to accommodate both student needs and faculty availability.

Instructional Staff

The selection of personnel for teaching the computer assisted instruction courses will depend on the faculty members wanting to initiate any composition, literature, or developmental courses. Executive agents for the computer laboratory will be faculty members who teach the courses. These members will attempt to introduce and update workable software consistent with their needs. Each individual instructor will be responsible for assembling and creating materials for the course each instructor teaches. Two full-time faculty members (one from Developmental and one from English) should oversee the needs of Areas B and C with the assistance of two students and one computer technician. The faculty members who instruct the computer writing courses in Area A will be responsible for their own needs as they are in traditional classrooms. The two faculty members who keep the Center operational and the two faculty members assigned to work in the other two areas of the Center should be rotated every quarter.

Faculty Writing Center Directors

One full-time faculty member will be hired as the director to oversee and organize
the operations of the Computer Writing Center and will be assisted by a second full-time faculty member as the assistant director. The assistant director should receive six hours of release time a quarter as compensation for assisting the director. These two positions should be rotated yearly. The assistant director will assume the duties of the director on the second year of operation. The director may choose to teach classes on an overload, but her or his first responsibility would be to manage the laboratory. This responsibility would include scheduling, training of writing tutors, coordinating mini-workshops for students and faculty (both English and content-area), publicizing the Center’s offerings, conferencing, and directing the work of other faculty members involved in the Center’s laboratory operations.

The two faculty members should represent the English and Developmental Departments. Their concerns should include overseeing scheduling of the Computer Writing Laboratory, and should implement software for use at all three areas for composition, word-processing, tutorial, shell development, and housekeeping. Collaboration with the Individualized Learning Center and The Learning Resources Center should be maintained. The software selected for use in any area of the Center should reflect the intended emphasis of each course and the philosophy of each department. Faculty members who teach each genre course would input ideas about their needs to the director of the Center.

Teaching Faculty

Faculty who are teaching computer-writing classes need not be involved with the Center’s operations. Teaching faculty members will be paid the same as in any other course in their departments. Six classes should be offered from both departments a quarter. The courses using computers as a tool should be scheduled in the same way that other courses are scheduled. Different designations and emphasis is discouraged in order to avoid students becoming apprehensive in taking a computer writing course. However, a prerequisite of keyboarding should be a consideration. The courses taught at the Computer Writing Laboratory should be offered for two quarters in an experimental basis. Both department chairpersons should schedule these writing courses in the most workable time frames when students are more likely to sign up, until the courses become routine.

Tri-Center-Laboratory Assistants

Two full-time student employees, and one full-time computer technician will be needed to assist in the Center’s and laboratory’s operations. Their duties will include:

1) assisting faculty during composition classes (if needed)
2) monitoring the tutorial and conferencing areas when open
3) assisting students in running terminals,
4) keeping accurate lists of students using the Center,
5) cataloguing new software or software
6) duplicating forms needed for operations
7) coordinating the functions of faculty members
8) keeping the hardware operational
*Duties should be rotated between both students.

Computer Writing Center Location

Location - accessibility to students should be the first concern. The Center should be in close proximity to faculty members of both departments who are presently in buildings S and 6.

Space - the laboratory with computers for networking should have room for twenty-five machines, four monitors, a central area to monitor the activity and storage for software needed for classes. The conferencing area should be adjacent to the computer room; and tutorial, storage area and materials room should be adjacent to the other two areas. Three areas are needed: Area A (Computer-Network Area); Area B (Conferencing), Area C (Tutorial and Storage Area). In addition an adjoining classroom should be available at the times that classes are scheduled at the Computer Writing Laboratory.

*The dimensions of each room are designated in Appendix I.
AREA A  PRICES LISTED ARE COMPETITIVE AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE

$1,589.00 ea. twenty-four IBM PC computers
  400.00 ea. twenty-four color monitors
  169.00 ea. twenty-four student work stations
  or
  50,000.00 local-area-net with twenty-four terminals
  700.00 ea. three letter-quality printers, Juki 6300
  300.00 ea. one dot-matrix printer, Epson Fx-85

AREA B

1,400.00 ea. four Apple IIe computers
  169.00 ea. four student work stations,
  1,729.00 ea. one IBM XT
  1,589.00 ea. one IBM PC
  3,500.00 ea. one IBM AT
  400.00 ea. two color monitors
  600.00 ea. one color and graphics monitor
  169.00 ea. three writing stations
  300.00 ea. one dot-matrix printer, Epson FX-85
  500.00 ea. one letter-quality printer, Silver Reed 550

AREA C

1,400.00 ea. two Apple IIe computers
  80.00 ea. one paper cutter
  40.00 ea. one automatic stapler
  300.00 ea. one dot matrix printer, Epson FX-85
  40.00 ea. one automatic hole puncher
  600.00 ea. two VCRs, Fischer
1,200.00 ea. one IBM Selectric typewriter
  400.00 ea. two television screen
  100.00 ea. two overhead projectors
  75.00 ea. two overhead screens
  400.00 ea. one large projection screen (lab)
  700.00 ea. three letter-quality printers, Juki 6300
  500.00 ea. two Silver Reed
  300.00 ea. three dot-matrix printers, Epson Fx-85

*Note: two printers have been purchased and are not included in these projections

  250.00 ea. eight work station desks
  189.00 ea. twelve double-seat computer tables
  260.00 ea. nine printer tables
  200.00 ea. two receptionist desks
200.00 ea. one L-shaped counter top to divide software access area from network
130.00 ea. thirty-two adjustable (office style) chairs
42.00 ea. thirty-two copy holders
89.95 ea. two desktop disk file
84.95 ea. four diskette storage cabinets with locks
200.00 ea. two large 4-drawer filing cabinets
130.00 ea. six upright open shelves, 84" H, 36" W
260.00 ea. three (6' circumference) tables
125.95 ea. twelve chairs, swivel with arm rests
260.00 ea. four square small tables
108.85 ea. eight chairs
126.94 ea. three shelves 84" H for supplies/equipment
500.00 twenty-five lockers
350.00 ea. one low (8' circumference) table, &O OQ OQ ea. two 3-part sectional couches
600.00 ea. two (S-magazine) wall racks
349.00 ea. two credenzas (table with shelves)
30.00 ea. four sets of five diskette plastic storage cases
100.00 ea. four 8' work tables
600.00 ea. four media cabinets with locks
23.95 ea. five disk trays

Time Frame for Implementing Laboratory

Approving and funding of proposal - April 1, 1986.

Selecting Equipment - May and June, 1986.

Ordering Equipment - September and October, 1986.

Delivering of Equipment - November and December, 1986.

Employing Student Laboratory Assistants - Nov. and Dec., 1986.

Organizing of Laboratory - December and January, 1986.

Testing of Equipment - November and December, 1986.


Opening of Writing Laboratory - Spring Quarter, 1987.

Release Time for System Acquisition and Development

Release time needed - 12 hours. Six hours release time for each of two faculty members: one from the English Department and one from the Developmental
Department for Spring and Fall Quarters, 1986.

Student Use of the Center

Pre-writing, writing, revision, and editing are integral parts of the writing process for beginning writers. Writings are generated from personal and/or vicarious experience, through research, and through the analysis of literature. Each stage of the writing process sets high demands on both the student and the teacher. Both must be able to communicate clearly before any good teaching or learning can result. The Center would encourage writing, skill development, and practice from any student at [Middleton]. The levels of maturity which reflect good writing would be enhanced.

Instructor and Student Laboratory Assignments

All faculty will send students for specific assignments at the Computer Writing Center to work on skill development, tutorials, or conferencing. Appropriate forms would be sent with the student, collected by the laboratory personnel, and filed. Length of time, specific software, and assignments worked on would be kept. The teacher would be notified of the students' attendance and involvement either with the student or through the Center's personnel. In addition, students would be free to use the Center to write out of class assignments, to meet their instructors for conferencing, or to do whatever encourages them to write. Immediate feedback would be provided through diagnostics and gradekeeping.

Prerequisites

Keyboarding and Data Processing 105 would be helpful, but not mandatory. For scheduled computer-composition courses, the same prerequisites required for English 112, English 113, Tech Writing etc. would be enforced.

Textbooks

Computer-Composition courses would continue to recommend the textbooks for each course if the instructor requires it. The same texts for writing classes which are selected by the department would continue to be recommended. Instructional guides would be developed by each instructor to demonstrate menus and prompts for student use of the available hardware and software.
Interview Schedule for the [MCC] Writing Center Case Study
(Writing Center Director)

1. I'd like to begin by talking a little bit about the Writing Center's mission and philosophy.
   a. I know that among the documents you gave me is a statement of the Center's mission, but before I discuss that with you, I'd like you, if you would, to just briefly explain the Center's mission as it has evolved over the past five years as well as describing the Center's goals as you envision them today.
   
   b. One of the documents you gave me describes the Center's mission as follows: "The Writing Center's mission is to encourage students to write better via a variety of experiences. We want to help them become better, more independent writers." Could you expand on this statement a bit?

   b1. What sort of experiences and environment do you try to provide?

   b2. What do you mean by "better" and "more independent"?

   b3. What, in your view, is the role of computer technology in helping students to become "better writers? More "independent" writers?

   b4. How has the role of computer technology in meeting these goals changed over the years (if it has)?

   c. Peer tutoring is also part of the Writing Center's philosophy. Could you briefly describe the role of tutors in the Center?

   c1. What kind of background in writing do the tutors have? What kind of background in computers? Could you describe the training you give them?

   c2. How are the peer tutoring and the computer aspects of the Center related?

   d. What changes, if any, would you like to make to help the Center in accomplishing its mission? Do you plan to implement any of these in the near or at least foreseeable future?

   e. Is there anything else you'd like to add regarding the Center's mission and goals?

2. Now I'd like to talk a bit about the configuration of the Center.
   a. According to the proposal I was given by Jim, the original plan (which, as I understand it, was never implemented) called evaluation sheets are used, do you have copies)?

   d. I'm curious about the status of the Center's networking options. For example, I know that a LAN was one of the original configurations considered. You've also told me that
the Center does not currently operate on a network, but is "wired" and has the capacity to operate on a network. Could you discuss the networking issue a bit. What, in your opinion and based on your knowledge of current composition and computers in composition theory and research, are the advantages and disadvantages of stand alone environment versus a networked environment for computers and composition classes?

e. The original proposal called for five printers to be housed in the Center's computer classroom--three high speed letter quality and two dot matrix. Currently, I believe each classroom is equipped with dot matrix printers (Epson LQ 510 and FX 86E). Could you discuss the printing needs of the computer classrooms, the options that were considered, and how satisfied you are with your current set-up?

f. Have you or are you considering adding any additional equipment? Additional computers? Overhead screen projectors? An over-sized monitor? Mice? Hard drives?

9. How would your ideal computer writing center be equipped?

h. Is there anything else you'd like to add in reference to hardware?

4. Now I'd like to talk a bit about software.

a. On one of the handouts you have me you indicated that the following software is available in the Center: PC-Write (version 2.01), Bank Street Writer (version ), Norton Textra (version 2.0), and Webster's Spell Check (version ).

PC Write is currently used primarily by English?  
Bank Street Writer is used primarily by DEV?  
Norton Textra is used primarily by ______?  Webster's is used primarily by ________?

b. How were these programs selected (why were they chosen over other word processors or spell checkers)? Who was involved? What criteria were used (if evaluation sheets used, do you have copies) Can you recall what other programs were considered?

c. Is the process you just described "standard practice" for considering or implementing a software purchase?

d. Do instructors ever indicate that they would like a specific package or kind of package to be purchased for use in their classes? If so, what happens?

e. Are there any other programs (commercial or in-house) that are used in the Center (generally available to students or used by specific teachers for their classes) that you are aware of? How were these programs chosen?

f. With the exception of Webster's Spell Checker (which is a simple kind of text analysis program and a word processing support program, the Center has available only word processing software. Given the wide variety of writing and English software available, could you discuss the philosophy or beliefs that have informed this choice? How does the
selection of Norton's 7, which includes an on-line handbook, fit into this philosophy?

9. If you had the ideally equipped computer writing center you described a few minutes ago, what software or kinds of software would you like to have available in this center?

h. Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding software?

6. Now I'd like to talk a bit about your role as Writing Center, and now as Writing Center Director/Manager of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Resource Centers.

a. The WC position description (both the original and revised) called for a candidate with "experience in English composition and knowledge of computer use and applications (especially word processing as it relates to the teaching of composition)." I see from your resume that you have considerable background in computer applications and corporate training, including training users in word processing.

a1. What prior experience did you have in "word processing as it relates to the teaching of composition?"

a2. Given your prior experience and educational background, what strengths and weaknesses (or if you prefer, advantages and disadvantages) do you feel you brought to this position? How did you go about addressing your "weaknesses?"

c. What computer or writing-related journals or periodicals do you read regularly or occasionally?

d. What organizations do you maintain a membership in? Which conferences do you attend regularly or occasionally?

e. What other sorts of things have you done to maintain and upgrade your technical skills and your knowledge of computer applications and writing research as they relate to directing the Writing Center and to the teaching of composition?

f. The original position description called for you to report to two faculty co-directors while the revised description calls for you to report directly to the chairs. How important do you feel faculty involvement in the Center's management and direction is, and what, if any, effect do you feel this administrative change had on faculty involvement in the Center?

I'd like refer now to your current and past position descriptions and ask you briefly describe how you accomplish various activities.

9. Since item one (WC) calls for the Director to "exhibit a positive, proactive approach in order to ensure the Writing Center's standards remain 'state of the art' in hardware, software, and in Writing Center methodology," it would seem that you have had a good deal of responsibility for determining the direction and shape that the Center has taken. Is this a fair assessment?
h. As LASRC Manager you "on a consultative basis, train and advise faculty on pertinent hardware and software applications for academic instructional use." (p.6, item 2) Since we discussed workshops a bit the other day, I'd like you to address the issue of advising--what is your role in advising faculty?" (Do you, for example, obtain examination versions of new software packages for faculty to examine or call their attention to recent articles in computer-related journals?)

i. You also "work with and advise faculty in integrating instructional materials to be used in a computerized environment" (item 6). How do you/have you accomplished this task?

j. You also "recommend, train, and manage lab technicians as well as clerical and tutorial staff" (item 4). Could you describe the hiring process, the scope of the technician and tutor positions, the qualifications you look for in technicians and tutors, and the training for these positions (I'm particularly interested in tutor training)?

k. Another activity (item 8) for which you are responsible is developing "instructional materials for faculty, tutor, and student use." You gave me copies of directions for using the Center's word processing packages and a copy of a workshop you developed and present yearly to dental hygiene students. Are these representative of the kinds and range of materials you've developed for the Center? What other materials have you developed? Does the Center maintain any sort of faculty or student resource bank?

1. Item 8 also mentions that as Director you "consistently evaluate software for curriculum content." What does this activity entail?

m. You also "develop and maintain a consultative and supportive relationship" with other departments and managers (item 5). Could you briefly describe what this responsibility entails and how it contributes to the functioning of the Center?

n. Finally, the position description calls for you to maintain a high level of student and faculty satisfaction" (item 3). How have you gone about satisfying this requirement and how have you/do you measure the Center's success in these areas?

o. Is there any other comments you'd like to make regarding your role as WC/LASRC Director?

7. Now I'd like to ask you to address some questions at a more general level.

a. What, in your opinion, are the most important advantages writing with computers offers students? What are the disadvantages?

b. What are the most important advantages teaching with computers offers teachers? What are the disadvantages?

c. What are the greatest challenges you have faced creating and directing the Writing Center?
d. You've talked about what you feel are the main advantages and disadvantages writing students and teachers face when using computers. Aside from these, are there any opportunities or dangers you see associated with computer technology and writing classrooms?

e. What are the two or three areas in which you feel the Writing Center has been most successful?

f. What are the two or three areas in which you feel the Writing Center has been least successful?

8. Are there any other comments you'd like to add related to anything we've talked about today or to any other aspect of the Writing Center, its history, and current profile or to writing and computers in general?
THE WRITING CENTER

The Writing Center, located in 3221 B&C, opened in January 1988. Since that time, fall, winter, and spring classes in English 111, 112, 131, 132, and DEV 075 and 110 have been held in the Center's computerized classroom. Classes are also taught in the Center during summer terms and specialized workshops are given to other departments interested in introducing their students to the Writing Center.

To prepare them to teach in the Center's computerized environment, instructors go through an in-depth orientation with the Writing Center Coordinator. While students are learning the fundamentals of English or business communications, they are also acquiring the new skill of personal computer operation. In addition to scheduled classes, over 8,000 students have utilized the Writing Center, where tutors also provide drop-in students with one-on-one guidance in writing as well as help or training in word processing. Any student with a writing need, regardless of the course in which he or she is enrolled, has access to and is welcome in the Writing Center.

The equipment in the Writing Center available to students consists of 46 NCR PC8's and 20 Epson Dot Matrix printers. Software programs used are PCWrite, Bank Street Writer, Webster's Spell Check.

1. The Writing Center is located in Room 3221. Phone: 449-5106. Hours: listed on the schedule. Equipment: NCR PC810's and Epson Dot Matrix printers. Everything is IBM compatible

2. The services available to any student with a writing need include:

One-on-one sessions with a tutor for problems such as grammar, punctuation, and organization in writing papers.

Training on a PC using Word Processing. This usually takes about an hour and a half and is required. It will familiarize the student with the software and hardware used in the Center. If a student is interested, the Center will provide instruction on the use of a spelling checker.

3. Appointments are not necessary, students can come in to use the computers anytime during free time. Tutor assistance and the initial computer training are available during Tutor Assistance hours.

4. There is always someone available in the Writing Center to assist students and answer their questions.

5. Students can use the Writing Center for writing needs in any class now and in the future at [MCC].

6. The skills acquired in the Center will help prepare students for computers in the workplace.
MCC Writing Center Philosophy

I. The Writing Center has been in operation for two years.

A. English and DEV English classes are held in the Center’s computerized classroom.

B. In addition, the Center serves the student population by offering walk in services.

1. These walk in services consist of one-on-one tutoring sessions and/or training on learning how to operate a computer using a word processing program.

II. Writing Center philosophy

A. The Writing Center’s mission is to encourage students to write better via a variety of experiences. We want to help them become better, more independent writers.

B. We take the time to teach, explain, nurture and encourage students so that they feel comfortable using our facility.

C. The persons or persons that have the most impact on the students in our Writing Center are the tutors.

D. Since the Writing Center at [MCC] is a highly diversified program, the tutors are an integral part of its operation and responsible for many of the services we offer.

1. Selection and training of the tutors becomes a central issue in writing Center operations.

2. Peer tutors are selected from a highly qualified pool of students who have met the strict requirements of the tutorial office. Exceptional tutors are sent to the Center to be interviewed by the Writing Center Coordinator and are chosen according specific writing center criteria.

3. The Writing Center is different from the environment in the regular tutorial office so tutors must become accustomed to fast-paced activity. They must also be able to work comfortably with computers. It is not necessary that they possess a great deal of computer knowledge when they are hired because I train them.

4. The tutors undergo an intensive training program.

Policies, procedures, and the necessary paperwork are covered first followed by an intensive tour of the facility. In-depth training on computer etiquette, word processing and related software, and troubleshooting follows.

5. Next tutors learn to ask probing questions to identify student needs. The last step is role playing. This enable the tutor to act out the techniques they have learned in a realistic situation.
6. The staff and tutors of the Writing Center want to make a student’s experience one of the most satisfying of their college career. It is crucial that students trust us and are not anxious or intimidated by anyone or anything in the Center. The success of the center has been phenomenal and the tutors are an integral, vital part of its existence and its future.
WRITING CENTER POLICIES

* In order to use the Writing Center, all students must participate in a 1 1/2 training session that acquaints them with the hardware and software, regardless of any previous computer experience they may have.

* To maintain integrity in the Writing Center, all students must type their own papers.

* Only registered Sinclair students may use the Writing Center.

* In order to allot sufficient time for all students to close down, it is necessary that computers and printers are shut down ten minutes before the Center closes.

* There are times when open lab availability is limited because of classes and workshops held in the Writing Center. During these times, only those students registered for these classes and workshops may utilize the Center.

* No food, drink, or children are permitted in the Writing Center.

* To keep the equipment in good working order, the Writing Center staff asks that students utilize the hardware and software appropriately.
Position Description Questionnaire for the LASRC Manager

SECTION I

Basic Purpose of the Position

To complete the section below, please write three or four brief sentences to provide a concise statement of the basic purpose of the position. It may be helpful to develop this statement by answering the following questions:

- Why does the job exist?
- Basically, what is the person in this position paid to accomplish?
- What is the overall end result expected of the job?
- What part of the department's or the College's objectives must be accomplished by the job?

The basic purpose statement should answer such questions. It does not require a detailed list of how various activities are accomplished. You might find it helpful to complete Section 2 on major activities first and then return to this section to summarize the job's basic purpose.

SECTION 1—Basic Purpose Statement

The position of Manager Liberal Arts and Sciences Resource Centers has been created to provide centralized management to resource centers within the division. He scope of the manager's responsibilities encompass a wide range to include: the ability to correctly configure hardware and software needs, globally set academic objectives, organize develop and present hardware/software workshops to faculty, conduct orientations and workshops to departments outside the division, provide analysis and application of pedagogical and managerial styles to develop operating procedures, maintain and administer budget publicize capabilities and services, ensure an educational experience through alternative teaching environments, and serve as consultant and resource center role model for other academic institutions.

SECTION 2

Major Activities and End Results of the Position

On pages 4 and 5, develop a list of the position's major activities and end results as follows:

* Think through what the job is supposed to do and make an initial list of all significant activities that are necessary to fulfill the job's basic purpose.
* Since an individual may perform some activities only occasionally—although they may be quite important—consider all of the activities within an extended period of time such as a full year.

* Using this initial list, divide the work into separate groups of related activities and rank them in order of importance. Keep working with the list until you have all of the activities organized.

* Once you have organized and prioritized the activities (including special assignments and activities performed only occasionally), write a clear, concise, but complete description of each important activity.

* Each statement of a major activity should include the following four parts:

  a. Identification of the principal activity,

  b. Explanation of how it is done (method),

  c. Explanation of why it is done (end results expected),

  d. A listing of the key support activities related to the principal activity.

* Example of one activity area:

  a. Activity: Select, develop, train and motivate staff.

  b. Method—Work directly with staff in solving performance problems, making recommendations for promotion, identifying training needs, and counseling employees.

  c. End Results—To ensure the continuity of staff and effective operations.

  d. Support Activities—Wage and salary administration, performance appraisal, hiring and firing actions.
SECTION II

MAJOR ACTIVITIES AND END RESULTS OF THE POSITION

1. Activity: Possess a high level of expertise and knowledge in all aspects of hardware/software configuration and application. Research, configure, acquire, and install state-of-the-art hardware and software in all Liberal Arts and Sciences Resource Centers (LASRCs) where applicable.

Method: Possess expertise of current systems, hardware configuration, LAN/network operations and procedures, CAI software, word processing and other critical technical information.

Result: Through in-depth knowledge of LASRC's unique methodologies, each center will be a state-of-the-art, highly developed educational environment for both faculty and students.

Support: Coordinator of Computer Applications, Information Systems and Services, LAS Department Chairpersons.

2. Activity: On a consultative basis, train and advise faculty on pertinent hardware and software applications for academic instructional use.

Method: Develop and conduct workshops, seminars or individualized training to faculty teaching in or involved with LASRCs on an as needed basis.

Results: Faculty familiarity and satisfaction with LASCRs will encourage maximum use and efficiency. As a result, faculty and students have an enriching, helpful environment in which to teach and learn.

Support: Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Information Systems and Support, Department Chairpersons.

3. Activity: Hire peer tutors (staff) and train them on all levels of software, hardware, applicable technical methodology, and policies and procedure of LASRCs for optimum support and operation.

Method: Establish and update (if necessary) hiring criteria for tutor positions within each LASRC. Maintain high level of rapport with Director of Tutorial Services to define potential candidates. Conduct thorough interviews and train staff regarding special LASRC requirements and objectives. Staff training includes in-depth technical training in the form of one-on-one instruction, group training, and peer training.

Results: Well trained staff members ensure a smooth functioning educational learning environment in each LASRC. Staff expertise in LASRC operations will result in a high
degree of confidence in each center from faculty, staff, and students.

**Support:** Director of Tutorial services for initial candidate screening, and LAS faculty to identify potential peer tutors.

4. **Activity:** Conduct and coordinate faculty, student, academic and corporate group orientations of all LASRCs.

**Method:** Encourage faculty to schedule orientations for classes either in their respective classrooms or on-site in one of the LASRCs so students can gain a better understanding of how they can utilize the centers. Provide information about LASRCs to area colleges and high schools and offer guided tours. In addition, demonstrate to visiting corporate groups LASRC operations.

**Results:** Classroom orientations facilitate faculty and student awareness of resource centers and enable them to use them to their fullest potential. Information and tours given to other academic institutions provide necessary guidelines to begin their own resource centers. By offering demonstrations to corporate groups, the business community becomes aware of the vast learning opportunities available at [MCC] Community College and also the potential contributions students can offer in the future.

**Support:** Faculty, administration, students, other academic institutions, and corporate groups.

5. **Activity:** Schedule classroom time and drop-in time for all LASRC's. Develop and conduct specialized training workshops for departments interested in presenting the LASRCs to students as tools to promote learning.

**Method:** Establish times for classes within the division and occasionally outside the division to use the computer and learning facilities of certain LASRCs. Classes may come as a group on a one-time only basis or on a regularly scheduled basis. Present quarterly workshops that introduce or expand other departments’ knowledge of LASRCs.

**Results:** By offering flexible usage of LASRCs, all students and faculty in the college population have access to applicable resource center offerings on an ongoing basis.

**Support:** Meet with faculty and department chairs to arrange special group presentations.

6. **Activity:** Develop, establish, and maintain operating procedures for all LASRCs.

**Method:** Through analysis and application of pedagogical ar.. managerial styles, derive a set of operating policies and procedures conducive to each LASRC.
Results: An organizational plan for each LASRC will provide guidelines for the efficient, maximum operation of all areas within each center.

Support: LAS Dean and department chairs.

7. Activity: Effective allocation of budgetary resources for LASRC's to include acquisition of hardware, software, new equipment, videotapes,

Method: Accurately forecast equipment and other needs for each LASRC.

Results: Each LASRC is adequately supported by their respective budgets. Effective planning ensures all funds are put to use to ensure maximum efficiency.

Support: LAS Dean, department chairs.

8. Activity: Develop, maintain and analyze records and statistical information for all LASRCs.

Method: Work jointly with Institutional Planning and Research to develop evaluation tools to provide accurate statistical analysis of student and faculty usage and satisfaction of LASRCs. Also maintain daily, quarterly, and annual records charting student population.

Results: Analysis of records will provide an accurate gauge potential redirection to assure an effective learning environment.

Support: Institutional Planning and Research, faculty and student input.

9. Activity: Publicize all LASRC's services.

Method: Develop and publish brochures and information sheets that explain workshops, orientations, tours and other services offered by LASRC's. Publications can pertain to individual resource centers or may be inclusive of all LASRCs.

Results: Faculty, staff, and students become fully aware of all LASRC offerings and can take advantage of the enriching opportunities available.

Support: College Publications Office.

10. Activity: Develop establish, and maintain strong rapport with Liberal Arts Chairpersons, other related chairpersons, and other related departments such as Information Systems and Support to ensure maximum effectiveness and efficiency of LASRC's equipment, hardware, software, policies and procedures.
Method: Meet with department chairpersons on an as needed basis to jointly establish departmental academic objectives for LASRC's. Maintain close and productive rapport on an informational and technical basis with Information Systems and Support.

Results: LASRC's will be maintained in the highest possible professional manner and needs and concerns of Liberal Arts and Sciences departments will be addressed and supported.

Support: LAS's chairpersons.

SECTION 3

The Nature and Scope of the Position

In order to help others understand what the position is all about, this section is intended to provide information about several key facets of the job. Please provide the following information:

A. Assignment, Review and Approval of Work—Describe the position’s workflow, indicating where the work comes from and where it goes.

