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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION, METHODS, AND OVERVIEW

All kinds of approaches are needed, to throw full light upon the objects of our study. (Kenneth Burke)

During the last thirty years, literacy has become a major social issue throughout the world, culminating in the United Nations celebration of 1990 as International Literacy Year. In Canada, the publication of More Than Words Can Say: Personal Perspectives on Literacy highlighted the United Nations' efforts, and various literacy coalitions of schools, businesses and other institutions across the nation work to promote literacy through programs such as Saskatoon's "Ad Hoc World Literacy Day." The federal government's Department of the Secretary of State allocated $110 million over five years to address the problem of illiteracy and established the National Literacy Secretariat to coordinate research and programs on literacy. One of these projects, administered and implemented by the Association of Canadian Community Colleges, established the National Adult Literacy Database, an on-line database listing both community college and workplace literacy programmes across Canada. This project also published Literacy in the Colleges and Institutes: A Focus on Community Partnerships which contains the results of a national survey of community-based literacy programs.¹

¹ For more information about the National Adult Literacy Database, contact Tamara J. Illersich, Project Co-ordinator, National Adult Literacy Database, Fanshawe College, P. O. Box 4005, London, Ontario, N5W 5H1.
Given the growing awareness that literacy develops over a lifetime and that much advanced literate behaviour is practiced and acquired at university, it is surprising that no set of data exists to describe how universities in Canada enrich their students' levels of literacy. My curiosity about what universities are doing to help students increase their levels of literacy led me to ask the research questions that guide this study:

- In what contexts--institutional, social, ideological, and technological--is writing taught to undergraduates in Canadian universities?
- In the universities that teach writing formally, how is this instruction carried out?
- What definitions of writing does this instruction presuppose and promulgate?

Participants at a workshop on "Language and Literacy in Canada" held in Toronto in 1979 outlined eleven categories of research necessary to build an understanding of literacy, including "Collation of Data." Twelve years later much of this work remains to be addressed, including recommendation two under "Collation of Data":

"Collection, collation, and analysis of the existing information accumulated by universities with respect to their admission tests and remedial programs in language" (Language 8). This dissertation takes as one of its major aims the task of collecting information about university policies toward testing and programs in language (English and French). This study also addresses another of the workshop participants' goals: an examination of "the whole field of language and literacy, setting it in its social and cultural context" (Language 8). Based on a multimethod research design including historical analysis, surveys, and case studies, this dissertation provides tentative answers to the three research questions listed above and satisfies two of the recommendations of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Strategic Grants workshop held in 1979.
Background

What do we know about writing instruction at Canadian universities? Nan Johnson's articles and book on the development of rhetoric in the nineteenth century have established much of the groundwork. Her article, "English composition, rhetoric, and English studies at nineteenth-century [Anglo] Canadian colleges and universities," for instance, outlines the chief influences on the study of rhetoric in English-speaking universities--"Hugh Blair, George Campbell, Richard Whately, Alexander Bain, James De Mille, and John F. Genung"--along with the intersections of rhetoric/literature and rhetoric/composition (296). Johnson's book, Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric: Theory and Practice in North America, outlines in detail the formulations and reformulations that rhetorical theory took throughout the century in Canada and the United States. In addition, Henry Hubert's dissertation on English studies in nineteenth-century Anglo-Canadian colleges discusses the part writing instruction played in the English curriculum in that century. Hubert focuses on the development of English studies in Canadian universities, a development consisting primarily of a movement from the teaching of rhetoric and composition to belles lettres and literature. Anne Taylor's "McCulloch to De Mille: Scottish Influences on the Teaching of Composition and Rhetoric in Nineteenth Century Canada," traces the Scottish influence on writing instruction; this Scottish influence did not outlast the Loyalists' preference for the British model of education, based on Matthew Arnold's "best that has been thought and written" of culture and the tenets of John Henry Newman, who held that "all branches of knowledge are connected together, because the subject-matter of knowledge is intimately united in itself, as being the acts and work of the Creator" (The Idea of a University, 575). Commentators on the role of writing instruction in the English department in the twentieth century focus on the
increasingly belletristic emphasis of this instruction and the decrease in writing as a productive art, though this focus has changed in the last thirty years (Davies; Frye; Gallivan; Kerpneck; Woodhouse).

In fact, the last thirty years have seen burgeoning change in the number and scope of courses on writing and in research about writing in Canada. But comparatively little analysis of the sort Johnson and Hubert perform for the nineteenth century examines writing instruction in Canadian universities in the twentieth century. In fact, I have been unable to find any detailed histories of composition teaching in Canada from 1920-1980. Only Nan Johnson's article, "Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres in the Canadian Academy: An Historical Analysis," contains a short section on rhetoric and composition between 1900 and 1950. According to Johnson, the territory of composition at this time included punctuation, organization, and vocabulary; "rhetoric" resembled literary study, focusing on the study of literary works and on literary appreciation (Johnson 868). Composition, narrowly defined as punctuation, organization, and vocabulary, became part of first-year literature survey courses, while rhetoric, defined as belletristic criticism based on taste and style, became part of critical theory courses (Johnson 869).

If we know little about writing instruction earlier in this century, we know equally little about that issue today. Previous surveys of writing instruction in Canadian universities focus on discrete subsections of writing instruction rather than on the broad cross-section studied in this dissertation. Russell A. Hunt surveyed 58 English departments in 1981 (35--60%—replied) to generate information about
writing programs within them. Of the departments that replied to Hunt's survey, 20 (57\%) offered "a course whose central or only purpose is instruction in expository writing" (7), and only five of the 20 allowed students to count a writing course towards a degree in English (8). Hunt also notes that "of seventeen [writing] programmes whose origins were dated, thirteen were instituted after the 1974-5 academic year, and seven more recently than three years ago" (16).

In 1984 Andrea A. Lunsford surveyed English departments in 52 English-speaking universities (42 replied; 81\%) to find out how many had established writing workshops and how many departments either offered or required courses on writing. Among her findings were that 33\% of English departments had some form of writing workshop or laboratory, 50\% offered some form of remedial writing instruction, and that only 24\% required students in English departments to take a course or part of a course on writing. Furthermore, only 26\% of English departments offered an English as a Second Language course.

Even more recently, Elaine Eldridge published the results of her 1987 survey of technical writing in 70 Canadian colleges and universities (35--50\%-- responded). Because of the difficulty of determining where technical writing might be taught within these institutions, she "had to make educated guesses as to where to send the questionnaires" (183), a process that necessarily leads to an incomplete sample. Nevertheless, one of the interesting results she reports is that of the eighteen

---

2 For the purposes of the research reported in this dissertation, I have included all degree-granting institutions that are members of the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada. These institutions are listed in the 1989 Commonwealth Universities Yearbook (Vol. 2) and in Figure 1.
Figure 1 (continued)

Key to Figure 1

**British Columbia**
1. University of British Columbia
2. Royal Roads Military College
3. Simon Fraser University
4. Trinity Western University
5. University of Victoria

**Alberta**
6. University of Alberta
7. Athabasca University
8. University of Calgary
9. Camrose Lutheran College
10. University of Lethbridge

**Saskatchewan**
11. University of Regina
12. University of Saskatchewan

**Manitoba**
13. Brandon University
14. University of Manitoba
15. University of Winnipeg

**Ontario**
16. Brock University
17. Carleton University
18. University of Guelph
19. Lakehead University
20. Laurentian University
21. McMaster University
22. University of Ottawa
23. Queen's University
24. Redeemer Reformed Christian College
25. Ryerson Polytechnic Institute
26. University of Toronto
27. Trent University
28. University of Waterloo
29. University of Western Ontario
30. Wilfrid Laurier University
31. University of Windsor
32. York University
Figure 1 (continued)

Quebec
33. Bishop's University
34. Concordia University
35. Université Laval
36. McGill University
37. Université de Montréal
38. Université du Québec:
39. Abitibi-Témiscamingue
40. Chicoutimi
41. Hull
42. Montreal
43. Rimouski
44. Trois-Rivières
45. University of Sherbrooke
46. College Royal Militaire St. Jean

New Brunswick
47. Université de Moncton
48. University of New Brunswick
49. Mount Allison University

Nova Scotia
50. Acadia University
51. Dalhousie University
52. University College of Cape Breton
53. University of King's College
54. Mount Saint Vincent University
55. Nova Scotia College of Art and Design
56. Nova Scotia Agricultural College
57. Université St. Anne
58. St. Francis Xavier College
59. Saint Mary's University
60. Technical University of Nova Scotia

Prince Edward Island
61. University of Prince Edward Island

Newfoundland
62. Memorial University of Newfoundland
departments that offer technical writing, "five have offered technical writing before 1970, six since 1970, and seven departments have offered some type of professional writing course since 1980" (183). From this we can deduce that writing instruction in technical writing increased over 200% since 1970, a trend that confirms Hunt's findings about the increase in writing courses being offered.

Program developers at two universities have also conducted surveys to determine how their counterparts at other universities provide instruction. C. J. Norman, Director of the Writing Centre at Queen's University, conducted a survey of writing programs at Ontario universities in 1989 to determine the components of each program and the relative emphasis on each of four components: writing centres, courses in composition, writing-across-the-curriculum programs, and proficiency testing. Norman reports no results for Lakehead University, Laurentian University, and the University of Ottawa (all Ontario universities with active writing programs); his sample, therefore, is not universal even within Ontario. Of the eleven universities in the sample, he reports writing centres in ten of the eleven institutions (McMaster is the exception); a heavy emphasis on courses in composition in only two universities (Toronto, Erindale campus; Waterloo); no writing-across-the-curriculum programs at nine universities and a low emphasis in this category at two universities (Carleton; Queen's); and a medium or heavy emphasis on proficiency testing at over half of the universities. Two of the most well-developed writing across the curriculum programs in Canada--at Laurentian and Western Ontario--pass without mention in Norman's report, an omission that belies the important work being done at those institutions.

In 1987, Mark Baetz, Anne C. Hall, Joyce Lorimer, and Michael Moore of Wilfrid Laurier University surveyed 56 English department chairs "requesting
information about their universities' policies and practices as regards student writing proficiency" (24--43%--responded). The low response rate limits the usefulness of the results as a representative or universal sample, but some of the information suggests trends. For example, fifteen of the 24 responding universities conduct a writing test, and thirteen offer "remedial" instruction (7). In addition, eighteen of the 24 universities offer writing courses.

While these studies provide some rudimentary information, they do not adequately map the terrain of writing instruction at Canadian universities. Most of the surveys reported above study a small sample of the total number of writing programs at Canadian universities, and thus report necessarily limited data. In addition, three of the surveys report results based on responses from less than two-thirds of their already limited sample, a condition that further reduces the ability of readers to generalize about conditions throughout Canada. Further, none of the studies combine research methods or use historical information and case-study methods to contextualize present-day conditions.

This dissertation reports the results of my attempts to map the territory of writing instruction at Canadian universities. I stand between the data presented here and the reader, however. To help readers make informed judgments about both the data and my interpretations of the data presented here, the next sections of this chapter describe my position as an interpreter of data and detail a research methodology particularly suited to develop data to answer the research questions of this study.
(De)Terministic Screens

Kenneth Burke coined the term "terministic screens" to describe the impossibility of observing the world from an "objective" and total perspective. In Burke's view, every reflection made in this or any other study involves first a selection of data, a selection that necessarily produces a deflection--a change or a framing--of the data (Burke 45). For the purposes of this study, the perspective includes placing the data and information reported here in a Canadian cultural context all too often overlooked, glossed over, or simply ignored. Canadian and American attitudes often seem identical, but at other times are wildly out of step. "Freshman composition," for example, remains a distinctly American phenomenon, while Canadian institutions traditionally prefer the English/Composition synthesis (Johnson 869). Even the seemingly fixed-in-stone punctuation rules (such as whether to place a comma inside or outside of quotations) vary between British and American codes.

If punctuation codes provide an example of stylistic differences, the bilingual nature of Canada provides another, far more crucial variation between Canadian and American attitudes. So far little mention has been made of the past and present tradition of writing instruction in French-language institutions. Such an omission or silence reflects a cultural difference between readers and researchers native to Canada and those readers and researchers not sensitive to the "two solitudes". Bilingual (French and English) universities and, consequently, bilingual writing programs, such as the writing across the curriculum program/Langue Intégrée aux Programmes at Laurentian University in Sudbury, embody one response to the co-existence of

French and English traditions. Writing instruction in Canadian universities exists within these cultural pressures—Anglo-Canadians striving to establish and protect an identity separate from an American one; French-Canadians striving to remain distinct from both American and English-Canadian influences. The history presented here attempts to account for Canadian cultural context as a factor in the development of writing instruction in Canada.

Finally, any researcher brings perspectives to a study, focuses on screens that determine—or to put it less strongly—influence the interpretations and information this study presents. I position myself in this history as participant-informer, as Canadian native, as past student and past teacher in some of the classrooms being discussed, and as partially U.S.-educated critic of these programs, past and present. My reading and writing about the history of writing instruction in Canadian institutions bears the marks of my experience in many subtle—and not so subtle—ways. For example, a traditional (and pervasive) attitude to writing among Canadian academics holds that writing cannot be taught—it is something learned or acquired indirectly, but it cannot be taught directly.4 My own experience as a student in both countries leads me to believe that writing can be taught directly, but the wherewithal to contest this issue comes almost exclusively from conceptions of writing and literacy developed in an American context. One of the guiding assumptions in this study, then, holds that writing can, and indeed, should be taught throughout the school and college years. My own research into pre-school literacy convinces me that writing does not occur

---

"naturally" but that it depends heavily on cultural practices and uses for writing. In Canada some readers challenge that assumption. Consequently, my reading of the history of writing instruction focuses on how this issue—that writing cannot be taught—and others like it informed and continue to inform university teaching of writing.

The terministic screens I bring to my research naturally influence the research methods I have used. For instance, the survey instrument (described more fully later in this chapter) attempted to identify the place writing instruction occupies in Canadian universities and to offer an opportunity for administrators to voice their concerns and attitudes to writing instruction. The survey questions, both in their selection and in how they were framed, cannot be called neutral or objective, but they did attempt to refrain from eliciting data to fulfill my own prophecies. One question—"How important is it for graduating students in your faculty to be able to write effectively"—was quite directive: who would not want to achieve this for their students? Nevertheless, answers to this question helped frame the rhetorical exigency for the entire questionnaire by pointing to the discrepancy between an issue that clearly was important but which garnered little research support and used untenured instructors for the most part.

On the other end of the continuum from directive are open-ended questions, such as the last question: "I would appreciate your using the space below to comment on any of the issues raised by this questionnaire." This question enabled respondents to comment with as little direction as possible. In my interpretation of the data

---

5 For an excellent overview of literacy theory and practice, see the Modern Language Associations recent publication, The Right to Literacy (1990). This volume provides a variety of perspectives that describe the factors influencing literacy.
gathered from open-ended questions such as the last question, I have resisted interpretation until after analyzing the results for the other questions. My interpretation of the results of the open-ended questions derived from ethnographic methodology: I had few expectations of the data from the last question at the outset, and the results come from reading the data and trying to find and match patterns that arise out of it. 6

My perspective as a native informant allows me to show how over-riding cultural beliefs can transform seemingly similar concepts when they are transplanted from an American to a Canadian context, how "composition" becomes "critical taste" in Canada rather than the productive art it is known as in the United States. I attempt to uncover concepts about writing that change from an American to a Canadian context and use them to help explain writing instruction in Canadian universities. The issues I focus on, and the attitudes I view them with, arise to some extent from my personal history as student, teacher, and researcher in both Canadian and American contexts. They are enhanced, however, by my immersion in the research necessary to chart the territory of Canadian university writing instruction.