The administration of the LASRCs will generate the work flow for this position. Work will either be completed and executed by the LASRCs’ manager or it will continue to other appropriate offices within the college.

B. Responsibility and Decision-Making Authority—Indicate the limits and controls on position’s authority regarding expenditure of funds, personnel decisions, changing policies or methods, etc.

The incumbent will have decision making authority in the administration of all LASRCs to include budget, equipment acquisitions, policies and procedures, and interactions with other departments.

C. Relationships with Outside Organizations—Briefly describe the nature and purpose of contacts with positions in other organizations.

Contacts with outside organizations will include relationships with other institutions of higher education, corporate businesses and pertinent professional organizations. LASRCs can offer guidelines to other Institutions regarding the development and operation of their own resource centers and can likewise benefit from established programs similar to ours. Outside contact with corporations provide a mutually beneficial arena in which to present [MCC]'s educational and technical edge, and inspire the desire to hire [MCC] graduates.

D. Specialized or Technical Knowledge—Indicate the specialized or technical knowledge the position and how it typically acquired.
Technical knowledge required for the position includes a high degree of expertise in system hardware and configuration, software applications, and electronic acquisitions. On a managerial basis, incumbent must possess the ability to manage from a global perspective while preserving the integrity of each resource center. A high degree of interpersonal, and management skills is also necessary.

E. Relationship of the Position to Others in Similar Functions—Indicate the positions typically held prior to promotion to the position. If it is one in a series or "ladder" of related positions (e.g., financial counselors, data processing, personnel, accounting, etc.), also indicate the positions above it on the ladder and the typical time required in each position prior to this position, including the "entry" position.

Previously held position - Writing Center Coordinator

F. Major or Unusual Problems—Briefly describe a few of the most complex, critical problems involved in achieving the basic purpose of the position. Highlight any aspect of these problems that might make the position different from similar positions in other academic institutions.

Some of the most complex aspects of this position include developing a comprehensive administrative structure for the LASRCs, ensuring that all resource centers are operating to their maximum effectiveness, and maintaining each center's unique methodology and purpose.

G. "Makes or Breaks" -- Describe the two or three critical results that must be achieved if the position is to fulfill its purpose.

To fulfill its purpose this position must successfully organize the administration of all LASRCs in the most effective way possible. Interaction between Liberal Arts and Sciences departments and this position is crucial for LASRCs to continue to be successful in their strategic roles to provide students with an alternative method of learning.

H. Typical Sources of Support in Meeting Problems and Challenges—Indicate other positions in the College that the position typically depends upon to provide resources (time, money, people) for overcoming problems in achieving the position's results.

Sources of support for this position are Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences chairpersons, Tutorial Services, Information Systems and Services.

I. General—Describe any significant factors not covered elsewhere that are important to the position. These might include special assignments; service on internal committees; membership in job-required professional organizations, geographic considerations; etc.

SECTION 4

Salary data (intentionally omitted)
SECTION 5

Organizational Relationships

Please complete the chart below to show the organizational relationships of the position. For each position directly supervised by the position, provide a brief description of major activities and indicate the number of personnel reporting to the subordinate position.

Position titles, reporting relationships, and number of employees shown on the organization chart should coincide with information in Section 4.

Next level above
the Immediate Supervisor

VICE PRESIDENT FOR
INSTRUCTION

The Immediate Supervisor

DEAN, LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES

The Position

MANAGER, LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES
RESOURCE CENTERS

Peers (reporting to same immediate Supervisor.)

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES DEPARTMENT
CHAIRPERSONS (8)

COUNSELORS (3)

DIRECTORS (2)
(HONORS/TV [MCC]

Subordinates, their major activities and number of employees reporting to each.
Sample Materials Created by the LASRC Manager: PC Write Tutorial

PC-WRITE STANDARD TUTORIAL

This tutorial will take you step-by-step through the PC-Write program, allowing you to type in text and conduct various functions of the program while working at your own pace. However, to familiarize yourself with the program, you should always look at the prompts at the top of the screen during the tutorial. Also, every ten minutes, the PC-Write program will stop and save any information you have typed up to that point.

The first thing you must do is "open" or "create" a file. You will name this file "tutorial". At the A> prompt, type: A> ed tutorial (The filename should be no longer than eight letters and should have no spaces between the letters.) Look at the top of the screen. Since this is a new file, press the F9 key (located on the left side of the keyboard) to create the file.

You are now ready to start typing text into your new file. The blinking underscore shows you where typed text will be entered. This symbol is called the cursor. You move the cursor around by pressing the arrow keys located on the right hand side of the keyboard.

At this point, notice the paragraph at the bottom of this page. Don't worry about centering the title now or correcting any mistakes you might make. You can make these changes later.

Type in the title of the following paragraph. Press Enter. Notice that the cursor is moved down to the next line. You should always press Enter at the end of a short line, at the end of a paragraph, or when you want to create additional lines between paragraphs. You do not have to press Enter while you're typing within a paragraph. Now begin typing the rest of the paragraph. Be sure to indent your paragraph. To do this, press the "Tab" key (located on the upper left side of the keyboard).

******************************************************************************

Foods of the World/Middle Eastern Cooking

No meal eaten in the Middle East ends without coffee or tea, but coffee takes precedence most of the time. Coffee is a social beverage, offered to guests by housewives and to customers by merchants; to refuse it borders upon insult. There are two distinct but similar ways of preparing it, Turkish and Arabic. Both are served black, in cups the size of a demitasse or smaller. And both are brewed by starting with green beans, roasting them to a chocolate brown color, pulverizing them at once, either with mortar and pestle or in a cylindrical coffee mill of chased brass, and quickly steeping them in boiling water.

The Turkish version is made in a coffee pot that has a long handle to protect the fingers from the fire and a shape narrowing from the bottom to the open neck to intensify the foaming action as the coffee boils up. Water, sugar and coffee are stirred together to your taste; then, at the first bubbling surge, the pot is whisked from the fire. It is returned briefly one or two more times to build up the foamy head, which is poured into each cup.
in equal amounts, to be followed by the rest of the brew, grounds and all. The dregs soon settle to the bottom, and the rich, brown coffee that covers them is ready to be enjoyed. The Arabs prepare coffee in a single boil they almost never use sugar; they pour the liquid into a second pot, leaving the sediment in the first, and then add such heady spices as cloves or cardamon seeds.

You will now make some changes to the text. Most of these changes can be made through PC-Write's "main menu." Move the cursor up to the top of the file. To do this, press the ALT key (located below the Shift key on the left side of the keyboard). This allows you to access the main menu. Now press the "S" key (notice it stands for "Search") to access a sub-menu. Now press the "T" key (it stands for top of file). Press the Shift key and the F8 key together. The title should be centered. (If you are at the top of your file and you want to quickly move to the end of your file, press "Alt", "S", "En")

Now create an additional blank line between the title and the first paragraph. Move the cursor to the left margin on the first line of the first paragraph. Press Enter.

Now you will delete some text. Move the cursor to the first letter of the first word in the second paragraph ("The"). Press the "Del" key (located on the right hand side of the keyboard) one time. Notice the letter "T" has been deleted. Press the "Del" key enough times to delete the rest of the word "The". Now move the cursor to the word "version" in the same sentence. Using the "Del" key, delete the word.

Now you will add some text. The cursor should be located at the space after the word "Turkish". Right where the cursor is, type in the word "coffee". Notice that you are not typing over any words; the rest of the words are pushed to the right as you type. Practice deleting and adding words to the text until you are comfortable using these functions.

Most everything you type you will want double-spaced. To do this, move your cursor above the text you want double-spaced. The cursor must be at the left margin and on a line all by itself. Move the cursor on the blank line below the title. Press "Alt", then "L" (it stands for "Layout"), then "S" (stands for "Spacing"), then "D" (for "Double"), then Enter.

Now try using the special fonts of underlining and boldfacing. Move the cursor to the first letter of the first word of the the title. Hold down the "Alt" key and the "U" key. Notice the text turns bright blue. Now move the cursor to the space right after the title. Press the "Alt" and "U" keys again. The title will be underlined when your text is printed out. Now move the cursor to the first letter in the words "Middle East". Hold down the "Alt" key and the "B" key to boldface the word. Move the cursor to the space after the word "East". Press the "Alt" and "B" keys again. The words will be boldfaced when your text is printed out.

Now try moving a block of text. Remember to also look at the top of the screen so that you familiarize yourself with the menus and sub-menus. Place the cursor on the last sentence of the second paragraph (starts "The Arabs"). Press the "Alt" key. Choose "E" (for "Edit"). Choose "S" (for "Search"). Choose "M" (for "Mark start"). Use the cursor to
highlight the text to be moved. After it is highlighted, press "Alt". Choose "E", then "S", then "M" (for "Mark end"). Move the cursor to the beginning of the second paragraph. Press "Alt", then "E", then "M" (for "Move"). Press "Alt" again, then "E", then "T" (for "Turn off mark"). Your text should be at the new location.

Now try deleting a block of text. Place the cursor on the comma after the word "beverage" in the second sentence of the first paragraph. Delete the comma, and put a period at that point. Now place the cursor on the word "offered". Press the "Alt" key, then "E", then "S", then "M". Use the cursor to highlight the rest of the sentence that you will delete. After it is highlighted, press the "Alt" key, then "E", then "D7" (for delete). The text should now be deleted.

Before you exit the tutorial, you should always save your work. To save and exit, follow these directions. Press "Alt", then "F" (for "File"). Then "E" (for "Exit and Save"). You should now see the A> prompt at the bottom of your screen. Do not turn off the computer yet; you have one more step to complete.

After you have created a file, it is likely that you will want to retrieve it at another time. To retrieve a file you have created, follow these steps. At the A> prompt, type: A>ed b:filename (You should type A>ed b:tutorial because your filename is "tutorial"). Press Enter. Look at the top of the screen. You do not need a backup file, so simply press the "Esc" key (located on the upper right hand side of the keyboard). You have now retrieved your file, and you may make any changes to it that you wish.

You are DONE! Leave your computer on and inform a Writing Center staff member that you have finished. She or he will assist you in spell-checking and printing your document.
Sample Materials Created by the LASRC Manager: PC Write Reference Sheet

PC-WRITE STANDARD REFERENCE SHEET

To Open a New File:
- At the "A" prompt, type: A>ed b:filename. Press Enter.
- Press F9 to create the file.

To Retrieve an Existing File:
- At the "A" prompt, type: A>ed b:filename. Press Enter.

To Delete Text:
- Place cursor on text to be deleted. Press the DEL key.

To Center a Line:
- Type in text and press Enter. Place the cursor on the beginning of the title. Press the SHIFT key and the F8 key at the same time.

Enhancements:
- To create the following special effects, press ALT in combination with the letter both in front of and behind the word or words to be enhanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT U</td>
<td>underlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT S</td>
<td>double-strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT T</td>
<td>italics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT E</td>
<td>elite type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT F</td>
<td>fast or draft mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT H</td>
<td>superscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT C</td>
<td>compressed print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT W</td>
<td>double-underlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT B</td>
<td>bold print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT O</td>
<td>overstrike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT Q</td>
<td>quality mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT P</td>
<td>pica quality mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT L</td>
<td>subscript</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS CAN BE CONDUCTED THROUGH THE MENU BY PRESSING THE ALT KEY TO BRING UP THE MAIN MENU AND THEN CHOOSING THE CORRECT SUB-MENU.

To Save a File:
- ALT, F, S

To Move to Top of File:
- ALT, S, T

To Move to Bottom of File:
- ALT, S, E

To Double-Space:
- Place cursor where double-spacing is to begin.
- ALT, L, S, D, Enter
To Delete a Block of Text:
- Place cursor on the text to be deleted.
- ALT, E, S, M - Use cursor to highlight the text to be deleted.
- ALT, E, D

To Move a Block of Text:
- Place cursor on the text to be moved.
- ALT, E, S, M - Use cursor to highlight the text to be moved.
- ALT, E, S, M - Use cursor to the new location.
- ALT, E, M
- ALT, E, T

To Obtain a Word Count:
- ALT, T, A, W

To Force a Page Break:
- Place cursor at point of desired page break.
- ALT, L, P, I, H

To Create Page Headers, Footers, and Page Numbers:
- Place cursor at the top of the page on which headers, footers, or page numbers will begin.
- ALT, L, R, H/F
- Choose H or F (headers or footers)
- Choose desired header or footer option.

To Spell-Check:
- Place cursor at top of file.
- ALT, T, S, N - When cursor highlights misspelled word, press F3 (Guess).
- Use arrow to choose correct spelling. Press F10 to replace.
- If word is spelled correctly, press the GREY+ key on the far right side of the keyboard to ignore the word.
- If word is not found on "Guess" list, press ESC to manually edit the word.
- To continue with spell-check, press the GREY+ key.

To Use Thesaurus:
- Place cursor on word to be checked.
- ALT, T, M, T
- Use arrow to choose desired word. Press F10 to replace.

To Locate a Particular Line or Page in the File:
- ALT, S, L, O
- Choose L or P to locate appropriate line or page.

To Preview Layout of File:
- ALT, P, V
To Print Entire File:
- ALT, P, A

To Print Partial File:
- ALT, P, R
- Choose appropriate pages to begin and end printing sequence.

To Save and Exit:
- ALT, F, E

*When saving and exiting the file after spell-checking, the program may ask you to press ESC to cancel or F9 to add words. In this case, press the ESC key.
THE WRITING CENTER: LIBERAL ARTS' TECHNICAL ADVANTAGE

by

When the Winter issue of INFO-EXPRESS came out, I immediately read it from front to back as usual. When I turned to the last page, I saw the questionnaire designed to provide feedback on what the college community thought about the publication. As I was completing it, I came to the last question which asked "Would you write an article for INFO-EXPRESS?" My pen did not even hesitate as I checked the YES box. When I received a call from Info-Express to do an article, I was delighted to oblige.

In my position as Coordinator of the Writing Center, and as a result of being in Corporate Training for four years previously, I keep up with publications which focus on training and development, and the computer and educational fields. In recent years I have read many articles regarding the growing trend toward incorporating a strong liberal arts curriculum into many degree programs in universities and colleges across the country. The reason for this is that a liberal arts background can provide a student with a rich variety of courses that can contribute to a well-rounded education.

Traditionally, the liberal arts have not ventured into the technical arena. Liberal Arts curriculums have been among the last to incorporate computer courses. Many students in a Liberal Arts discipline have not been exposed to the same technology as students in other more technical fields. These "non-technical" students may also have a certain anxiety about learning to use a computer. It is essential that colleges and universities prepare all students to use computers because of the strong likelihood that they will encounter them in the workplace.

Community College has taken a crucial step toward offering today's high technology to the "non-technical" student. Four years ago, the Liberal Arts and Sciences division recognized the need to incorporate computers into the curriculum. After much research, planning, and development, the Writing Center opened Winter Quarter of 1988.

The Writing Center is the largest and most well-equipped writing center in the area. There are plans to expand the Center in the Fall of 1989. At present there are 32 NCR PC8's and 11 Epson Dot Matrix printers occupying rooms 321 A, B & C. The Center has a computerized classroom, a tutor/student conferencing area and, beginning Fall quarter, there will be additional space operating as an open lab.

The two word processing programs used in the Center are PC-Write and Bank Street Writer. Both are the full versions which will expose a student to applications they are more likely to see in the workplace. The result is that while students are learning the fundamentals of English or business
communications, they are also acquiring the new skill of personal computer operation. Other software used to complement the word processing packages are Webster's New World Spelling Checker and Grammatik III, a grammar checker.

The scope and focus of the Writing Center concentrates on the following areas:

1. To provide an instructional area where regular English/DEV English classes are held.

2. To provide instructors with a solid foundation in order to teach a traditional class in a computerized environment.

3. To function as an open lab where students from classes held in the Center can come to work on their assignments.

4. To function as an open lab for students with any writing need, regardless of the course in which they are enrolled.

5. To provide drop-in students with a tutor for one-on-one guidance in writing as well as help or training in word processing.

A student does not need to have keyboarding in order to use the Center's facilities. Although keyboarding experience can be beneficial, even students with no experience can save a great deal of time in creating, editing and revising their work.

To date, over 3,500 students have utilized the Writing Center. It is important to my staff and I that students who come to the Center leave with a sense of satisfaction, accomplishment, and most of all, pride in their work and in themselves.
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Dr. [Ann]       Office:
English 111     Phone: 2517

COURSE DESCRIPTION: Course emphasizes prewriting, drafting, thesis development through basic patterns of exposition.

PREREQUISITES: Dev. 075, 110 or qualifying score on ASSET Skills Assessment Test.

COURSE OBJECTIVES: The overall objective of English 111 is to empower students with the confidence to write effectively and correctly for a variety of audiences; to experience writing as a way of thinking and a way of producing new knowledge; and to understand and practice writing as rewriting.


GRADING SCALE: The course requires four written themes, a final essay examination, and homework exercises. The course grade is based on a 400 point scale. Students are expected to show improvement in writing to demonstrate they have integrated methods of revision into their themes; therefore, themes have an ascending scale of value.

| Theme 1 25 pts | Homework exercises 50 pts |
| Theme 2 50 pts | Final Examination 100 pts |
| Theme 3 75 pts | 400 pts |
| Theme 4 100 pts |  |

A = 360 pts +; B = 320 +; C = 280 +; D = 240 +

THEMES: Themes are to be written or typed on standard size theme paper, one side of the page only, double spaced. NO SPIRAL PAPER ACCEPTED. Themes are due on the date listed on the syllabus. Late themes accepted up to two classes; 20% will be deducted from late themes. All four themes and the final are required for a student to receive a passing grade.

ATTENDANCE: Absences more than the times the class meets per week lowers the final number points by 10 for each absence.

USING THE WRITING CENTER: This course teaches you two skills—to compose coherent, audience-directed themes and to use a word processor—important skills in the age of information. The class is taught in the writing center and you are to use the writing center to do homework, drafts, and revisions. Some of your writing—brainstorming, invention and editing you will do outside the writing lab; these activities are preparation for revised, grammatically correct compositions. The more you use a word processor to complete your themes the more you develop your writing and computer literacy.
PC-WRITE GUIDELINES

1. THERE ARE TWO KINDS OF DISKS. THE PROGRAM DISK IS LABELED PC-WRITE AND BSW. IT IS THE DISK THAT ENABLES THE COMPUTER TO FUNCTION. THE DATA DISK IS USED TO STORE INFORMATION IN THE FORM OF FILES.

2. IN ORDER TO OPERATE, THE SYSTEM REQUIRES THAT BOTH DISKS ARE USED. THE PROGRAM DISK GOES INTO THE TOP DRIVE (DRIVE A) AND THE DATA DISK GOES INTO THE BOTTOM DRIVE (DRIVE B).

3. THE ON/OFF SWITCH IS ORANGE AND LOCATED IN FRONT OF THE COMPUTER. ONCE THE SYSTEM IS TURNED ON, IMMEDIATELY PLACE THE PROGRAM DISK LABEL SIDE UP INTO DRIVE A AND CLOSE THE LEVER. (WHEN PLACING THE DISK INTO THE DRIVE, YOUR HANDS SHOULD BE HOLDING THE LABEL PORTION OF THE DISK.)

4. THE SCREEN OF YOUR COMPUTER IS CALLED THE MONITOR, UNDERNEATH THAT IS THE BASE WHERE THE ON/OFF SWITCH AND TWO DISK DRIVES ARE LOCATED. THERE IS ALSO A STANDARD KEYBOARD WITH SOME ADDITIONAL FUNCTION KEYS.

5. ONCE THE PROGRAM DISK IS IN DRIVE A, THE DATA DISK CAN BE PLACED INTO DRIVE B USING THE EXACT SAME METHOD AS DESCRIBED ABOVE.

6. DURING CLASS THERE WILL BE TWO DISK BOXES. ONE HOLDS THE PROGRAM DISKS, AND THE OTHER HOLDS YOUR INDIVIDUAL STUDENT DATA DISKS. YOUR INSTRUCTOR WILL LABEL THE DATA DISKS EITHER BY NAME, NUMBER, OR LETTER AND ADVISE YOU AS TO WHAT YOUR NUMBER OR LETTER IS. AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS YOU NEED TO GET A PROGRAM DISK AND YOUR DATA DISK. AT THE END OF CLASS THE TWO DISKS NEED TO BE RETURNED TO THEIR APPROPRIATE BOXES.

7. ONCE THE COMPUTER HAS POWERED UP, THERE WILL BE A MESSAGE ON THE SCREEN ASKING FOR THE DATE. BYPASS THIS BY PRESSING THE ENTER (RETURN) KEY. PRESS THE ENTER KEY AGAIN WHEN THE SYSTEM ASKS FOR THE DATE.

8. ONCE THE A> (CALLED THE A PROMPT) IS ON THE SCREEN, YOU ARE READY TO BEGIN.

9. TO CREATE A FILE MEANS TO PUT IT ON THE COMPUTER FOR THE FIRST TIME. THEREAFTER, A FILE IS REVISED OR EDITED.

10. TO CREATE A FILE, TYPE THE FOLLOWING: ED B:FILENAME AT THE A>PROMPT. IT WILL LOOK LIKE THIS: A>ED B:FILENAME. THEN PRESS ENTER. THE FILENAME IS THE UNIQUE NAME THE FILE WILL BE CALLED. (FILENAME ARE LIMITED TO 8 CHARACTERS.) THE SYSTEM WILL THEN ASK YOU TO PRESS F9 TO CREATE THE NEW FILE.
Essay One

THE DEATH OF BERNY PARET
By Norman Mailer

Paret was a Cuban, a proud club fighter who had become welterweight champion because of his unusual ability to take a punch. His style of fighting was to take three punches to the head in order to have back two. At the end of ten rounds, he would still be bouncing, his opponent would have a headache. But in the last two years, over the fifteen-round fights, he had started to take some bad mailings.

This fight had its turns. Griffith won most of the early rounds, but Paret knocked Griffith down in the sixth. Griffith had trouble getting up, but made it, came alive and was dominating Paret again before the round was over. Then Paret began to wilt. In the middle of the eighth round, after a clubbing punch had turned his back to Griffith, Paret walked three disgusted steps away, showing his headquarters. For a champion, he took much too long to turn back around. It was the first hint of weakness Paret had ever shown, and it must have inspired a particular shame, because he fought the rest of the fight as if he were seeking to demontrate that he could take more punishment than any man alive. In the twelfth, Griffith caught him. Paret got trapped in a corner. Trying to duck away, his left arm and his head became tangled on the wrong side of the top rope. Griffith was in like a cat ready to rip the life out of a huge boxed rat. He hit him eighteen right hands in a row, an act which took perhaps three or four seconds, Griffith making a pent-up whimpering sound all the while he attacked, the right hand whipping like a piston rod which has broken through the crankcase, or like a baseball bat demolishing a pumpkin. I was sitting in the second row of that corner—they were not ten feet away from me, and like everybody else I was hypnotized. I had never seen one man hit another so hard and so many times. Over the referee's face came a look of wow as if some spasm had passed its way through him, and then he leaped on Griffith to pull him away. It was the act of a brave man. Griffith was uncontrollable. His trainer leaped into the ring, his manager, his cut man, there were four people holding Griffith, but he was off on an orgy, he had left the Garden, he was back on a hoodlum's street. If he had been able to break loose from his handlers and the referee, he would have jumped Paret to the floor and whaled on him there.

And Paret? He died on his feet. As he took those eighteen punches something happened to everyone who was in psychic range of the event. Some part of his death reached out to us. One felt it hover in the air. He was still standing in the ropes, trapped as he had been before, he gave some little half smile of regret, as if he were saying, "I didn't know I was going to die just yet," and then, his head leaning back but still erect, his death came to breathe about him. He began to pass away. As he passed, so his limbs descended beneath him, and he sank slowly to the floor. He went down more slowly than any fighter had ever gone down, he went down like a large ship which turns on end and slides second by second into its grave. As he went down, the sound of Griffith's punches echoed in the mind like a heavy ax in the distance chopping into a wet log.
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Revision Exercise: "The Chicken"

Name ____________________________
Section __________________________

Directions: Read the story all the way through. Study the story and then write it over again in a better way. You will want to change many of the sentences, but do not leave out any important parts of the story.

THE CHICKEN

A man lived in a farmhouse. He was old. He lived alone. The house was small. The house was on a mountain. The mountain was high. The house was on top. He grew vegetables. He grew grain. He ate the vegetables. He ate the grain. One day he was pulling weeds. He saw something. A chicken was eating his grain. The grain was new. He caught the chicken. He put her in a pen. The pen was under his window. He planned something. He would eat the chicken for breakfast. The next morning came. It was early. A sound woke the man. He looked out the window. He saw the chicken. He saw an egg. The chicken cackled. The man thought something. He would eat the egg for breakfast. He fed the chicken a cup of his grain. The chicken talked to him. He talked to the chicken. Time passed. He thought something. He could feed the chicken more. He could feed her two cups of grain. He could feed her in the morning. He could feed her at night. Maybe she would lay two eggs every morning. He fed the chicken more grain. She got fat. She got lazy. She slept all the time. She laid no eggs. The man got angry. He blamed the chicken. He killed her. He ate her for breakfast. He had no chicken. He had no eggs. He talked to no one. No one talked to him.
APPENDIX D

Materials Provided by Nancy
Syllabus

ENGLISH 111 [Judy]--SPRING 1992

PREREQUISITES:

DEV 075, DEV 110, or qualifying score on English Skills Assessment.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

To develop composition skills by learning to: Construct a unified, coherent, well-developed, and correct essay centered upon a single thesis.

TEXTBOOK:


WRITING ASSIGNMENTS:

Four 500-word themes (15% each)
Six 100-150-word paragraphs (5% each)
One essay examination (10%)

Themes must be written and printed in the Writing Center. All listed assignments must be completed for a passing grade.

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES AVAILABLE:

The Tutorial Services program provides free educational assistance for any [MCC] student who is enrolled for credit (Room 6221 or call 2792)

Students are responsible for informing the instructor of any instructional accommodations and/or special learning needs at the beginning of the quarter.

Assistance is available to eligible students through Handicapped Student Services (Room 10-324 or call 2752).

ATTENDANCE AND WITHDRAWAL:

Students are responsible for all material covered in class. Unsatisfactory attendance (missing more than two classes) may result in the lowering of the final grade. The last date to withdraw with a W is noon on Saturday, May 23.

OFFICE: 6323C Phone: 226-2596
Hours: MWF 10-11, TR 11:30-12:30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mar 31 | Chapter 1
Computer Handout/print syllabus | Apr 2
Describe assignments
Computer and syllabus review
Diagnostic |
| 7 | Assign invention--3 (11)
Chapter 2--discuss event writing
in Dillard essay/layout of chapters
Return and correct diagnostics | 9
Chapter 3--Discuss descriptions in essays
Discuss their topics/Start writing |
| 14 | More essays/Chapters on
Cueing (12), Description (14)
Write | 16
Complete draft/discuss with peers/me
Discuss possible profile topics |
| 21 | Theme 1 due
Revise draft and turn in
Assign invention--4 | 23
Chapter 4--discuss essays, characteristics of profiles
Discuss their topics/start writing |
| 28 | Discuss modes (15, 16, 17)
Write | 30
Write/discuss with peers/me |
| May 5 | Theme 2 due
Chapter 5--discuss essays, characteristics of explaining concepts
Revise draft and turn in
Assign invention--6 | 7
Chapter 6
Discussion of strong verbs, avoidance of passive
Discuss characteristics of position/Write |
| 12 | Chapter 6--discuss essays
Write | 14
Write/discuss with peers/me |
| 19 | Theme 3 due
Revise draft and turn in
Assign invention | 21
Chapter 7 Discuss essays, characteristics of solutions
Write |
| 26 | Sentence structure/style
Write | 28
Write/discuss with peers/me |
| Jun 2 | Theme 4 due
Revise draft and turn in | 4
Chapter 22
Finish paragraphs |
| 11 | 9 Final Exam | Return |
Paragraph Assignments

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARAGRAPHS

For each of the six questions, write a well-developed paragraph of approximately 100-150 words. Each paragraph should have a clearly identifiable topic sentence and enough information from the article to support the topic sentence and be understood by a person who has not read the article itself. Do not use any words from the original article unless you enclose them in quotation marks: put the ideas into your own words.

The paragraphs will be evaluated on content and organization primarily, but clear and correct expression will also count. They should be turned in as you finish them, but all of them must be turned in by Thursday, June 4.

PARAGRAPH 1

Briefly describe what our society sees as the "typical" grandmother and explain (using specific details from the essay) how Gerald Haslam's grandmother differs from this stereotype. (p.63)

PARAGRAPH 2

Identify and describe the steps the surgeons follow in the suboccipital craniectomy operation David Noonan writes about in "Inside the Brain." (p. 104)

PARAGRAPH 3

Define (in your own words) the term parthenogenesis and use the examples David Quammen uses about aphids in the article "Is Sex Necessary?" to show why parthenogenesis occurs. (p. 139)

PARAGRAPH 4

In "More Testing, More Learning," Patrick O'Malley says that "major, infrequent, high-stakes exams work against the best interests of students both psychologically and intellectually." Classify the objections he makes to such exams into those two categories, psychological and intellectual; briefly describe or illustrate each problem; and show whether you agree or disagree with O'Malley. (p. 230)

PARAGRAPH 5

Explain why Jessica Statsky is opposed to organized sports for children between the ages of six and twelve. (p. 190)

PARAGRAPH 6

Compare and contrast the positions of those who favor distribution of contraceptives in the schools and those who oppose it. (p. 226)
Exercise 1

VERBS

To make your writing livelier, control your use of weak verbs like to be (am, are, is, was, were, being, been) and to have and also your use of the passive voice (the verb to be plus a past participle; for instance, (is believed, was seen). Some examples of sentences needing to be rewritten because of weak verbs or passive voice:

1. More remote, less densely populated suburbs, whose lower values were often a function of how far they were from work centers, and small towns in rural locations, whose lower values were a reflection of the difficulty of earning a living, are likely to see considerable appreciation of their property values in the next two decades.

Since many people will no longer have to commute to work centers to earn a living, property values in the more distant suburbs and rural areas should appreciate considerably in the next two decades.

Rural and exurban property values should appreciate considerably in the next two decades as it becomes easier for people to earn a living in areas remote from work centers.

2. The shelter will be owned by the town, but it will be run by members of the humane society and supported, in part, by funds raised by them. The bulk of the operating funds, however, will be supplied by the town.

Although the town will own the shelter and pay most of the operating expenses, members of the humane society will run the facility and provide additional support through fund raising.

3. There is a hasty way of writing which is counterpart to the hasty way of reading. It is becoming more common every year and raises less and less protest.

A hasty way of writing, counterpart to the hasty way of reading, grows more common every year and raises less and less protest.

Hasty writing, like hasty reading, grows more common every year and raises less and less protest.

4. To make the most of your investments, it is essential that you understand what your goals are and what your financial temperament is.

To make the most of your investments, you have to understand your goals and financial temperament.
Exercise 2

PROPOSAL EXERCISE

Situation: You belong to an organization (social, hobby, professional, church, political, charitable, etc.—you determine the nature and function of the organization).

Problem: A core of half a dozen people usually carry out the work of the group, but otherwise attendance and participation has been uneven. Now two of the hard workers are moving out of town and the organization’s ability to function is threatened.

How can you solve this problem?

As a group, determine (on paper or on the screen to be printed):

1. What possible solutions are there for this problem and which one can you all support?

2. Whose support do you need to help you (the core group of workers) take action?

3. How can you convince this audience that the problem is serious and must be solved?

4. How can you convince this audience that your solution is feasible?

5. What questions might this audience ask about your solution and how would you answer them?

6. What objections might they make to it and how would you answer those objections?
Introduction to PC Write

TO: ENG 111 and ENG 112 Students

FROM: [Judy]

SUBJECT: Introduction to PC-WRITE STANDARD WORD PROCESSING

This short introduction to PC-WRITE will allow you to use a computer to complete the class assignments. You are using two disks: a 5 1/4 inch PC-WRITE program disk in drive A and a 3 1/2 inch data disk in drive B. In order for you to accomplish the writing assignments, you need to know general guidelines for operating the system and specific editing commands. When using PC-WRITE, always look at the Prompts at the top of the screen.

Key combinations and key sequences appear in this handout in the following format:

A plus sign (+) between key names means you must press the keys at the same time. For example, "Press Ctrl+C" means that you press Ctrl and hold it down while you press C.

A comma (,) between key names means you must press the keys in sequence—for example, "Press Alt, then F" means that you press the Alt key and release it, and then press the F key and release it.

PART I

Booting Computer

If your computer is off, insert your disks in the appropriate drives and turn on the computer. You may bypass date and time by pressing <ENTER>. When the "A>" symbol appears on the screen, the operating system (DOS) is booted.

If your computer is on but the "A>" is not showing, you may boot the computer by inserting the disks in their drives and then pressing the CONTROL+ALT+DEL keys at the same time.

Loading Files

To load a new file, at the "A>" type "D," leave one space, and type the filename (which should not be longer than eight characters and should not have any spaces between the letters) and press <ENTER>. At this point, the prompt will tell you to press F to create the new file.

To load a file you have already created, at the 'A>" type ED, leave one space, type the filename, and press <ENTER>. PC-WRITE will load the file, and you may begin to type.
Saving Text

Whenever you open a file, PC-WRITE will automatically write a backup to keep in case you run into problems while editing the file. While editing, every ten minutes PC-WRITE will automatically save the file in memory to disk.

* To save file in memory to disk - Alt, then F, S. (or F1, F3)

* To exit file and save - Alt, then F, E. (or F1, F2)

* To exit file and not save - Alt, then F, U, then
Alt, then F, E.
(F1, F, F2)

NOTE: After you exit from the file and the main menu appears, press F2 if you wish to return to DOS.

Printing A File

Once you are ready to print, follow this procedure:

* Turn the printer control box to the corresponding letter on your computer.

* Make sure the printer is ready. (Turn it on; all green lights are displayed, and no red light is showing.)

* Paper is lined up correctly. (The crease is even with the ribbon.)

* To preview layout of file - Alt, then P, V.

* To print entire file - Alt, then P, A.

* To print partial file - Alt, then P, R.
NOTE: Enter page data and press <ENTER>.
PART II

INDEX

ADDING TEXT  LINE OR PAGE IN THE FILE
CENTER A LINE  LINE SPACING
COPY TEXT WITHIN FILE  MOVE TEXT WITHIN FILE
CURSOR MOVEMENT  PAGE BREAKS
DATE SPACES  SPELL CHECK
DELETING TEXT  THESAURUS
ENHANCEMENTS  WINDOWS
HEADERS AND FOOTERS  WORD COUNT
HYPHENS  
LETTER CASE  

Adding Text

When the writing screen appears, you will see Push on the top line. To change to Over, press Scroll Lock. These two modes allow you to add text as follows:

* Push indicates words will be pushed ahead to the right as you insert text.

* Over indicates letters will be replaced, typed over, as you add text.

* To add spaces:

a. <ENTER> creates line or paragraph spaces. (Make sure cursor is at left of text for new line above and at right of text for new line below.)

b. INS inserts a blank space and automatically pushes text ahead.

c. SPACE BAR inserts spaces in Push mode, but it replaces text with spaces in Over mode.

Center A Line

To center text on a line, press Shift+F8.
**Copy Text Within File**

a. Start marking text  
   - Alt, then E, S, M.  
   (F3)

b. Move cursor, end marking  
   - Alt, *then* E, S, M.  
   (F3)

c. Move cursor to new location

d. Copy marked text  
   - Alt, *then* E, C.  
   (F3)

e. Remove highlighting  
   - Alt, *then* E, T.  
   (F5)

**NOTE:** With copied text still selected, you may press Alt, *then* E, U, C (or F4, F4) to erase it.

**Cursor Movement**

* Use Arrow keys to move up, down, left, or right.

* Use Home to reach left margin.

* Use Shift+End to reach right margin.

* Use End to reach last character in a line.

* Use PgUp to scroll up a line.

* Use PgDn to scroll down a line.

* Use CTRL+PgUp to scroll up one paragraph.

* Use CTRL+PgDn to scroll down one paragraph.

* Use Alt, then S, T to move to top of file.

* Use Alt, then S, E to move to end of file.

**Date**

Press Alt, *then* E, I, D (or Alt+F4, F5) to insert current date at cursor.
Deleting Text

* DEL deletes at the cursor and to the right of the cursor.
* BACKSPACE, the key above <ENTER>, deletes to the left of the cursor.
* SPACE BAR deletes at the cursor and to the right only when in Over mode.
* TO DELETE A BLOCK OF TEXT:
  a. Place cursor on the text to be deleted.
b. Alt, then E, S, M.
c. Move cursor to highlight the text to be deleted.
d. Alt, then E, D.

NOTE: To undo delete - Alt, then E, U, D.

* CTRL+ESC deletes a word with the cursor on the first letter.
* CTRL+BACKSPACE deletes a word to the left of the cursor.
* SHIFT+CTRL+ENTER deletes the entire line.
* CTRL+ENTER deletes from the cursor to the end of the line.
* SHIFT+CTRL+BACKSPACE deletes from the cursor to the start of the line.

Enhancements

To create the following special effects, press Alt in combination with the letter both in front of and behind the word to be enhanced. A symbol will appear in front of and behind the word. This is a signal to the printer and will not appear in your printout. If you change your mind and want to remove the enhancement, delete the symbols the way you would delete any other character in the text.

Alt+U - Underline
Alt+W - Double-Underlining
Alt+S - Double-Strike
Alt+I - Italic
Alt+E - Elite Type
Alt+H - superscript1234
Alt+C - Compressed Print
Alt+D - Double-Wide Print

Alt+B - Boldface
Alt+O - Overstrike
Alt+Q - Quality Mode
Alt+F - Fast or Draft Mode
Alt+P - Pica Quality Mode
Alt+L - Subscript1234
Headers and Footers

Headers and footers show only upon printing or preview.

a. Headers

* To print only page number at top of page:

Center page number (-2-) - Press Alt, then L, R, H, H, C.
Flush right number (Page 2) - Press Alt, then L, R, H, H, F.

* To include other text with or without a page number:

Text at left, page number at right - Press Alt, then L, R, H, H, T.
Date at left, text at right - Press Alt, then L, R, H, D.
Text at left - Press Alt, then L, R, H, O.

Note: Type text between quotes on top line, then press <ENTER>.

* Turn off headers with Alt, then L, R, H, N.

b. Footers

* To print only page number at bottom of page:

Center page number (-2-) - Press Alt, then L, R, H, F, C.
Flush right number (Page 2) - Press Alt, then L, R, H, F, F.

* To include other text with or without a page number:

Text at left, page number at right - Press Alt, then L, R, H, F, T.
Date at left, text at right - Press Alt, then L, R, H, D.
Text at left - Press Alt, then L, R, H, O.

NOTE: Type text between quotes on top line, then press <ENTER>.

* Turn off footers with Alt, then L, R, H, F, N.
c. Create Your Own

* To change parts and/or their positioning in single line header or footer:

Alt, then L, R, H, H, O, then type in header text.

Alt, then L, R, H, F, O, then type in footer text.

* Type page number as $$$ . Push text left or right with +++ .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Positioning</th>
<th>Example Header</th>
<th>Example Footer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page numbers</td>
<td>.H : Page $$$</td>
<td>.F : $$$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank line</td>
<td>.H :</td>
<td>.F :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush left</td>
<td>.H : Part 1+++</td>
<td>.F : $$$$+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush right</td>
<td>.H : ++++$$$</td>
<td>.F : ++++ Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered</td>
<td>.H : ++++Heros+++</td>
<td>.F : ++++$$$+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Include a blank line header last, and first for footer, to separate lines from regular text on each page.

**Hyphens**

To control hyphens, do the following:

* Normal Hyphen - Enter it with the **Hyphen Key** to divide a word between lines or as part of a compound word. This hyphen always prints. PC-WRITE will divide a word at a normal hyphen.

* Soft Hyphen - Enter it with Shf+Ctl+Hyphen. Place it within within a long word so it can be divided if necessary. This hyphen does not print except at the end of a line.

* Hard Hyphen - Enter it with Ctl+Hyphen. Use it instead of a normal hyphen to keep a compound word together on a line. This hyphen always prints.

**Letter Case**

To change the case of a letter from upper to lower or lower to upper - F8.

**Line Or Page In The File**

When in a file and you wish to know the line or page of the cursor location, press Alt, then S, L, O.
**Line Spacing**

To control line spacing, use the following:

* Single Spacing - Alt, then L, S, S. No added blank lines print.

* Double Spacing - Alt, then L, S, D. One extra blank line prints.

* Triple Spacing - Alt, then L, S, T. Two extra blank lines print between lines.

**Move Text Within File**

a. Start marking text  
   (F6)  
   - Alt, then E, S, M.

b. Move cursor, end marking  
   (F6)  
   - Alt, then E, S, M.

c. Move cursor to new location

d. Move marked text  
   (F6)  
   - Alt, then E, M.

e. Remove highlighting  
   (F5)  
   - Alt, then E, T.

NOTE: With moved text still selected, press Alt, then E, U, M (or Shf+Ctl+End, F6) to move text back to original position.

**Page Breaks**

* Automatic paging - Alt, then L, P, A. (Alt+F7 F3)  
   Turns auto-page on or off.

* Hard Break  
   - Alt, then L, P, I, H. (Alt+T)  
   Does not adjust upon repage.

* Soft Break  
   - Alt, then L, P, I, S. (Shf+Alt+T)  
   May adjust upon repage.

* Removing Breaks  
   - Alt, then L, P, R. (Alt+F7, F)  
   Deletes all page breaks in document.

* Repage  
   - Alt, then L, P, D. (Alt+F7, F5)  
   Repages entire document.
Spaces

* Normal Space - Press SPACE.
* Space At Right - Press INS.
* Hard Space - Press CTL+SPACE.
   (Keeps words together.)
* Soft Space - Press SHF+CTL+SPACE.
   (Used in formatting.)

Spell Check

* Place cursor at top of file.
* Alt, then T, S, N.
* When cursor highlights misspelled word, press F3 (Guess).
* Use arrow to choose correct spelling. Press F to replace.
* If word is not found on "Guess" list, press ESC to manually edit the word.
* To continue with spell check, press the Grey+ key on the far right side of keyboard.

Thesaurus

* Place cursor on word to be checked.
* Alt, then T, M, T.
* Use arrow to choose desired word. Press F to replace.

Windows

You can split the screen horizontally to open up different viewing windows. You can
display portions of the same file, or different files, and mark and move text between them.
A window bar containing window number and current filename displays at top of each
window. One window at a time is active, indicated by the cursor and style of window bar.
All cursor and editing keys affect only that window, until you pick another to move to.
The status line on top line applies to file in active window only.
* Open window (same file)

a. Place cursor where you want to split the screen.
b. Press Alt, then V, O, S (or F2, F4). New window bar displays.
c. Press PgUP or PgDn to move to window above or below bar.
d. Editing or scrolling the screen affects only the window you’re in.

* Open window (different file)

a. Place cursor where you want to split the screen.
b. Press Alt, then V, O, N (or F2, F6).
c. Press PgUp or PgDn to move to window above or below bar.
d. Type the name of file to open in the new window, press <ENTER>.

e. If later you want to keep the new window open but switch to yet another file, you can either split the current window again using the same procedure above, or press Alt, then F, O (or F1, F6) to close the current file and open another.

* Pick another window

a. Alt, then V, P, U (or F2, PgUp) moves cursor one window above, making it active.
b. Alt, then V, P, D (or F2, PgDn) moves cursor one window lower, making it active.

* Single window

Alt, then V, G, S (or F2, F7) closes all other windows, leaving the current one open.

* Close window

Alt, then V, G, C (or F2, F3) closes current window. With just two windows displayed, this fills the screen with the remaining window.

**Word Count**

To count for the entire document or selected text, press Alt, then T, A, W.
APPENDIX E

Materials Provided by Alec for the CSU Program Case Study
Model Apple Syllabus, 1989

English 110C
Teacher’s Name
Quarter and Year

Office: [XXXX] Hall Office Hours:

Department Office Phone Number (421 [XXXX]): 292-6065

Text: Memering and O’Hare, The Writer’s Work, 2nd ed.

2 Double-sided (800k) 3.5-inch diskettes [A CSU] Freshman Composition folder

A good dictionary

Course Description:

English 110C is a beginning University composition course designed to improve expository writing by providing opportunities to study and practice the writing techniques and the reading skills necessary to be a writer.

Each student can expect to be required to demonstrate his or her mastery of basic composition, reading, and mechanical skills by (a) preparing and presenting for evaluation at least two essay examinations and at least four 500-600 word compositions, (b) demonstrating his or her ability to analyze and evaluate expository prose, and (c) participating responsibly and actively in the course.

Departmental Grading Standards:

1. Minimal Composition Skills: A student will receive a grade of C in English 110C only if he or she can, by the end of the quarter, regularly write essays that are responsive to the assignments and that satisfy the following minimal criteria:

   a. An essay must present a clear central idea which provides focus for the composition.

   b. An essay must be clearly organized; logical development of thought must be readily discernible.

   c. Paragraphs within a composition must be unified, coherent, and adequately developed. They should contribute to the development of thought in the essay.

   d. An essay must offer supporting details which make the central idea clear and convincing.

   e. An essay must demonstrate a student’s ability to use the language well; choice of words must be appropriate and specific.
2. **Minimal Reading Skills:** A student will receive a grade of C or better in English 110C only if he or she can regularly demonstrate the ability to:

a. Recognize the topic or thesis statement of a reading assignment.

b. Paraphrase the argument and supporting statements of a reading assignment.

c. Relate the thesis and main ideas discerned in a reading assignment to a classroom discussion or writing assignment.

3. **Minimal Mechanical Skills:**

a. An essay will not receive a C or above if it contains major problems in syntax. Excessive fragments, confused sentence structure, or run-on sentences in a 500-word expository composition usually indicate an inability to write Edited American English; such problems are not evident in C papers.

b. While the C paper may, of course, contain a few mechanical errors, such errors must be minimal. An essay will not receive a C when it contains serious basic problems of proofreading and editing, such as subject-verb disagreements, comma flaws or other punctuation mistakes, or numerous spelling errors.

**Class Policies:**

1. **Attendance:** The unique framework of this course demands that you attend class daily and that you hand in your papers on time. Those of you who choose to miss more than four class meetings may find your final grade affected by your absences. Should you accumulate, at any point in the course, more than six unexcused absences, you may be disenrolled from the course and, therefore, unable to receive credit for it. (Depending on the time of the quarter, you may receive a grade of E for the course.) Since this course is structured on a tight time schedule, YOU MUST BE ON TIME.

Computer Time: Since so much of your work this quarter will have to be done on a computer, an additional "attendance requirement" specific to this section of English 110C is computer time. Unless you own a Macintosh Plus or Macintosh SE or have private access to one, this means that you can expect to spend from 3 to 7 hours or more outside of class each week in a Macintosh lab on campus. (The exact number of hours will depend largely on your personal keyboarding proficiency.)

2. **Late Assignments:** In fairness to all class members, no late papers will be accepted at any time. Assignments due in class are due at the beginning of the class period; assignments due at other times will be announced in class. The midterm and final may not be taken late.

3. **Assignment Format:** Most of your drafts will be written on the computer either in lab or in class. Occasionally, you may need to write an assignment by hand. You may write initial drafts by hand; however, eventually you will be expected to type all hand-written work
pertaining to your papers, including hand-written initial drafts, onto your work disk and back-up disk. The format of all final drafts will be discussed in class and should always include the course number, your name, my name, the assignment number, and the date.

4. Materials: Everyone is required to purchase a Freshman Composition Folder and to keep all of the work done for this course in it; these folders will be collected and kept by the English Department at the end of the quarter. Important information about this course is printed on the covers of the theme folder, so you should read it carefully.

If you wish, during the eighth and ninth weeks of the quarter following your completion of English 110C, you may retrieve your Freshman Composition Folder from the Writing Secretary in [XXXX] 421. All folders not retrieved by that time will be destroyed.

Everyone is also required to purchase two 3.5-inch double-sided, double density diskettes. You may buy these diskettes anywhere you like, but I recommend that you buy them from the [CSU] Audio-Visual and Computer Store in Suite 060 Neilwood Gables.

5. Plagiarism: Using someone else’s ideas or words as your own is a serious offense in the University. Note carefully the definition and explanation of plagiarism appearing on the back cover of your Composition Folder. Suspected cases of plagiarism will be sent on to the Committee on Academic Misconduct for review.

6. Grading: Your final grade will be determined according to the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Papers</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm and Final</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first paper will be worth 10%; the second 15%; the third 15%, and the fourth 20%, for a total of 60%. The midterm exam and the final exam will be worth a total of 15%. The remaining 25% will be distributed among the following: your initial and working drafts; your critiques of other students’ papers; in-class writing assignments; homework; class participation, and pop quizzes.

NOTE: You will not pass the course unless you have completed and handed in all the major writing assignments for the course, including all drafts of each paper.

English Department Ombed:

The Freshman Composition program appoints an Embed each year whose job it is to receive questions and complaints about English 110C. The Embed is an experienced teacher of 110C whose function is to resolve differences. Students not satisfied with their English 110C course or instructor are encouraged to bring the problem or grievance to the Embed, especially if they feel unable to discuss the problem with their teacher. Students’ visits and problems will be kept confidential; students may talk with the Embed anonymously if they wish.
Autumn, 1989: Day-By-Day

Week One

September
22  R  Introductions to course, syllabus, diagnostic essay
23  F  Due: WW 3-14; 2 blank double-sided Mac disks 
       Diagnostic Essay

Week Two
26  M  Due: Attitude Survey 
       Guided Tour
27  T  Due: WW 28-62; Complete Guided Tour 
       Paper #1 introduced; Macstruction
28  W  Due: WW28-41; four prospective topics for Paper #1 
       Freewriting; Journals 
29  R  Due: WW 14-26; 2 focused-freewrite journal entries on 2 prospective 
       Paper #1 topics 
       Clustering; Share topics
30  F  Due: Exploratory Draft for Paper #1 
       Writer's Choices; Drafting; Revision

Week Three
October
3   M  Due: WW 3-14; 1 journal entry using dialogue 
       Dialogue; Discuss sample essays; Discuss common problems in 
       exploratory drafts
4   T  Due: 1 journal entry describing a person, place, or thing 
       Description; Discuss sample essays; The principles of peer-
       responding
5   W  Due: Sentence Work 1; Working Draft for Paper #1(2 copies) 
       Responding Session
6   R  Writing Workshop
7   F  Due: WW 73-85; Final Draft and all other work for Paper #1 
       Paper #2 introduced; Discuss sample essays

Week Four
10  M  Due: WW 67-73; four prospective topics for Paper #2 
       Brainstorming; "The Writer's Mind"
11  T  Due: Focus and invention notes for Paper #2, including "The 
       Writer's Mind" 
       Share topics
12  W  Due: Exploratory Draft for Paper #2; Sentence Work 2 
       Sentence Work
13  R  Due: WW 85-127 
       "Florida" (Strategies of Development)
14  F  "Florida," continued (Strategies of Development)
Week Five

17  M  Due: First Working Draft for Paper #2 (3 copies); Sentence Work 3
18  T  Due: Responses to 3 First Working Drafts
      Responding Session
19  W  Sample Drafting (and revising)
20  R  Due: Second Working Draft for Paper #2 (3 copies); WW
      261-69
      Paragraph work; Introductions and conclusions
21  F  Due: Responses to 3 Second Working Drafts
      Responding Session

Week Six

24  M  Writing Workshop
25  T  Sentence Workshop; (Assign Sentence Work 4)
26  W  Due: WW 129-50
      Paper #3 introduced; Discuss sample essays
27  R  Due: Final Draft and all other work for Paper #2
      MIDTERM EXAM
28  F  Due: 2 journal entries explaining why you like/dislike a particular
      movie, television program, album, concert, book, poem, car,
      restaurant, etc.
      MIDTERM EXAM, continued

Week Seven

31  M  Due: WW140-50; 4 prospective topics for Paper #3
      Standards and Criteria

   November
1   T  Due: Sentence Work 4; Focus and invention notes for Paper #3,
      including "The Writer's Mind"
      Sentence Work; Share topics
2   W  Due: Exploratory Draft for Paper #3; Review WW 129-50,
      especially the sample essays
      Objective summaries
3   R  Critical summaries
4   F  Writing Workshop

Week Eight

 7   M  Due: First Working Draft for Paper #3 (3 copies)
      Sample Drafting
8   T  Due: Responses to 3 First Working Drafts
      Responding Session
9   W  Due: Sentence Works
      Sentence Work; Writing Workshop
10  R  Due: Second Working Draft for Paper #3 (2 copies)
      Responding Session
11  F  NO CLASS: VETERANS’ DAY
Week Nine
14 M Due: Sentence Work 6
      Writing Workshop
15 T Due: Final Draft and all other work for Paper #3; WW 165-76
      Paper #4 introduced; Discuss sample essays
16 W Due: 4 prospective topic-audiences for Paper #4
      Brainstorming the two sides of an issue
17 R Due: Topic and invention notes for Paper #4, including "The
      Writer's Mind"
      Share topics
18 F Due: Exploratory Draft for Paper #4
      Mandatory Conferences

Week Ten
21 M Due: First Working Draft for Paper #4 (3 copies)
      "Ads that Work"
22 T Due: Responses to 3 First Working Drafts
      Responding Session
23 W Due: Sentence Work 7
      Sentence Work; Writing Workshop
24 R NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING DAY
25 F NO CLASS: COLUMBUS DAY OBSERVED

Week Eleven
28 M Due: Second Working Draft for Paper #4 (3 copies)
      "The Drawbridge"
29 T Due: Responses to 3 Second Working Drafts
      Responding Session
30 W Writing Workshop

December
1 R Due: Sentence Work 8
      Sentence Workshop
2 F Due: Final Draft and all other work for Paper #4; Attitude Surveys
      Collect Freshman Composition Folders; Class Evaluations
Software Evaluations
[Excerpted]

We have also analyzed and reviewed the following software packages, considering if and how each program might be integrated into the philosophical and pedagogical structure of our English 110C drafting curriculum:

Word-Processing Software *MacWrite (5.01)*: An excellent program, *MacWrite*’s icon-based finder system with its ruler based formatting and simple procedure for cutting and pasting text within a document enables students to operate and survive within the word processing program within approximately one hour. There are no unnecessary or superfluous characteristics to cause confusion or to make the word-processing program unwieldy or overwhelming. We currently use this program in our classes, and we continue to evaluate its effectiveness.

*Microsoft Word* and *WriteNow*. Both of these programs are basically adaptations of *MacWrite*, but contain more sophisticated formatting, printing, and organizing procedures. This added sophistication makes these programs more complex and more difficult to learn than *MacWrite* and, therefore, less attractive for use in a Freshman Composition course.

Editing and Style Software Generally, the editing and style software that now exists is either too elementary or too rigidly prescriptive to support the writing- and student-centered drafting philosophy and pedagogy that forms the core of our writing program.

**PROSE Instructor**: This program allows the teacher to respond to the student’s text as it exists on the student’s disk, providing the opportunity for the teacher to make comments (largely dealing with grammatical issues) within windows, which can be made invisible behind the student’s text on the computer screen. By entering a code, the student is able to access the teacher’s comments. A major problem with this package is that the program denies the existence of a hard copy of the student’s document. Since **PROSE** places the teacher’s comments only on the disk, the student must be at a computer terminal to read them, limiting her freedom. Also, since a large percentage of the responding to drafts in our student-centered, language-centered curriculum is done by other students, the use of **PROSE** would eliminate this sharing, a crucial dimension of our program.