**Methodologies**

The (de)terministic screens outlined above filter data gathered through three different methods of uncovering knowledge about writing instruction at Canadian universities: a summary, critical examination, and extension of what has been written about the history of writing instruction in Canadian universities; surveys to find

---

6 I doubted that more than a handful of respondents would fill in an open-ended question, and I expected those who did comment to elaborate on their courses or programs. The range and volume of comment included in response to the last question provided a rich though unfocused set of data.
where writing instruction takes place in universities and who is responsible for providing it; and case studies of three well-developed programs. Each of these methods contributes information that helps me answer the research questions that guide this study:

- In what contexts—institutional, social, ideological, and technological—is writing taught to undergraduates in Canadian universities?
- In the universities that teach writing formally, how is this instruction carried out?
- What definitions of writing does this instruction presuppose and promulgate?

Rationale

In an effort to examine writing instruction in Canadian contexts more fully than any one research method would allow, this dissertation uses a multimethod research design. Grounded in the emerging understanding of social phenomena as subjective rather than objective without denying the usefulness of certain kinds of "objective" data as pertinent to certain kinds of research questions, multimethod research has emerged as a research style precisely because the multimethod nature of contemporary social science has convinced many researchers that solutions to their research problems require more and different kinds of information than any single method can provide, and also that solutions based upon multimethod findings are likely to be better solutions—that is, to have a firmer empirical base and greater theoretical scope because they are grounded in different ways of observing social reality. Multimethod research is thus . . . an attempt to apply to our individual work lessons learned at the level of the discipline as a whole and thereby to enrich the collective effort to which we each contribute. (Brewer and Hunter 28)

Chief among the advantages of multimethod research are the multiple sets of data that each research method creates and the opportunities for comparison among different data sets that attempt to answer the same research question.
In composition, the methodological democracy described by Brewer and Hunter in a social science context appears in research textbooks, in conference presentations, and in journal articles as well. Janice M. Lauer and J. William Asher list ten different kinds of empirical research methods including case studies, ethnographies, sampling and surveys, and experiments. A similarly democratic attitude prevails in an article in *Rhetoric Review* recording the proceedings from a panel of historians in composition studies. This article presents a variety of research methods or attitudes to history: traditional, Marxist, feminist, archaeological, and deconstructionist ("Octalogue"). Composition, which derives some of its methods and directions from the social sciences and others from historiography, shares the need for a multimethod approach to research because of the notoriously difficult problem of identifying factors that influence writing and the teaching of writing.

These different kinds of knowledge help to "triangulate" or provide checks on each other by reinforcing the conclusions that each method of inquiry suggests. Historical research based on analysis of archival and other written documents, for example, suggests that universities placed a heavy emphasis on belles-lettres writing towards the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth (Johnson; Hubert). The surveys conducted as part of this study provide evidence to suggest that this emphasis on belles-lettres rhetoric continues at many universities in the form of first-year courses in English called "Composition and Literature" (Memorial University;  

---

7 In *Multimethod Research: A Synthesis of Styles*, John Brewer and Albert Hunter discuss how multiple measures (triangulation) contribute to a greater understanding of research problems (see pages 83-84). According to Brewer and Hunter, exploratory studies (such as this dissertation) allow for greater interdependence and interaction between data collection methods. Consequently, data collection methods have not been "insulated" from each other in this study of writing instruction at Canadian universities.
The University of British Columbia; the University of Ottawa). Case study evidence from the University of New Brunswick—including interviews, course syllabi, and calendar descriptions—corroborate the evidence that belleuristic rhetoric remains a force. The triangulation at work in this example shows how evidence from each method—historical, survey, and case study—of this multimethod research design contributes information necessary to answer the research questions.

Historical analysis constitutes perhaps the most appropriate method to provide data about past events in answer to the research questions of this study, but other research strategies provide more and better information about current events. Robert K. Yin, in his book on case study methodology, identifies three criteria for selecting research methods: "(a) the type of research question posed, (b) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioural events, and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events" (16). Historical research, for example, answers "how" and "why" questions but does not focus on contemporary events. Case studies, however, can answer the same kinds of questions as historical research but add to them a focus on current events. The combination of historical research and case studies, then, provides researchers with data including both past and present events. Survey data, on the other hand, can answer a different set of questions such as "who," "what," "where," "how many," and "how much" with a focus on contemporary events (Yin 17). The combination of survey, case study, and historical research provides researchers with methods to uncover answers to the full range of research questions. The following paragraphs justify the use of each method by detailing how each method contributes data to help answer each of the three research questions.
The first research method--historical analysis--provided historical information about contexts of instruction that came from reading other histories, from respondents' answers to survey questions, and from documents gathered and interviews conducted in the case study sites (the University of New Brunswick and the University of Winnipeg). In addition to the historical information detailed above (see "Background"), the primary sources of historical information came from archival records at the case study institutions and documents attached to completed survey forms. Both the surveys and the interviews with those responsible for teaching writing (conducted in the case studies) provide information about the history of how writing instruction was carried out. For example, one respondent\(^8\) wrote a long letter describing the evolution of her institution's different policies from 1973 to 1990. Library research and documents gathered at each case study site also contribute to the history of instruction, a history capable of providing important insights into "how" and "why" writing instruction takes place in Canadian universities.

The second research method employed in this study used surveys to collect data. Floyd J. Fowler, Jr. identifies four major reasons for survey research: probability sampling, standardized measurement, collecting information that is available from no other source, and special analysis requirements for survey information (11-12). The third purpose drives the survey portion of this dissertation: collecting information about writing instruction in Canadian universities that is unavailable from any other source. As such, this method of research was not only natural but necessary for the success of this study.

\(^8\) Kenna Manos of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, May 31, 1990.
While surveys provide a broad perspective, they yield only a "thin" description. Case studies form the third research method used to gather data for this study. To enrich the picture of writing instruction in Canada, I asked some questions and sought documents that provided information about the contexts and practice of writing instruction at each institution, data that would help construct answers to research questions one and two: dates, names of courses, number and kinds of students, syllabi, and passive observation of some classes. Interviews and observations made at the case study sites provide valuable information to corroborate information gathered through historical and survey methods, but they also provide a rich source of information in answer to the third research question--what definition of writing does this instruction presuppose and promulgate? The interviews allow informants to qualify, elaborate, or deny definitions that a reading of texts (syllabi, class exercises, textbooks) gathered in the survey or historical research might suggest.

Details of Survey Methods

In the survey reported in this dissertation, the sample population was limited to universities (see Figure 1, "List of Universities Surveyed"). This population does not include, for example, programs in colleges affiliated with universities that maintain a curriculum separate from the university, nor does it include information from community colleges, which have traditionally assumed a much more active role in literacy education in Canada. Also not included in the survey were the colleges d'enseignement général et professionnel (CEGEP's) in Quebec, which also take a more active role in writing instruction.

---

9 The introduction to this chapter gives some evidence to justify this statement, especially the recent creation of the National Adult Literacy Database.
The survey questions all focus on discovering information unavailable from any other source:

- Who teaches writing in each faculty?
- Is writing instruction required or even recommended as an option for students in the faculty?
- Have writing programs been growing or withering in the last decade?

Most of the questions were closed, with the exception of the last, which asked for reaction and comment on the issues raised in the rest of the questionnaire. Closed questions increase the response rate because they allow respondents to answer more quickly and less ambiguously. Of course, they also limit the range of answers, a situation that the final question of this survey was designed to help alleviate by providing respondents with a formal opportunity to elaborate or comment on the issues raised in the survey. Limiting the number of questions also worked to keep the survey brief and thus increase response rates.

An early draft of the survey was pretested by one of the deans in the final sample and a professor who had acted as an assistant department head. They indicated several problems with the initial survey, such as how they were asked to define "writing instruction." Would courses that "focus on writing" include only courses that were primarily about writing or would courses with a writing component also be included? Subsequent revisions of the survey defined a writing course as "a course that asks students to write frequently and focuses on improving writing skills" and kinds of writing instruction as "courses, tutorials, and writing centers." These reviewers also suggested that I should revise a question asking if programs had been expanded to ask also if programs had been discontinued, which in their view was more probable given the inadequate funding of universities in the seventies and
eighties. They also suggested that some room be left open for respondents to write general comments, a comment that takes the shape of the last question (number ten) in the final survey: "I would appreciate your using the space below to comment on any of the issues raised by this questionnaire."

The next stage of revisions centered around pretests of the complete survey package: an envelope containing a cover letter, the survey, and an addressed return envelope was distributed to six deans at one Canadian university. All six returned the survey within the allotted time and with few changes or questions about the survey. The survey packages were then assembled and mailed to 279 deans and administrative officers in the English-language universities and 63 deans in the eight French-language universities, a total of 330. After the initial response cycle (during which two-thirds of the respondents returned the survey), a follow-up letter and copy of the survey were sent to those who did not respond to the initial request for information. The follow-up process raised the response rate to over 80% (277 responses: 242 for the English-speaking universities and 35 for the French-language universities), thus making the results of the survey generalizable to the entire population.

Details of Case Study Methods

Case studies provide a way to explore in more depth and detail the context in which writing instruction operates. Robert K. Yin's Case Study Research (rev. ed.)

Though this was a valid suggestion, the results of the survey show that very few programs have been discontinued and that a steady increase seems to be the norm.
guided the design of the case studies, including orienting the case studies as exploratory and descriptive. Yin describes sources of evidence for case studies, such as documentation, interviews, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical settings of instruction, most of which were used in varying combinations in both case studies reported in this dissertation. He also describes data analysis methods such as pattern-matching, explanation building, and time-series analysis, all of which are used in the interpretation of data gathered in the case studies described in Chapters Four and Five.\textsuperscript{11} Data from the case studies provide some answers to questions that arise in the interpretation of the survey results, such as "What is the nature of writing instruction provided in literature/composition courses like the one offered at the University of New Brunswick?" By providing more information about some of the instruction mentioned in the surveys, the case studies deepen our understanding of the survey results.

Detailed examinations of two different writing programs (University of New Brunswick and the University of Winnipeg) offer a rich account of what writing instruction consists of in a variety of institutional settings in Canadian universities. The case study sites were selected on the basis of several criteria outlined below. Programs needed to

\begin{itemize}
  \item be well-developed (in terms of different components of instruction, such as writing centres, courses in the disciplines);
  \item represent different approaches from each other;
  \item serve a different kind of student body, from the non-traditional in Winnipeg to the very traditional in New Brunswick;
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{11} For more information on data gathering and data analysis for case study research, I refer the reader to Robert K. Yin, \textit{Case Study Research: Design and Methods} and the descriptions of data gathering and analysis in chapters four and five, pages 84-126.
• represent institutions from different geographical regions of the country;

• cover a range of different-sized institutions (Winnipeg lists 7815 total students; New Brunswick: 10,543);

• include institutions with differing histories (New Brunswick, one of the first universities founded in Canada, carries the largest burden of tradition of the two universities studied here).

Each case study strove to provide data about the three research questions that guide this study:

• In what contexts—institutional, social, ideological, and technological—is writing taught to undergraduates in Canadian universities?

• In the universities that teach writing formally, how is this instruction carried out?

• What definitions of writing does this instruction presuppose and promulgate?

In answer to the part of the first research question focusing on technological contexts, I visited the University of Winnipeg writing program, where the first-year rhetoric course is taught both traditionally and in a computer-based environment. This difference became a research focus during the site visit to determine how instructors, students, and administrators felt computerization affected instruction. In terms of the overall research design, these data address part of research question one: what is the technological context of teaching writing?

Similarly, because of the non-traditional student population at Winnipeg, another centre of interest and data gathering became ideological purposes for teaching writing. In the Winnipeg case, how might the teaching of writing be related to empowering students to challenge the present political and social power structure? What ideological influences showed up in the textbook (which the writing instructors authored collaboratively and produced locally)? Research focuses like these build a deeper and fuller understanding of how writing instruction exists in social and
cultural context, one of the research agendas defined at the SSHRC workshop in Toronto in 1979. 12

In answer to the second research question, the case studies gathered as much data as possible about each program's practice of writing instruction through site visits that included interviews with students, teachers, and administrators; class visits; and gathering examples of course syllabi, sample student essays, brochures, and administrative documents. This part of the data collection focused on research question two, "How is writing instruction carried out?" This research identifies the teaching of writing in the context of educational practice; more simply put, does each writing program teach writing as a process to be learned? Do the programs emphasize revision? What methods of evaluation are used? Do students always write alone or do they sometimes write collaboratively? Many of these questions applied to writing courses focusing on the practice of writing as taught at both of the case study sites. Another kind of instruction, writing tutorials in writing centres, also demanded another set of questions to identify the context of that instruction: were students free to attend or required to attend tutorials? What kind of resources did the centre offer students? Were there any peer tutors, and if so, what were their roles? Finally, a fourth set of questions guided interviews and visits to teachers of writing in disciplines other than English. At the University of New Brunswick, instructors in engineering answered questions about the importance of writing to their students, described the ways writing fit into their courses, and provided copies of assignments that they used.

12 See page two for more information and sources regarding this workshop.
Research question three, "What definitions of writing does this instruction presuppose and promulgate?", drew from the data outlined above. Definitions of writing emerged from a knowledge of the ideological and institutional, not to mention technological, context of the writing instruction provided at all three institutions. Interviews, together with textual analysis of written documents (exams, syllabi, brochures) and interview comments all contribute to a reliable and rich understanding of how each institution defines writing and the curricular implications of these definitions.

The site visits were organized around the individual schedules of informants, both for interviews and for class visits. Other data gathering included writing to the librarians at each institution before arriving for the site visit. These letters set up appointments and helped ensure efficient use of time in the library during site visits. Library work uncovered relevant historical documents, such as calendar descriptions, minutes from university senate documents, and textbooks used in writing courses.

A Multimethod Synthesis

Data gathered through each of the three methods described above--historical analysis, surveys, and case studies--provided information to fill in the map of writing instruction in Canada today. Table 1 outlines how each of the research methods contributes information toward answers to each of the three research questions.

Research question one, "What is the present state of writing instruction in Canadian universities?", called for survey research to best gather data of a broad cross-section of universities throughout Canada. The survey revealed the size of the teaching force in Canada, the value administrators put on the ability of their students
Table 1: Research Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the present state of writing instruction?</td>
<td>How is writing taught?</td>
<td>What definition of writing is used?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Analysis**

Historical analysis of recent events (1970-90) tell us about writing instruction today through an examination of institutional and social contexts for instruction that are still prevalent.

Written history provides comparative data about past instructional practices in different social and institutional contexts (19th century).

Historical analysis uncovers past definitions of writing as these definitions continue to influence present practice.

**Survey Data**

Surveys provide the best way of collecting information about the number and variety of courses, instructor status, factors influencing program development.

Surveys provided some insight into how writing gets taught at a wide cross-section of institutions.

Survey comments provided information about the definitions of writing invoked by different responders.

**Case Studies**

Case studies provide in-depth examples of writing programs in action, the attitudes and beliefs of the people who run them.

Case studies provide opportunities for viewing the ways particular programs teach writing.

Case studies provide the most creditable information about definitions of writing used today through the multiple opportunities to see instruction in action and question participants.
to write well, and identified some of the factors that affect writing programs across the nation. Historical analysis revealed some of the factors that affect the present state, such as the funding cutbacks of the last twenty years. One of the results of the lack of adequate funding is a policy that forbids curriculum expansion. At some institutions, the lack of funding for new courses means that proposals for new courses--such as in composition--necessitates the removal of a literature course from the curriculum in English department settings (Hunt 17-18). Recent history, then, helps explains present practice. Case studies provided data sets that overlapped the survey results but which also extended those results by placing them in institutional histories and provided interviews with a wider variety of informants about the writing programs mentioned in the survey.