**Tools for Writers**: This is an excellent tool for advanced stylistic analysis; however, the focus of instruction in English 110C is on developing a writer’s sense of self and concept of audience, not on polishing an already mature style. Generally speaking, our students are not yet ready to have the lengths of their words, sentences, and paragraphs analyzed and evaluated for maturity and variety. Our students, rather, need instruction that will help them to generate and arrange material towards the effective communication of their ideas. This program, however, could prove beneficial in our upper-division writing classes.

**MacProof (2.0)**: We are excited by **MacProof**’s potential as a student editing tool. Unlike the other grammar and spelling checkers we have evaluated, it does not correct the writer’s mistakes; it merely identifies potential errors, which the writer can then consider
and correct, if necessary. One of the best functions of MacProof is the "Expansion" function, which displays each sentence in a student's essay as a separate entity, allowing the student to see possible sentence structure flaws that might go unnoticed if the sentence were buried within a paragraph or page of other sentences. Unfortunately, however, MacProof has some major problems. The program is very slow, forcing the user to sit for a long time while an essay is loaded. Also, many of MacProof's categories are either too specialized ("Sexist Language" or "Racist Language") or too broadly defined ("Confused Language" or "Vague Language") to be of any real help for beginning freshman writers. The major defect with this program, though, is that a writer cannot make changes to her draft while in MacProof, which means that she must record any changes to be made on a hard copy and then later transfer those changes to the computer. This time lapse between discovering needed revisions and making those revisions isolates the student from the process of writing within the fluid language environment of the computer. This awkward delay prevents MacProof from being a useful program for our students.

MacLightning (Spelling/Grammar Checkers): The strength of this program is that it frees teachers from having to make small-scale comments on essays, allowing them to focus on helping students with larger problems in organization or in supporting a thesis. But such programs, in general, tend to be too prescriptive, telling the student what the correct spelling or word choice is. We are concerned that such prescriptive programs may make students too dependent on the computer.

Invention Programs Think Tank: An interesting outlining tool for the computer, Think Tank allows the writer to make a general outline, which she can then expand to include whole pages of text, referenced to the various key words in the outline. The problem with Think Tank is that this type of outlining is not a procedure that a student-writer could utilize without immediate access to a computer. It would be useless for a student to come to rely on the invention technique provided by Think Tank, if she will not be able to use it again after the class is over.

CREATE: The major problem with this invention package is that the questions it asks are subject-sensitive or subject-specific. Regardless of the selected topic, the same heuristic series of prompts is elicited from the program. The use of questions as heuristics is philosophically and pedagogically acceptable, but tying a student to a computer for such invention is a disservice. A responsive teacher or peer-responder could accomplish the same result even more effectively by prodding the writer to actively investigate her specific based on actual responses to her actual thinking and writing.

Generally, we find ourselves facing a dilemma when we consider the invention programs now available: Is it more practical to teach our students a variety of invention techniques, such as brainstorming, clustering, freewriting, Burke's pentad, and the journalistic questions, or to spend the same amount of class time introducing them to a single software program that would allow them to invent towards a topic only while at the computer terminal? Our fear is that such an approach might, by tying them exclusively to the computer for the purposes of invention, inhibit their writing beyond English 110C, throughout the University and across the curriculum.
We have also begun developing our own word-processing software, a program which we are currently referring to as Write Stuff. Intended solely for academic purposes and essentially an adaptation of the standard MacWrite program, Write Stuff would feature:

1) **Preset Formatting.** The MacWrite program, as it was developed by Apple, Inc., and is now marketed by Claris, has limited preset formatting. The system opens to a new document with single spacing, one oddly placed tab, a standard font, a standard font size, a standard font style, and no headers, footers, page numbers, or other formatting necessities. This arrangement forces the student writer to learn to format her document immediately.

Students and instructors find formatting documents to be the most confusing aspect of MacWrite. Since the rationale for utilizing Macintosh computers in our writing classrooms is that the simplicity of the system facilitates the rapid acquisition of word-processing skills for writing, requiring students to learn how to manipulate the formatting menu before they can complete a writing task seems wasteful. One of our proposed improvements to be made upon MacWrite would be to have Write Stuff open to a standard, academic, pre-formatted document, with double spacing at six-lines-per-inch, the Indentation Marker set to create a new paragraph each time the Return key is hit, no tabs, a standard font, font size, and font style, a header with the page number icon, date icon, and student name icon already placed, a footer, and a title page with no page number, date, or name for the first page of the document. Students will still be able to learn the formatting techniques if they are interested, but they will not have to master them in order to turn in an assignment.

2) **Expansion Capabilities.** Our proposed Write Stuff will utilize the expansion capability of MacProof (2.0), providing students with the option of viewing their essays sentence-by-sentence, with each sentence taken out of the jumble of sentences that make up paragraphs and pages. Unlike MacProof, however, Write Stuff will allow students to revise and rewrite text while it is displayed in this expanded form. Students would then be able to work with others on sentence-level revisions while in an environment that facilitates the detection of under-developed or over-developed sentences.

3) **Handbook Menus.** Write Stuff will feature a variety of menu items to aid students in proofreading their texts. While most existing spelling checkers either correct the student's spelling errors automatically or at least immediately supply the correct spelling for the student, the spelling checker we envision for Write Stuff will simply highlight potentially misspelled words, leaving the responsibility for correcting the potential error to the student-author. More important will be "Handbook" menu commands, which will give students ready access to usage and mechanics guidelines. This computerized "Handbook" will give the student the equivalent of a regular English usage handbook at her fingertips as she composes and revises at the keyboard.

We have also created, with some technical assistance from the Center for Teaching Excellence and the Office for Computer-Based Instruction, a module for computer-assisted sentence-combining introductions, explanations, and exercises using Course of Action TM, a desktop authoring program produced by Authorware, Inc. Course
of Action has allowed us to animate sentence manipulation as a means for enhancing the syntactic fluency of our students' writing as they learn how to draft and revise. This courseware development will continue into the 1988-89 academic year. Beginning in Autumn Quarter, 1988, we are also working with the University's Writing Center to develop and introduce computer-assisted instruction for the use of students working in the Center.
The English Department's [Computer] Project: Ideal Wish List—1988

In the best of all possible worlds we would:

** Update each of our three present classroom-labs ([XXXX] Hall rooms 307, 308, and 312) with:

- full networking among all machines and printers so that
  1) a document can be viewed on all machines simultaneously,
  2) that document can be revised simultaneously by all students within the
     classroom-lab(s),
  3) the document can be revised by one member of the class while the rest of the
     students watch that revision occurring on their own screens,
  4) a teacher can direct the entire class's attention to a particular student's text,
     drawn from that student's own disk,
  5) students can automatically save all their work on a central hard drive,
  6) teachers can review their students' writing as those students write and revise
     their texts, and
  7) our classroom-labs can be tied into the University's fiber optics network,
     allowing our students to work on their writing from potentially anywhere in the
     campus community;

- 1 additional Laserwriter, so each classroom-lab would have one;

- two additional printers, for a total of seven, with all printers, by means of networking,
  accessible from all machines;

- large-screen projection capabilities, connected to the local network, so that a text can be
  displayed on a wall screen;

- upgrading of our existing Macintosh Pluses; and

- dustless whiteboards.

** Create five additional classroom/labs in [XXXX] Hall (two for our advanced writing
  courses and three for use by the Writing Workshop), arranged similarly to our existing
  labs, each equipped with:

- 21 Macintosh SE's;

- 7 Imagewriter II's;

- 1 Laserwriter;

- full networking of all machines and printers, as described above;
— large-screen projection capabilities, as described above;

- dustless whiteboards;

** Provide additional equipment for business and technical writing classes in two of these five additional classroom-labs:

- full-page monitors for all machines;

— a scanner in each room;

— additional graphics, desktop publishing, and spreadsheet software for each workstation;

— electronic graphics tablets, in addition to mouses, at each workstation.

Additional comments:

A file server would serve all six classroom-labs, as well as the offices of teachers and administrative staff involved with the Project.

All teachers and staff would be supplied with a Macintosh SE computer for their own use in their offices.

Each of the four Apple TA offices would be equipped with three Imagewriter II’s, to be used for the creation of instructional materials.

The [Computer] Project administrators’ office would be equipped with an Imagewriter II and a Laserwriter, to be used for professional-quality materials and correspondence.
Five-Year Plan

New Curriculum
Computer-Enhanced Writing Component
Proposed Time Line *

1990-91 (first year)

Training session for all instructors teaching computer-enhanced courses ($3,600)

Begin the shift from English 060 to English 11OW (10 sections of English 11OW [Program Excellence])

Upgrade existing facilities (see attached sheets)
—Add 1 twelve-month GAA at 50% to assist with research and administration and to direct ongoing evaluations

Design plan to evaluate English 11OC

Planning for English 302C

Writing Center
—Training session for Writing Center staff ($600)
—Search for Director (tenure-track Associate Professor)
—Move to larger space
—Add computer workstation ($1,900)
—Expand staff of GTA’s as tutors to 10 (from 7)
—Add peer tutors (at no cost—they will receive credit)
—Funds for the development of the second and third courses (continuance of current GEC proposal practice)

Continuing funds for operations and maintenance of labs

Additional faculty and GTA’s for the second writing course

1991-92 (second year)

Training session for all instructors teaching computer-enhanced courses

Planning for English 052C and English 053C
—Convert Writing Workshop director from A & P to faculty line

Complete the shift from English 060 to English 11OW (add 1 lab)

Expand English 11OC (including English H110) to 6 classrooms (from 640 students/ quarter to 1,056 students/quarter, by adding two labs)
—Training of faculty and GTA's
—Begin evaluation

Planning for English 267C

Phase out English 301

Pilot English 302C

Reduce the number of English 304 sections offered

Faculty development and incentives through the Writing Center
—Training session for Writing Center staff
—Add 2 computer workstations
—Funds for workshops and consultation
—Support for faculty teaching second writing course

Continuing funds for operations and maintenance of labs

Additional faculty and GTA’s for the third writing course

1992-93 (third year)

Training session for all instructors teaching computer-enhanced courses

Pilot English 052C and English 053C

Expand English 11OC (including English H110) to 8 classrooms (from 1,056 students/quarter to 1,356 students/quarter, by adding two labs) —Appoint tenure-track faculty director of Computers in Composition and Literature

Pilot English 267C

Evaluation of English 302C

Expand English 302C (add 1 lab)

Shift English 305 to the College of Engineering and teach English 304C and English 305C as majors’ courses in English (add 1 lab)

Faculty development and incentives through the Writing Center —Training session for Writing Center staff —Add 2 computer workstations —Pilot satellite centers in Agriculture and Biological Sciences (funding to come from individual Colleges) —Support for faculty and GTA’s teaching second and third writing courses

Continuing funds for operations and maintenance of labs
Additional faculty and GTA's

1993-94 (fourth year)

Training session for all instructors teaching computer-enhanced courses

Evaluation of English 052C and English 053C

Expand English 052C and English 053C (add 1 lab)

Expand English 11OC (including English H110) to 11 classrooms (from 1,536 students/quarter to 2,112 students/quarter, by adding three labs)
Evaluation of English 267C

Expand English 267C (University open labs)

Evaluation of English 304C and English 305C

Faculty development and incentives continue through the Writing Center — Training session for Writing Center staff — Add 2 computer workstations — Expand satellite centers (funding to come from individual Colleges) — Support for faculty and GTA's teaching second and third writing courses and working in satellite centers

Evaluation of the Writing Center

Continuing funds for operations and maintenance of labs

Additional faculty and GTA's

1994-95 (fifth year)

Training session for all instructors teaching computer-enhanced courses

Complete conversion of English 110 (including English H110) to English 11OC (from 2,112 students/quarter to 2,688 students/quarter, by adding three labs, for a total of 14) [CSU] becomes first major university to deliver all of Freshman English on computer.

Fall evaluation of English 11OC

20% of English 267 on computer (University open labs)

50% of English 302 on computer (existing facilities)

All of English 304 and English 305 on the computer (existing facilities)
Faculty development and incentives continue through the Writing Center — Training session for Writing Center staff — Add 2 computer workstations — Support for faculty and GTA’s teaching second and third writing courses and working in satellite centers.

Continuing funds for operations and maintenance of labs

Additional faculty and GTA’s

* At the end of the conversion of regular classes to computer-enhanced classes, the course ceilings will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 052 and English 053</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 110W</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 110</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 267</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 302</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 303</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 304 and English 305</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultants' Site Visit
[Computer] Project, [Center] State University
February 25-26, 1989

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles and Cynthia L. Selfe

In February of 1989, the [Center] State Board of Regents commissioned an evaluation of the [Computer] Project located in the English Department at [Center] State University. This project currently serves 24 sections of first-year English composition classes in three university-owned composition computer classrooms and could be expanded to serve the majority of first-year students.

Our evaluation of this Project is based on reading preliminary reports written by the [State] Board of Regents, and by the administrators of the [Computer] Project and the Director of Writing. During the evaluation site visit, we reviewed additional documentation, toured the facilities, met with students who have participated in the Project, interviewed teaching associates who have taught computer-assisted classes, and talked extensively with University and Project administrators.

Overview of Recommendations

Our major conclusion based on all the evidence we have obtained is that this is an extraordinarily successful project, one that results in improved attitudes about writing and increased skill on the part of students, and on that fosters an energetic and enthusiastic community of teachers committed to innovative pedagogical approaches and excellent teaching.

It seems self-evident to us that this Project should be expanded to serve the majority of the first-year students and, indeed, extended to the additional writing courses planned in [Center] State's new undergraduate, general education program tentatively scheduled for 1990-91. This expansion should be supported by additional faculty involvement, supervision, and development. In addition, it will require significant increases in physical facilities, hardware, technical support and maintenance, and software. All of these investments would be returned in the quality of the university level education that [state] citizens expect and deserve from their major research university.

Quality Indicators of the [Computer] Project

The [Computer] Project's syllabus (a variation on the regular 110 syllabus) is based on a model of instruction validated by the best and most recent research available in the field of composition studies. First of all, class size in Project sections is limited to twenty students, the optimal number recommended by the National Council of Teachers of English. Given this reduced class size and the introduction of supporting technology, well-prepared instructors can provide individual attention and feedback according to individuals's needs and writing abilities. Second, using computers as writing tools, instructors set up a climate that encourages collaboration among students who learn to participate effectively in peer critiques, critical reading and writing activities, invention and
revision, the successive refinement of ideas in multiple drafts of assignments, and informal writing activities designed to encourage learning.

Although many of these strategies are possible in some form without computers, the students and the instructors reported that computer technology enhances their classroom environments and makes new and more effective kinds of collaboration and writing possible. The computers take the drudgery out of the writing process so that both students and teachers can concentrate on the intellectual development of ideas. Neither technology nor good teaching alone is sufficient to account for the extraordinary success of this Project; rather, it is the thoughtful integration of the two that works so well.

In terms of the second-level quality indicators, we have observed outstanding coherence, synergism, involvement, and vitality within the community of instructors involved in the [Computer] Project. Much of the credit for this atmosphere clearly belongs to the Project’s Coordinator [Alec], and his assistants, Debby [X] and David [X]. They constantly support the instructors in the program, making themselves available at all times for technical assistance and pedagogical consultation. Particularly, we noted that [Alec’s] knowledge about composition studies, computer-supported pedagogy, and enthusiastic attitude toward the Project set an exceptionally positive tone for the work that goes on within the group.

The high expectations of the Project staff for their students’ work are clearly evident in the classroom and in [The Best], a collection of the best writing from all the computer-supported classes. A tribute to the energy and commitment of these teachers, [The Best] is published three times each quarter. In addition, we observed further indicators of the Project’s quality, such as a list of research projects and several proposed dissertations that provide evidence of a challenging, questioning attitude within the Project.

**Challenges for the [Computer] Project**

No matter how exemplary a program is, however, one of the purposes of an outside evaluation is to identify possible areas for improvement. In that spirit we have identified the following challenges that this Project faces.

We consistently observed during our visit that the Project is an isolated subset of the first-year composition program (English 110), itself a subset of the English Department at [Center] State University. Although the Vice Chair for Rhetoric and Composition and the Chair of the Department of English are all fully aware of the Project’s activities and accomplishments, they do not participate in it regularly or systematically. The Director of Writing was instrumental in designing the project, negotiating the initial funding, and in implementing it initially, but he does not participate in day-to-day supervision of the Project. The current leaders of the Project, as graduate students, are not included in decision-making processes that have a direct bearing on the Project and on the future of writing in the undergraduate curriculum at [Center] State. Furthermore, neither the Project Coordinator nor the Director of Writing sits on the University’s Composition Committee.
The Project's isolation within the English Department is exacerbated by the fact that few regular, tenured, or tenure-track faculty teach first-year composition courses, with or without computers; and only one supervises the three hundred sections a year that are offered at [Center] State. The few faculty members who occasionally teach introductory writing choose to do so only with honors students. As a result of this isolation, the Project's successes have not affected the English Department as a whole, and have certainly not affected other units outside the Department, even though the potential for emulation exists across the undergraduate curriculum. We consider this situation unfortunate, indeed. Writing is a fundamental medium for thinking and learning in every discipline in the academy, and computer-assisted writing environments are necessary support systems for the work that will be done in nearly every field in the twenty-first century.

If regular faculty were involved more centrally in the [Computer] Project, we believe that the level of self-evaluation and research could be enriched. Although the students themselves have generated a list of research questions, they lack the experiences with research methodology and theory to plan and conduct important scholarly inquiries that could provide leadership for the nation's public research institutions. Additionally, increased faculty involvement would allow the Project to balance the teaching and research missions that are so fundamental within major research universities. There is certainly no shortage of qualified faculty members in the English Department, including the Director of Writing, but their current duties do not allow them enough time to participate in this project often enough to have a significant impact on the Project's research agenda.

Finally, we believe that only if regular faculty are involved can the [Computer] Project's successes be exported effectively to other writing courses within the University.

**Recommendations for the [Computer] Project**

As a result of our observations, interviews and reading, we can make the following recommendations for the [Computer] Project:

- **New Faculty Positions**

  We applaud the productivity of the graduate teaching assistants and the graduate faculty. They are clearly overextended, however, and the Department needs new positions if this program is to thrive and grow.

  For example, the responsibilities of the Writing Center Director, currently assigned to a graduate student, exceed those that should be assigned to a non-tenure track member of the staff. Although the current Director, Kimberly [X], is doing an outstanding job, she cannot expand the Center's tutorial services to a level adequate for one hundred sections of first year composition per quarter, add computer-assisted instruction to upgrade existing services and, at the same time, work effectively on faculty development projects across the University. Administrative responsibilities demanded in this position and others are interfering with graduate students' timely progress toward their degrees and their focus on
research and scholarship. The Coordinator of the Project is himself a graduate student who is employed in this full-time position.

Although institutional and departmental constraints will determine how duties should be assigned to individual faculty members, one possible solution is to hire a faculty-level Writing Center Director who would coordinate this Project as a part of her or his duties, especially if [Center] State would like to see the expansion we have outlined above. This person could also supervise the efforts of the excellent graduate students on the Writing Center staff, and coordinate the entire range of consulting services offered by the rhetoric and composition faculty, including computer-assisted instruction, "writing across the curriculum" workshops, and faculty development in all departments.

- Expansion to Other Undergraduate Writing Courses

The approaches central to the current [Computer] Project need to be implemented in all three of the required writing courses in the new [Center] State University curriculum. In addition, computer-assisted approaches should be used to enhance the entire "writing across the curriculum" effort.

Wherever writing occurs with the University, there is an opportunity for expansion of the curricular innovations demonstrated in this Project. Computers should be present in every writing environment at a modern University.

- Enriched Research Agenda for the [Computer] Project

Right now the scholarly questions the graduate students are asking about computer-support in composition classes are limited to immediate concerns about classroom environment and specific teaching techniques. These students should be encouraged to ask increasingly critical and sophisticated questions about the relationship between technology and writers, academic institutions and the larger culture beyond the academy. They should be anticipating and proposing future applications of computers in communication and learning situations, testing the ways in which applications of computers from other disciplines can be used in writing processes and making fruitful connections between current composition and literary theory and the use of computers.

- Increased Diversity

While teachers within the [Computer] Project have identified an obviously successful model for the computer-assisted writing classroom, they have an opportunity to explore many new strategies for computer networking, combining theories of reading and writing, linking composition to other courses outside the English Department, and offering a broader range of sophistication in the computer applications they teach. This Project has worked so well because the project has involved a homogeneous population of students, but this situation is changing. As increasing numbers of minority students are attracted to English 110C courses and as entering first-year students are exhibiting growing sophistication in their computer skills, Project teachers must modify existing content and pedagogy appropriately.
Outreach and Articulation

No university or college-level project can be entirely successful until it operates within larger educational systems. The [Computer] Project’s leaders should be imaging and working toward a future in which students come to [Center] State University already equipped to write using a range of computer systems. Currently these skills must be taught at the university level, and they take valuable time away from the teaching of composition. Furthermore, such as situation prevents students from acquiring increasingly sophisticated computer skills when they enter the university setting. Project leaders should be involved in a cooperative effort with State department of officials and public and private school teachers to design a kindergarten-through-college curriculum that promotes computer literacy adequate for the twenty-first century.

[Computer] Project leaders should also be encouraged to discuss their successes and the challenges they face with leaders of similar projects across the country. Certainly, this effort would be facilitated with computer support, particularly the use of BITNET.

Outreach efforts within the University should also be undertaken. Project leaders should be encouraged to explore computer applications being used in introductory programs across the University in order to exploit cross-disciplinary connections. A fringe benefit of this effort might be that students would perceive the computer-supported work in composition classes as increasingly germane to their own fields of study. Additional outreach projects could include much needed faculty development for tenured and tenure-track faculty within and outside the English Department, the productive use of existing computer networks within the university for the exchange of electronic mail and communications, and on-line library access.
Sample Teacher Evaluations

Excerpts from Teacher Evaluations (AU, 1987, and WI, 1988)

The best observation I could make was that the Mac seems to draw a class together in important and exciting ways; I had the impression early on, and this remains, that the atmosphere in a Mac classroom is not unlike that of the illustrious "Think Tank" in political, law, and medical circles. In my imagination (overactive, maybe) these places are active, stimulating, and immeasurably precise. Think Tanks also embody the essence of strong community effort--everyone working toward a common goal, each one in bettering writing. In English 110, as taught on the Mac, the atmosphere is like that of a Think Tank in that there is an intangible unity that comes from the whirring click of keyboards--students are more apt to turn to one another with opinions, questions, aid, computer anecdotes. As an instructor, I loved this, and for me it's the most redeeming feature of Mac instruction in the classroom.

Writing their papers on the computer makes students more willing to make changes and revisions. There are more real shifts between drafts, including major changes in organization. This is partly because the students can see the whole paper better as they are working on it, and partly because major shifts in organization are easy to accomplish because they can "cut and paste."

In the twenty-three years that I have taught, I have never had students ask if they may rewrite a final draft. I've always allowed D and E papers to be redone, but students never choose to do this extra writing. This quarter, however, students act as if I've commended some kind of national constitution when I answer their question with, "Of course, you may rewrite this essay if you wish." I'm delighted that they want to try to improve a paper. That reflects a positive attitude that smells to me like success in their future.

With computers in the composition classroom, the student's concern for the quality of their writing goes deeper. On papers 2 they had already begun to produce five or six drafts of each paper. Not until this quarter does this happen until paper #4, if at all. These students are agonizing over word choice, linkage, conclusions at this early part of the quarter.

Spelling and grammar and punctuation mistakes were fewer and farther between because students were able to correct them with greater ease on the screen. And anything which helps them ease the pain of editing is a great invention in my book. I also found that most of the students were more willing to revise using the computer. At times during my prior 110 classes, I found large percentages of the class, particularly in the latter stages of the drafting process, extremely hostile of the idea of rewriting. And I am convinced that a large part of that is due to the fact that they were having to rewrite pages out by hand--pages which they had already typed two or three times over. The Mac makes such repetition unnecessary. The students are willing to spend the time really revising their work, instead of merely changing word choices and sentence structure, because it is easy to move paragraphs and sentences and even entire pages on the Mac--because you always have the option of undoing what you've done if you don't like it.

Writing workshops. They are great. Students actually do writing in them. They ask questions--of me and of each other. It is one of the most productive times we have. When I was looking at the end of the syllabus at the beginning of the quarter, at first I was dismayed to find all the writing workshops scheduled. They had, in times past, gone over less than wonderfully. The computer changes all that. Their time is at a premium, and when they can actually get their hands on the computer, they really tend to take advantage of it. And while this group is not necessarily asking me more questions about individual papers, they are definitely getting more input from other class members. Which is a great thing to see.
I'm in the lab today, I am sitting at computer 6, typing away. I have been here all period; I typed and printed some poetry. Behind me is a table of people reading each other's drafts and talking about them. There are maybe eight people at computers; one girl appears to be doing her math. It's certainly her prerogative, I suppose. A student from Jim's class is here, using the lab time. The students respect the fact that I'm working, but know I'll answer their questions. I have been asked whether "anti-trapper" contains a hyphen (I don't know, but he's read substantially more in the field than I have, and says he's seen it without one, so I deferred to his superior reading experience), how to spell "humongous," and how to cite a pamphlet. I have changed the paper in three printers. One boy has asked me about his Communications paper, and I have tried to help him nail down his strategy. They say goodbye to each other, and then to me.

This is the way a workshop should be.

The best observation I could make was that the Mac seems to draw a class together in important and exciting ways: I had the impression early on, and this remains, that the atmosphere in a Mac classroom is not unlike that of the illustrious "Think Tanks" in political, law, and medical circles. In my imagination (overactive, maybe) these places are active, stimulating, and immeasurably precise. Think Tanks also embody the essence of strong, communal effort—everyone working toward a common goal, such as ours in bettering writing. In English 110, as taught on the Mac, the atmosphere is like that of a Think Tank in that there is an intangible unity that comes in that whizzing click of keyboards—students are more apt to turn to one another with opinions, questions, aid, computer anecdotes. As an instructor, I loved this, and for me it's the most redeeming feature of Mac instruction in the classroom.

The quality of my students' papers was better than the quality of papers for the regular composition courses which I taught last year. Their papers were more pleasant to read, partly because they were clear, printed copies, and partly because the finished product was better.

Writing their papers on the computer makes students more willing to make changes and revisions. There are more real shifts between drafts, including major changes in organization. This is partly because the students can see the whole paper better as they are working on it, and partly because major shifts in organization are easy to accomplish because they can "cut and paste."

Sentences combining is much easier to do on the computer. The students avoid tedious re-copying, and they can see better what the changes are. When they print out their revisions, I can also see better what changes they have made. By making up a sentence work exercise from their own papers and putting it on their disk, I could show them how sentence combining carried over into their own writing.

In the twenty-three years that I have taught, I have never had students ask if they may rewrite a final draft. I've always allowed D and E papers to be redone, but students never choose to do this extra writing. This quarter, however, students act as if I've amended some kind of national constitution when I answer their question with, "Of course, you may rewrite this essay if you wish." I'm delighted that they want to try to improve a paper. That reflects a positive attitude that smells to me like success in their future.
Spelling and grammar and punctuation mistakes were fewer and farther between because students were able to correct them with greater ease on the screen. And anything which helps them ease the pains of editing is a great invention in my book. I also found that most of the students were more willing to revise using the computer. At times during my prior 110 classes, I found large percentages of the class, particularly in the latter stages of the drafting process, extremely hostile to the idea of rewriting. And I am convinced that a large part of that is due to the fact that they were having to write pages out by hand—pages which they had already copied two or three times over. The Mac makes such repetition unnecessary. The students are willing to spend the time really revising their work, instead of merely changing word choices and sentence structure, because it is easy to move paragraphs and sentences and even entire pages on the Mac—because you always have the option of undoing what you've done if you don't like it.

A lot of trial and error goes into this computer business. Trial and error's not undesirable, though. I think that by giving the students a sense of "tinkering" with computers, we are also setting them up for the "tinkering" that goes into the writing process. On the computers, you practice, you make mistakes, and eventually you'll learn. And this type of environment is conducive to the writing process. What is also important is that the students, after about two weeks, get a sense of how much difference a computer makes in the ease of the writing process. All the busy work is eliminated—revision consists of pressing a few buttons, or moving the mouse around. They forsake their typewriters quickly.

One thing that struck me about teaching with the Apples is the greater sense of a "writing community," rather than writing classroom. I remember teaching last year when students sat in bolted chairs, usually trying to distance themselves as much as possible from both the teacher and other students. The biggest difference is during writing workshops. The students in the bolted face-front, small writing area classrooms would more often than not, I think, simply begin writing and revising. They'd sit there with pencil or pen and not be really willing to do much with their writing. I think they had the sense that they had a written or typed document in front of them. Why ruin all that hard work? In the Mac lab, though, their writing is simply lights on a screen, easily changeable, easily printable. They can't ruin anything because they can reprint a text almost as fast as change pop into their heads. They're simply more involved with their writing. I used to sit staring off into space and maybe answering a question or two during the writing workshops of the old days. Now I'm running from computer port to computer port answering a non-stop barrage of questions.

Probably the thing that sticks out the most is how the computer lab allows more immediate interaction between the writer, writing, and the teacher. Students now are actually writing exploratory drafts that are "exploratory" rather than trying to knock out a final draft in the first shot. I think writing is just less (and this is going to seem paradoxical) of a mechanical task with the computer. They can sit down and just start clicking away. What motivates them to write even more is that if they have a puzzling point in their text they can simply raise their hand, ask me the question, and fix the problem right there. Then they move on.

I feel that participating in this program has made me a better teacher. I think the computer plays a significant role in the course—a role we too often try to fill; we can't write the papers for them, but I think in conventional 110 classes we spend much too much time talking, when all along they should be experimenting with their writing, their style, everything and anything that has to do with writing. I've learned that they really don't need me up there all the time spouting off about commas splices, etc. Instead, they need the freedom to experiment, and I think the Mac offers this. Now how do I get my conventional class to enjoy writing in class as much as my Apple kids did? I really notice an incredible desire on their part to write, write, and write some more! In a way, I hate to think it's simply the computer, but I sure do recognize a different attitude about in-class writing this quarter; they hate it.
Autumn Quarter 1990

MEMOIRS OF ENGLISH 110C

With apologies for my failure to keep a journal (due to time pressures rather than laziness—no kidding), I offer some thoughts about my first experience teaching computer-enhanced composition, restricting my comments to only those aspects of my 110C course that involved the Macs, the classroom set-up, and techniques I adopted as a result of our pre-quarter workshops.

* * * * *

As veterans of 110C mentioned during our preparatory workshops, the presence of computers and the physical accommodations of the rooms do create a classroom dynamic different from that of a traditional classroom. Students seemed to sense that the room was a lab in which work was to be done—and they were eager to work at the computers whenever possible. This eagerness had a positive effect on their writing: even those who started with an "I-hate-to-write" attitude found writing and editing on a computer to be pleasurable (or, at least, not too painful), which led to a greater willingness to revise and experiment with their drafts.

The table set-up probably had an even more profound effect than the Macs on the classroom experience. Because students could easily see and talk to each other, a sense of class unity seemed to develop. I think this was the first 110 class I have taught in which students called each other by name and spoke directly to each other (rather than always to me) during discussions—a refreshing change. Although students treated me as an authority in the class—someone to settle arguments during discussions or to provide a definitive answer to questions about writing—I think I was able to de-center myself (for instance, by joining them at the computers or tables) in a fruitful way that contributed to the classroom atmosphere of a workshop where workers, myself included, got together to help each other.

The layout of the classroom also facilitated group-work, which was the most positive aspect of the course, in my eyes. For some activities such as doing writing exercises from their handbook, I let them form their own groups, but for peer-response sessions, I put them into assigned groups that I established early in the quarter on the basis of the writing abilities suggested by their diagnostic essays. Of the six (three-member) groups, only one was noticeably weak (I had grossly misjudged the ability of one student in this group). Because the other groups had gelled by the time I recognized my error, I was loathe to disrupt and regroup them, so I simply spent more time with the weak group on response days—not the best solution, I admit. On the other hand, my most
successful group (Yvoma-Chrisssy-Jason) impressed me to no end. Yvoma's second-language difficulties, apparent in her diagnostic, worried me, but an early conference assured me that she had the ability and determination necessary to improve if she could receive good advice and support. So I grouped her with two strong and confident writers, hoping that they would be helpful to each other as well as to her. The results were far better than I had anticipated. Yvoma made impressive strides quickly—between the first and second working-drafts of her first paper, in fact—and her writing continued to improve throughout the quarter. Of course, most of the credit goes to Yvoma, who also met me regularly for conferences and sought help for her second-language problems at the Writing Center, but I think the support and encouragement of her group contributed significantly to Yvoma's self-confidence, which led to increasingly ambitious and sophisticated essays. As for Jason and Chrisssy, not only did they commit themselves to helping Yvoma, even working with her outside of class, but they also challenged each other's thinking and writing in marvelous ways. The striking success of this group and the generally beneficial results of the others have convinced me of the fruitfulness of established peer-response groups and of multiple drafting.

This was the first time I instituted double peer-response days, which also turned out well. On the first response days, the students used editing guidelines taken from the St. Martin's Handbook (one of the best things in the book) to do written responses to their group-members' first working drafts. The guidelines led to more detailed, constructive peer responses than I have seen in my previous 110 experience. Most of the students devoted 30 to 40 minutes to editing each paper. Usually during whatever class time was left, students conferred with me or began revising their essays at the computers. For the second response days, they brought in new working drafts—and here, of course, the computers played an important role, for students could easily revise their first drafts between Tuesdays (first response days) and Thursdays (second response days). On the second days, students would read their new drafts aloud to their groups; then the groups would discuss the changes that had been made and further ways of improving the essays. These second response days were not as widely successful as the first. All of the students felt that reading aloud was beneficial, but I found that the discussions were not equally fruitful for all groups. Veronica Leach had her students write out three specific suggestions for improvement of each essay on the second response days; perhaps I will try that or something else in the future. I'm open to suggestions.

I also probably need to make greater use of the computers. Other than scheduling computer workshop time on every editing day (which was possible because class sessions were two hours long), I did not make computer work a regular part of the classroom experience. I may schedule pre-writing activities at the computer next quarter. Feeling more comfortable myself now with the Macs, I will be more inclined to use them during class.
Well, I'm writing this during our first responding day and it looks like everybody is really into this. I don't think it's the computers or if it's because I have a really vocal class this quarter (I love it -- a freshman-level class where we discuss things) or if it's the classroom set-up. I know it wasn't how I went over peer responding in class since that was on a Monday after I drove to Syracuse and it went over like a pregnant mouse trying to pole vault.

I'm sitting here kind of worried about one group since I just noticed that none of them got off to a good start in their exploratories, but they seem to be discussing OK.

1:12 PM
Well, I've been typing for four minutes and nobody seems to be noticing what I'm doing -- which is fine with me. Nobody's started on the computers yet which is a good sign that they're still discussing their drafts. Maybe it's that they're in groups of four instead of three and they are so into this. Also, doing the responding at home is cool. I'll have to look at the drafts on Friday to see what kind of comments are being given -- if there are more or less comments and to see if they are substantial or not.

I'm a little worried about some of the students who didn't go to the Writing Workshop -- I think I had five or six of them and none of them ended up even going, I think. I think they didn't want to drop the course because of the computers. It'll be interesting to see how the computers help their writing. Are there plans to use computers over there? Didn't I ask that in my first journal entry? I don't know. I didn't bring my diskettes.
Thats something I'll have to remember -- on responding days, bring your own diskettes.

You know, there are a lot of fonts on this hardfile. Like this one or this
Here's one I've never seen before.

What does this look like?

This one looks like a Disney movie title.

Well, I better stop fucking around before somebody notices I'm just playing.

1:22s is almost half over and everyone's still talking and no one is
really interested in whether or not there’s a teacher in the room. No one seems to notice the computers either. Everyone is really involved in responding -- laughing, gesturing, arguing, interrupting each other. Last year, I had to go around to make sure everybody was working; now it looks like I don’t even have to bother. Everybody’s having a lot of fun -- they didn’t like it when I pointed out in a Donald Murray essay we read that writing was supposed to be fun, but I think they’re all enjoying it now.

Maybe I’ll have them do a journal entry on how they thought the responding session went. That could be good and it could be bad (an opportunity to suck up to the teacher).

Well, it looks like a few are getting out their ZIP packets and starting on tomorrow’s assignment, but nobody’s gone to the computers yet. I hope they don’t leave that to the last day because they might have problems getting printouts and stuff like that. This reminds me -- I need to teach them the paper format. It’s in The Modern Writer’s Handbook, but I think I should tell them how to do headers and stuff like right-justifying and centering.

I’d say about half the class is finished now and it’s 1:27 PM. I guess that’s about half-way. Nobody’s gone to the computer yet. Maybe

Sorry, I had to go get a stapler with staples in them.

The group next to me is still going at it. One of them seems pretty good -- “I never got a true idea about what you felt.” I think some have started to bullshit a little bit, but that’s OK. They’re the “captains of their ship” and maybe the bullshitting will give them a better sense of camaraderie. Also, they’ve been going pretty heavy all class and it might be a good idea to let the drafts percolate for a while before they start seriously working on them.

1:33 PM
A couple of women have started to read “Bar Wars” and they seem pretty shocked that I would assign this. Somebody’s talking about Carlos Snow. I hope they do good pissed-off journal entries tomorrow since the essays are really about offensive things -- sexism and racism.
1:37 PM
Did you know that you have to tell the computer not to update the time? Also something weird was happening with my mouse. Anyway, it looks like everybody's kind of bullshitting now. Well, they'll do the work eventually. I guess bullshitting in the dorm with the same people gets kind of boring after a while. I hope this will lead to even better discussions as the quarter gets on. These kids are really picking up things fast, but I'll have to look at the final drafts to see if they get it. Hopefully, by the last paper they'll be ready for me to take the training wheels off and not show me any drafts and still get a good essay. By then, they should be really familiar with the computers, too, so maybe they'll be doing extra drafts. Who knows? I'm glad I set aside the second week just to talk about the computers and to introduce them to the theory on which this course is based. That seems to help a lot better than just throwing everybody into it right with essay #1 as I did last year.

1:42 PM
They can't read my writing on the board and I told them I had it in a bad font. When will those big screens be ready? That would be really neat to use.

1:43 PM
Somebody's complaining about only having 30 minutes to do her work and not taking responsibility for it. Children will be children. I can tell she's going to have a problem with me and my WRITING = CHOICE = RESPONSIBILITY.

1:44 PM
Four minutes

1:45 PM
1:46 PM
Well, time to go. Nobody worked on the computers which was kind of disappointing, but we'll see how it turns out at the end of the week. Where's the next class? Oh that's right. Don's doing conferences today. I'd better lock up.
Tue, Nov 14, 1989
1:11 PM

I hate the end of the quarter. By now, everything is old and no one is interested in doing anything substantial. They've learned how to go through the motions of existence and I always wonder if I've done anything substantial.

For the fourth essay, I have them do all their work by themselves and/or in groups. I call this "weaning from the dictates of the instructor." They are in groups now. I wonder how I can incorporate the computers into this set-up. Think think think think. Maybe for the second working draft, instead of having them print-out their drafts, I'll just have musical computers -- I'll have everybody bring up their draft on screen then go to another computer and write comments on the screen in a different font or something. I hope that works.

You know, I haven't written in this journal in so long, I forgot what my last entry was about. Excuse me while I check that out.

1:18 PM

Well, I checked out my last entry and here's what happened: the responses really weren't that good, so I changed how that goes in my ZIPs packet. I think the computers are helping the kids who would normally not be interested in writing in terms of bringing down anxiety levels, but for some kids they need more. It's kind of disappointing how late in the quarter and nobody seems to freewrite or anything on the computer at all. One student even turned in her journal entries hand-written. I'm trying to decide how much I should get her for that (if at all). Computers or not, it's still very hard to get over the literal-minded, simplistic reasoning they have. Maybe I'll have them re-read an essay from week two and do a journal entry.

One problem I've noticed with groups is that through the quarter, students tend to prefer the four-person group to the class discussion. They tend to talk among themselves during class discussion as if they were in small groups again. Maybe a collaborative project would stop that. I'm not sure how to set that up, because I'm really not a collaborative worker myself. I think our goal is to get these kids to be self-sufficient and not go along with the crowd. Maybe I should have them work on the computers more to emphasize the concept of being a self-contained unit. Maybe this is cause for the Second Working Draft Idea above.

1:29 PM

Do you we only have 19 working computers in this lab? No, wait, 20, I forgot this one. I hope another one doesn't break down. Are they really that fragile?

Idea: Maybe I'll talk with Faye to see what she's doing the day my 2nd Working Draft is due. Maybe I'll get her students to come into my lab and send my students over to her lab to respond to each other's drafts. Hmmmmmm. I'll have to see what Faye thinks of that and maybe we can work out some logistics. The biggest problem I can think of
would be somebody losing somebody else's file or something, or deleting a whole page of text. But with back-ups, that should mean that nobody will lose anything. Theoretically.

1:35 PM
Somebody just asked if they could go. NO!!!! I asked if he wanted to work on the computer to start his draft and he said no. Maybe I'll go put diskettes by the computers as an incentive. Here I go.

1:40 PM
Well, I laid out the diskettes and I still have 2,536 pounds of protoplasm arguing over whether Elvis is alive or not. Actually I hear somebody talking about drug-testing which is an interesting topic if she takes a unique approach and writes a essay instead of a pamphlet. Although if she wants to do a pamphlet, I guess she can use the column function. I just noticed I set up one lousy group. Three dumb guys and a Catholic girl. I better scroll up so no one comes by and reads that.

1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM
1:43 PM

There. That's enough. Wow, somebody's still talking about drug-testing. She's even giving specific proposals as to how it should be done -- it sounds pretty specific and doesn't just reiterate one radical side or the other. Well, I figure no matter what, out of 20 students, you're lucky if you get two or three that get educated. The rest fulfill requirements.

1:46 PM
Everybody's getting ready to go. I wrote a little note at the bottom of Sentence Work 7

Got interrupted. Gotta go.
I probably am not the first to mention this, but I did want to write about the environment in the 110C classrooms. It's certainly different...at first I wasn't sure if it was my students or the environment or, perhaps, both. It is a positive environment in many respects and I intend to utilize that in the upcoming quarters that I teach. First, the students are much more open to one another. They can't help talking about things when they are facing one another. This did prove to be a bit of a problem in that once they start talking, they can't stop. That's one way you can lose control of your class, but I'm prepared now to turn that into something positive also. Responding sessions I found to be completely different than in regular 110. When they get that other student's paper to read, their natural tendency, I think, is to want to read it and then write a little (not as much as in 110), and then discuss it. So, in the future I want to leave plenty of time for discussion of topics and revising—conferences among themselves. I know the idea is to get them to write a lot, but if it is just an attempt to get them to find errors (which is the way they perceive responding, I think) then the purpose is defeated. Verbal exchange can be a plus in this situation.

One recurring problem I had throughout the quarter was the students showing up for a responding session and not having those extra copies of their drafts—they were always hoping (no matter how much I stressed it) they could print it before class. This sometimes delayed their getting started...as the quarter progressed and I had the problem licked (I thought) it started again because they said that the lines were so long everywhere on campus that they couldn't wait. I don't know how to overcome this problem—any ideas?

I didn't seem to have the problems so many other TA's had with the Macwrite program—sure the students complained a bit, but then they found other labs to go to that had the program on the hard drive. I stressed from the beginning that I taught writing and not computer literacy, and they accepted that readily. I'm an IBM compatible owner and that is what I know best, but I didn't let them know that. I just told them I did write on a computer. I was also very fortunate that many of my students already had computer experience and Mac experience, so this made it easier for them to get started and answer more complex problems that I couldn't answer for students with questions. One thing they did seem resistant to (and I can't understand why) was their
ignoring the spell checker. Some got it right away while others never bothered. Quite perturbing to me were the students who did use the spell checker but didn't proofread and therefore, ended up with the wrong version of a homophonic pair—their instead of there—you know that kind of thing. They tend to think of that computer as a god at times and think that proofing isn't necessary which brings me to my next point—Revision. So many of my students liked revising on the screen and once it was the way they thought they wanted it, that was the end of the story—they didn't even check for typos. Don't get me wrong—they did actually revise their papers for ideas and organization, but then that was the end of it. They really didn't express an interest in honing the paper into an error-free essay. I have talked to other TA's about this and there are some who make them print out a copy and revise it in class and I intend to try that next time. As a matter of fact, I'm going to use the classroom computers much more during class than I did this last quarter (since Macwrite should be on the hard drive by then too) because it seems such a waste to have them all sitting there unused. I also think this will force some of the more "lazy" students to write and revise more than they would normally.

Also, this could be just a generalization or a fluke, but my students this quarter (my first teaching 110C) wrote longer papers than the students in my previous three regular 110 classes. They seemed less concerned with length than with content which has always been a problem for me—how do you tell a student that if they just sit down and write a critical essay in a successful way, there is no magic length that makes it successful? But I attribute this disinterest in length to the computers because they forget about pages when they are writing, and they just write period. As a matter of fact, I had to encourage them to be less wordy and more precise. I had to get them to cut out superfluous material rather than try to add detail and description. This is what made teaching 110C so much more satisfying than teaching 110. Thanks.
Friday, January 5, 1990
3:22 PM

Sorry these didn't come in before Eric, but I had to get to Florida! Anyway, I'm looking through the entries now and I really haven't changed much in my feelings towards the computers. The class turned out really well; the average GPA was 3.0, which is a little higher than it was for last fall's students. I really can't say any of the small problems I had last quarter were caused in any way by the computers or the lab or anything like that. It would be nice if the Denney labs were open on weekends, but even then since so few students use them it probably wouldn't make a big difference.

I think my exuberance over not having to go around on responding days was a little unjustified. I might go around for the first day and/or have everyone turn in the sample responding I have in the Zips packet before the first responding session. I wish there were more literature on how peer responding affects students' writing. I haven't tried doing class responding on the computer, that might be interesting to try next quarter.

Just a quick note that if this networking thing works it'll be really nice. MacWrite II is a decent program, I think. When you have time to screw around with it, you realize it can do a lot of powerful stuff: move the 16-ton weight of idk idk idk idk.

Up the essays until the third week.

The computer just did something really weird so I don't want to write anymore in case something messes up. It says I'm writing on page 111. This computer does a lot of weird things to the computer before they hit the essays until the third week.

The computer just did something really weird so I don't want to write anymore in case something messes up. It says I'm writing on page 111. This computer does a lot of weird things.
Excerpts taken from *The Best*
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Drowsy, I sit up, slowly sifting through my intertwined covers and sliding my feet off the bed. Curiosity roaming wildly through my half-coherent brain, I twist my door open. My eyes squint as beams of light pierce my deep sleep. The noises all break through to reality. My senses couldn’t take it in all at once. The sirens, the men in blue, my mother pushing me aside so I couldn’t see... The strong shadow of my brother stood out in the background as he pumped my father’s chest. He breathed his every last breath, pulsed his every last muscle to revitalize the man I once called my father.

—from "Sleep Away Reality" by Maureen Whitford. Mo, a physical therapy major from Cleveland, likes cheese. Instructor: Joel W.

This year was different. We were the power team of the state and everyone knew it. Through the course of the day we breezed through the tournament, not losing a single game, giving up very few points to the opposition; floor-shattering spikes and immovable blocks sent team after team falling back on their heels. One team, in fact, asked us if we were from California or if there was a "mercy rule" in volleyball. We just laughed and went on to our next opponent.

—from Brett Hardtle. Brett, a star volleyball player from Perrysburg, Ohio, is majoring in education. Instructor: Barbara K.

The doorknob is cold. The smell of stale air is overwhelming. Poppa is lying in his bed with his arms at his side. He is motionless as I sit at the chair beside his bed. His lips are parted, cracked and chapped from the dry air. His eyes are sunk deep into his head, and the skin on his face hangs limp. I take his hand; it is still warm. I lean my head against the cold bars of his hospital bed. There are no tears. I must tell the family. I go to my mother first because I know that is what he would want.

—from "Poppa's Death" by Jenette Schwemler, a freshman from Des Moines, Iowa, majoring in criminology. Instructor: Andy S.
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\textit{This set of paragraphs come from a variety of sources: personal experience essays, journals, midterms, in-class collaborative assignments and freewrites.}

When I was younger, I was a dreamer. Still I am young and so still a dreamer. Music was always the voice within my dreams, whether day or night. That voice helped me to transform my dreams from a vision of the fancy to a materialistic everyday event; the event of creating. Music was the beginning of everything then, and maybe the beginning of everything now.

—by Jeremy Ernst. Jeremy is from Mt. Orab, Ohio. Instructor Tom V.

It's getting late now—real late. Everyone has slipped into unconsciousness leaving me in a barrage of human wreckage. Bodies are sprawled out across the floor leaving not an inch unoccupied. I'm ready to crash, but where? . . . I climb the stairs once again to find everyone in the hall has gone. Perfect! I lie in the corner, completely motionless. With a shiver I realize why I'm alone up here. There's no glass in the window, and it's a good thirty below outside. I rip the curtain off the window to use it for a blanket. The curtain rod hits me in the head. Warily I flop onto the floor, freezing. At least I can rest. After lying there a while I'm awakened as a brunette with big eyebrows comes up the stairs. Evidently she's had the same experience I had with the bedroom because her back is drenched. She lies on the floor a few feet down the hall from me. I crawl over to her, throw most of the curtain over her body, and lie down next to her. She's wet, but her body heat is keeping me warm. We say nothing, just lie there feeling our temperatures dropping.

—by Todd Williams, a freshman majoring in architecture, from Wheelersburg, Ohio. Instructor: Stan B.

The grueling, painful swim practices, which had exhausted me for six months out of the year, were blurred in my mind. They didn't matter anymore. The excited chatter of the nervous swimmers was a buzz in my ears. I looked around the humid natatorium. The pool was filled with swimmers warming up their muscles for competition. Other gangly, wet swimmers walked around the pool deck stretching and talking amongst themselves. A number of them had shaved their heads, a "psych-up" ritual among male swimmers, producing a pale, stubbled scalp. The more creative swimmers had designs patterned in their hair: an American flag (actually colored red, white, and blue), the name of a swimming team or its mascot, and a lightning bolt. A shrill whistle broke the buzz of excitement in the air. Silence was followed by the announcer's booming voice, "Please clear the pool." The second warm-up was over.

—by Natasha Burns. Natasha is an engineering major from Columbus. Instructor: Randy D.
The grim sterility of the operating room struck out at me. As everything was being cleaned up and things put back into place, I caught a glimpse of the shiny metal tools. Oh my God, I shouldn't be awake, my mind screamed, as I felt a bubble of hysteria steadily building up inside. But wait, I thought, I need something to drink and things'll be okay. So I once again labored to sit up. When one of the nurses rushed over to restrain me, I fought still harder to rise.... I focused on water alone in order to stay the billowing clouds which were ominously looming above me. Vaguely, as if in a dream, I felt the nurse grip me as she raised the cup. Almost everything was lost by now, so I could barely discern the yellow Dixie cup she held to my parched lips. Only with her help could I manage a swallow. Never had anything tasted so good! The soothing sensation of that delicious liquid trickling down my throat was the last I knew.

—by Rachel Craemer, from Orrville, Ohio, majoring in dairy science. Instructor: Holly F.

As the evening progressed, I was feeling very calm and relieved. The day ended with dinner at his house. We never kissed or hugged each other because even holding hands with a boy before marriage is a social crime. This experience, although considered prehistoric to many people, is still a strong base for Indian marriages. We marry to love instead of love to marry. Vageesh was a wonderful and terrific person, who shared many common interests with me. However, since I had planned on being a permanent U.S. citizen, our relationship could not flourish.

—from "Indian Custom" by Sandhya Dave, originally from Kanpur, India. Sandhya is a pre-med major. Instructor: Faye P.

The night was dark and rainy as he walked into the alley. The man then reached into his coat pocket and pulled out a bag of marijuana. Four drug dealers came from behind him and grabbed his bag of pot, hitting him in the head with a rock. After he fell to the ground, they took his wallet and discovered that the man that they just killed was an undercover police officer. Before they could escape, Sgt Magruff, the crime dog, entered the alley and yelled for them to freeze. However, the fugitives ignored Magruff, then proceeded to kick him in the snout. When Magruff came to he was in the local veterinary hospital with multiple contusions to the snout. Magruff knew that he had been defeated, yet he also knew that sooner or later he would catch up to the criminals and teach them that crime doesn’t pay. So remember, kids, take a bite out of crime!

—collaborative paragraph by Kristen Cox, Tom Ross, Bobby Schneider, and Vince Malone. Instructor: Tracy V.

It was a cold morning, one of the first in fact when the mercury had dared below forty degrees. The morning had been difficult as most mornings were because of the mere fact of having to get out of bed. I showered, took out the dog, and gulped down a glass of orange juice as would become routine in the following years of college. I went out to the car and sat as it warmed up. My mind was dull, thinking only of the cold as I clutched myself to stay warm. I listened to the morning radio show as they talked about a variety of different subjects. I switched on the lights and backed the car in to the quiet street. As I began forward I kept listening to the radio in an attempt to avoid having to think. A red
light loomed ahead and my attention focused on the exhaust of the car in front. The white
smoke flowed out of the tailpipe and swirled around the rear bumper as it floated upward
and slowly dispersed. Eventually my routine journey took me on to 315 South. It was here
that I saw it. Due to the fact that the days were still warm it caused bodies of water to
give off steam and Antrium Lake was billowing with towering columns of the water vapor.
I slowed down to watch this spectacular view. The steam looked to be
pseudo-cumulonimbus clouds some twenty feet in the air. The surface of the lake was
glass smooth as the wisps of water vapor rolled off its surface. The white steam cloud
spilled over on to the highway and cars drove through it—gently parting the fog and
dispersing it so it was no longer visible. The sun had just begun to rise, making the
horizon appear to be a red-orange line stretching far to the north and south. The few
clouds in the sky reflected streaks of pink overhead.

—by Vincent Fu. Vincent is an aero- and astroengineering major from Columbus.
Instructor: Priscilla T.

Hurrying into school that cold Tuesday morning in the fall, I expected another typical day.
Little did I know the trouble that was to befall me. The morning was the usual: a
composition on Macbeth, how to work the F=ma equation in Physics, and a little sleep to
the background of "Feliz Navidad" in Spanish. However, as I dozed, the intercom blared
loudly, "Tracy Petrie and Laurie Robbins please report to the Assistant Headmaster's
office as soon as possible." My heart jumped, and I raced down the hall to find Laurie.
She was standing in the middle of the hallway, waiting for me.

—by Tracie Petry, an accounting major from Akron, Ohio. Instructor: Jim B.

Rolling over to hit the snooze button for approximately the sixth time, I hear the faintest
little click. Little did I know, the breaking of my first nail would be the start of a life of
extreme frustration. I thought I was fine, because [when] I was strolling by my half asleep
roommates in the front room, they did not mention a thing . . . I had an adult body with a
baby's mind of my new sex. What should I do when the first man approaches me? I will
soon know both sides of the field, so I should be an expert. With my new profile and
sparkling personality, the "old self" must be forgotten. With new friends and a more
responsible outlook on life, I was to be the "woman of the 90's." Independent and
self-reliant, I had to venture out into my "new world."

—by Mike Snyder, a business major from Akron, in response to the midterm question:
"You wake up one morning and discover that you are no longer the sex you were when
you went to sleep the night before. What is your reaction? What are the implications for
you? What can you now expect from life? friends? career opportunities? What is your
attitude toward your new sex, now that you live it?" Instructor: Julianna L.