Research question two--"How is writing instruction carried out?"--also draws upon data from all three research methods. Case studies of the different university writing programs at New Brunswick and Winnipeg provide the primary data sets to help answer this question. The case studies allowed me to interview instructors about their goals, how they coordinate evaluation with learning, and what factors affect their ability to teach well (salary, budget, office space, rank within the institution). The survey of instructional practice reveals the extent of the concerns of instructors as well as the extent of instructional practices. Finally, historical information about each institution's teaching of writing provides context that helps explain present practices and the factors that inhibit or support change.
Research question three—"What definitions of writing appear to operate in Canadian universities?"—relies for answers primarily on case studies and survey responses. The survey responses often included comments that specifically address this question, either from an out-of-date perspective (as handwriting/penmanship, spelling, and punctuation) or from an informed viewpoint (as writing-to-learn/learning-to-write or making knowledge in the disciplines). Case studies provided definitions that emerged through interviews, syllabi, and course or program content. Historical evidence, particularly the recent history of conferences such as the "Learning to Write" conference in Ottawa and the 1979 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council "Report on Language and Literacy in Canada," provides written evidence of competing definitions of writing.

For each research question, then, three research methods provide data to sift and evaluate, data that provide varying amounts of information about each topic, and data that contribute to accurate and important findings. The ability to compare results from each of the three methods constitutes the distinctive advantage of a multimethod research design. For an exploratory study such as this dissertation, the multimethod approach also offers the advantage of mapping the territory of writing instruction in Canadian universities more fully by integrating the maps of others into a larger, more detailed, and more accurate chart.

**Overview of the Research Results: Chapter Summaries**

Chapter Two provides an overview of how writing has been taught in Canadian universities from the establishment of universities until the present in both both French and English institutions. The first French colleges worked with seminaries to provide a basic liberal arts education in the tradition of the French
Jesuit classical college. Rhetoric and belles-lettres formed an integral part of the curriculum at these colleges, so much so that two of the eight years of instruction bear the names "Rhetoric" and "Belles-Lettres." As these terms announce, rhetoric and writing instruction combined literary reading and criticism. This curriculum remained in place—and substantially unchanged—well into the twentieth century. In English universities, rhetoric was taught as an oral and written system useful for training lawyers and preachers in the early part of the nineteenth-century. By the end of that century, English literature and composition supplanted rhetoric as the practice of oral and written communication; the result in the early part of the twentieth century has been a narrow emphasis on bellettristic rhetoric/criticism and an equally narrow conception of composition as correct style and form.

Chapter Three presents the results of my national survey of writing programs. This survey summarizes data about courses and other instruction (including writing centres and writing across the curriculum programs) from all of the English and French-speaking universities. The survey gathered data about the rank of the people who provide instruction, the kind of support institutions provide to encourage research by instructors, the kind of courses each faculty requires or encourages students to take, the trends toward expanding or contracting programs, and the factors affecting decisions to fund writing programs.

The fourth and fifth chapters provide a contextualized view of writing instruction by examining writing programs at two universities: the University of Winnipeg and the University of New Brunswick. These case studies detail specific examples of how writing programs develop historically and describe the instructional practices of each program in the context of each institution. They also provide,
through interviews with students, teachers, and administrators in these programs, important data about the nature of writing instruction in these Canadian universities.

The final chapter discusses major issues raised throughout the study, including issues from the chapters examining the history, present practices, and case studies of teaching writing. Chapter Two, on the history of writing instruction, raises questions about the kind of rhetoric necessary today: should it be rhetoric as an oral and written practical art as in the nineteenth-century, an art of belleuristic criticism, or some kind of new textual rhetoric such as the one Susan Miller proposes in *Rescuing the Subject*? The surveys reported in Chapter Three raise questions about the status of teaching writing in Canadian universities: what implications follow when most writing instructors come from the untenured ranks? Chapters Four and Five, which detail the case studies of two writing programs, identify rhetoric and composition theory as the missing component of many writing programs and raise the question of what can be done to change that situation. All of these issues must be addressed if writing instruction in Canadian universities can adapt to the changing society and the changing role within this society that these universities seek to serve.

A much fuller, if necessarily incomplete, understanding of writing instruction and its place in the Canadian academy and society follows from an examination of writing instruction’s history as a discipline, or perhaps more accurately, as first a discipline (Rhetoric) and then a sub-discipline (of English) before what I believe is now its re-emergence as an integral and central part of undergraduate education. The next chapter seeks to outline a history of writing instruction by tracing the development of some of the key ideological positions--positions such as `writing cannot be taught' or that `the study of English consists only of the study of literature
in English'-- that present-day university administrators and teachers articulate. The history, then, helps to identify the arguments of those who would keep the study of writing impoverished in Canadian universities.
CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF WRITING INSTRUCTION IN CANADA

The problem with universalized pedagogies is that they disguise and compromise the context of teaching. French students are not American students; what may be said about composition in French in France may not necessarily be said about composition in America. (Sharon Crowley)

The difficulty Sharon Crowley poses above splinters into multiple problematics when applied to the Canadian context. Writing instruction in Canada takes place in French in Quebec, in French in Alberta, in English in Quebec, and in both French and English in Ontario. As Lysianne Gagnon points out, writing about Quebec French, "Written French is much more formal and complex than spoken French, and the gap between the two is much wider than in English. It is possible for someone with an average knowledge of English as a second language to write a clear and correct letter dealing with simple concepts. The same would be unthinkable in French."¹ Any history that purports to describe Canada must be doubly and triply suspect under the caveat that Crowley offers and that Gagnon supports, and this one is no exception. To uncover the disguises that compromise our understanding of the teaching of writing at Canadian universities, this chapter will perform two tasks, as both an "archaeological and rhetorical" enterprise.² In an archaeological sense, this chapter uncovers markers of change in the curriculum such as course descriptions in

¹ See "In language, everything is a question of power," Globe and Mail, Saturday November 3, 1990: D2.

calendars, student examination answers, and debate about the purpose of a liberal education. In this archaeological evidence lie many stories of the tradition of writing instruction in Canadian universities.

As a rhetorical activity, this chapter constitutes a history that reflects the issues of our times (1991) by acknowledging the marginalized voices of women, minority cultures, and French Canadians in the literature about writing instruction. Their absence from most histories about writing instruction needs to be identified because, as these groups have either emerged or asserted their agendas for education in Canada, the nature of writing instruction has begun to change. Demographic change affects the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg, which serves a student population that is "statistically unlikely to gain admission to universities" and "the broad range of ethnic communities in the city" (only 40% of the population is ethnically anglophone). Another example of demographic changes concerns the gender of the teaching population. With the increasing participation rates of women in universities, more women have graduated and pursued advanced degrees, particularly in the humanities. Women have changed the demographic profile of those who teach English and particularly writing courses because writing courses have been the least desirable courses to teach and the most likely to be given to female instructors. At the University of Winnipeg, for example, seven of the nine members of the Writing Program are women. The Writing Program uses a collaborative writing model which in turn relies on theories of writing and teaching derived at least partially from feminist theories of writing and subjectivity.  

---

3 See Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford, *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990), pages 132-136 where the authors describe dialogic (that is, not
demographic changes can cause changes in curriculum, particularly instruction in writing, as the example from the University of Winnipeg demonstrates. ⁴

Larger contextual factors, such as the decline of oral debate and the rise of print literacy and electronic technology, have also contributed to the changing status of writing instruction; in Quebec, the "Quiet Revolution" in the 1960's led to the changing of the Jesuit-model humanities education (the study of rhetoric and belles-lettres) to a more modern curriculum. Another important contextual characteristic concerns the purpose of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Anglo-Canadian universities. As Robin Harris points out, both French and English universities had as principal purposes the defense of their respective cultures. The French sought to protect their culture against British influences, particularly after the conquest in 1760 and the efforts to establish British educational and religious institutions in Quebec (Harris 16-17). The English sought to establish institutions that would save their youth from the perfidious evils of republicanism rampant in the rebel colonies to the south:

The founders of these institutions [the King's Colleges at Windsor, Fredericton, and Toronto] were impelled by precisely the same motive as inspired their French Canadian contemporaries who were at this time busily engaged in founding collèges classiques; the preservation of a tradition, in this case, the British tradition. These colleges, too, in their own way, were to be 'citadelles nationales,' the enemy being a republican United States rather than a Protestant English-speaking materialism. (Harris 27)

⁴ For details about the University of Winnipeg's Writing Program, see Chapter Four.
It is within this context--of struggle between colonies and former colonies, the conquered and the conquerors--that university education and writing instruction developed.

The focus of writing instruction today is shifting from preserving culture to encouraging literacy. Pressure from employers concerned about literacy in the workplace together with pressure from government Ministries of Education and reports from the universities themselves about students' ability to write all contribute to new programs, new tests, and an increasing awareness of the intransigence and depth of the task of improving student writing ability. Nevertheless, fundamental differences divide university administrators today in their attitudes towards writing instruction. Some universities avowedly disclaim any responsibility to offer writing instruction for credit (McMaster). One administrator wrote "If students cannot write, they should not be at university." At others (Waterloo, Alberta, British Columbia), faculty are hired and promoted on the basis of their ability to teach and conduct research in the areas of rhetoric and composition, and their work carries weight within the academy. One administrator who represents this attitude wrote "We are committed to improving our students' and ourselves in this centrally important area [writing instruction]."

---

5 For example, see C. J. Norman's report entitled "The Queen's English" and the subsequent furor including articles in the Globe and Mail. Labatt's Breweries, Placer Dome (a mining company), Bell Canada, Canadian National Railways, Domtar and Canadair are just a few examples of companies actively participating in literacy programs.

6 Wayne Whillier, Associate Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, McMaster University made this comment in a letter (4 April, 1990) sent in response to the survey reported in Chapter Three.
The administrator who sees no need or place for universities to provide writing instruction clearly conceives of writing instruction as remedial, and writing skill as something that should have been "mastered" before students finished secondary school. The administrator who views writing and writing instruction as centrally important to the work of a university conceives of writing as a way of shaping knowledge. How did we arrive at this tension, and the subsequent policies and curricula that ensue, between conflicting conceptions of writing?

In the archaeological sense introduced at the beginning of this chapter, the outline of history that this chapter presents identifies some specifics of how students in Canadian universities have been taught how to write. As a rhetorical activity, this chapter attempts to link these specifics with some of the larger, contextual factors affecting Canada and Canadian universities. These rhetorical links examine writing instruction within the context of universities as church institutions, as citadels of national culture, and as extensions of the state.

The Movement from Church to State Institutions: 1735-1900

Writing instruction in Canadian universities began, of course, no sooner that the universities themselves. Dates marking the earliest instruction reflect the settlement and development of communities. The first college was established in Quebec in 1635, but it did not offer college level classes until the 1660s (Harris 15). The College of New Brunswick obtained a charter in 1787 but did not begin offering college-level instruction until the 1820s, and a similar college in Windsor, Nova Scotia (King's College-Windsor) began granting degrees in 1807 (Harris 28). King's College in Toronto obtained a charter in 1827 and began offering college-level courses in 1843 (Harris 30). The University of Manitoba began its existence in 1877
as an administrative unit to coordinate three existing denominational colleges (Gregor and Wilson 33). All of these institutions were tied to religious denominations; their education served primarily religious goals.

Jesuits established the first college in Quebec (which grew into Université Laval) in 1635, one year before Harvard College. With this college, a system of education began that continued uninterrupted into the middle of the twentieth century, a system modelled on the classical college curriculum of seventeenth-century France (Henchey and Burgess 22). This curriculum consisted of six elements divided into two areas, *lettres* (grammaire, belles lettres, rhetorique) and *philosophie* (philosophie, sciences, mathematique) organized by year as the following chart shows (Audet 232; Harris 14; Magnuson 42).

**Table 2: The Classical College Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eléments Latins</td>
<td>Grade 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Syntaxe</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Méthode</td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Versification</td>
<td>Grade 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belles-Lettres</td>
<td>First Year University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rhétorique</td>
<td>Second Year University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Philosophie I</td>
<td>Third Year University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Philosophie II</td>
<td>Fourth Year University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four years form the secondary area (secondary to primary school) from which students must pass an exam to continue on to the college stage or last four years of study outlined above. Students would generally start the first year of the
classical curriculum when they were thirteen years old, and the college stage at age seventeen.

The *grammaire* section of the curriculum sought to prepare the student to read in French, Latin, and Greek through the analysis of words, phrases, and paragraphs (Audet 215). According to the University of Montreal Faculty of Arts calendar of 1946,

Cette discipline, note le prospectus, propre à notre enseignement classique est une méthode nécessaire de recherche, un exercice éminemment formateur de la raison, à condition que celle-ci ait le temps de faire la synthèse des connaissances acquises par l'analyse. L'analyse employée seule resterait stérile; elle est complétée par la synthèse qui oblige l'esprit à recomposer, à créer à son tour, en mettant en jeu, avec la raison, la mémoire, l'imagination, la sensibilité. Même dans les classes de Grammaire, l'élève s'entraîne à cette double méthode, non seulement par le thème et la version, mais par le commentaire des textes et l'exercice de la composition. (Quoted in Audet 215)\(^7\)

In the two years of the study of lettres at university, the students proceed to acquire

"le sens des valeurs, le respect de la vérité, l'amour du bien, la perception de ce qui est élevé et délicat" (Audet 216)\(^8\). In the first of these two years, students

l'élève perfectionne d'abord sa langue maternelle, il étudie les procédés de style et de composition, il étudie moyens d'expression qui font la valeur d'une page, grâce à l'analyse littéraire des textes latins, grecs et français; il devra ensuite, dans des compositions personnelles, s'enforcer d'appliquer ces

---

7 Translation: "This discipline, notes the prospectus, appropriately sees that classical education is a necessary method for research, an exercise eminently formed by reason, a condition which they [students] would have long enough to make a synthesis of the knowledge acquired through analysis. Analysis functions only to remain objective; it is completed through the synthesis which must repay the spirit, to create in its own style, and to bring out in play with reason, memory, imagination, and sensibility. In the same way as the classes in grammaire, the student learns through this double method, not only the theme and the text, but through the commentary on texts and through the exercise of composition."

8 Translation: "the sense of values, the respect of truth, the love of goodness, the perception of that which is elevated and delicate."
They then proceed to the study of rhetoric, having mastered the means of reading and writing in French, Greek and Latin. This reading aims to "permis à l'élève de prendre contact avec les grands maîtres de la pensée humaine et de dégager de leur commerce un idéal humain complète par les lecons de l'Histoire que le christianisme vient au besoin rectifier et perfectionner" (Audet 216).¹⁰

The curriculum outlined above, by virtue of its standardization, formed a model duplicated throughout Quebec in French-language colleges that was to last with only minor revisions well into the twentieth century. The college and seminary founded in Quebec City became the first French-language university, Université Laval, in 1851. The second French-language university, Université de Montréal, wasn't founded until 1921. Both offered the classical college program as the "only degree program offered by the faculties of arts of these universities [Laval and Montreal]" (Harris 508). By virtue of being the only means of obtaining a bachelor of arts, the classical college program formed a prerequisite for entry to professional schools, such as law, medicine, and theology. The program was offered almost exclusively by schools controlled by Bishops of the Roman Catholic church. As late as the early 1950s, the teaching of the classical course (including Latin, then a

---

²⁹ Translation: "the student having first perfected his maternal language, studies the procedures of style and of composition, the level of expression which gives the page value, grace to the literary analysis of Latin, Greek, and French texts; it has to follow, in personal compositions, they embed and apply this process, invent and explain in a logical fashion the ideas of their reflections."