The truck was back. I rolled to my back so that I could see what was happening by the
road. I heard the door slam shut and saw a man cross in front of the lights holding a rifle.
A rifle, what is he doing with a rifle? What is it—he's going to kill all three of us. At this
point I was regretting that Brent even went out with this girl and even more that I was not at home in bed. I carefully watched the man pace back and forth across the road, not realizing that he would step less than three feet in front of Brent without seeing him. After the man walked for awhile, he spotted something on the side of the road. I thought he had seen Mike, but it was my bike he saw instead. My bike! The man grabbed it and yelled, "I'll give you guys five seconds to come out or I'll trash the bike." We were all too afraid for our lives, I suppose, and offered no reply. Then he threw my bike in the back of his truck. My heart fell. We were caught. I slowly rolled over to get out of the puddle, and as I did this I heard the engine of the truck accelerate. When I turned to look, it was gone.

—by Jeff Ellinger. Instructor: Larry D.

I was taking a shower on a cold winter night when I suddenly heard a loud noise. Without thinking, I ran outside with nothing on. Standing in front of me was a large man dressed in black. He had on a ski mask and was carrying a French poodle. He asked me if he could bathe his dog in my tub. I didn't know what to say, so I started running down the street. At this point I seriously wished I had clothes on—or at least shoes. Then I saw the man with the poodle running behind me. He was screaming, "I just want to wash my poodle!" There was no way I was going to stop, clothes or not. Without thinking, I ran into an open house and slammed the door behind me. I didn't realize it at first, but I had run into my boyfriend's house. I stood there in the hallway with his parents looking at me. "Hi," I said in a shaky voice.
"What the hell are you doing?" they screamed.
"There's a man chasing me down the road, wanting to wash his poodle in my tub!"
"Yeah, right! This is just your trick to seduce our innocent son!"
Just then the man ran into the house hysterically laughing and took off his coat and hat. It was my boyfriend! Yeah right, their son is really innocent!

—a collaborative effort by Trisha Menker, Mike Moldovan, Chet McGlone, and J.T. Shilling. Instructor: Michael H.

When the day for you to leave for boot camp rolls around you are excited and think that you are ready for the challenge that most people never take on—attempting to become a Marine. The instant you arrive at the military desk in the airport you realize that you're the property of the Marine Corps. Marines are yelling at you from all directions telling you to sit up straight and remain quiet while maintaining perfect cover and alignment. Cover is being directly behind someone so that you cannot see past the person in front of you; alignment is lining up perfectly to those on your left and right so that someone looking down the row could only see the first person's head. During the silent bus ride to the recruit depot, the base where you will be trained, you try to imagine what the next three months will be like.

—by Dustin Andecover. Dustin is a freshman from Fremont, Ohio. Instructor: Lisa N.

Summer and adolescence, aren't they the two explanations for adventurism? There is
something in the combination of warm air and brewing hormones that changes a model kid into a rebel. One summer evening, I went a bit too far. I engaged in the unimaginable, the forbidden. Yes, I actually drove my friend's motor scooter. I disobeyed my mom even though riding a moped was on the top of her list of no-no's.

—by Polly Kamin. Polly is from Highland Park, Illinois, and is undecided in her major, although she may choose physical therapy. Instructor: Rob D.

Suddenly the water surface leapt up towards me. The next thing I knew, I was in the water next to my raging machine, which was still running! The craft was spinning in rapid circles only a few feet away, seeming as though it were trying to catch me. Kevin, having had a better grip to begin with, was still aboard. His arms still outstretched and hanging onto the gunwales for dear life, he looked like a petrified hood ornament. As the boat made two more circles around me, I yelled "JUMP! JUMP!" Finally, Kevin leapt toward me with hesitation. Just as I could grab his left arm and protect him, the boat flipped itself over. The main engine was flooding, while at the same time the prop and water intake stuck up above the water surface, together producing a loud whine which echoed across the lake. I knew then that we were safe and that it was only a matter of seconds until the mechanism would shut itself off. As the motor cried itself to sleep, I looked across the lake towards the main dock and boathouse. Terry and Bill were already about halfway out in a rescue boat to help me, and Ian was in another boat, heading out to rescue my swamped craft.

—by Doug Pierce, an engineering major from Hudson, Ohio. Instructor: Joyce F.

While my parents and I stood amongst the multitudes waiting for the elevator, I contemplated my chances for survival on the twenty-third floor in a fire. Before I pronounced myself "dead at the scene," the elevator came. We weasled our way to the front of the line and stepped in. Obviously, everyone else had the same idea; the people just kept piling in. I felt like I was part of the circus act where twenty clowns crunch into a tiny car. So there we all were, packed shoulder-to-shoulder and some less fortunate ones, such as I, nose-to-armpit with someone who definitely forgot to use his Dial that morning.

—by Lanette Locke, an undecided major from Dayton. Instructor: Mary W.

I went back up to the twin room, got dressed and made my bed. I sat down in the middle of the pink carpet, surrounded by animals, with Phoebe B. Beebe, my favorite monkey, in my lap. The pink and green Snoopy look-alikes bounced around the room. The soft, red rooster chased the blue dinosaurs under one of the beds. The baby kangaroo sat in his mother's pouch and watched Phoebe play with the redheaded lion. After all the stuffed animals finished playing, Phoebe and I tried to find new things to play with in the big dresser. We looked through it, but found the same old red polyester pants, the buttonless button-down shirts, and the same old socks that needed mending. We even started to go into the closet. I cracked the door open and tried to peck in, but it was too dark as usual. I'd never gone all the way in before because it always looked too dark and too scary. I'm going all the way in this time, I told myself, opening the door a little more. But once
again, I saw the big furry coat hanging inside. I slammed the door shut, dropped Phoebe, and ran into the hall. Then I decided to finish my donut

—from "The Donut" by Denise Titus of Fort Collins, Colorado. Instructor: Don Y.

I wasn’t the best soccer player in the world. Well, quite honestly, I wasn’t very good at all. But I had my heart set on being the star of the Fairview varsity soccer team in 1987. Many times as a child I had dreamed of being a great athlete, and I felt that for once I was going to have my chance. I thought that with determination and hard work, I could overcome my lack of experience. Never could I have been so wrong. Sure, I had played soccer as a child, but this was different—much more competitive. I longed for the days of chasing after the ball in a pack of twenty other screaming children, all of whom had no idea where the ball even was. I am able to admit this now, but to admit it then would have destroyed everything I was working for. I felt I had to stay with it because I had worked too hard on my game during the summer to quit.

—by Rob Weisbarth. Rob is a psychology major from Fairview Park, Ohio. Instructor: Tom S.
APPENDIX F

Materials Provided by Brian
Syllabus
Instructor: [Brian] Office: 569 DE
English 110C–Spring 1992 Tel #: 292-6065 (Message)
T,R 12noon-1:48pm DE 307 Mailbox: 421 DE
Office Hours: T,R 2-4pm Home Phone: 262-2054
By Appointment

REQUIRED TEXTS AND MATERIALS:
1. Cop-Ez course packet (060 Bricker Hall)
4. An [CSU] Freshman Composition Folder
5. A Good Dictionary
6. Manila folder(s) to use as a Writer’s Journal
7. Two double sided 3.5 inch disks

WEEK ONE:
March T 31 Introduction to the course; Diagnostic exam
April R 2 2-12; Bring disks

WEEK TWO:
April T 7 13-31; Biographic Letter
R 9 64, 69-76

WEEK THREE:
April T 14 4 TOPICS FOR PAPER 1; 32-34, 35-45, 83-86
R 16 EXPLORATORY DRAFT FOR PAPER 1; 46-68

WEEK FOUR:
April M 20 Conferences (FIRST WORKING DRAFT FOR PAPER 1
DUE IN CONFERENCE)
T 21 JOURNALS DUE; 77-82, 89-103
R 23 SECOND WORKING DRAFT FOR PAPER 1; 87-88, 82,
104-116

WEEK FIVE:
April T 28 FINAL DRAFT FOR PAPER 1; Chapter 1 of RP
R 30 FOUR TOPICS FOR PAPER 2; 117-123, 147-153

WEEK SIX:
May T 5 JOURNALS DUE; 126-134, Review logical fallacies
(119-120); Chapter 2 of RP
R 7 Class Debate; EXPLORATORY DRAFT FOR PAPER 2
WEEK SEVEN:
May  M 11  Conferences (FIRST WORKING DRAFT FOR PAPER 2 DUE IN CONFERENCE)
       T 12  SECOND WORKING DRAFT FOR PAPER 2; 124-125, 135-146
       R 14  FINAL DRAFT FOR PAPER 2; 154-161

WEEK EIGHT:
May  T 19  162-173 (Elements of Fiction and "Araby")
       R 21  174-177 ("Everyday Use"); Start looking for a story to write about (see list: 180)

WEEK NINE:
May  T 26  TOPICS FOR PAPER 3; 178-182 (and supplement)
       R 28  EXPLORATORY DRAFT FOR PAPER 3; Chapter 3 of RP

WEEK TEN:
June M  1  Conferences (FIRST WORKING DRAFT FOR PAPER 3 DUE IN CONFERENCE)
       T  2  SECOND WORKING DRAFT FOR PAPER 3; 183-184, 186-202
       R  4  FINAL DRAFT PAPER 3; COMPLETED FRESHMAN COMPOSITION FOLDER

GOOD LUCK ON YOUR FINALS!! HAVE A WONDERFUL AND SAFE BREAK
ASSIGNMENT FORMATS:

1. Please keep all written course work— invention notes (clusters, brainstorming, etc.), exploratory drafts, working drafts, final drafts—organized in the Freshman Composition Folder. This way, you will be able to keep track of your work, and your peers and I will be able to evaluate your work more easily. These folders will be collected at the end of the quarter and kept by the English Department. If you wish, during the eighth and ninth weeks of the quarter following your completion of English 110C, you may retrieve your Freshman Composition Folder from me. Just stop by my office. All folders not retrieved will be destroyed.

2. Invention notes can either be written by hand or word processed. Please write on one side of the page only, leave about one inch margins for my comments, and staple all pages together. Also, please do not use spiral paper; it makes for such a mess. (I know; it sounds a bit anal retentive, but humor me.)

3. All drafts—exploratory, first and second working, and final—must be word processed. We will use the format adopted by the MLA (The Modern Language Association of America). While I do not require that you buy a MLA Handbook, I would recommend picking one up to help you with future papers you will write for other classes, especially if, by chance, you may be considering English as your major. (What a concept, eh?) For this class, however, the paper format described on page 81 of the course packet will do nicely. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask me.

4. All word-processed work must be completed with the IBM Word for Windows software (or some other program which is compatible with Word for Windows). While this requirement may seem Draconian and unfair, the reason for it is quite practical: we will be working on our papers in class, and if you have worked with an incompatible system outside of class, you would not be able to work in class. That's reasonable, eh? Papers not written on IBM Word for Windows will not be accepted. That is, hand-written papers, typed papers, papers written on portable word processors/typewriters, or papers written on a Macintosh will receive an E.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

English 110C is a beginning University composition course designed, with the unique capabilities of the computer in mind, to instruct students in the fundamentals of expository writing as illustrated in the students' own writing and in the essays of professional writers. Each student can expect to be required to demonstrate his or her mastery of basic composition, reading, and mechanical skills by preparing and presenting for evaluation at least three 500-750 word (3-6 page) papers, by demonstrating his or her ability to analyze and evaluate expository prose, and by participating responsibly and actively in the course.

c. Relate the thesis and main ideas discerned in a reading assignment to a classroom discussion or writing assignment.
3. **Minimal Mechanical Skills:**
a. An essay will not receive a C or above if it contains major problems in syntax. Excessive fragments, confusing sentence structure, or run-on sentences in a 500-word expository composition usually indicates an inability to write Edited American English. Such problems are not evident in C papers.
b. While the C paper may, of course, contain a few mechanical errors, such errors must be minimal. An essay will not receive a C when it contains serious basic problems of proofreading and editing, such as subject-verb disagreements, comma flaws or other punctuation mistakes, or excessive spelling errors.

**CLASS POLICIES:**

1. **Attendance:** The workshop structure of this course demands that you attend class daily and that you hand your papers in on time. Those of you who choose to miss three classes will find your final grade affected by your absences. (That is, your final grade will be reduced a letter grade.) Should you accumulate, at any point in the course, four or more unexcused absences, you will fail the course. You may, of course, disenroll and, therefore, not receive credit for the course. A "W" will appear on your transcript after the third week of the quarter. After the seventh week of the course, however, you cannot withdraw from the course, and your resulting grade will be an E. (What is excused and unexcused will be determined, of course, on an individual basis, taking several factors into consideration. As a general rule of thumb, present written proof to legitimate the excusableness of your absence.) Your best bet is to always talk to me before an anticipated absence or immediately following an unexpected absence. Furthermore, repeated tardiness will be counted as absences. Quite simply, this course is structured on a tight time schedule, so please be on time. I would imagine, however, that none of you will want to miss my wonderful course. (Try not to disillusion me.)

2. **Late Assignments:** In fairness of all class members, no late papers will be accepted at any time. Assignments due in class are due AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CLASS PERIOD. So, do not run in seconds before the end of class and hand me a paper. I will not accept it. Also, do not expect to be able to print the paper in the classroom lab before class begins. I won’t let you, and your paper will be considered late and, therefore, not accepted. Assignments due at other times will be announced.

Note: Disk crashes and closed or full computer labs are not acceptable excuses for late papers. You must back up your work and plan your time accordingly, especially since you are working with IBMs for which there exists but a few labs.

3. **Plagiarism:** Using someone else’s ideas or words as your own is a seriously heinous crime in the University. Please note carefully the definition and explanation of plagiarism appearing on the back cover of your composition folder. Suspected cases of plagiarism will be sent on to the Committee on Academic Misconduct for review. Those convicted of plagiarism are expelled from the University. If you are ever in doubt or are confused by this truly delicate and serious issue, please do not hesitate in contacting me.

4. **Grading:** Your final grade will be determined according to the following breakdown:
Three 3-6 page papers 75% Journals                  15% Class participation 10%
100% Each of the three papers will be worth 25%, for a total of 75% of your final grade.

NOTE: You will not pass the course unless you have completed and handed in all the major writing assignments for the course, including all drafts of each paper.

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OMBUD:

The Freshman Composition program appoints an Ombud each year whose job it is to receive questions and complaints about English 110. The Ombud is an experienced teacher of English 110 whose function is to resolve differences and misunderstandings. Students not satisfied with their English 110 course or instructor are encouraged to bring the problem or grievance to the Ombud, especially if they feel unable to discuss the problem with their teacher. Students' visits and problems will be kept confidential, and students may talk with the Ombud anonymously if they wish. Ombud: Elizabeth Pantoe Office: 365 [X] Hall Phone: 292-8401 Office hours: M,R, 10-12:30pm and 1-4pm and by appointment

THE WRITING CENTER:

The Writing Center, located in 147 University Hall, serves all members of the university community, including undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. If you desire individual assistance with a specific aspect of your writing, you are welcome to visit the Center. It is not a remedial writing lab; it is a place where you can receive individualized advice about topic development, organization, thesis support, sentence structure, mechanics, usage, and so on. It is not an editing or proofreading service. Although they sometimes can accommodate walk-ins, the Center staff is meeting with increasing numbers of students each quarter; therefore, it would be best to call (292-5607) or stop in to make an appointment. If you wish to keep your visit confidential, your instructor will not be notified.
Instructor: [Brian]
English 110
Diagnostic Exam

In order for me to get a feel for the class, so to speak, and to make sure each of you is properly placed, I must be reduced to forcing you to write this diagnostic exam. Just read the question carefully and write the very best essay you know how. Do not worry. I will not grade this exam. As the title suggests, this exercise is purely diagnostic.

Your essay question:

The decisions made by the Academy of Motion Pictures in presenting awards have grown tiresome. You feel that the interests of the Academy no longer reflect the interests of the public. Therefore, on the night before the Academy Awards Ceremony, you break into the safe which holds the envelopes. After you crack the safe, an alarm sounds; you only have enough time to change the winners of the Best Picture, Best Actress, and Best Actor awards. What are your new selections? Why do you choose this picture, this actress, and this actor?

Simple enough, eh? Do not panic. Happy thinking and happy writing.
CONFERENCING APPOINTMENTS

Please sign up for a 15 minute conferencing appointment so that we may discuss your paper plans one on one. This session, however, will not be a proofreading service. That is, I will not read your paper and then tell you how to write the next draft. Rather, you will come to the conference with a completed first working draft and with several questions concerning your paper. This appointment will be your opportunity to air out any problems you are encountering as you progress through the writing process. The basic strategy, then, is to write a first working draft, print it out, read it over, think about the draft, formulate any questions or concerns you may have about the paper, and then discuss these questions with me at the conference. Good luck and I'll see you at the conference.

CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME:
Instructor: [Brian]
Class: English 110C

WRITING JOURNAL ENTRIES

The journal will be an opportunity for you to express your ideas and feelings in writing without the sometimes stifling pressure caused by the fear of being "wrong." Many of us are taught to believe that we do not have anything to say, that we cannot think, that our opinion means nothing. What a load of crap! We all are thinking human beings who can formulate an opinion about a particular subject and share it with others. Our opinions are important and valid simply because they are ours. The journal will be your chance to develop confidence in your own thinking and in your own opinions.

The main thing to keep in mind when writing your journals is not so much what you say but how you say it and how well you explore your ideas, feelings, and beliefs. Each batch of entries will receive a letter grade based not upon syntax or grammar but, instead, on the quality of the content: To get an E, do not do them; a D, write insignificant trash just to fill up space; a C, skim the surface of an issue or write about something mundane; a B, go into depth, but only sometimes; an A, stretch yourself thin, go way beyond the obvious, rip yourself and the way you see things apart and pour it out on the page. In other words, do not be ordinary or superficial. Challenge yourself to rethink and to reevaluate what you believe and why you believe what you believe.

JOURNAL FORMAT: 1. Over the course of the quarter, you will write two sets of four journal entries each. The due dates are listed in the syllabus. Keep an eye out for when they are due and do not be caught trying to write the entries the night before they are due. You will undoubtedly produce poor writing.

2. Both sets will contain four entries. Three of the entries will be your responses to each of the three professional essays you will read (three for the informative paper and three for the persuasive paper). The fourth entry will be on any topic of your choice. When responding to the professional essays, do the following:

a. Summarize the essay--what is the purpose or overall thesis of the essay and what are the author’s main points? Remember to summarize briefly and do not restate the essay with all of its details. (1/2 page typed at most)

b. Then respond to what the author says. Evaluate the essay: Do you agree with the author? Why or why not? What are some of the assumptions the author makes? Do you agree with these assumptions? Why or why not? What does the author neglect to consider? Do you agree with some of the points but not others? Explain.

c. To help with your evaluation of the essay, you may wish to consider and answer some of the questions following each of the essays. Some of the questions are good ones which you may want to consider. Of course, you do not have to answer any of these questions if you don’t want to, but you do have to evaluate the essay in some manner.
d. If you have trouble thinking of something to say, consider the following suggestions:

1. Make a list of questions that came to your mind as you read and thought about the essay. Then try to answer one or all of these questions as thoroughly as possible.
2. Write a conversation (dialogue) between two parts of yourself about a point that's unclear, a passage that puzzles you, or an idea that you have mixed feelings about. However, don't just mention your confusion, try to work toward an answer with the dialogue.
3. Write an imaginary interview of the writer, a dialogue between you (a talk show host, perhaps) and the writer (a guest on your show) about his or her ideas. This dialogue could take the form of a debate or a series of questions that you then try to answer as you think the writer would.

The fourth entry can be on anything you like. You may want to continue a discussion on one of the essays. You may want to develop more thoroughly your own position on one of the issues considered in one of the essays. You may wish to write your own informative or persuasive essay (which ever the case may be) in response to one of the professional essays. The journal is a great place to work out some of the preliminary ideas for a paper. (This is how the journal can play a role in the invention stage of writing.) Or you can write a creative entry as your fourth entry: a. Write a short personal narrative describing a unique experience. b. Go to the zoo. Using only a pencil and paper, set the animals free. c. Experience the birth of your child or reexperience your own birth in writing. d. Consider your greatest fear and confront it on the page. e. What would it be like to step into your favorite painting or to be projected into your favorite short story or novel? f. Live an hour or a day in the body of a homeless person. g. You discover our present perception of reality is a farcical facade. What is reality, really?

3. Students always want to know how long an entry should be, and I always respond, "As long as it takes." Well such an answer, while perfectly appropriate, is not practical. So, officially, each journal entry should always be two handwritten pages or one word-processed page long. Most important is not so much the length of the entry but the quality of the thinking and writing.

4. Put the four entries in a manila folder with your name on it and turn it in to me on the due date. You may have noticed that the journals are due on the same day that we will be discussing the respective professional essays. Hopefully, by your writing about the essays beforehand, you will be better prepared to discuss them in class.
SAVING AND BACKING-UP YOUR WORK

1. After you have completed working on your draft and are ready to save, go to the "File" window and activate the "Save" command. When the "Save" window appears, click on the C drive, name your file ("explore," "lstwork," "2ndwork," "final," etc.) and click "Ok." Your document will be saved on the internal hard drive within the "Winword" directory. Once your document is saved on the C drive, put your floppy disk in drive A, go to the "File" window, and activate the "Save As" command. Click on the A drive and repeat the above process, using the same file name, to save your document on one of the floppy disks. At this point, your document should be saved on the hard drive and on one floppy disk.

2. To back up your document on the second disk, exit the Word for Windows program and exit the Windows environment. You should now be in "DOS," and you should see "C:\>" on your screen. Put your back-up disk in drive A, type "a:" and hit enter. You should see "A:\>" on the screen. Type "copy c:\winword\filename.doc a:" (for example, copy c:\winword\explore1.doc a:). Be sure to include the three letter suffix "doc" following your file name. Hit enter and your file should then be copied from the C drive over to your floppy disk in drive A. You must remember your file name and type the exact name followed by a period (.) and the suffix "doc" if you want it to copy from the C drive to your floppy disk in drive A. If you forget your file name, put the first floppy disk in drive A, type "dir" and hit enter. A list of your files should appear on the screen. Find your file name. Remove the first floppy disk, put in the second floppy disk, and complete the back-up procedure with the proper file name.

3. Periodically throughout your time at the computer, you should save your work on both the C drive and on one of the floppy disks, possibly every 15 minutes or after every page of work. When you are ready to end your session at the computer, then you should make your final saves on the C drive and one of the floppy disks, and then back up your work on the second floppy disk using the process described in paragraph 2.

4. Remember the difference between "Save" and "Save As": "Save" will replace the original file with the new changes, thus changing the original file. If you want to keep the original file and save your changes to that file under a new name, use the "Save As" command. For example, if you already saved your exploratory draft under "explore," and you want to save the revisions you made to that document while keeping the "explore" document intact, save your changes under a new file name such as "lstwork1" using the "Save As" command. Also, you must use "Save As" to save your work on drive A after saving it on drive C. If you only use "Save," your work will automatically be saved on drive C, and you will not be given the option to change from drive C to drive A.
Instructor: [Brian]
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Helpful Hints The Later Stages of the Drafting Process

I usually scribble all of this information on the board. Unfortunately (or probably fortunately for your back pack), you cannot take the board home with you. Realizing this practical problem, I thought I might transcribe some of these scribblings onto a handout which may, or may not, help you when you are frantically writing your final drafts.

WHEN REVISION 2ND WORKING DRAFT TO FINAL DRAFT:

1. Remember that revision means “to see again.” Develop your objective third eye and critically examine your draft as if you had never seen it before.

2. To help guide your critique, follow the helpful hints hand-out on the evaluative paper, the criteria questions for the evaluative paper, and your peers’ 1/A responses.

3. As you write your final draft, write it as if it were a totally new paper. Remember that even though these early drafts may look nice on the computer screen or laser printed, the drafts ARE NOT written in stone. Do not let earlier drafts limit your writing process. Make it a point to develop beyond your first and second working drafts in order to create a successful final draft.

WHEN WRITING/PROOFREADING THE FINAL DRAFT

1. Remember that each of these drafts must be completed on the computer. One aim of this class is to realize how the computer can facilitate the writing process. Unfortunately, the lab resources are limited, so please plan ahead and be sure to complete the drafts before class. As a reminder, I will not accept late papers and I will not accept papers which are not word-processed on the Word for Windows software.

2. Please check your spelling. The computer is a wonderful help in this task; however, the computer CANNOT, as yet, tell you if you are using a word incorrectly. Please to distinguish for yourself between homonyms (e.g.: their, there, they’re or two, to, too).

3. Look out for choppiness. Use those wonderful techniques that Lanham points out for you (e.g.: use active voice, vary sentence structure and sentence lengths, avoid unnecessary use of prepositional phrases, say what you mean to say in a clear, straightforward manner). The best way to catch sentence choppiness and awkward sentence construction is to read the draft aloud or, better yet, to have a friend read it aloud to you.

4. Check carefully for grammatical errors; use the handbook when in doubt. You should pay special attention to the following problems:

a. run-ons (chapter 13)
b. subject verb agreement (chapter 15)
c. pronoun agreement (chapter 16)
d. the comma (chapter 24)
e. the semicolon (chapter 25)
f. the colon (chapter 26)

5. More hints: a. have friends (literate ones) proofread your paper  
b. read draft aloud or have friend read draft aloud to you  
c. read draft backwards  
d. visit the writing center  
e. see me

6. Remember to use the MLA format (see example essay format in text).

7. Turn in all notes and drafts with your final draft. Put it all in your theme folders.
Chapter 1: Who's Kicking Who?

Read each of the following actual prose examples and decide how you would revise them using the Paramedic Method Lanham discusses in Chapter 1.

1. In Gower's research, it was found that pythons often dwell in trees and live near rivers.

2. Frozen breads and frozen pastry completed the process of depriving the American individual of the pleasure of boasting of his or her baking.

3. Constant viewing of rock videos is harmful to children's emotional development.

4. The firm is now engaged in an assessment of its procedures for the development of new products.

5. The practice of disposing of nuclear waste in Antarctica would be in violation of an international treaty.

6. Escaping into the world of drugs, I was rebellious about anything and everything laid down by the establishment.

7. Those responsible for the evaluation of teachers have put emphasis on procedures in teaching and have seldom made an examination of the products, that is, the efficiency of the teacher as indicated by what his or her pupils can do following instructions.

8. The dry season in Panama is the time during which trade winds seem to be blowing fresh from the north of the country and a heavy blue sea is breaking all along the coast of the Pacific side.
Instructor: [Brian] English 110C
Possible Answers to Revising Prose Exercises

Chapter 1: Who's Kicking Who?

Provided below are only possible revisions to the Chapter 1 exercise handout. I merely used Lanham’s Paramedic Method outlined in Chapter 1 of Revising Prose.

1. In his research, Gower discovered that pythons dwell in trees and live near rivers. [Or . . . dwell in trees near rivers.]

2. Because of the advent of frozen breads and pastry, the American individual could not boast of his or her baking. Or, The advent of frozen breads and pastry made it impossible for the American individual to boast of his or her baking. Or, with the advent of frozen breads and pastry, the American individual stopped baking.


4. The firm is now assessing its procedures for developing new products.

5. Disposing nuclear waste in Antarctica violates an international treaty.

6. I rebelled against societal norms by escaping into the drug world. [Or, . . . by entering the drug culture.]

7. Those who evaluate teachers [or, Teacher evaluators] emphasize teaching procedures, thus seldom examining the teacher’s ability to successfully instruct students.

8. During Panama’s dry season, trade winds blow from the north, and a heavy blue sea breaks along the Pacific coast.
Read aloud the following paragraph abstracted from an English textbook and revise it using the paramedic method. Pay especial attention to the shape and rhythm of the sentences and revise them to make the paragraph come to life, i.e., more exciting to read. It may be easier to begin by revising each sentence separately, but be careful not to change their meanings in the context of the paragraph. Again, make use of the cut/paste, delete, insert functions which the computer provides you, thus making revision a more pleasant and effective task.

Readers with some degree of critical experience have the habit of noting aspects of plot, character, tone, theme, imagery, point of view, and numerous other variations of literary form as they sum up and discuss their reading experience. But before we begin to examine any of these aspects in isolation, we can here consider some truly basic features characteristic of fiction in general. We can do that conveniently with the pieces in this section because they are all brief enough to permit easy reference from text to commentary. They include a poem, a couple of excerpts from stories printed in full farther along in the book, and four selections that are essentially complete short stories. For all their brevity these four display the unity and completeness you will find in the rest of the stories included in this anthology.
English 110C
Revising Prose Exercises

Chapter 3: Sentence Length, Rhythm, and Sound

Read aloud the following paragraph abstracted from an English Student’s working draft. Consider what makes a coherent paragraph—topic sentences, logically arranged supporting details—and pay special attention to the shape and rhythm of the sentences so as to revise them to make the paragraph come to life, i.e., more exciting to read. Take advantage of the computer’s ability to manipulate text electronically and move sentences around, delete unnecessary wording and prepositional phrases, alter sentence length a la Lanham’s Paramedic Method.

When I was in Junior High School, I wanted to look thin. I decided to go on a diet. I cut down on eating meals and bought some Nature Diet Pills. I bought the pills—they looked like brown horse pills—from a discount store. I did not know at the time, but I was killing myself. I took the pills for a week or two, but then the skin under my nails turned yellow and I started feeling sick. I went to the doctor, and he told me that I had anemia from not eating right. I lost a little weight after getting sick, but my mother and my doctor made me quit my diet. I slowly started gaining my weight back. My goal in dieting was to look like a cover girl, but I discovered that it was not worth dying for, and my case is one of many that occur. Many individuals want to change their appearance. Sometimes individuals even suffer and die to become more attractive.
E1: Paragraph Revision Exercise

Instructor: [Brian]
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Paragraph Work

A student is working on an early draft of a paper explaining why he likes the movie *Nightmare on Elmstreet Part 3*. In the paragraph below, the student compares the third film to the two preceding *Nightmare on Elmstreet* films. Given this purpose, what changes would you make to improve this paragraph?

Read over the paragraph and discuss possible changes with the members of your group. Think about having and placing a clear topic sentence, ordering supporting details to illustrate the topic sentence, leading readers through the paragraph ("cueing the readers") with appropriate transitions, and creating an effective final sentence or two which wraps up the intent or purpose of the paragraph. Use the "Cut/Paste" command under the Edit window to move sentences around and insert or delete words in order to make the paragraph a coherent unit.

The movie *Nightmare on Elmstreet* is a very different movie from the first two Nightmare films but is entertaining. The difference between the third film and the other two was the third film had very little gory scenes in the picture. The first two were full of these scenes. Freddy Kruger killed a lot of people in the first two films, but not in the third movie. Kruger rips open the bellies of innocent teenagers. The third movie made up for not having a lot of violence. There was a lot of special effects and humorous lines for Freddy. This was bad, because the third movie was not scary. I thought that it was entertaining, though. The first two pictures kept me on the edge of my seat and my hands sweating. The third film was humorous, in a way, when he killed the teenagers. I was entertained by the third movie and scared by the first two.
Read the following very short short story.

As he left for a visit to his outlying districts, the jealous Baron warned his pretty wife: "Do not leave the castle while I am gone, or I will punish you severely when I return!" To the servants he said, "Do not lower the drawbridge for anyone until I return."

But as the hours passed, the young Baroness grew lonely, and despite her husband's warning, she decided to visit her lover who lived in the countryside nearby. The castle was located on an island in a wide, fast-flowing river, with a drawbridge linking the island and the land at the narrowest point in the river.

"Surely my husband will not return before dawn," the Baroness thought.
She ordered her servants to lower the drawbridge and to leave it down until she returned.

After spending several hours with her lover, the Baroness returned to the drawbridge, only to find it blocked by a madman wildly waving a long and cruel knife.

"Do not attempt to cross this bridge, Baroness, or I will kill you," he raved.
Fearing for her life, the Baroness returned to her lover and asked him for help.

"Our relationship is only a romantic one," he said. "I will not help you."
The Baroness then sought the help of a boatman on the river.

"I will do it, but only if you can pay my fee of five marks," he said.
"But I have no money with me."

"That is too bad. No money, no ride" the boatman said flatly.
Her fear growing, the Baroness ran crying to the home of a friend and after again explaining her plight, begged for enough money to pay the boatman his fee.

"If you had not disobeyed your husband, this would not have happened," the friend said. "I will give you no money."

With dawn approaching and her last resource exhausted, the Baroness returned to the bridge in desperation, attempted to cross the bridge to the castle, and was slain by the madman.

* * * *

Make a list of the characters and decide who is the most guilty and who is the least guilty. Be prepared to defend your choices.
E3:
Instructor: [Brian]
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Introduction Exercise
The Evaluative Paper

What makes a "good" love song? Think about this question and jot down a few aspects that you feel should be in a love song. Next, listen to the songs and respond to the following questions: Do you consider this song to be love song? Why or why not? If so, which do you like better and why?

"Music of the Night" from Andrew Lloyd Webber's The Phantom of the Opera

Night-time sharpens,
heightens each sensation...  
Darkness stirs and
wakes imagination...
Silently the senses
abandon their defenses...

Slowly, gently
night unfurls its splendour...
Grasp it, sense it--
tremulous and tender...
Turn your face away
from the garish light of day,
turn your thoughts away
from cold, unfeeling light--
and listen to
the music of the night...

Close your eyes
and surrender to your
darkest dreams!
Purge your thoughts
of the life
you knew before!
Close your eyes,
let your spirit
start to soar
And you'll live
as you've never
lived before...

Softly, deftly,
music shall surround you...
Feel it, hear it,
closing in around you. . .
Open up your mind,
lit your fantasies unwind,
in this darkness which
you know you cannot fight--
the darkness of
the music of the night. . .

Let your mind
start a journey through a
strange, new world!
Leave all thoughts
of the world
you knew before!
Let your soul
Take you where you
long to be!
Only then
can you belong
to me. . .

Floating, falling,
sweet intoxication!
Touch me, trust me,
savour each sensation!
Let the dream begin,
let your darker side give in
to the power of
the music that I write--
the power of
the music of the night. . .

"All I ask of You" Andrew Lloyd Webber’s The Phantom of the Opera

RAOUL
No more talk of darkness;
Forget these wide-eyed fears.
I’m here, nothing can harm you--
my words will warm and calm you.

Let me be your freedom,
let daylight dry your tears.
I’m here, with you, beside you,
to guard you and to guide you. . .

CHRISTINE
Say you love me every waking moment,
turn my head with talk of summertime...  
Say you need me with you,  
now and always...  
promise me that all you say is try--  
that's all I ask of you...  

RAOUL  
Let me be you shelter,  
let me be your light.  
You're safe: No-one will find you--  
your fears are far behind you...  

CHRISTINE  
All I want is freedom,  
a world with no more night...  
and you, always beside me,  
to hold me and to hide me...  

RAOUL  
Then say you'll share with me  
one love, one lifetime...  
let me lead you from your solitude...  

Say you need me with you  
here, beside you...  
anywhere you go, let me go too--  
Christine, that's all I ask of you...  

CHRISTINE  
Say you'll share with me  
one love, one lifetime...  
say the word and I will follow you...  

BOTH  
Share each day with me,  
each night, each morning...  

CHRISTINE  
Say you love me...  

RAOUL  
You know I do...  

BOTH  
Love me--  
that's all I ask of you...  
anywhere you go let me go too...
Love me--
that's all I ask of you...
E4: Thurber Exercise

Read the following incomplete short story and then write a paragraph or so ending, wrapping up the story in the way you might expect it to end. After writing the ending, go back into the earlier sections of the story and italicize any words, phrases, plots, or sections that influenced the way you decided to write the ending. That is, can you locate aspects in the text which directed you to expect the ending you provided? Be prepared to discuss with the class why you wrote this particular ending.

The Owl Who Was God

Once upon a starless midnight there was an owl who sat on the branch of an oak tree. Two ground moles tried to slip quietly by, unnoticed. "You!" said the owl. "Who?" they quavered, in fear and astonishment, for they could not believe it was possible for anyone to see them in that thick darkness. "You two!" said the owl. The moles hurried away and told the other creatures of the field and forest that the owl was the greatest and wisest of all animals because he could see in the dark and because he could answer any questions. "I'll see about that," said a secretary bird, and he called on the owl one night when it was again very dark. "How many claws am I holding up?" asked the secretary bird. "Two," said the owl, and that was right. "Can you give me another expression for 'that is to say' or 'namely'?" asked the secretary bird. "To wit," said the owl. "Why does a lover call on his love?" asked the secretary bird. "To woo," said the owl.

The secretary bird hastened back to the other creatures and reported that the owl was indeed the greatest and wisest animal in the world because he could see in the dark and because he could answer any question. "Can he see in the daytime, too?" asked a red fox. "Yes," echoed a dormouse and a French poodle. "Can he see in the daytime, too?" All the other creatures laughed loudly at this silly question, and they set upon the red fox and his friends and drove them out of the region. Then they sent a messenger to the owl and asked him to be their leader.

When the owl appeared among the animals it was high noon and the sun was shining brightly.
The following is the complete short story as originally written by James Thurber. Compare your ending with his ending. Was your ending similar to his ending? Why or why not? What in the text suggests the ending he wrote? How do they compare with the elements which influenced your ending?

The Owl Who Was God

Once upon a starless midnight there was an owl who sat on the branch of an oak tree. Two ground moles tried to slip quietly by, unnoticed. "You!" said the owl. "Who?" they quavered, in fear and astonishment, for they could not believe it was possible for anyone to see them in that thick darkness. "You two!" said the owl. The moles hurled away and told the other creatures of the field and forest that the owl was the greatest and wisest of all animals because he could see in the dark and because he could answer any questions. "I'll see about that," said a secretary bird, and he called on the owl one night when it was again very dark. "How many claws am I holding up?" said the secretary bird. "Two," said the owl, and that was right. "Can you give me another expression for 'that is to say' or 'namely'?" asked the secretary bird. "To wit," said the owl. "Why does a lover call on his love?" asked the secretary bird. "To woo," said the owl.

The secretary bird hastened back to the other creatures and reported that the owl was indeed the greatest and wisest animal in the world because he could see in the dark and because he could answer any question. "Can he see in the daytime, too?" asked a red fox. "Yes," echoed a dormouse and a French poodle. "Can he see in the daytime, too?" All the other creatures laughed loudly at this silly question, and they set upon the red fox and his friends and drove them out of the region. Then they sent a messenger to the owl and asked him to be their leader.

When the owl appeared among the animals it was high noon and the sun was shining brightly. He walked very slowly, which gave him an appearance of great dignity, and he peered about him with large, staring eyes, which gave him an air of tremendous importance. "He's God!" screamed a Plymouth Rock hen. And the others took up the cry "He's God!" So they followed him wherever he went and when he began to bump into things they began to bump into things, too. Finally he came to a concrete highway and he stared up the middle of it and all the other creatures followed him. Presently a hawk, who was acting as outrider, observed a truck coming toward them at fifty miles an hour, and he reported to the secretary bird and the secretary bird reported to the owl. "There's danger ahead," said the secretary bird. "To wit," said the owl. The secretary bird told him. "Aren't you afraid?" he asked. "Who?" said the owl calmly, for he could not see the truck. "He's God!" cried all the creatures again, and they were still crying "He's God!" when the truck hit them and ran them down. Some of the animals were merely injured, but most of them, including the owl, were killed.

*Moral: You can fool too many of the people too much of the time.*
APPENDIX G

Materials Provided by Julie
Syllabus
English 301C
Instructor: [Julie] Office: 468 Hours: M, W, F 1-2 p.m., and by appointment
Phone: (office) 292-3754 (please call during office hours only)
(home) 481-0433 (please do not call after 10 p.m.)

Purpose: English 301C is an upper-level college composition course designed to improve expository writing by providing opportunities to read and respond to essays, and to compose coherent essays (both individually and collaboratively) related to these readings. Class discussions will focus on issues and points of view presented in the assigned readings to help you develop your own ideas and positions for your essays. This course will not be limited to purely informative writing, but rather expanded to include critical, interpretive, persuasive, and narrative writing. The primary goal for this course is to help you to think more profoundly and to write more ambitiously than you have before. Two of the four essays which you will hand in this quarter will be written collaboratively. All essays will be written using Macintosh SE computers, and MacWrite II.

Some things to consider: I don’t expect that every student is an "ideal" candidate for this course. Those who probably should not take it are: —those who do not wish to collaborate —those who do not have time to collaborate —those who don't like computers —those who don't like Macintosh computers (esp. those who own IBM's and may be unwilling to make time to work in the Mac labs)

Materials: Ways of Reading ed. Bartholomae & Petrosky (available at SBX) at least two 3.5" disks, double-sided, double density a good dictionary and a grammar handbook

Course Policies: Time: Because of the collaborative component of this course, as well as the computer component, this course will require a lot of time. You will be put into groups according to times when you can meet, and you will have to meet outside of class. You also must consider when you can get to the computer labs on campus. (You have priority in the ones in Denney, which have rather limited hours.)

Attendance: Basically, I'll only say this once. Attendance is extremely important in this course. You must come to class every day. You must be here to participate actively in discussions and in class writing activities, as well as in-class group work times. Three or more absences may cause you to fail this course.

Computers: All drafts, essays, and in-class writing assignments must be done on Macintosh computers, using MacWrite II. If you are not familiar with these computers and/or this program, you must attend a workshop at the beginning of the quarter, outside of class time, in order to familiarize yourself with the program. We will not spend class time learning the program; however, I will spend some time in class showing you how the network works in room 343. There is a Reference Guide to the Macintosh, available at Bricker Cop-Ez for about $1.85, which will help you to brush up on your skills.

Collaboration: Collaborative groups will be assigned at the beginning of the quarter, according to common interests, and most importantly, times when individuals can meet
conveniently. Groups may not be changed. If problems arise within a group, we will try to
deal with them together.

Assignments: In order to pass this class, you must complete all major assignments. You
will write four papers for this class, two individually and two collaboratively. Each paper
will grow out of class discussions, which will grow out of assigned readings. Papers 2 and 4
must be completed collaboratively. Assignments are due as indicated on the syllabus.
Papers are always due at the beginning of class. No late papers will be accepted.

Paper Format: All drafts must be typed using MacWrite II. Essays should be typed in 12
point Helvetica or Palatino, with standard one-inch margins. You must always use
SpellCheck, and you must proofread all your work. If you don’t, your grade will
automatically be lowered by one full letter grade, and your assignment will be handed back
to you to reprint in correct form.

Plagiarism: Using someone else’s words or ideas as your own is a serious offense at the
University. Suspected cases of plagiarism will be sent to the Academic Misconduct
Committee for review. If you are caught plagiarizing, you will fail English 301C.

Grading: Your final grade will be determined according to the following breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*your "Other" grade will be comprised of class participation, attendance, and in-class
writing assignments

Please note: Papers 2 and 4 are collaborative papers, and you will be graded as part of a
group. However, 25% of your grade will be determined by your peers. This, naturally, is to
ensure that all members of the group do work. When you hand in a collaborative paper,
each group member will hand in a group evaluation, giving each member (including
yourself) a grade, and defending that grade. As instructor, I reserve the right to suspend
the group component if I feel that a group is trying to inflate its grade.

The Writing Center: The Writing Center, located in University Hall, serves all members of
the university community, including undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. If you
desire assistance with a specific aspect of your writing, you are welcome to visit the
Center. It is not a remedial writing lab; it is a place where you can receive individualized
advice about topic development, organization, thesis support, sentence structure,
mechanics, usage, and so on. It is not an editing or proofreading service. Although they
sometimes can accommodate walk-ins, the Center staff is meeting with increasing numbers
of students each quarter; therefore it would be best to call (292-5607) or stop in to make
an appointment. If you wish to keep your visit confidential, your instructor will not be
notified.
English 301C
Daily Syllabus

Week One
Monday, March 30: Introduction to course
Collaboration survey

Wednesday, April 1: Review of Macintosh
In-class writing assignment

Friday, April 3: Discussion—Freire, "The Banking Concept of Education"
Introduction to Essay 1

Week Two
Monday, April 6 Draft of Essay 1 due
Responding session in groups (Aspects)

Wednesday, April 8 Discussion—Rich, "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision"

Friday, April 10 Re-Vision of Essay 1

Week Three
Monday, April 13 Discussion—Emerson, "The American Scholar"

Wednesday, April 15 Essay 1 due
Introduction to Essay 2

Friday, April 17 No Class: Easter weekend

Week Four
Monday, April 20 Discussion—Fish, "How to Recognize a Poem When You See One"

Wednesday, April 22 Group activity: "found" poetry

Friday, April 24 No class: Group conferences

Week Five
Monday, April 27 Writing workshop

Wednesday, April 29 Essay 2 due

Friday, May 1 Discussion—Ruskin, "The Nature of Gothic"
Introduction to Essay 3

Week Six
Monday, May 4 No class: Individual conferences

Wednesday, May 6 Discussion—Berger, "Ways of Seeing"

Friday, May 8 Trip to Wexner Center

Week Seven
Monday, May 11 Draft of Essay 3 due
Responding session in groups

Wednesday, May 13 Essay 3 due
In-class writing activity (Ghost Chapters)
Friday, May 15  Discussion—Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight"

Week Eight
Monday, May 18  Group activity: Geertzian reading

Wednesday, May 20  Writing workshop

Friday, May 22  Discussion—Wideman, "Our Time"

Week Nine
Monday, May 25  No class: Memorial Day
Wednesday, May 27  Writing workshop
Friday, May 29  Discussion—Percy, "The Loss of the Creature"

Week Ten
Monday, June 1  No class: Group conferences
Wednesday, June 3  Writing workshop
Friday, June 5  Essay 4 due
                 Conclusion to the course
Collaboration Contract for Participants
In the English Department's Collaborative Classrooms
(English 261C, 301C, 302C, 303C, 304C, 305C, and 367C)
Spring 1992

I have read the syllabus for this course and understand its particular nature and requirements. By signing below, I agree to participate in collaborative writing projects, to share work with the members of my group, and to be graded as a member of a group. I understand that I have made a commitment to my collaborative group, and that this course depends on cooperative interaction between members of each group.

Name: (please print) __________________________

Signature: __________________________

Date: __________________________
Consent Form for Participants
in the English Department's Collaborative Classrooms
(English 261C, 301C, 302C, 303C, 304C, 305C, and 367C)
Spring 1992

I have read the syllabus for this course and understand its particular nature and requirements. By signing below I give my permission that any of the work I produce for this course may be used for research purposes. I understand, in addition, that my anonymity will be maintained and that none of my work will ever appear verbatim in published reports of research conducted in Ohio State's Academic Challenge and Program Excellence Collaborative Classrooms without my prior expressed written consent. I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time, now or in the future, without being penalized in any way.

Date:

Signed:

Instructor's Name:

Permanent Mailing Address:

Phone Number: ( )
Collaboration Compatibility Survey

Name: Do you live on or off campus? If you live off campus, will you be able to come to campus in the evening and/or on weekends?

Address:

Phone number: Major: Interests:

Times when you will almost always be able to meet with a group:

Do you own a Macintosh computer? Do you know how to type? Do you have any experience with collaborative writing? If so, please explain.
Hints for Successful Collaboration

Collaborative Groups are Groups of People
● Each member of your group is an individual; getting to know each other’s strengths, capabilities, and personalities will help your group immensely.
● The diversity of abilities and backgrounds in your group may be frustrating at times, but this diversity is actually the greatest benefit of working in a group.
● Remember that when you are a member of a group, that is a different thing from being a solitary scholar.

Working and Playing Well Together
● Don’t avoid conflict. More creative solutions are found with some conflict than without it.
● Discuss concerns and frustrations openly with your group members. It’s best to work problems out as they occur rather than allowing them to fester, unattended, until a crisis brings them out.
● Don’t just complain about problems—actively seek solutions for them.
● Listen.
● Compromise. You simply won’t be able to have your own way all the time.

Responding to and Revising Each Other’s Work
● Remember that it’s difficult for people to give up their feeling of “ownership” over what they’ve written. Here are some suggestions to make the process of revision easier: -As a writer, try to create an objective attitude toward your work. It is the words on the page that other people are responding to, not you as a person. -As a reader/responder/reviser, treat others as you would like to be treated. Be sensitive! -If you change something that someone else has written, be sure to explain to that person how and why you changed it.

Organizing Your Collaborative Project
● Allow your group plenty of time for collaborative work. It takes longer to work as a group than to work individually. Give your group time for informal discussion. Often, this is where the best ideas emerge.
● Be specific about deadlines for drafts, revisions, etc. It may help to make up a written schedule.
● Be specific and fair with your division of labor. Each group member should know what is expected of her/him.
● Be flexible. Your group is not a machine, and can’t be expected to work like one.
● You may want to assign roles within your group, like leader, secretary, etc. These roles could be reassigned every time you meet, or with each new project, or whatever.
● A good idea is to monitor the workings of your group in a notebook. Jot down ideas and observations about the process of writing the paper to use in your evaluation letters.

Evaluating Your Collaborative Project

I will ask each of you to give me an evaluation letter, which you will hand in with your final group projects. The letters should answer the following questions: 1. What was your individual contribution to the paper? How much time did you personally spend on it?
What portions of the paper were you responsible for? How would you rate yourself on your contribution to the paper, on a scale of 1-10 (10 being the highest)? 2. Describe each of the other group member’s contributions to the paper, using specific examples of their participation. Do you feel that each person in the group did his or her fair share of the preparation and writing of the essay? Rate each group member on a 1-10 scale. 3. What do you think of the paper itself? Does it serve a certain purpose and address a certain audience? What is its greatest strength? Biggest weakness? What was the most positive experience when composing it? Least positive? How would you rate this paper (1-10)?
Excerpts from *A La Carte*

The [Center] State University,
[Computer Enhanced Composition and Literature] Program
Volume 5, Number 1, Spring 1992

The following writing samples include excerpts from essays, journals, and in-class assignments from students in the English Department's computer-supported English classes, both Macintosh and IBM.

**Basic Writing**  
Freshman Composition  
Informative Writing  
Technical Writing  
Composition and Literature  
The American Experience

**David Enbanks**

*David is a freshman Chemical Engineering major from Columbus, Ohio. He writes, "After reading Roland Barthes, my class was asked to submit papers exposing hidden messages in popular media. This assignment gave me an opportunity to dispel some myths and misunderstandings about rap music." Instructor: Karen H.*

It has been said many times and repeated over and over again that black rap artists hold an unnecessary dislike for non-black races. But is this dislike unnecessary and unfounded? I intend to show that this dislike has been built over many generations and that it is only now that the young black population has a voice, through rap music, that this is being expressed to a broad audience.

One of the most prevalent factors is one that is probably common to most inner-city youth. I will call this factor ghetto-centrism. This suggests that the ideas and beliefs that are common to rap artists are based on the ghetto. No matter what direction ghetto residents look, they see nothing but ghetto. It is as if they are trapped. Therefore, all thoughts are ghetto-based. One common belief among ghetto dwellers is that if you are born in the ghetto, then you will die in the ghetto. Inner city residents hardly receive help from outside their environment. And lastly, the ghetto is all black. All the frustration that comes up due to their surroundings, the low chance of moving out of the ghetto, and the low level of intervention from non-ghetto whites is geared toward the whites who appear to be the only possible source of their problems. But whites are not the only victims of this type of racism. Asians are also highly disliked by inner-city blacks. The only view of Asians that young blacks see is that of the convenience store owner who has a vehement distrust of blacks. Blacks are seen as perpetrators of crime and violence. This obviously is not a label that one enjoys wearing and therefore causes even more tension.

Ghetto-centrism may be a new term but definitely represents an age-old problem.

Another contributing factor to this problem is cultural values. This involves teachings and
lessons passed on to the younger generation. A major medium for teaching culture is through religion. A growing number of today's youth are converting over to the Nation of Islam. This religious community teaches that the white man is the Devil and the oppressor. They stress that the white man has nothing but ill will for the black man and that blacks should therefore rely on each other for identity and strength. The teachings thrive on the fear and dislike of whites that is present in most blacks. This religion stresses discipline and strict obedience to all rules. With this type of enforcement, it is ensured that what is taught will be respected as if it were law. Another cultural trait that may promote hatred among blacks is parental teachings. These teachings may be related to the Muslim beliefs. That is, although not intentionally, many non-Muslim parents may pass on the concept of the white man being the root of all of their problems. Some even teach that the Jews buy up everything but don't do anything to blacks. They go on to say that Jews then try to identify with the plight of the blacks. And when it comes to Asians, they are stereotyped to be that store owner who does not trust the blacks. This even further fuels the discomfort of always being labeled as a criminal.

The final source of hate comes from the history books. Ever since blacks took their first history course in grade school, they have been bombarded with the stories of the cruel treatment from the white upper class. Slavery has its place in every black person's mind. And the memories are stirred every time they feel that they are being mistreated by whites. The civil rights era can also take its share of the blame. During this time it was law that blacks had less human rights than whites. Every photograph that shows the struggles of that era shows a black man at the mercy of a white man or, even worse, at the mercy of a dog. We cannot overlook the job situation either. Even after all of the civil rights and equal employment acts have been enacted, blacks are in no way equal in the job market and are always the first to feel the effects of job cuts.

This all comes together to cause much discomfort within the minds of young blacks. There are certainly messages in rap music that promote racial hatred. But you must look at all contributing factors in order to properly evaluate the situation. Rap musicians are only expressing what has been built up in a race of people for centuries. And now that rap has been established as a sounding board, people are beginning to recognize that there is an almost irreversible dilemma within the young black population.

Diana Pasalis

Diana is enrolled in Freshman Composition this quarter. She wrote this journal entry in response to an assignment asking students to recreate their earliest childhood experience. Instructor: Jeff B.

"Mommy, where is God?" I asked.

"God is up in heaven," answered Mommy.

I thought to myself, "No, He's not. God is out in the middle of the street." One of my earliest memories as a child is when I was four years old. We lived in a big red brick house. Our street ended in a cul-de-sac. Our house, along with others, sat at the end
of the circular street. In the center of our circle sat a great, towering tree. This is what I would see now if I visited my old tranquil street.

In the eyes of a four-year-old there was a completely different picture. When I was four years old I imagined this tree as a big frog's head which had exaggerated eyes with colorful flowers planted around it. This frog head represented God to me. I remember I would always stop and wave at this frog head.

I look back now and see that comparing a frog's head to God is disrespectful in a way. I felt God was stationed in front of my house because I was a little angel. Running down the street was not just running—it was flying to me, as an angel would with her wings. Today if I drive down my old street, I will just see the gigantic tree in the center of our street. I think one day I should take time to run as if I am flying, and remember an early childhood memory.

Six anonymous 301C students
This dialogue was written by six 301C students. They first wrote a discussion question on the computer screen, and the others responded to it (in a "musical computers"-type exercise). The dialogue was constructed in response to an interview they read with Chris Burden, a performance artist who had a friend shoot him in the hand so he could see what it would be like. Instructor: Claudia B.

Chris Burden says he will never get shot in the arm again. In everything he does he never rehearses, and he never seems to be nervous. How is all this art? The person interviewing him in the article suggested it was theater. I think it is more theater than art—do you think it is more art or theater?

I think theater is art. It is a form of expression but in the physical sense.

I agree that theater is an art form. It may not be the typical type of theater that most people recognize, but it is still a performance. It is almost like an improve situation. Although there is a general plan, Burden never truly knows what is going to come up next.

I agree with the fact that what he does is theater, and that theater is art. But what he does isn't art itself, and he is not an artist. He is an improve actor, making real life into a show. That doesn't make his work art, and it doesn't make him an artist. If I b.s. my way into getting an "A" on our art definition paper because I go into some song & dance about my aging grandmother's heart operation, which prevented me from turning my paper in on time, I have made real life into a show, and I have acted out a part for some purpose. But what I did would not be art, and it wouldn't make me an artist.