¹⁰ Translation: "permits the student to make contact with the great masters of human thought and to engage in a free and easy way in their discussions of ideal humanity through the lessons of history which Christianity has come to rectify and perfect."
necessary prerequisite for completion of the classical course) in the public schools of the province could only be allowed with the permission of the local Bishop.

English Canada has its own, separate story of development, but it is a story that also includes important ties between religion and education. Thomas McCulloch, the first president of Dalhousie University (established 1838), arrived in the Maritimes in 1803 to find no public education, no universities (except for King's College, Halifax, which restricted admission to those conforming to Church of England vows), no qualified instructors, few materials (books, paper, ink), and high immigration rates (Taylor 70-74). In 1809 McCulloch set up Pictou Academy as an alternative to the restricted, denominational training offered at King's, which included in the statutes of the university the following requirement:

No degree shall be conferred till the candidate shall have taken the oaths of allegiance and obedience to the statutes of the University, and shall have subscribed to the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, and the three articles contained in the thirty-ninth canon of the Synod of London held in the year of our Lord, 1603.11

Similar statutes can be found in the charter of King's College, Fredericton. McCulloch's educational philosophy promoted open access to non-sectarian education, a position based on the belief that all people can be improved by teaching.

Rhetoric became the focus for this teaching because it enabled the communication of knowledge to others, a goal valued highly in a society that needed to train educators, ministers, and lawyers as a way of developing social institutions (Hubert 57-60). Embedded in this focus on communication was the ideal of rhetoric as public discourse—teachers, preachers, and pleaders all performed publicly. Similar

goals prevailed in the United States at that time. As S. M. Halloran and others have argued, public discourse was an ideal of rhetorical training in the United States after the initial influence of Ramism in the seventeenth century and before the rise of belles-lettres in the nineteenth century (Halloran; Lunsford; Reid).

In Ontario, conditions similar to those McCulloch found also prevailed: textbooks were scarce, writing instruments crude, and school facilities primitive at the start of the nineteenth century. The following anecdote reflects on teaching conditions around 1850:

... no training whatsoever was required to be "qualified" as a Teacher ... My first School was in the Province of New Brunswick, at Cole's Island, on the beautiful Washademoak in Queen's County, Parish of Johnston, where, at the county Town I received my license, (at the mature age of 16), to "teach the young ideas." ... The Books consisted of the New Testament, Primer, and Walkingame's Arithmetic ... My first Ontario School was a more pretentious affair, but not so agreeable ... In the neighborhood they were all pro-Yankee in feeling--called United States: "the other side." All their previous teachers had been Yankees, and "they had no use for a Bluenose." Their School Books were all Yankee, and so was their pronunciation. (Hodgins 309)

Certainly, conditions such as these were the norm outside of the established urban areas and for the great majority of people.

However, the children of those who controlled the government, social scene, and religion of York (Toronto) experienced vastly different educational circumstances. The wealthy and powerful group of thirty-nine families (the "Family Compact") established Upper Canada College then worked to ensure that the proposed University of Toronto would remain under their cultural and religious control:

Like so many other institutions, what ultimately became the University of Toronto was an idea long before it became a reality. A land grant of about a quarter of a million acres was set aside for its support in 1797. The subsequent years saw a gradual increase in pressure for definite action, until a
royal charter was finally granted in 1827. Religious controversy, however, was to cause a further period of delay before classes were opened. The problem was that John Strachan, with his influence in the governing Family Compact, had tried to ensure that the new institution would be under the control of the Anglican Church. (Fleming, 142-3; see also Hubert, 180)

The publicly-elected governing assembly objected to Strachan’s motives and "petitioned the King to cancel the charter on the grounds that the benefits would be confined to a favoured few" (Fleming 143). Eventually each denomination had to establish its own college and funding while a central University College taught arts courses. By the 1890s many of the denominational colleges entered into federation agreements with the University of Toronto, albeit at the loss of control of curriculum and examinations in all but courses on religious knowledge (Fleming 144).

This surrender of control marks a pivotal point in the evolution of Canadian universities as institutions. Non-denominational and state supported institutions traditionally accept a wider cross-section of students and establish broader goals for education than private, religiously-affiliated institutions. Changes in the goals of the institution and the demographics of the student body are among the factors that affect how writing gets taught (witness the controversy over the Harvard entrance examinations of the 1890s and the subsequent changes in writing instruction: Reid, Lunsford, Connors, Berlin). The University of New Brunswick, for example, was chartered first as the Academy and then the College of New Brunswick before a royal charter in 1829 established it as King’s College, New Brunswick. The charter called for tests of religious fealty to the Church of England, tests that were abolished only in 1846 (MacKirdy 33). Still, the public perceived the institution as an "aristocratic and
Anglican preserve" until a new charter established the University of New Brunswick as a non-denominational institution (Pacey 60).¹²

Many of the present universities share this history in some way. King's College (Halifax) only accepted students who were firm believers in the Church of England doctrine. The University of Ottawa, originally a Roman Catholic institution chartered by the Pope in 1889, didn't turn over control of most of the university to a lay board until 1965. Wilfrid Laurier University's former names include Waterloo Lutheran University (1959), Waterloo College of Arts (1924), and the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary (1910).

Institutions founded in the 1950s and 1960s, however, tend to have evolved from secular rather than religious bases. York University in Toronto was a response to the demand for higher education within the metropolitan Toronto area that the University of Toronto simply could not accommodate. Brock University in St. Catharines similarly filled the demand for higher education in the Niagara peninsula but without the overt influence of religious colleges and their traditions. And the University of Waterloo evolved from the efforts of a small group of industrialists in Waterloo who were dissatisfied with the education in technological areas offered at the only other local institution, then called Waterloo Lutheran University.

**Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in Anglo-Canadian Universities**

Rhetoric courses in the early colleges served first to prepare the elite of the colony to serve in professional occupations such as clergy, law, business, medicine.

(Pacey 60; Firth 29-31). In New Brunswick, for example, the existence of King's College at Fredericton was subjected to vigorous attacks from those who saw its classical curriculum as much too far removed from practical education in agriculture and engineering (Firth 30). Concerns like these can be better understood if we explore what went on in the classrooms by examining the courses of study at several maritime universities—Dalhousie, Acadia, Mount Allison, and the University of New Brunswick.

The Reverend James Somerville, L.L.D., delivered the first convocation address at the University of New Brunswick. He summarized the course of study as heavily classical, with a great emphasis on "Greek and Roman Classiks" (including orations of [A]Eschines and Demosthenes; two books of Cicero's De Oratore; five books of Quintilian), pure mathematics (trigonometry, geometry, algebra, calculus), and logic (Locke, Reid, Beattie) (740). In addition, Somerville offers this advice to those destined for "public Speakers":

I would earnestly recommend to you, a repeated and attentive perusal of Aristotle's Three Books of Rhetorick; Cicero De Oratore; and Quintilian's institutes. With the latter every scholar should be intimately acquainted, as it is perhaps the most perfect treatise of its kind extant. Read with care the whole Twelve Books, but more especially, the Eighth Book to the end. If you do this, you will gradually find your Taste to become more correct, and your style more neat, pure, and harmonious. You may derive much benefit from the Work of Dr. Blair on Rhetorick and Belles Lettres; and from the Second Volume of Dr. Beattie's Elements of Moral Science: although there are scarcely any observations in these two respectable Writers but what may be traced to the great Antients before mentioned." (New Brunswick Royal Gazette, March 11, 1928)

In the early part of the nineteenth century, this kind of neoclassical curriculum predominated. The inclusion of Blair reflects the popularity of Blair's textbook in North America (see Kitzhaber 81; Guthrie 61-62) and the challenge to Greek and
Latin language and literature as subjects of study through the belles-lettres movement.

In a commemorative oration delivered in 1862, J. Marshall d’Avray (Professor of Modern Languages and Literature) described the educational opportunities available to students at the University of New Brunswick. We should note his title—professor of modern languages (French, English) and literature—and the change in mission from the neoclassical education described in 1828 above. He remarks in his address that writing instruction follows the study of the history of the English language and literature,

... A study full of charms to the eager enquirer after an accurate acquaintance with the language and literature of that great country to which we all turn with pride and affection as the "Home" of our ancestors. A study which affords an immense mass of most valuable information in the history and the rise and progress of literary effort from the first rude Bardic songs of the Celtic nations... to the poetry of Chaucer, Surrey, Sydney, Spencer, Shakespeare; from the harsh inversions and obscure metaphors of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles to the polished, clear, and flowing sentences of an Allison [Addison?], or a Macauley—and in order that the lessons thus learnt—the principles of elegant diction thus acquired may be practically applied, one lecture every week is devoted to composition—to that direct instruction in the art which alone can confer the skill to avoid the errors and to imitate the excellencies of our best writers (The Head Quarters, July 2, 1862: 2.)

This passage raises a number of issues that are still with us today, such as which group(s) are included and excluded from "our ancestors"; why no literature written by women is mentioned; why the study of language should be primarily a study of literature; and, finally, why composition should be reduced to one lecture each week devoted to the avoidance of errors and the imitation of excellencies?

D'Avray's motives, one can imagine, include convincing his audience that the study of modern languages and literature is worth while, a study of value equal to the study of Greek and Latin languages and literature which formed the reigning
paradigm. Given the turmoil that preceded the establishment of the University of New Brunswick just three years earlier, D'Avray's position would have been far from the accepted one. Earlier in the essay he remarks that the "Mother Country was to furnish the colony with models and guides" (1) and that "few of the masses, however highly educated, anywhere possess the innate force of individual character, or are ever placed in such circumstances as enable them to rise to distinction" (1). The transmission of culture, not the development of minds and ideas, begins to compete for a primary position among the goals of universities, and, within a few years, displaces instruction in writing as a productive public discourse altogether.

A clear instance of this displacement occurred at the University of Toronto. In the late 1840s, Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric* was listed as the standard text for the rhetoric course, which remained an integral part of a student's education through the 1860s and into the 1880s:

The pass [or three-year B.A. degree] student's program . . . focused on literary history in the first two years, with composition added in the second. The pattern for pass students was, therefore, that followed by King's College in London, with composition treated as an advanced course. Honours students wrote more than pass students: they had composition in the second year. After 1863, honours students wrote weekly exercises. Composition for pass students was thus presented as a senior "finishing" course, much as rhetoric had been in many classical programs. But for honours students, composition was an integral part of the curriculum. (Hubert 183-4)

Robin S. Harris notes that chairs in English first appeared in the 1880s at Dalhousie, Queen's, and Toronto (138). The work of these professors, however, was not defined by establishing a dichotomy between literature and composition; literature and composition were regarded as "different branches of the study of English language and literature" (138). It should come as no surprise, then, that the kind of rhetoric being taught at this point was no longer rhetoric as public discourse but rather
rhetoric as belles-lettres appreciation or criticism. Early nineteenth-century rationales for writing instruction described the goal of students' education in oratory as speaking in public, and a news story in the *Acadia Athenaeum* in 1875 takes this as a commonplace when it describes the "Sophomore Exhibition, an old, we had almost said time-honored institution" that included orations, music, and readings:

> Public speaking, in some one or other of its several departments, being the aim of the majority of college students at the present day, we think it well to bring them occasionally on the public platform, and thus give an opportunity for the cultivation of their oratorical powers. In this college each student is required to appear before the public twice in his course of study to deliver an oration. (28)

As the century drew to a close, and enrollments rose one thousand percent over two generations, the community atmosphere of the "Sophomore Exhibition" gave way to examination methods much less suited to individual attention and which did not consume the time and energy that graduating classes of 13 students allowed (the size of the graduating class at the University of New Brunswick in 1893).

What impact did the changing class sizes have on the theory that informed writing instruction at the turn of the century? Andrea A. Lunsford, writing about a similar change in education practice in colleges and universities in the United States, identified the advantages of the oral system of teaching and evaluation as "strongly interdisciplinary, bring reading, writing, and speaking together to deal with issues of public concern," as unifying theory and practice, and as reflecting "a dynamic, collaborative learning model" ("Writing Assessment" 5). The separation of writing and speaking that the new evaluation method enforced resulted in a dramatic loss of purpose: writing became not primarily a means of influencing important public affairs but merely a way to demonstrate proficiency. Divorced from its original purpose in rhetorical instruction, writing shifted its focus from discovering and sharing knowledge to being able to produce a "correct" essay on demand; lost the theoretical framework
that related language, action, and belief; and became increasingly preoccupied with standards of usage, a tendency that grew, by the turn of the century, into a virtual cult of correctness. (6)

Nan Johnson's description of what composition consisted of in Canadian universities between 1900 and 1925 offers circumstantial evidence to confirm that a similar movement was at hand in Canada: "'Composition' courses covered punctuation, 'proper construction of sentences,' 'the structure of the whole essay,' 'effective ordering of thought,' and 'accurate employment of a good English vocabulary'" ("Rhetoric and Belles Lettres" 868). As Johnson points out, this period (1900 to 1925) in the history of writing instruction in Canadian universities was characterized by composition as correctness and rhetoric as belles lettres.

Charles G. D. Roberts, professor of English at King's College (Windsor), wrote in 1887 that "The true wisdom which education aims to confer consists mainly in the ability to handle the facts of life; and this wisdom, I believe, to be attained most effectively through persistent contact with the wisest that has been thought and said,—that is, the best literature" (Roberts 41). Roberts goes on to make it clear that he advocates the reading of English literature, and that this reading forms one of two ways to teach composition: "by persistent and reiterative study of good models, and by assiduous practice" (41). Close reading, not wide reading, of the best English literature will, according to Roberts, help students develop a "pure, easy, and telling style" (41). Roberts' writing exercises included having students "read over certain pages [of a literary model] till the contents are familiar without being actually memorized. Then the effort of the pupils should be directed to writing down the substance of these pages, not in their own words entirely, but as far as possible in the words of the author" (42). Clearly, this kind of writing instruction does not focus on
the classical canons of invention, arrangement, or delivery; only style and memory remain, and memory only as an adjunct of style, not as a help to delivery.

**Composition in Twentieth-Century French-Language Universities**

The program of education which had lasted literally for centuries in Quebec changed dramatically between 1960 and 1970 with the abolition of the classical college system of education and the implementation of *colleges d'enseignement général et professionnel* (CEGEPs). The CEGEPs share some characteristics with two year colleges in the United States, the British Sixth Form, and the French Lycee, but differ in their unique amalgamation of "advanced technical preparation, general education, pre-university study, continuing education, and community service" (Henchey and Burgess 105). In the university system, they provide two years of pre-university work, including what previously had been the first year of studies. In effect, this change shortened the university bachelor's programs to three years from four. These new colleges resulted from many pressures, including demographics: in the years between 1961 and 1981 enrollments in post-secondary education increased 250%, from 66,000 to 250,000 (Henchey and Burgess 112). In 1961, for example, the classical colleges enrolled only 18% of the 13 year-olds in the province, and many of this group of 13 year-olds failed to complete the course (Magnuson 42). In addition, the classical colleges attracted "a disproportionately high number of students from upper- and middle-class families"; these middle and upper-class students (mostly boys) also tended to complete the course and go on to university (Magnuson 42). The growth in enrolments of women also increased, from a ratio of ten men to each woman student in 1955-56 to three men to each woman student (Magnuson, 43).
In addition to changes in demographics, major cultural changes within Quebec demanded and forced changes in the educational system. Known as the "Quiet Revolution," this social movement transformed Quebec completely. It was driven by changes in the economy from an agriculturally-based rural population to an urban, service-sector population. One of the consequences brought French-speaking Quebecers face-to-face with "barriers that seemingly prevented them from reaching the heights in those occupations that a liberal capitalist society most esteems. . . . 60 per cent of the difference in income between francophones and anglophones in Quebec derived from discrimination in favour of anglophones for high-level positions" (Bothwell, Drummond, and English 268). In politics, these inequities found expression in demands by Quebec for a special status within Confederation, demands that have culminated in the recent furor over the Meech Lake constitutional talks and agreement that failed to be ratified. The Premier of Quebec in 1962, Jean Lesage, set the precedent for such a special status by negotiating a pension plan agreement with the federal government that allowed Quebec to "opt-out" of any federal social plan but still retain the right to an amount of funds equal to that given to any other province which did adopt the federal plan. As a result, Lesage claimed that "Quebec, finally, could be recognized as a province which has a statut spécial in Confederation, and I have succeeded" (quoted in Bothwell, Drummond, and English 273).

In education, the church controlled the classical colleges. Even as late as 1967-68, of the 81 classical colleges 79 were run by clergy of one sort or another and enrolled four times more students than the public system—51,265 to 13,802 (Magnuson 41, 44). By 1983-84 the figures had reversed, with almost 90% (139,000)
of students pursuing post-secondary education enrolled in public institutions and 78,000 of these students pursuing pre-university studies (Henchey and Burgess 103).

Today, university writing instruction presents quite a different profile from that of the late fifties and early sixties. The Université de Montréal offers a minor programme within the B. A. spécialisé en études françaises called "Mineur en pratiques d'écriture." This program, which seems to be a study of literary writing, includes courses on "Les Ecrivans Par Eux-Memes," "Langue et Litterature," "Comment Redriger," and "L'Art De La Prose" from the French department and options such as "Ethnographie de la Communication" from Anthropology, "Theories de la Communication" from Communication, and "Philosophie et Ecriture" from Philosophy. The descriptions for these courses indicate a theory of writing vastly different from the scholasticism of the Jesuit model of writing instruction that had been dominant. The following course descriptions provide further evidence of the change in focus.

FRA 1011: Usage et clarte

Revision des difficultes de la langue ecrite (orthographe, accords, syntax, vocabulaire) par des exercises individualises. Explication du systeme grammatical (linguistique appliquee au francais).

FRA 1013: La redaction

Exercices individuels et analyse collective de problems concrets particuliers.

FRA 1014: T. P. les ecrivains par eux-memes


FRA 1951: Langue ecrite, enseignement sur mesure repartis sur 2 trim.
Exercises individualises par ordinateur sur l'orthographe, les accords, la construction des phrases, et le choix des termes.\(^{13}\)

Students in these courses work on the processes of writing and reading collectively as well as individually, and the concept of students drafting essays and studying theories of writing certainly marks this instruction as radically different from what preceded it in French-language universities in Canada.

In addition to this program and these courses, the Department of Communication offers major and minor programs in communication:

Le programme de mineur en sciences de la communication offre à la fois des cours pratiques et théoriques permettant à l’étudiant de développer des compétences dans l’analyse de médias de se familiariser avec les diverses théories de la communication et d’acquérir une méthode de travail scientifique. Il constitue également un complément intéressant pour divers autres programmes d’études.

Le programme de majeur vise à former des intervenants dans les processus de conception et de réalisation de stratégies de communication et de recherche en communication. Les cours offerts couvrent donc les grands cadres théoriques (traditionnels et modérés) de la communication les politiques et les stratégies d’intervention et de recherche dans les secteurs des organisations et des nouvelles technologies ainsi que la connaissance des pratiques médiatiques. Ce programme est un bon point de départ pour tout étudiant qui veut poursuivre des études avancées en communication.\(^{14}\)


\(^{14}\) Translation: The minor program in communication sciences offers at the same time practical and theoretical courses that allow the student to develop skill in media analysis and familiarize themselves with diverse theories of communication.
Again, this program offers study of theories of communication rather than the study of belles-lettres and style. It also radically changes the social setting of communication from the school-room and the study of literature to the workplace and the study of modern technologies of communication.

As part of the result of the survey of Canadian university writing programs reported in the next chapter, respondents attached copies of many policy documents to their responses. Two documents published by the Conférence des Recteurs et des Principaux des Universités du Québec provide direct policy statements about spoken and written French: "La Connaissance de la Langue Chez les Étudiants Universitaires" (1986) and "Fiches sur les Politiques Universitaires Concernant La Connaissance de la Langue" (1990). Unlike the English-language universities, French-language universities have developed policies to cope with the failure of students to possess an adequate mastery of language ("Connaissance" 3, 13). The committee that wrote this report defined an adequate mastery of the language of instruction as

---

and to acquire a method for scientific work. It functions as well as an interesting complement for various other programs of study.

The major program aims to make interventions in the process of and realization of strategies of communication and of research in communication. The courses offer coverage of the major theoretical frameworks (traditional and modern) of communication and of the new technologies as well as the knowledge of media practices. This program is a good departure point for all students who wish to pursue advanced studies in communication.
Maitriser la langue... connaître les règles et procédés qui en
determinent l'usage au plan orthographique, morphologique,
syntaxique et lexical et permettent, tant à l'oral qu'à l'écrit, d'exprimer
clairement des idées et de les organiser en un ensemble cohérent. Il
s'agit d'une compétence de base, que pré suppose l'apprentissage des
normes de rédaction ou de présentation propres aux diverses
disciplines. (13)15

While acknowledging that the factors that have impeded students from developing
this mastery may lie outside the university, the committee maintained that an
adequate knowledge of the language of instruction is indispensable for students to
pursue their studies (13). Consequently, the committee wrote eight recommendations
to establish policies aimed at developing student writing and speaking skills. These
recommendations propose immediate admission restrictions for students who cannot
pass entrance tests, eventual restructuring of the education system to force students to
demonstrate competence before coming to university, coordination between
secondary schools and colleges and universities, changes in teacher education
programs, and, of course, further research.

"La Connaissance de la Langue Chez les Étudiants Universitaires" and other
documents arise from deep concerns within French Canada about a general "crise des
langues" and specifically about higher literacy in universities. These concerns have
resulted in policies established by each university; in the case of French-language
universities, they have agreed as a network to require mastery of French as a
condition of admission beginning in 1992 (Université du Québec à Hull). While the
policies differ from one institution to another, the following universities require a test

15 Translation: "To master the language... is to know the rules and
processes that determine the use of it [the language] in spelling, morphology, syntax,
and lexicon and permit, as much in the oral as in the written, the clear expression and
organization of ideas in a coherent group. It concerns a basic competence that the
learning of proper norms of composition or of proper presentation in various
disciplines presupposes."
either for admission or graduation: Université Laval, Université de Montréal, Université du Québec, Université du Québec à Montréal, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Télé-Université, and the Université de Sherbrooke. At the Université du Québec à Montréal, for example, students write both admission and graduation exams; each takes one-and-a-half hours. The admissions exam focuses on grammar and linguistic concerns through dictations and a writing sample, while the exit examination requires a writing sample to test both "connaissance explicite du code linguistique" and "production et organisation de la communication orale et écrite" (Fiches 8).

The policies outlined above and the pedagogies that have developed from them contrast strongly with the Jesuit model of education outlined earlier. Rather than learning language through the reading of great books, contemporary approaches emphasize linguistic knowledge and include contexts for language outside of traditional humanistic discourse. The large-scale testing programs and inter-university cooperation evident in the policy statements outlined above point to a far different socio-cultural backdrop for writing instruction, a scene that takes place in large, state-supported institutions. Rather than taking the traditional liberal arts context (a context relying on students' abilities to absorb the ability to produce written language), contemporary writing instruction adopts modern approaches emphasizing linguistics and theories of communication to teach writing explicitly.

**Composition in Twentieth-Century English-Language Universities**

Composition in universities in English Canada also changed remarkably in the twentieth century, though not with the suddenness and radical nature of the changes in French language universities in Quebec. In the early part of the century,
composition became subordinate to the study of literature and driven by concerns for correctness. In 1953, A. S. P. Woodhouse defined the humanities, including language and literature, "not as subjects of practice, but as subjects of study" (539). It follows from such a definition that writing instruction, commonly seen as the practice of writing, would be excluded from the curriculum of universities. Allied to this definition of writing is Woodhouse's definition of the purpose of education—"the achievement of general cultivation by means of the acquisition of knowledge" (540). For Woodhouse, a prominent member of the academic community and representative of his time, general cultivation meant acculturation in English language and history. He blames progressive education for "the havoc wrought in education south of the Border." Qualifying examinations in composition and successful remedial instruction offer proof that the secondary schools fail to provide basic preparation for the education Woodhouse champions, but Woodhouse does not allow for the possibility that the secondary schools define the goals of education differently (grounding education in action rather than contemplation of the beautiful) and serve a vastly different population (non-native speakers of English, members of different racial and religious groups). Remedial writing programs are symptomatic of the gulf between university culture and general culture and operate as "correctives" for those uninitiated into university culture which has its own "appropriate functions."

What are these appropriate functions? Northrop Frye, another well-respected and representative member of the academic community, wrote in 1957 that "The university is doing its proper job when it presents the student with a coherent area of knowledge and enables him to progress within it" (5). Further, Frye comments that

---

16 See the section on "Rhetoric in Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Canadian Universities" earlier in this chapter.
"The university informs the world, and is not informed by it" (5). It follows from these attitudes that writing instruction, particularly writing instruction that takes as its scene the business community or takes as its clientele students whose first language is not English, does not fall under the proper purview of universities:

The English teacher's ideal is the exact opposite of "effective communication," or learning to become audible in the marketplace. What he has to teach is the verbal expression of truth, beauty and wisdom: in short, the disinterested use of words. (Frye 5)

When Frye does comment upon writing in Canada, he refers to creative writing and the reproduction of literary culture, and literary culture that largely excludes prose of any sort.

In the United States, a similar attitude exists in universities:

The question of egalitarian versus elitist higher education is central to the historical resistance of universities to remedial education, and often to basic writing. It lies at the base of the unwillingness of many departments to assign their best teachers to remedial classes and of administrators, boards of trustees, and legislators not to allocate funds for remedial programs in universities... and it informs our century-long tradition of blaming the high schools and assuming that remedial students are simply not "college material." (Lunsford 251)

As shown in some of the comments from my survey of university administrators reproduced in Chapter Three, the century-long tradition of blaming the high schools continues in Canada as well.

The courses universities offered in the 1950s included what Nan Johnson has labelled as the literature/composition synthesis particular to Canada. At the University of New Brunswick, the first-year literature course attempted to "familiarize [students in the Faculties of Arts and Science] with the critical methods employed in the study of various literary forms and to provide assistance in the
writing of clear and concise prose" (108). This course was taught through three
weekly lectures and a tutorial "for those needing special assistance in English
composition" (109). This traditional "Introduction to Literature" was accompanied
by what was called simply "Course for Applied Science Students," a year-long course
"concerned primarily with the writing of clear and concise English prose" and with
encouraging reading and logical thinking skills. In addition to these two introductory
courses, the English department offered two special upper-division courses, one for
students in English--"Creative Writing and Practical Criticism"--and one for third-
year engineers designed to "improve the student's powers of self-expression, and to
induce an appreciation of good literature" (110). These courses tended to focus on
literature, treating composition as remedial and subsidiary to the study of literature.
Even the "Course for Third-year Engineers" tended to focus on the study of literature,
and for that reason the Engineering faculty withdrew support for it and began
teaching the course themselves from the mid-1950s on.

The bellettristic strand I have been describing dominated and continues to be a
force within English departments. Another strand of rhetoric also existed, however, a
strand calling for a much broader definition of rhetoric and writing. The first
evidences of this consist of the repatriation of the writing course for engineers at the
University of New Brunswick I mentioned above. More specific evidence comes
from the appearance of Father Daniel Fogarty's 1959 book entitled Roots for a New
Rhetoric. Fogarty, dean of education at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, examined
the theories of I. A. Richards, Kenneth Burke, and the general semanticists
(represented by Alfred Korzybski, S. I. Hayakawa, Irving Lee, and Wendell Johnson)
in an effort to assemble a modern rhetoric that could be used in teaching. Fogarty
was, after all, a dean of education. Fogarty's modern rhetoric contrasts with "current
traditional rhetoric," a term he coined to describe the theory (or lack of coherent theory) that dominated first-year communication courses—the emphasis on the modes, mechanics, and forms of communication. In the final chapter to *Roots for a New Rhetoric*, Fogarty proposed his version of a first year course called "Prose Communication." In this course Fogarty sketches out a plan for teaching students what constitutes rhetoric based on a synthesis of the important concepts in the work of Richards, Burke, and the general semanticists. In Fogarty's words:

[A new rhetoric] will need to consider its own basic presuppositions as all disciplines must do in a time of crisis and challenge; it will need to broaden its aim until it no longer confines itself to teaching the art of formal persuasion but includes formation in every kind of symbol-using, from a political speech to a kitchen conversation; it will need to adjust itself to the recent studies in the psychology and sociology of communication; and, finally, it will need to make considerable provision for a new kind of speaker-listener situation—the area of group discussion.

In recent research in rhetoric and composition today we can see many indications that the profession has indeed been working toward many of the goals that Fogarty articulated. But as James Berlin points out, "Fogarty, unfortunately, found no audience until the seventies" (*Rhetoric* 134). In Canada, Fogarty's audience convened only in the 1980's.

In the absence of any positive influence from Fogarty's work, other attempts to deal with the "problem" failed to address the root cause—an inadequate conceptualization of writing and writing instruction. In 1976, F. E. L. Priestley and H. I. Kernecke of the University of Toronto published a study of undergraduate education in English departments in Canada on behalf of ACUTE (Association of Canadian University Teachers of English). In their report, Priestley and Kernecke identified three of the major approaches used by universities to remedy the
deficiencies in their student's writing: literature and composition courses, writing courses, and writing centres. They recommended a combination of writing centres and composition courses to "cope with the writing problems students now bring to Canadian universities" (36). At the same time, Priestley and Kerpneck define "real university courses" as "all of the literature courses" (21) and label basic writing as a "threat" and "insidious danger" to the proper work of English departments.

Priestley and Kerpneck also voiced criticisms of secondary schools, citing reductions in the time assigned to English from ten periods to four and trends away from teaching grammar (14). For Priestley and Kerpneck, students who watch television "grow up with no sense of the real capabilities of language, of the precision and beauty of its proper use" (14). Literature embodies the most precise and beautiful use of language, what Priestley and Kerpneck label as "the real university courses" (21). Opposed to the real business of university English teachers are courses "designed to improve a student's skill in the English language" (20). These courses consist of "work which properly belongs in the secondary schools" (20), work which "cannot fall on its [the English department's] regular staff" (21). If follows from this position that any attempt to correct what Priestley and Kerpneck see as the deficiencies of students must be a temporary measure. Permanent measures would threaten to change the university as an institution, a change Priestley and Kerpneck violently oppose, concluding that "[u]niversity teaching of the fundamentals of English composition and of comprehension can be nothing but an emergency measure, a stop-gap of limited effectiveness to be abandoned as soon as the emergency itself can be resolved" (22).
The "emergency" Priestley and Kerpneck invoke began as early as 1927, however. In that year a professor of English at the University of Alberta, E. K. Broadus, blamed (in-part) the "constant reading of newspapers and cheap fiction" for poor student writing and suggested a method for addressing the problem. Broadus' solution consisted of enlisting faculty members to identify students who needed tutoring in writing. Students who were identified through this process were contacted by a professor, interviewed to identify the nature of the student's problems, and supplied with appropriate tutoring by a professor of English. At the time, the University of Alberta enrolled approximately 1200 students, but even in a school that small the time-intensive process of tutoring became onerous and the plan Broadus developed died. For at least 50 years previous to the Priestley and Kerpneck report, student writing had been a temporary emergency.