I guess what he does could be considered some form of theater, but when I think of theater: I think of a play or dance of something already rehearsed and practiced. Whereas in what Chris Burden does it's something that he fantasizes about doing; he doesn't practice getting shot five times before he does it in front of an audience—he just does it. If Chris got up on a stage and acted out getting shot, without really doing it, then it would
seem more like theater to me. Personally, I don’t think what Chris Burden does is art at all.

Let me just begin by saying that I really do think what Burden does is art—even though I consider it to be terribly BAD art. In answer to the original question, I think theater is art, and I guess I would have to say that I think what Burden is doing is theater, so it’s also art. (Kind of confusing, huh?) Theater is art to me because it can cause me to feel so many different emotions, and it can change attitudes and opinions. And it does not necessarily have to be in order to do this. That’s why I can still consider Burden’s so-called “work” to be art— even though I think it’s pretty dangerous and stupid.

Leslie Isom
Shannon Stapleton
Sandra Valles

This poem was composed by three 301C students. They were given the --skeleton of a poem by A. R. Ammons, called "City Limits," with blank spaces replacing words in every line. The students replaced the blank spaces with words, and came up with a "new" poem. They write, "Our first impressions of this poem were that it was a contrast between the inner turmoil of the city and the inhabitants which live within. We based our word selection on emphasizing the eloquence and calmness of nature versus the bedlam of the city." Instructor: [Julie]

"City Limits"

When you consider the question, that it does not withhold itself but pours its aura without selection into every nook and cranny not overhung or hidden, when you consider that birds’ singing make no awful noise against the clamour but lie low in the light as in a high fortress; when you consider the seclusion, that it will look into the guiltiest

dept of the solemn heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening, when you consider the abundance of such existence as illuminate the glow-blue bodies and gold-skeined wings of flies swarming the dumped guts of a morbid slaughter or the coil of shit and in no way winces from its storms of mind; when you consider that air or vacuum, warmth or desolation, squid or wolf, rose or lichen, each is accepted into as much spirit as it will take, then the heart moves roomier, the metropolis stands and looks about, the leaf does not increase itself above the grass, and the dark work of the deepest thought is of a tune with May bushes
and autumn leaves lit by the breadth of such calmly turns to praise.

"City Limits"—by A. R. Ammons
When you consider the radiance, that it does not withhold itself but pours its abundance without selection into every nook and cranny not overhung or hidden; when you consider that birds’ bones make no awful noise against the light but lie low in the light as in a high testimony; when you consider the radiance, that it will look into the guiltiest swervings of the weaving heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening; when you consider the abundance of such resource as illuminate the glow-blue bodies and gold-skeined wings of flies swarming the dumped guts of a natural slaughter or the coil of shit and in no way winces from its storms of generosity; when you consider that air or vacuum, snow or shale, squid or wolf, rose or lichen, each is accepted into as much light as it will take, then the heart moves roomier, the man stands and looks about, the leaf does not increase itself above the grass, and the dark work of the deepest cells is of a tune with May bushes and fear lit by the breadth of such calmly turns to praise.

Carmen Berardi, James Brown
Jason Crowell, Chris Keller
Eric Mell, Tina Schnipke

These poems were written by an entire 110C class during a "musical computers" exercise. Each student began with a favorite line from Walt Whitman’s "Song of Myself," then began a poem in response to it. Students periodically switched terminals, and continued poems that their classmates had begun. Instructor: Rob D.

A child said What is grass? fetching it to me with full hands; How could I answer the child? I do not know what it is any more than he. What is the sun shining through the window? Glistening off the faces of all people.

No person will ever fully understand the contents of the universe. The young man sits at the bench staring in the middle of a grassy patch surrounded by many other young men. They laugh and talk of places past and present.

The past is an entity not worth searching through. It is like the future in that death is a
part of it for all. And the present lives without touching the past, for once it is gone, it
dies.

Birds land on the grass, peck and leave. Do they know that the past is gone, and the
present is only another part of the past? No, they simply move on, and the grass is gone.

The trees shot up from the green, eliminating the green grass and a part of the present,
forming a new form of the present without earthly boundaries, reaching in futility for the
sky, and yet, always hoping that they might touch the future.

But does the future reside in the sky or is it an immaculate cleansing floor the gleaming
blank space that we have always dreamed off. Where nothing will matter anymore.

Clear and sweet is my soul, and clear and sweet is all that is not my soul
If there is only what there is then could there be
any sweetness
Yes the sweetness that we create from our own souls
and the horror
and all
created in a bare space, the world that we are given
which exists, but has no meaning until we begin to see it
until we begin to say what it means.
At Ameriflora, the dancers dance and Bob Hope tells jokes
the President looks out at the beauty and the cheer
and says this is America
he knows no other
but on the streets the people with the signs
live a second reality. They do not fit into the commercial news
no one knows what to say about them
because there is nothing to say
it was a dream, all a dream
death now rules the air
like the smell of rotten eggs and bad milk

the crowd wearing black
wishing they were dead
so they could get out of the cruel world of Ameriflora
the President with a look of terror on his face
realized what had to be done
kill them all and preserve his power
or else die trying
for he knew his duty as President
was to fulfill the wishes of the people
ever knowing how to please his people
with his own desires, then turn them to his will,
to lead them around in circles, while they think
they're going in a straight line.
We follow the best leaders who take us
where we want to go, but not
where we want to end up, life goes
round and round, and we see what we want to know

we move on.

John Burney
Karri Larsen
Brian Schaefer
Alan Skerl

These 110C students were asked to write satirical responses to a letter in Ann Landers’ column from a freshman girl, worried about her long-distance relationship. Instructor: Rosemary Hathaway

Hey you very naive girl
Wake up and smell the coffee. "Lou has taken out a couple of girls and says they were ‘okay, but nothing special.’" On a clear night, look up and count the stars in the sky, double it, and add seven. This is how many girls Lou has slept with since your separation. It sounds like you are way behind. If, after four years of cheap, gratuitous sex you find yourself not despising men in general, and Lou specifically, go find him and you will be his. May you find nirvana in this cruel and thoughtless world.

Not,
Richard Cranium
(a.k.a. Brian Schaefer)

As the advice columnist for Car and Driver magazine, I am perplexed as to why you wrote me about your little problem. Usually I get letters concerning the new Jaguar, or how to find parts for a ’70 Ferrari. Yours has got to be the most depressing letter I have ever received at this magazine (except maybe that guy who ran his ’65 Corvette without oil until the engine froze up). Due to my open-mindedness and my good nature and my weekly paycheck— I will not hesitate to answer your letter. First you need to check Lou’s feelings for you, to see if there is any spark left in his side of the relationship. Next, idly mention to your parents that you would like to talk, so they don’t get all rewed up and bent out of shape. You may want to prime them first by greasing them up with good feelings. Add fuel to your side—praise their appearances and good taste, or whatever other b.s. comes to mind. Once you and Lou are together with both of your parents, jump-start the conversation. Talk about the weather (cars), local sports (cars), and finally (cars) school and your relationship. Your parents may race out roaring at first, but let them get everything out of their system. Your turn will be next. When you have started to talk, make sure to pace yourself. You will do yourself no good if you explode back at them full speed. Cool your jets, and let Lou tell his side, and then you tell yours. After your parents have a little time to see what you’re saying, maybe they’ll see that the gleam in your eyes is the headlights of love running on all cylinders.

Alan Skerl

Dear E and R in Dante’s Inferno,
Screw college. Kill your parents and any siblings, collect the life insurance, inherit the house and car, marry Lou and live happily ever after. Of course the plan relies on the utmost secrecy and you may spend the rest of your life in prison, but wouldn’t it be better to give it a shot rather than live your life knowing that you could have saved your relationship, and yet you turned your back on Lou? I’m sure he would do it for you.

Psychotic Psychiatrist
(a.k.a. John Burney)
English 301C
Essay 1 Assignment

Surely any one of us who has made it through fourteen or fifteen years of formal education, can think of a class, or an occasion outside of class, to serve as a quick example of what Freire calls the "banking" concept of education, where students are turned into "containers" to be "filled" by their teachers. If Freire is to be useful to you, however, he must do more than call up quick examples. He should allow you to say more than that a teacher once treated you like a container, or that a teacher once gave you your freedom.

Write an essay that focuses on a rich and illustrative incident from your own educational experience and read it (that is, interpret it) as Freire would. You will need to provide careful detail: things that were said and done, perhaps the exact wording of an assignment, a textbook, or a teacher’s comments. And you will need to turn to the language of Freire’s argument, to take key phrases and passages from his argument and see how they might be used to investigate your case.

To do this you will need to read your account as not simply the story of you and your teacher, since Freire is not writing about individual personalities (an innocent student and a mean teacher, a rude teacher, or a thoughtless teacher) but about the roles we are cast in, whether we choose to be or not, by our culture and its institutions. The key question, then, is not who you were or who your teacher was, but what roles you played and how those roles can lead you to better understand the larger narrative or drama of Education (an organized attempt to "regulate the way the world 'enters into' the students").

Freire would not want you to work passively or mechanically, however as though you were following orders. He would want you to make your own mark on the work he has begun. Use your example, in other words, as a way of testing and examining what Freire says, particularly those passages that you find difficult or obscure.

Although you will not be writing this essay collaboratively, I expect that you will want to think and talk about it with your classmates. I will assign one in-class responding session which you will do with your groups. You may also want to schedule a time independently to get together with members of your group, to read each other’s essays and discuss the ways that they each respond to Freire.

I expect your final draft to be 4-6 pages.
English 301C
Paper 2 Assignment

For your second essay, I want you to take a leap from Emerson into a collaborative consideration of his philosophy of education and its application to your experiences at Ohio State University. I'm suggesting a couple of different options as far as ways to approach the assignment, which will finally be a 5-7 page essay. Also, I'll be glad to discuss any "creative" approaches you might have to this topic.

Option One:
In the three numbered sections of "The American Scholar," Emerson speaks of "the education of the scholar by nature, by books and by action." Choose the argument he makes that seems to you to be the most powerful or most interesting, and apply it to the curriculum at your own school. What does the education of an American scholar at Ohio State University look like 150 years or so after Emerson's address to students and teachers at Harvard?

You might need to search out your college catalogue or whatever documents your school has prepared to explain its curriculum. As you begin thinking about your essay, you could imagine that you are writing a piece for an alumni magazine, or perhaps a position paper to be presented to a faculty committee charged with reviewing undergraduate education.

Option Two:
Imagine Emerson himself as a teacher who wants to have his students read "The American Scholar" (perhaps along with some other selections from this anthology). What kind of assignment might he give? What, that is, would he ask you to do with the readings? What would he do as your teacher? Write an essay that considers specifically both how, in practice, a modern teacher might encourage an Emersonian use of books and why, so far as you are concerned, a modern teacher might want to.
English 301C Essay 3 Assignment

To read is, in this case, to undo. Such a project, however, demands that we not simply snicker at TV, presuming its stupidity and our own superiority. Rather we need a critical approach that would take TV seriously (without extolling it), a method of deciphering TV's component images, requiring both a meticulous attention to concrete detail, and a sense of TV's historical situation. Genuinely seen through, those details illuminate that larger context, and vice versa, so that the reading of TV contains and necessitates a reading of our own moment and its past.

The essays in this book represent my efforts to set such a critical example.
—Mark Crispin Miller
Introduction to Boxed In

Option One:
Miller is an example of a critic who works against the grain of the material he studies (in this case TV) and against the grain of what he assumes to be a common misreading of that material. He reads against the way "The Cosby Show" or the Shield ad want to be read; he writes against what he assumes to be the viewers' blindness to motive and detail. Write an essay in which you try your hand at Miller's kind of criticism, developing a close reading of a particular show or ad currently on TV

Option Two:
You've seen Miller's "reading" of both a Shield ad and "The Cosby Show." Behind both are certain assumptions about how TV works and how viewers typically respond (both consciously and subconsciously). Let's assume (for the sake of this assignment) that Miller has only sort of got it right, that something about the nature of TV and something about a viewer's experience of TV is missing or hidden, or displaced or skewed or lost in his reading. Write an essay in which you respond to Miller, as though you were going to show him where and how his account is wrong or incomplete. As the ground for your response, use a particular ad or show (something you could put up next to his readings of the Shield ad or "The Cosby Show".

In order to write either essay, you will need to present your material carefully and to show how it might be read. The questions you ask should include these: How does it work? What does it assume of its audience? What is its hidden logic? What are its intentions? How and why are these hidden or hard to see? Whose interests might these intentions be said to represent?
English 301C
Essay 4 Assignment

The starting point of these reflections was usually a feeling of impatience at the sight of the "naturalness" with which newspapers, art and common sense constantly dress us a reality which, even though it is the one we live in, is undoubtedly determined by history.... I resented seeing Nature and History confused at every turn, and I wanted to track down, in the decorative display of what-goes-without saying, the ideological abuse, which, in my view, is hidden there.

—Roland Barthes, Introduction to Mythologies

In Mythologies, Barthes "reads" some characteristic examples of French popular culture. He reads against what he takes to be a common but false understanding (against common sense, or what most people think), and he reads in the name of the "public" or the "spectator," whose experience he comes to understand in a way he believes they cannot, because he thinks they fail to pay attention or they take things for granted. He looks for the hidden agenda, the ideology behind objects or events that do not seem to require such attention, that are presented as neutral, value free, naturally and inevitably there, as though their significance to us "goes-without-saying."

As a way of extending your sense of Barthes' method even further, write an essay, (or perhaps a series of "mythologies") in which you provide a similar reading of an example (or series of related examples) of American culture MTV, the Superbowl, rollerblading, Geraldo, or whatever you choose. Use your imagination! You can either extend, or reproduce, or comment on, or revise Barthes' project in Mythologies. Perhaps you like what he is doing and would like to try your hand at it with some material from your own culture. Or perhaps you think there is something wrong with what he is doing and you'd like to show him a better way. In either case you should make some reference to Barthes and what he would do. What would he notice in your example? What would he say about it?

You should imagine that you are writing to an audience who is as much a part of the culture as you are. You should imagine, that is, that you are talking to people who will be familiar with the example or examples you choose, but whose understanding of them you will have to enlighten.
English 301C
Re-Vision Exercise

Problem-posing education, as a humanist and liberating praxis, posits as fundamental that men subjected to domination must fight for their emancipation. To that end, it enables teachers and students to become subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism. It also enables men to overcome their false perception of reality. The world—no longer something to be described with deceptive words—becomes the object of that transforming action by men which results in their humanization (218).

—Paulo Freire
"The 'Banking' Concept of Education"

If the imagination is to transcend and transform experience it has to question, to challenge, to conceive of alternatives, perhaps to the very life you are living at that moment. You have to be free to play around with the notion that day might be night, love might be hate; nothing can be too sacred for the imagination to turn into its opposite or to call experimentally by another name. For writing is re-naming (490).

—Adrienne Rich
"When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision"

There is a difference between writing and revising. In the first case, you are working on a subject—finding something to say and getting words down on paper (or, finding something to say by getting words down on paper). In the second case, you are working on something that you have already written. You are working on words already on a page.

Revision allows you the opportunity to work more deliberately than you can when you are struggling to put words on the page for the first time. Revision gives you the time and the occasion to reflect, question, and reconsider what you have written. The time to do this is not always available when you are caught up in the confusing rush of composing an initial draft. In fact, it is not always appropriate (or useful) to question what you write while you are writing, since this can block thoughts that are eager for expression and divert attention from the task at hand.

The job for the writer in revising a paper is to imagine how the text could be altered—for the better, of course. This is seldom a simple, routine, or mechanical process. You are not just copying-over-more-neatly or searching for spelling mistakes. In fact, this can be the most difficult phase of the composing process, because you must try to look at your text with new eyes.

If you take Freire and Rich as guides, revision can be thought of as a struggle against domination, and a way of experimenting with renaming your ideas. If a first draft is driven by conventional ways of thinking and writing, a second can enable a writer to see the way that conventional ways of thinking and writing affect what she or he says, and push against habit and convention.

For this assignment, read back through your draft, underlining words or phrases that seem to be evidence of the power of language to dominate, mystify, deceive, or alienate. Underline words or phrases that seem to be inspired by convention, or "what you think you're supposed to write." Try to understand what you want to say in your essay, and prepare a second draft that seems more "humane," in Freire's terms. In other words, work with sections that you don't quite understand, and try to understand them in your own terms.
English 301C
"When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision"

Compare "Aunt Jennifer's Tigers" (1951):

Aunt Jennifer's tigers stride across a screen,
Bright topaz denizens of a world of green.
They do not fear the men beneath the tree;
They pace in sleek chivalric certainty.

Aunt Jennifer's fingers fluttering through her wool
Find even the ivory needle hard to pull.
The massive weight of Uncle's wedding band
Sits heavily upon Aunt Jennifer's hand.

When Aunt is dead, her terrified hands will lie
Still ringed with ordeals she was mastered by.
The tigers in the panel that she made
Will go on striding, proud and unafraid.

To this excerpt from "Planetarium" (written around 1968)

I am bombarded yet I stand
I have been standing all my life in the
direct path of a battery of signals
the most accurately transmitted most
untranslatable language in the universe
I am a galactic cloud so deep so invo-
leted that a light wave could take 15
years to travel through me And has
taken I am an instrument in the shape
of a woman trying to translate pulsations
into images for the relief of the body
and the reconstruction of the mind.

Questions for discussion:
What are some of the formal differences between the poems?
What are the thematic differences?
Rich says, in reference to "Tigers": "In those years formalism was part of the strategy—like
asbestos gloves, it allowed me to handle materials I couldn't pick up barehanded" (488). What is
the material that Rich "couldn't pick up barehanded"?
In reference to "Planetarium," Rich says, "At last the woman in the poem and the woman
writing the poem become the same person" (493). What could she mean?
Further, Rich says, "But poems are like dreams: in them you put what you don't know you
know" (487).
Is what she knows in the second poem different from what she knows in the first? How do
we know?
Let's look at the form of Rich's essay. What might be the rhetorical strategies of using
such a form?
How are the two poems the same? How are they both about writing?
Assignment:
Take the following poem, from which some words have been eliminated, as indicated by the blank spaces. Replace the missing words with other ones that you find appropriate, interesting, or provocative, to make this poem "your own." When you are finished, please briefly describe the implications of some of the choices you made as a group.

"City Limits"
When you consider the question that it does not withhold itself but pours its aura without selection into every nook and cranny not overhung or hidden; when you consider that birds' singing make no awful noise against the clamour but lie low in the light as in a high fortress; when you consider the seclusion, that it will look into the guiltiest

depths of the solemn heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening; when you consider the abundance of such existence as illuminate the glow-blue bodies and gold-skeined wings of flies swarming the dumped guts of a morbid slaughter or the coil of shit and in no way winces from its storms of malice; when you consider

that air or vacuum, warmth or desolation, squid or wolf, rose or lichen, each is accepted into as much spirit as it will take, then the heart moves roomier, the metropolis stands and looks about, the

leaf does not increase itself above the grass, and the dark work of the deepest thought is of a tune with May bushes and Autumn leaves lit by the breadth of such calmly turns to praise.

Group comment:
Our first impressions of this poem were that it was a contrast between the inner turmoil of the city and the habitats which live within. We based our word selection on emphasizing the eloquence and calmness of nature versus the bedlam of the city.
Assignment:
Take the following poem, from which I have eliminated all punctuation, capitalization, and stanza breaks, and decide where punctuation, caps, and/or stanza breaks should be. When you are finished "revising" the poem, please briefly describe the implications of some of the choices you made as a group.

"City Limits"
When you consider the radiance, that it does not withhold itself; but pours its abundance without selection into every nook and cranny, not overhung or hidden.

When you consider that birds bones make no awful noise against the light, but lie low in the light as in a high testimony.

When you consider the radiance, that it will look into the guiltiest swervings of the weaving heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening.

When you consider the abundance of such resource as illuminate the glow, blue bodies and gold skeined wings of flies swarming, the dumped guts of a natural slaughter, or the coil of shit and in no way winces from its storms of generosity.

When you consider that air or vacuum, snow or shale, squid or wolf, rose or lichen; each is accepted into as much light as it will take, then the heart moves roomier.

The man stands and looks about, the leaf does not increase itself above the grass? and the dark work of the deepest cells is of a tune with May bushes; and fear lit by the breadth of such, calmly turns to praise.

Group comment:
One o the members thought that the poem was fine just the way it was. We all thought that the stanza were where we put them. With punctuation, we played around as to which would sound better when the poem was read. Also we felt that the commas and the semicolons would make the poem flow along better.
Erin
Jennie
Bill

Assignment:
Take the following poem, and try to render it in prose, being faithful to the meaning, but not necessarily to the language. When you are finished, please briefly describe the implications of some of the choices you made as a group.

"City Limits"
Large cities seem to have no boundaries and everything is in plain sight. Within these cities the birds are seen but not heard.

The problems of the city grow, the inner cities have problems that make the people move out to the suburbs. There are limits but yet there are no limits because the problems and frustrations spread with the growth of the city. Then you have this vicious cycle of unending turmoil that causes people to become unobservant.

Group comment:
The reasons that we chose to simplify this abstract poem in our own terms was because once put in simple terms we realize that what he is referring to is an every day problem.
Assignment:
Take the following poem, and insert line breaks in it, where you think they should be. When you are finished, please briefly describe the implications of some of the choices you made as a group.

"City Limits"
When you consider the radiance, that it does not withheld itself but pours its abundance without selection into every nook and cranny not overhung or hidden; when you consider that birds' bones make no awful noise against the light but lie low in the light as in a high testimony; when you consider the radiance, that it will look into the guiltiest swervings of the weaving heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening; when you consider the abundance of such resource as illuminate the glow-blue bodies and gold-skeined wings of flies swarming the dumped guts of a natural slaughter or the coil of shit and in no way winces from its storms of generosity; when you consider that air or vacuum, snow or shale, squid or wolf, rose or lichen, each is accepted into as much light as it will take, then the heart moves roomier, the man stands and looks about, the leaf does not increase itself above the grass, and the dark work of the deepest cells is of a tune with May bushes and fear lit by the breath of such calmly turns to praise.

Group comment:
LINES 1-12 WE SEPARATED THE WAY THEY ARE FOR THE EFFECT OF REPETITION
LINES 13-15 WERE SEPARATED THE WAY THEY ARE FOR ANALOGY REASONS
LINES 1-21 WERE SEPARATED THE WAY THEY ARE FOR READING CONTEXT
Assignment:
Take the following poem, and using the Wordfinder tool in MacWrite II, replace words with other ones that you find appropriate, interesting, or provocative, to make this poem "your own." When you are done, please briefly describe the implications of some of the choices you made as a group.

"City Limits"
When you contemplate the radiance, that it does not withhold itself but pours its abundance without selection into every nook and cranny not overhung or hidden; when you consider that birds’ bones make no awful noise against the light but lie low in the light as in a high passage when you consider the radiance, that it will look into the condemned detour of the weaving heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening; when you view the abundance of such resource as illuminate the glow-blue bodies and gold-skeined wings of flies swarming the dumped substance of a natural slaughter or the coil of shit and in no way cringes from its storms of generosity; when you consider that air or vacuum, snow or shale, squid or wolf, rose or lichen, each is accepted into as much light as it will take, then the heart moves wider, the man stands and looks about, the leaf does not rise itself above the grass, and the dark work of the deepest cells is of a tune with May bushes and fear lit by the depth of such calmly turn to praise.
"City Limits"—by A. R. Ammons

When you consider the radiance, that it does not withhold itself but pours its abundance without selection into every nook and cranny not overhung or hidden; when you consider that birds’ bones make no awful noise against the light but lie low in the light as in a high testimony; when you consider the radiance, that it will look into the guiltiest swervings of the weaving heart and bear itself upon them, not flinching into disguise or darkening; when you consider the abundance of such resource as illuminate the glow-blue bodies and gold-skinned wings of flies swarming the dumped guts of a natural slaughter or the coil of shit and in no way winces from its storms of generosity; when you consider that air or vacuum, snow or shale, squid or wolf, rose or lichen, each is accepted into as much light as it will take, then the heart moves roomier, the man stands and looks about, the leaf does not increase itself above the grass, and the dark work of the deepest cells is of a tune with May bushes and fear lit by the breadth of such calmly turns to praise.
Writing Assignment 2
English 301C
In-class Writing Activity

The starting point of these reflections was usually a feeling of impatience at the sight of
the "naturalness" with which newspapers, art and common sense constantly dress us a
reality which, even though it is the one we live in, is undoubtedly determined by history....
I resented seeing Nature and History confused at every turn, and I wanted to track down,
in the decorative display of what-goes-without-saying, the ideological abuse, which, in my
view, is hidden there.
—Roland Barthes, Introduction to Mythologies

Certainly The Simpsons is a (representative?) piece of American culture, and can be "read," in
Barthes' terms, as a nonlinguistic text. It embodies design and intention; it is constructed to create
effects, to produce certain ends, and to shape both what and how we think. But to what extent
does a television show like The Simpsons reflect History, and to what extent does it reflect Nature?
In other words, why is The Simpsons the show it is, and not some other show? How does it reflect
some of our deepest beliefs as a cultural community? How have we, in a sense, "created" and
"written" The Simpsons? As a group, use Roland Barthes' method to "read" The Simpsons as a text.
Remember that Barthes would "watch the watcher" and make conclusions about what the watcher
sees, and how that reflects the beliefs of our society.
The Simpsons is a satirical look at the American family. It is reaction to the many years of "the perfect family" image which has been portrayed throughout television history. Traditionally, the family sitcom consisted of the happy parents and their obedient children. The conflicts that occur are often minute and easily resolved within the half hour. The Simpsons challenge not only the traditional sitcom, but the stereotype of the American nuclear family.

Ironically, this cartoon deals with more problematic situations than other television shows. For instance, the problem of Ward "knocking up" June would never have been presented as a focus of Leave it to Beaver. Whereas on The Simpsons, this issue was the focus of an entire episode.

Television is a reflection of society. Today, there are a lot less shows which revolve around the white middle-class family. These are no longer popular because society has become more accepting of different ways of life. The Simpsons are evidence of this. Although they are the extreme opposite of past families, they are filling some need. The popularity of the show demonstrates this.

Kristi
Carrie
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The Simpsons reflect some of our deepest beliefs as a cultural community by showing the woman at home being pregnant, while the man is out working or looking for a job. In the show it was strongly emphasized that Homer found a "good" job and not one in a fast food restaurant. Since Marge and Homer had premarital sex and Marge became pregnant, it was expected of Homer to marry her. Homer wanted to buy her a nice ring, even though Marge said she didn't need one. Pregnancy was looked down upon, the pamphlet the doctor gave Marge was entitled "So you've ruined your life." Marge's sisters were judging Homer solely on looks, instead of his inner beauty. Marge was pictured as incapable of getting a job, she didn't work while she was pregnant. It's based on real-life situations, but they always seem to be on the down side of life.

Our society has created a "perfect family" where people fall in love and then have children. This show portrays the fact that this isn't always the case that mistakes do happen. The particular scenes they were reflecting back on were from the early 1980's ideals were different then than they are now. In the '90's it is not uncommon for the man to stay home and care for the children. This is a relatively new twist in our society. More women are out in the work force in this decade than in the past also. The economic problems nowadays are forcing more women to go out and work and help bring money to the household.

Dena
Teresa

Homer says he became a more responsible adult after he gets married and has a child. Then he lets Bart eat frosting for lunch. Parents these days are more passive and lenient these days then they were 10 years ago. United States is supposed to be an equal opportunity employment and Homer mocks it when he gets the job at the nuclear power plant. The only reason he got the job because he will let the boss manipulate Homer. The other two guys were hired because they were friends with the Human resource Manager. With Marge getting pregnant, it was kind of reflects the younger generations attitude of "have fun now, worry about the consequences later." Perhaps ten years ago some people in society had premarital sex but it was
not broadcasted like it is today. Maybe having the Simpson's in animation form people except the information the show is trying to get across in the comical way. It is not so much of a lecture type show.
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