In a review of the Priestley and Kerpneck report, Robert M. Jordan of the University of British Columbia argued for a more liberal definition of English studies:

> English departments are at the leading edge of a powerful impulse toward new understandings of language. We face a serious challenge for serious work, not merely a freshman-level prelude to literary studies . . . Most English departments are heavily weighted toward "service courses"—improperly so-called in my view, since that term underestimates the importance and the intrinsic vitality of composition as a human activity. (123-4)

Jordan expresses here a view of writing as a "human activity" rather than a skill to be mastered, a study of language relevant to both the world outside the study of English literature and necessary for that study. This attitude is consonant with Fogarty's argument for the work of Richards, Burke, and the general semanticists as important to the creation and performance of a new rhetoric, a rhetoric that would include
English studies but also range more widely to include a wide variety of texts in the way Robert Scholes defines "texts." Jordan represents a second strand or attitude to writing, one that stands in direct contrast to the traditional, or to use Fogarty's phrase, current-traditional rhetoric of Frye and Priestley.

The attitude Woodhouse, Frye, and Priestley articulate still exists, even dominates and directs the attitudes and resulting programs and curricula at many institutions. Competing with that attitude, however, is what may be best termed "the new rhetoric" aligned with the position I have identified with Fogarty and Jordan:

Fundamental to this new discipline is a rejection of its immediate past, the tradition of composition teaching of the past century, and an attempt to find or redefine an appropriate heritage, sometimes in the classical rhetorical tradition, sometimes in the contemporary intellectual milieu, more typically in a unique welding of the two. For when contemporary rhetoricians have turned to the classical tradition, they have reconceived classical notions from a contemporary point of view. Thus they have retrieved such classical concepts as audience, context, occasion; the three kinds of argument--ethical, logical, emotional; the five arts--invention, arrangement, style, memory, delivery. In each case, however, the concepts have been reinterpreted from a twentieth century perspective. (Freedman and Pringle, 173-4)

This passage appeared in the proceedings of an important conference focusing on writing instruction held in Ottawa in May, 1979 called "Learning to Write." The conference attracted 1250 people and produced a collection of essays that included Janet Emig's "The Tacit Tradition" and Richard Young's "Arts, Crafts, Gifts and Knacks." Other organizations continue the emphasis of this conference; Inkshed (established 1982) names both an annual conference and a newsletter devoted to the study of writing and reading, and the Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric (established 1981) also promotes the study of writing under the broader aegis of rhetoric. Indeed, Robertson Davies, novelist and professor at the University of
Toronto, encouraged the study of rhetoric in 1982 in an article entitled "A Return to Rhetoric":

Rhetoric is the art of persuasion, certainly, but I hope I have suggested that it is also a technique for the fine deployment of words and ideas, and as such it is worth everybody's attention and--dare I propose it--it is worthy of a return to the curricula of schools and--yes, of universities. (194)

Davies comments that rhetoric is "inextricably linked with thought," thereby employing a definition of rhetoric not simply as style but as creative shaping of texts. The new attitude Davies articulates marks a distinct shift from the attitudes of Woodhouse and Frye, but not one without predecessors. As James Berlin commented at the 1988 Conference on College Composition and Communication, literature departments have "discovered rhetoric . . . [because] they're struggling for language that we [rhetoric scholars] have" ("Octalog" 30).

Today in courses and programs of writing instruction at Canadian universities we can witness the competition between old attitudes and new attitudes towards writing instruction. These two attitudes show up in letters and reports sent to me as part of the data collection for a survey on writing instruction that forms the basis for the next chapter. Two reports in particular, one from a small art school on the east coast (the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design) and another from a mid-size university in Ontario (Wilfrid Laurier University) help illustrate how these attitudes shape writing instruction. These examples function to provide succinct exemplars of my argument that old attitudes to writing affect the form of present instruction.

Kenna Manos, Head of the English Department at the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design (enrollment= 500), describes the changes in that school's writing instruction:
Before 1973, the writing requirement for graduation consisted of an essay submitted by all degree students to the English Department. No official composition courses were offered, although there had been for some years an "English Department" which functioned as a writing centre: one person, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., 4 days a week. Then came the "Use of English Exam" in 1973, which had to be passed before students could graduate. In 1974, all incoming students began sitting this exam, the passing of which became a prerequisite for all academic courses taken at the College... In 1975, we began offering English composition courses, and then students who failed the exam had to take this course, or an English course at another university, before they were permitted to re-sit the exam. (25-50% fail at each sitting; the exam is given 7 times a year.)

Because the exam is a prerequisite for academic courses, its format was influenced by the wishes of the academic faculty here... which means that the exam is still 50% objective and 50% paragraph and essay. 17

At present, this college offers three composition courses: the course all students take, an "advanced composition" course for senior students, and a practical writing course through another department.

The test given at the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design shows signs of the definition of writing as style. It requires students to answer "objective" questions about sentence-level usage problems, what Manos identifies as "surface error" corrections. The other half of the test asks for a direct writing sample, a test with much higher validity than tests of grammatical correctness and which is often associated with recent research in composition. The syllabi from the the "English Composition" and "Advanced English Composition" courses also negotiate uneasily between the old attitude (which viewed writing as style) and the new attitude (which views writing as rhetorical process). The course description for "English Composition" identifies that the aim of the course is "to help students improve their writing skills... [through] organization of ideas, clarity of expression, coherence, diction, and style... [and] a review of basic grammar and sentence structure."

"Advanced English Composition" aims to help students "learn to write with more clarity, precision and coherence; and to develop a sense of style and grace in writing." Notice that no mention is made of invention or of rhetorical situation, although several of the writing assignments build these concepts implicitly by requiring students to "write a letter to a public official" or "attend a session at the Law Courts, City Council, the School Board, or any public meeting and write a brief report . . . about the distinguishing features of the language used." Students apparently are not directly taught audience, situation, exigency, and purpose as rhetorical concepts, but they are expected to use them. Many of the assignments focus on belletristic notions of style, such as "Closely examine one passage by your chosen author and discuss how it exemplifies the larger work in style, characterization, setting, and/or theme."

At Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario, writing courses developed "in the late 1960s, mainly to provide interested students with a more direct and intensive approach to writing improvement than can be provided in, say, an English literature class." The report of a university committee describes the forms this instruction took:

Various ad hoc arrangements were tried, culminating with the establishment of a basic credit course . . . At a time when other universities were introducing frankly remedial measures (e.g., clinics), WLU preferred to adopt the more academic alternative of a university-level elective credit within the English Department itself. The course became very popular and was offered in an increasing number of sections. Soon, however, the pressure of student demand . . . necessitated some mechanism for keeping enrollment within reasonable limits." ("Report" 2)

---

18 The information about Wilfrid Laurier University comes from the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on English Language Testing and Training" by Mark Baetz, Anne C. Hall, Joyce Lorimer, and Michael Moore (1987).
Consequently, the university developed a placement test to "allot the available places in the course" by identifying the weaker students and giving them first priority to register in the course (2). However, two problems developed. First, the course was not a remedial course, but students who needed intensive work were being placed in it. Second, the test that decided who could enroll in the course encouraged students to perform badly if they were to have any chance of registering. The effects on the course content took a few years to surface and resulted in "gradually downgrading the course to a virtually remedial status inconsistent with its intended role in an academic curriculum" (2).

In 1985, two new elective courses were offered that were not connected to the placement test. In 1988, the old course was discontinued and a non-credit Writing Centre opened. The placement test became transmogrified into "The English Achievement Test" which serves to identify weak students who are then directed to the Writing Centre. Three other courses in writing enhance the two new courses noted above, for a total of five at present. These recent changes accommodated three of the recommendations of the advisory committee: one, a new test and new purpose for the test; two, a writing centre to help those identified by the test as needing help; and three, the elimination of the old course replaced by two new electives. However, the new program did not follow the recommendations concerning a writing-across-the-curriculum program.

At both the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design and Wilfrid Laurier University, faculty attitudes within and without the English department impede attempts to reform curricula. At the heart of the problems of reform lie two conceptual difficulties: First, how do the various people involved in reform define
writing? Second, what kind of student writer do they seek to educate? When basic issues such as these fail to be resolved, the instruction that results will necessarily fail to achieve the high expectations of the reformers.

**Conclusion: Writing Instruction Today**

Some institutions, such as McMaster University in Hamilton, offer writing instruction only in the context of the study of English literature. But McMaster is clearly an exception. Most universities offer a variety of different kinds of writing instruction, ranging from well-staffed writing centres, to first-year English literature and language courses, to courses in a variety of disciplines, to minor and major undergraduate programs in writing and rhetoric. The extent of these courses and the nature of them will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, but their existence marks an important new direction in writing instruction in Canada. Some of these courses address student populations not included in the traditional schemes of instruction such as those imagined by Woodhouse and Frye, such as basic writers and second language students. Some of them also reconceptualize writing as a much larger and more complex activity than simply that of studying the greatest hits of English literature. Questions of gender, of the place of different racial groups in a multicultural society, of the special place of Quebec in Canada, and of the relationship between government and the universities—specifically, the relationship between what the university produces and what society wants graduates to be able to do—all have affected the nature of university course offerings, and particularly the nature of writing instruction.

More and more pressures are being brought to bear on universities by students, governments, and businesses to offer instruction in the study of writing in
the larger context of society, and not exclusively in a bellettristic context. It is this redefinition of writing by the variety of contexts, audiences, and purposes it serves that best describes the variety in writing instruction apparent in Canadian universities today. Educators in professional departments—engineering, nursing, education—recognize the need for writing instruction that serves their particular constituencies. A recent survey of civil engineers, for example, rates writing skills as more important than engineering skills for engineering graduates (Molgaard and Sharp). In the face of reports such as this one, university English department offerings of literature with some stylistic instruction fall far short of adequate. As a result, many different departments throughout the university have begun offering writing instruction tailored to the needs of their students, as Chapter Three will show. If this trend continues, the changes it will bring promise to antiquate the traditional role of English departments, who define writing instruction according to the beliefs articulated by Frye and Priestley and Kerpneck. The present state of writing instruction suffers from great tensions between bellettristic definitions of writing (grounded in beliefs that writing is subsidiary to the study of literature and culture) and discipline-specific definitions developed by departments outside of literary study.
CHAPTER III
THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING OF WRITING IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

Knowledge is not only to be found in demonstrations, it can also be found in . . . institutional regulations." M. Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge

Michel Foucault's comment points to a wider scope for the development of knowledge about writing instruction than might at first be imagined by those reading research based on course descriptions and required textbooks. Writing instruction can be described by the assignments, textbooks, or topics discussed in classes, but it is equally informed by the institutional context within which it takes place. Consequently, any description of writing instruction needs to take account of the context of instruction: status of instructors, discipline in which instruction takes place, size of institution, and many other constraints. Institutional guidelines can tell us much about writing instruction: What faculties offer writing instruction? Who teaches writing? Do administrators value the teaching of writing? Are writing programs developing or being swept aside in cost-cutting measures? The answers to these and other questions are presented in this chapter and contribute to our understanding of writing instruction in Canadian universities by providing reliable data gathered from a survey of administrators at 62 Canadian universities. These data were gathered using a questionnaire mailed to the 330 deans of all undergraduate faculties. Over 80% (277) of these faculties responded to the ten-question survey that sought to identify basic information, such as how many instructors teach writing,
what faculties teach writing, and what factors affect the establishment of writing programs.

While the bulk of this chapter will report results from the survey I conducted of writing instruction, these results will mean little unless they are placed in a theoretical frame that explains how these results inform writing instruction. This framework includes descriptions of how universities conceptualize writing, what part writing plays not only as a means of transferring information but also as a means of producing knowledge, and how the university locates the "writing subject" within its various discourses. The conceptualization of writing as a mechanical art of achieving correctness in expression, for example, leads to instruction that focuses on sentence-level concerns and testing that asks students to answer questions about grammar and usage. Recognizing the various conceptualizations of writing invoked by different administrators and instructors across Canada helps explain the multitudinous forms writing instruction takes. These conceptualizations, in turn, create institutional guidelines for instruction in the form of tests, courses, and degree requirements. The rest of this chapter answers three questions:

- first, what are the theoretical or conceptual issues at stake in an investigation of writing instruction;
- second, what does the survey tell us about these issues;
- third, what are the implications, theoretical and practical, of this new knowledge for the ways writing is taught at Canadian universities?

**Theoretical and Practical Issues**

We might ask, "What is at stake in an examination of the institutionalization of writing instruction?" The answer is threefold. Most importantly, we need to explore how writing functions as both communication and as the production of
knowledge in the culture of the university. Related to the idea of writing as shaping knowledge is the issue of how writing challenges and engages current debates about epistemology: does writing simply communicate knowledge or does writing also shape knowledge? Finally, how do different disciplines within universities locate or position what Susan Miller calls the "writing subject"? The possibilities for students and instructors when they write are constructed and limited differently in different institutional settings: English departments traditionally locate the writing subject in belletristic contexts; business writing courses often locate the writing subject as "conduit" in the transfer of clear information. Subjectivity, then, forms the third important focus for framing the results of the survey. Each of these three issues form important strands in the report of the results of the survey (section two in this chapter) and in the discussion of what these results imply for the theory and practice of writing (section three of this chapter).

First, how can writing be theorized as both the communication and production of knowledge? In "Means of Communication as Means of Production," Raymond Williams discusses how means of communication must also be conceptualized as means of production. Writing, and instruction in writing, form part of the means of communication that Williams discusses, including such diverse forms as technical writing and remedial writing courses, one-to-one tutorials in writing centres and

---

1 The term "writing subject" refers to the concepts of presence and authorship as they exist in writers, including student writers. A writer's "subjectivity consists of the possible or potential thoughts that make up the mental world of the writer. Bounding or limiting this world are institutional contexts, psychological histories, discourses of many kinds, and many other factors. I use the term to describe the limitations on authorship that specific textual or discursive practices allow in university disciplines. A "writing subject," then, consists of a set of beliefs and discursive practices made possible through institutional structures. For more discussion, see Susan Miller's Rescuing the Subject, pages 15-20.
computerized writing instruction. Traditional models of communication posit a clear, transparent scientific discourse that "senders" can use to communicate with "receivers." Such a concept of language has come under attack by many scholars (Richards; Lyotard; Simons among others). These scholars see writing as both a means of communication and as a means of production of both knowledge and material goods, including such goods as diverse as cultural essays, technical reports, manuals, brochures. When viewed as a means of production as well as communication, writing becomes the production of discourse subject to historical development and to ideological biases. Such discourse, and the knowledge legitimized by discourse, is inextricably linked to power. We need only note the difference in value between student writing and professors' research, between the ways Northrop Frye defines writing ("the verbal expression of truth, beauty, and wisdom: in short, the disinterested use of words"\(^2\)) and the definitions supplied by people at the margins of the academy. In the words of Jean-Francois Lyotard, "Knowledge and power are simply two sides of the same question: who decides what knowledge is, and who knows what needs to be decided?" (9).

Writing instruction in Canadian universities emerged from particular cultural circumstances that shaped it into an instrument of cultural control by the French and English upper classes. As we saw in Chapter Two, these ends at times included traditional English culture and traditional French culture ("citadelles nationales") and called for bellettristic essays of appreciation for these cultures. Today, Canadian universities are beginning to acknowledge the place of writing instruction as a technological and vocational discipline in addition to its place as a philosophical

endeavour and as a cultural practice of literary criticism. Such an acknowledgement has lead to the establishment of writing courses, writing centres, and scholarly research about writing. These kinds of instruction often raise issues of power when rationales for rules of writing come under scrutiny by students who are often unfamiliar with the culture of the university.

The new status being accorded writing instruction also marks it as an emerging discipline, but this discipline is hobbled by numerous impediments to both disciplinary status and theoretical development. Raymond Williams identified two impediments or "ideological blocks" to the conception of writing as both a means of communication and a means of production:

- the abstraction of communication that represents it as a one-way sender/receiver corridor;
- the identification of communication as production of marketable products and of communication as unrelated to the shaping of culture and the products of culture at every step of production. (Williams 50-53; my italics)

The first block to a full understanding of communication, and writing in particular, concerns the conceptualization of writing as the transmission of ideas from a sender to a receiver. I. A. Richards calls this the "One and Only One True Meaning Superstition" and contrasts it with theories of communication as "over-determined, as having multiplicity of meaning" (Richards 39). In the context of the present study, the conceptualization of writing as a transmission of ideas from sender to receiver surfaces in comments of Canadian university administrators who speak of writing as
"spelling, grammar, and handwriting"\(^3\) and as communication skills, which course descriptions define as assignments that are "clear, precise, and concise."\(^4\)

The second block to viewing writing as historically situated, the separation of communication from the products of that communication, has been addressed by courses in some disciplines. These courses oppose the conceptualization of writing as transmission with a conceptualization that implies the situatedness of any communicative act, the necessarily limited nature of language to communicate universally. Such a definition shows up in course descriptions which define writing in relation to the context of its production. For example, the following course description from a law faculty implies the situatedness of writing in legal contexts: "A writing course exploring what one can learn and say about the legal imagination, what it can mean to learn and think and speak like a lawyer."\(^5\) Courses in law at Queen's University, in the sciences the University of Manitoba, and in education at the University of Saskatchewan all focus on the ways writing shapes and develops knowledge.

The third issue at stake concerns how the institutional rules, played out through language games, constitute the "writing subject,"\(^6\) and consequently define in

\(^3\) From one respondents' reply to the survey detailed in this chapter.

\(^4\) From the description of Chemical Engineering 301, Technical Writing, at Queen's University.

\(^5\) From the course description of Law 332, Legal Imagination, at Queen's University.

subtle ways the range of writing and thinking acts that can occur. Susan Miller states that "the act of writing is a process that fictionalizes stability, requiring that the writer will be judged according to his or her awareness of the possible fictions within textual worlds," an awareness built through the language games played out in universities (149-50). She also addresses the shifting concept of the reading subject, arguing that

our reading strategies do not greatly depend on writers' precedent reputations or on their personal standing within communities. These strategies do, however, depend on specifically institutional privileges that an age of high literacy began to develop in the late eighteenth century, as work by textual archaeologists like Michel Foucault has shown. (14)

The "institutional privileges" that Miller notes above refer to practices such as who can claim writing authorship. Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford describe the material changes that have taken place as a result of new literacy practices, changes evident from the terminology developed to describe (for example) the new categories of authorship: ghostwriter, managed textbooks, multiple author grant applications, and citations of corporations that sponsor research, and research teams (93-97). In Canadian university English departments, the writing subject often exists as the traditional, solitary author, "the individual-who-produces-text," in an unproblematic way (Ede and Lunsford 90). This individual (whether student or professor) is asked to produce texts alone, usually focusing on a specific, detailed reading of one poem, story, novel or author. However, conceiving of a writing subject as a writer in the act of writing undercuts "the traditional split between subject and object" needed for the the traditional Canadian English department model of a writing subject because the act of writing and rewriting in the writing process contest the traditional notion that a text exists independently of its author and "severely calls into question the editorial fiction of the unified, consistent, controlling author" (Miller 16). Students confront
the gulf between a critical model that identifies writing as static and unified and their own experiences of texts as developing, emerging, and only barely under control, if at all. Professors, fully acculturated and positioned as writing subjects in literary discourse, wonder at the seemingly bizarre nature of student attempts to write proper academic discourse. The limited conceptualization of the writing subject described above, then, forms one barrier to the development of writing as an important theoretical and practical art because of the ways it limits, situates, and attempts to erase the writing subject.

In the institutionalization of courses like the one in law described above, universities develop new conceptions of writing that break away from the traditional practice in Canadian universities of composition and rhetoric as formal correctness and belles-lettres criticism. These new conceptions of writing may be linked to the increasing acceptance of technical and vocational education in Canadian universities from 1920 to the present, but they also rely on the re-emergence of rhetoric as a mode of theoretical inquiry. The work of James Boyd White in legal rhetoric, for example, provides the basis for the course in law at Queen's University described above.

The rest of this chapter attempts to establish where writing instruction takes place in Canadian universities and to offer insight into the conceptualizations of writing and the writing subject that define the nature of this writing instruction.

---

Results From a Survey of University Administrators

Where does writing instruction occur in Canadian universities? To answer this question, I surveyed every dean of an undergraduate faculty in each Canadian university (or high-ranking academic official in the case of small colleges), a total of 330 people (277 replied). As part of this search, I also surveyed deans and directors of continuing education faculties/schools because of the likelihood of remedial writing programs being found there. My goal in the survey was to establish some broad, cumulative knowledge about how writing gets taught to Canadian university students. As Chapter Two demonstrated, we know something of the history of writing instruction in Canada, but we know very little about it today: How extensively is writing taught? Who teaches writing? Which students get instruction in writing?

My goal was to describe, as fully as possible, in as many institutional settings as possible, where writing programs are located. The results of this broad a search provide as wide a variety of examples as possible of how writing instruction is institutionalized, and thus allow for a more precise (accurate) critique of the marginalization of rhetoric as a productive art, a critique of the valorization of language as a conduit for the transmission of ideas, and a critique of definitions that posit illiteracy as deficiency, a disease to be remedied.

Survey Design

The sample population, then, is limited to universities (see Figure 1, "Map of Canada and Key Listing All Universities in the Survey" in Chapter 1). It does not

---

8 See George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Metaphors We Live By, pp. 10-13.
include, for example, programs in colleges that are affiliated with universities but that maintain a separate curriculum. It also does not include information from community colleges which have traditionally assumed a much more active role in literacy education in Canada. It also does not survey the colleges d'enseignement general et professionnel (CEGEP's) in Quebec which also take a more active role in writing instruction.

All of the survey questions focus on discovering information unavailable from any other source: Who teaches writing in each faculty? Is writing instruction required or even recommended as an option for students in the faculty? Have writing programs been growing or withering in the last decade? Most of the questions were closed-ended, with the exception of the last question that asked for reaction and comment on the issues raised in the rest of the questionnaire. The number of questions was also limited to ten as a way of keeping the survey brief and thus increasing response rates.

9 Usually students in two-year colleges do not transfer to universities; in British Columbia, however, they do. Note also that a survey of community colleges has been performed and codified in an on-line database at Fanshawe College in London, Ontario. For more information, contact Tamara J. Ilersich, Project Coordinator, National Adult Literacy Database, Fanshawe College, P. O. Box 4005, London, Ontario, N5W 5H1.

10 Closed-ended questions were chosen to increase the response rate for this survey because they allow respondents to answer more quickly and less ambiguously. Of course, they also limit the range of answers, a situation that question 10 was designed to help alleviate by providing respondents with a formal opportunity to elaborate or comment on the survey.

The English version of the survey, with results for each item, is reprinted on the next four pages.
Writing Instruction at Canadian Universities

This survey attempts to gather information about writing instruction at Canadian universities. It attempts to compile base-line data about how many programs there are, who runs them, what faculties and departments require formal writing instruction for graduation, and what factors determine the role of writing instruction in university programs.

Provide as much information as you can, but choose to fill in the survey minimally rather than not answer at all. If someone else in your faculty is better able to answer, please pass the questionnaire and introductory letter on to that person. A high response rate is crucial to the validity of the results.

Please return this survey by April 30, 1990 if possible.

1. Does your faculty (that is, administrative unit) offer any instruction in writing (for example, courses devoted to writing, tutorials, a writing center)?

144 Yes 133 No (Go to question 3) [277]

If yes, please provide the name and campus address of the person who directs this instruction, answer question 2, and then complete the rest of the survey. (If more than one person directs writing programs in your faculty, please list as many as possible.)

Name: 144 people were listed here
Address: ___________________________________________ ___________________________________________

2. Please identify the number of people at each academic rank who provide writing instruction in your faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Number currently at this level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time lecturer or instructor</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time lecturer or instructor</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do any members of your faculty conduct research on writing?

83 Yes 178 No [259]
4. Does your faculty support research on the teaching of writing through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) research grants</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) released time from teaching</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) research assistants</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How important is it for graduating students in your faculty to be able to write effectively? (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are students in any department in your faculty required to take a writing course (that is, a course that asks them to write frequently and focuses on improving writing skills)?

134 Yes 127 No [261]

7. Are students in any department in your faculty encouraged to take a writing course as an elective credit?

139 Yes 127 No [273]

If you answered yes to either question 6 or 7, please provide the names and descriptions of these courses. (You may list the description below or attach a photocopy of the description printed in the calendar.)

Course Name: 181 respondents listed at least one course
Department:
Description:
8. During your tenure as dean, has your faculty discussed or proposed:

a) establishing new kinds of writing instruction (for example, new courses, tutorials, a writing center)?

130 Yes 130 No [260]

b) enhancing present writing instruction (for example, courses, tutorials, a writing center)?

147 Yes 112 No [259]

c) reducing present writing instruction (suspending writing courses, increasing writing class sizes)?

35 Yes 212 No [247]

d) discontinuing writing instruction (not fund graduate teaching assistants, close writing centers)?

10 Yes 238 No [248]

If the answer is yes to any part of question 8, please attach a description or photocopy of the proposals and identify the person or people who can provide more information.

136 respondents commented in this space and/or included attachments

9. If you were asked to provide or increase funding for writing instruction in your faculty, what factors would affect your decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Not A Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) cost of program</td>
<td>1 (128)</td>
<td>2 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (23)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) qualifications of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructors</td>
<td>1 (94)</td>
<td>2 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) availability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructors</td>
<td>1 (83)</td>
<td>2 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (34)</td>
<td>4 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) change in writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills of entering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>1 (79)</td>
<td>2 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (46)</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) other</td>
<td>1 (212)</td>
<td>2 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (212)</td>
<td>4 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (212)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I would appreciate your using the space below to comment on any of the issues raised by this questionnaire.

170 respondents asked for a summary of the results.

Please print your name, faculty, and institution in the space provided below:

Name: __________________________________________

Faculty: ________________________________________

Institution: _____________________________________

   Please send me a summary of the results. [193]

   Please send me a one-page bibliography of scholarship on writing across the curriculum.

Return this survey to:

Roger Graves
Department of English
The Ohio State University
164 West 17th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio, USA 43210

Thank you very much for your time and help.
Survey Results

Respondents returned 277 of the 330 surveys (83.9%) that were mailed out (the covering letter that accompanied the survey asked deans to pass the survey on to someone more capable of answering the questions accurately rather than choose not to fill it out). While the survey was addressed to deans, the actual respondents ranged from the deans of each faculty (approximately 47%) to associate deans (12%), department heads (6%), and instructors themselves (35%). Consequently, the rate of return for the results was high (over 83%). In questions asking for the attitudes and priorities deans would assign to problems, the results have been screened to include only responses filled in by deans, associate deans, or department heads.

The results are also limited by different return rates for the English-language and French-language surveys. The English language survey response rates were very high—90.3% (242 of 268). Eleven other returns from the English-language survey were eliminated from the sample because their responses indicated that their faculties did not teach undergraduates. In the French-language survey, 35 of 62 surveys were returned, giving a response rate of only 56%. The low response rate for the French-language survey may be attributable to a variety of problems. Perhaps most important was my inability (due to time and budget constraints) to follow-up non-responses by mailing a second survey form and letter. However, the timing of the survey (it was mailed about three months before the Meech Lake accord expired) and the difficulty of translating some of the terms and concepts of the survey may also have affected response rates. Finally, French-language universities in Quebec have adopted a set of clearly articulated policies regarding facility with written language. One consequence has been a concentration of writing instruction in one institutional location—usually French departments. Potential respondents outside of these
departments may not have responded because they assumed that the relevant information would come from French departments.

To help organize the discussion of the results of the survey, I divided it into sections grouped under five headings:

A) How widespread is writing instruction?

B) What do we know about the people who teach and research writing at universities?

C) Do administrators value instruction in writing?

D) What attitudes did respondents articulate towards writing?

E) What is the range of instruction offered at universities?

A) How Widespread is Writing Instruction?

The first question on the survey asked deans to identify whether or not their faculty offered instruction in writing. The survey form and covering letter defined writing as "courses devoted to writing, tutorials, or a writing center." Approximately two thirds (67%) of the faculties that responded to the survey either require or encourage their students to take a course that focuses on improving writing skills. Perhaps more surprising than the extensive demand for writing instruction is the extensive system that exists to provide writing instruction. Over half (52%) of the faculties that responded provide some kind of instruction in writing. A common assumption of many involved with writing instruction is that this instruction generally takes place within English departments; the surveys tell us that, at the very least, instruction takes place in many other places in Canadian universities.

Why? Robin Harris notes in his study of Canadian universities that in the 20th century we have seen an increasing trend toward education in professional
education and a consequent decline in the arts and science degree programs (528). At some universities we can still see signs of the centrality of an arts and science degree in the requirements for students in professional schools to take one or two courses in humanities or arts. As some respondents to the survey commented, the purpose of this requirement for an arts course was at least in part to ensure that the students did some writing. However, faced with large classes and a paucity of funds to hire assistants, required writing in many university courses has become scarce and multiple choice examinations routine. In addition, the prohibitive expense of large first-year writing courses rules out that avenue. To obtain some control over the nature of instruction in writing, many faculties have established their own writing programs, such as the engineering courses that Susan Stevenson teaches at Simon Fraser University. At some universities writing instruction occurs in numerous departments such as continuing education, English, engineering, and education. This scattered approach serves the immediate need of the department or agency funding it, but as one respondent to the survey commented, "There is a strong need on our campus for a context outside of teacher education language arts class to consider the issues involved with reading and writing." The result tends to be scattered groups of courses and instructors who do not communicate among themselves.

One response to the need for leadership outside of each discipline's immediate needs is known as writing across the curriculum (WAC). WAC programs have been adopted by a small number of universities (Dalhousie, Western Ontario, Laurentian, and the University of King's College-Halifax) who require students to take a number of "writing intensive" courses offered in many different disciplines each semester. Western Ontario, for example, has designated some courses as "essay courses":
Many courses at Western have a significant writing component. In order to recognize student achievement, a number of such courses have been designated as Essay Courses and will be identified on the student's record... Three-year BA programs must include at least two essay courses, one of which must be senior.\footnote{From page 21 of the calendar.}

This approach is combined with competency testing at Laurentian University. Students who do not pass the "language competency test" (administered to all entering students) "are encouraged to take a WAC course in which the instructor promises to offer both extensive writing assignments and assistance (in the form of formative evaluation) during the process of completing the assignments."\footnote{Quoted from "Writing at Laurentian University: A Summary," by Dr. Catherine F. Schryer, Department of English.} Tying graduation to completion of these writing intensive courses has led to "ongoing controversy... [because] many students complete all other requirements for their degree and are unable to graduate because of the writing competency requirement."\footnote{From the survey filled out by Charlotte Neff, Acting Dean of Social Sciences, Laurentian University.}

Writing-across-the-curriculum programs offer one means for universities to help all students improve writing skills. In the example of Laurentian University, wedding instruction to testing often creates more problems than it solves.

Table 3 summarizes the answers to question one and questions six and seven, which asked if students were either required or encouraged to take a writing course (defined on the survey as "a course that asks them to write frequently and focuses on improving writing skills").
Table 3: Percentage of Faculties Offering, Requiring, and Encouraging Students to Take Writing Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculties</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- offering instruction</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- requiring instruction</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- encouraging instruction</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>(134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- either requiring or encouraging instruction</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important and interesting way to view the responses is by discipline:
Which disciplines are most likely to offer instruction in writing? Which disciplines are most likely to require instruction in writing? The survey results show that arts, arts and sciences, continuing education, and law faculties are most likely to offer instruction in writing, while professional faculties (agriculture, engineering, education, and business) usually offer such instruction, and science faculties rarely offer writing instruction. In economic terms, the arts and science, continuing education, and law faculties are the producers. The chief consumers of this instruction, however, come from a broad range of disciplines both within arts and sciences and from the professional schools. In fact, more demand for writing instruction comes from professional schools than from arts and science faculties if we judge on the basis of the number of faculties that require students to take writing courses.
The reasons for the high demand for writing instruction in professional schools vary, but one of the foremost must be the close connection between the work world and the education provided in these faculties. In the health science professions, writing assumes a minor part of both the curriculum and the practice of professionals in the field. However, in either engineering or business faculties, writing assumes a more important role because of the demand for written reports in the daily work of graduates of these faculties.

On a purely practical level, professional studies cannot avoid or dismiss the need for a literate student body. One course in business at St. Mary's University called "Managerial Communications" addresses the need for helping students develop writing skills using both lectures and microcomputer laboratory equipment:

Students learn correct grammar, spelling, punctuation, and mechanics through structured practice. They develop style by experimenting with linguistic principles and points of theory [such as principles of arrangement] learned in lecture-discussion classes. They learn to compose effective business documents (routine, good news, bad news, and persuasive letters; long and short reports; resumes; and the like) by analyzing cases and applying rhetorical strategies, often based on models presented in class. To communicate quantitative data through visuals they must learn basic models of layout and design, and the technical features of tables, charts, and graphs. Then they must learn to select data that best conveys their most important concepts and present that data using the most appropriate visual.\textsuperscript{15}

The "Managerial Communications" description quoted above suggests the ways professional faculties locate the writing subject and theories of writing differently than, for example, English departments in Arts faculties. Business students must learn the rhetoric not just of letters but also of visual communication: how to present ideas in symbol systems including words but also extending beyond them through

\textsuperscript{15} From a course description provided by Dr. Tom Musial in response to question seven on the survey form.
non-verbal images. The references to "select data that best conveys their most important concepts" and to "applying rhetorical strategies" to written reports indicates that writing is not conceived of purely as an exercise in attending to the formal conventions of prose, either at the level of punctuation or of modes of discourse. This course also seems to suggest that students take "data" and turn it into "information" using rhetorical principles. Students, then, are more likely to conceive of writing not as the production of material goods (a report; a letter) but as the act of producing information through language. The three issues outlined at the beginning of this chapter--writing as conduit vs. shaper of knowledge, the location of the writing subject, and writing as information rather than material good--provide a way of distinguishing this course from similar courses offered twenty years ago or even today by instructors less able to design theoretically-sound courses because of the demands of funding cuts and large workloads that sap energy and time (each semester 650 students enroll in the course described above which is staffed by only four people).

Table 4 shows clearly that most arts (98%) and arts and sciences (92%) faculties offer some kind of writing instruction. Many survey returns for arts faculties came mainly from English departments, and some respondents clearly count introduction to literature and introduction to fiction courses as writing courses (McMaster University, for example). Nan Johnson points out that the combination of rhetoric and belles lettres (or composition and literature) in these courses represents a peculiarly Canadian response to the dual need to educate students in both language and culture, in both critical writing and critical reading (Johnson 869). Nevertheless, these courses do not usually focus specifically on writing instruction; the emphasis is almost always on reading, with instruction in writing a peripheral activity dealt with
mainly through one-hour optional tutorials once a week or marginal and terminal comments on graded essays. The writing subject imagined by these courses differs remarkably from the writing subject in Managerial Communications described above. The bellettristic writing subject negotiates among concepts of taste and conceptions of reading, interpreting, and identifying with written texts that often are not presented as rhetorical choices but as correct choices, informed choices—essentially, acculturated choices—that exist independently of any human contact. This strand of idealism constructs a writing subject capable of producing bellettristic discourse that shows an appreciation for "beauty," "tradition," and the educational visions of Matthew Arnold and John Henry Newman.16

Table 4 (and Figure 2) identify the disciplines most likely to offer writing instruction, and Table 5 identifies the disciplines who require or encourage writing instruction.

Table 4: A List of Disciplines Most Likely to Offer Writing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Percentage Offering Writing Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>98&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> One university, Acadia, indicated that it did not offer courses on writing as defined in the survey and covering letter.

<sup>b</sup> Forestry faculties were included under this heading.
Table 5: A List of Disciplines Most Likely to Require or Encourage Students to Take Writing Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The categories for this table were largely derived using the names given by respondents (Arts). However, some of the categories were gathered under a general name when too few responses were reported in any one category and when collapsing the categories did not significantly alter the response. For example, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and veterinary medicine were gathered under "Heath Sciences," but nursing remains separate because half (four of seven) of the respondents indicated that they either encouraged or required students to take writing courses.
B) What Do We Know About the People Who Teach and Research Writing at Universities?

Answers to four questions in the survey provide data about the people who teach and research writing at universities. Question one asked for the names of the people who direct writing programs in the faculty being surveyed. Question two asked for a count of the number of people who teach writing, divided according to academic rank. Question three asked if any members of the faculty conducted research in writing, and question four asked for information about support for research in writing provided by the faculty.

Limitations

Respondents reported a total of 1,674 instructors teaching writing. However, one respondent included all members of the science faculty because the faculty emphasizes writing in all of its classes, according to the respondent. Clearly these courses do not have writing as the focus, as the survey stipulated. Nevertheless, this answer raises an important limitation of the data for this question: how did the respondents define writing when they answered the questionnaire? While one can never answer that question with full knowledge, the answers that stray too far from

---

17 For a list of these people and their institutional locations, see Appendix B.

18 In "Upstairs Downstairs, Or Why 'Writing' and 'Program' are Four-Letter Words" (Inskshed March 1988, 10-12), Michael Moore notes the problems implicit in the definitions of writing that people outside of rhetoric and composition circles use to denote what it means to write and teach writing: "By the phrase 'writing program' they [colleagues, administrators, and students] do mean something quite definite, quite simple, quite operational, quite ancillary to real academic work. Instrumental knowledge (and waive the knowledge part). Stroke improvement. The quick fix. Surfaces. Skills. Tools. The whole reductive and patronising lexicon of technique, of the mechanical and servile arts."
what may be expected--such as the faculty of nursing at the University of Alberta employing 75 writing instructors--can usually be spotted.\textsuperscript{19}

Untenured Workforce

If we adjust the results to remove the response noted above that included every instructor in the faculty, we find that almost two-thirds of the instructors who teach writing belong to the non-permanent part of the workforce (teaching assistants, part- and full-time lecturers) and that only one third of the instruction comes from the professoriate. In addition, if we were able to isolate the courses that did not involve the teaching of literature, almost surely we would note that very few tenured faculty teach writing.\textsuperscript{20}

Why? Teaching writing, in the context of Canadian universities, holds no academic prestige within the English department and very little without. Certainly the figures quoted above suggest that senior faculty avoid the teaching of writing on a wide-spread scale, and the figures within English departments suggest that this effect only widens within these departments. Professors who have worked their way through the system of academic rank and who consider their specialties to be

\textsuperscript{19} On another level, the issue of defining writing instruction the way the survey stipulated--as courses that focus on writing--by its very nature misses much of the instruction that occurs informally or in courses that focus on traditional academic endeavours without directly addressing issues in writing. Traditionally, this kind of instruction has been very successful at small colleges, and it is no surprise to find that Douglas Vipond, Russ Hunt, and James Reither of St. Thomas University (an affiliate of the University of New Brunswick) are the main supporters of this kind of writing instruction. When educators attempt to transfer this concept to large institutions, this kind of writing instruction is known as writing-across-the-curriculum. In the survey I conducted, any formalized writing across the curriculum programs were noted by respondents.

\textsuperscript{20} McMaster University, for example, reported that they have eight people teaching writing, only one of whom is from the tenured ranks.
literature of particular periods or authors see the teaching of writing as an adjunct rather than an integral part of their responsibilities. More importantly, however, many professors define writing and the teaching of writing reductively, as little more than a matter of teaching students proper usage and grammar and making them obey these linguistic rules. This reductive view of writing and the teaching of writing holds sway not only within English departments but in some parts of the larger context of the university. One respondent at McMaster University wrote "If students cannot write, they should not be at university" and outlined the various places outside the university that students could go to for help: high school, community colleges, and non-credit courses through the continuing education department of the university. However, another respondent from McMaster University commented that a recent proposal to institute writing instruction in the science faculty had been tabled because "the Faculty that would have had to put on the course [Arts] did not agree to teach it."

In addition to the reductive definition of writing that blocks the teaching and study of writing, administrators at universities worry about funding. The respondent from science at McMaster also noted that "The current curriculum reform in the Faculty [of science] is being adversely affected by a budget reduction strategy in the university." The political infighting over territory and funding, combined with the devaluing (in terms of academic prestige) of writing, leads to a situation that leaves those with the least prestige and job security to help the students who most need help to enter the discourse of the university.

Geographical and Disciplinary Views of the Workforce

The survey results show no geographical grouping in the data describing the ranks of instructors who teach writing. The ten largest writing programs in terms of
number of instructors are located at (in order) Concordia, the University of British Columbia, the University of Montreal, York University, the University of Alberta, the University of Victoria, Simon Fraser University, York University (again), the University of Windsor, and the University of Toronto (see Figure 3). However, as this list suggests, the size of these universities distinguishes many of these programs from the programs at smaller institutions. Only two of the top ten programs in terms of number of instructors had total enrollments of less than 13,000 students: the University of Victoria and the University of Windsor. Only one other school smaller than 13,000 students—Wilfrid Laurier University—had a writing program among the 20 largest programs. Schools that have modest enrollments (10,000 to 15,000 students overall) but large numbers of writing instructors seem to have made a commitment to writing instruction that outpaces far larger institutions. Commitment means more than employing an army of sessional instructors, of course, but at the minimum large numbers of instructors would seem to indicate that a financial commitment has been made. In addition, the three small schools listed above all employ professors who specialize in rhetoric and/or composition as an area of academic research. Consequently, these programs also promise to define writing not as reductive but as rhetorical, not deficit-driven but process-driven.

21 York University reported two separate writing centers in two distinct academic departments. Because they appear to function independently of one another, they are reported separately.
Figure 3: Locations of the Ten Writing Programs with the Most Instructors
The top twenty writing programs in terms of number of instructors show a
distinct disciplinary bias: thirteen of the top twenty reside in arts or arts and science
faculties. Three other programs come from continuing education faculties. Clearly,
arts and science faculties provide the "natural" home for writing programs when the
faculty assume or confirm responsibility for preparing and improving student writing.
When arts and science faculties do not confirm this responsibility, continuing
education departments often find themselves "saddled" or "burdened" with the task of
teaching students to write. Typically, these writing programs consist of large-scale
writing centres: York University has three such operations, and the University of
Toronto also has at least two. The other typical component takes the form of non-
credit courses offered through continuing education departments. The non-credit
status, extra cost to students, and the limited duration (many of these courses meet as
few as three or six times in total) of many of these courses handcuff both instructors
and students and send messages clearly condemning student inadequacies, implicitly
discouraging non-traditional students from continuing, raising the cost of education to
those who can least afford the extra cost, and reifying the definition of writing as
remedial and as linguistic deficit.

Research by Workforce

We should also note the total number of instructors, 1674. Question four of
the survey asked if any members of the writing program conducted research on
writing. Thirty-two percent of the respondents reported that someone in their writing

22 Katherine McManus reported at the "First National Writing Conference"
in Winnipeg, November 27-30, 1990, that the University of Toronto has two writing
centres—Woodsworth College and Innis College—although no mention of either one
was reported by the 16 separate respondents to my survey by people in various
faculties at the University of Toronto.
programs conducted research. Because of the way the question was phrased we cannot be sure about how many people within each program conduct research. Institutional support for these scholars, however, is limited. Only 19% of institutions provide research grants to faculty who research in writing; 15% provide released time from teaching; and 15% provide research assistants. The lack of support for research on writing would seem to confirm the findings that few writing programs employ people who conduct research on writing.

Of course, the lack of funding for research on writing forms part of the larger, equally bleak picture for research support for funding throughout the humanities. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the prime source for research funding in the humanities in Canada, notes that since 1978-79 the grants budget of the Council has risen from about $37 million to its present level of approximately $82 million, but after adjustments for inflation and other costs, the real value of the SSHRC budget has hardly changed during this time... Although SSHRC's clientele represents 55 per cent of all full-time university faculty in Canada, SSHRC receives only 12 per cent of the total budget provided for the three research granting councils.\textsuperscript{23}

Because of the lack of a tradition of research and scholarship on writing in Canadian universities, little can be done to change the status of writing instruction in Canada. Instructors need to have time off, money to support their work, and research assistants to help perform the research itself. Without an interest in research, without the time to reflect on their work, and without the intellectual questions that arise from research, the development of knowledge about writing and the concomitant development of skill in writing that society demands will not be met.

\textsuperscript{23} From SSHRC News 3 (Spring 1990): p. 7.
The confluence of these various factors inhibit the growth of rhetoric and composition as the disciplinary base for writing instruction. Michel Foucault, in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, identifies similar relations between broad cultural conditions and the discursive practices approved by institutions (179). Foucault relates the example of how the discipline of psychiatry was formed out of "a whole set of relations between hospitalization, internment, the conditions and procedures of social exclusion, the rules of jurisprudence, the norms of industrial labor and bourgeois morality" (179). In composition studies, a constellation of factors--including but not limited to the dominance of universities by the upper-middle-class, the prevalence of literary notions of taste, prohibitions against granting university credit for writing courses, and conservative ideologies that view public discourse as a threat to established political structures--work to de-value the teaching of writing.

Table 6 presents a summary by academic rank of the number of people who teach writing from graduate teaching assistant to full professor. The largest single group consists of part-time lecturer (34%) followed by teaching assistant (18%) and full-time lecturer (14%). Together, these three groups make up the category of "Non-permanent staff" presented in Figure 4. Table 7 identifies the percentage of faculties supporting research in writing through research grants, release time, and research assistants.
Table 6: Number, Percentage, and Rank of Writing Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time lecturer or instructor</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time lecturer or instructor</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n= 1674)

Figure 4: Who Teaches Writing?
Table 7: Faculty Support for Research on Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Percentage Providing Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research grants</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released time from teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistants</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C) Do Administrators Value Instruction in Writing?*

Question five of the survey asked "How important is it for graduating students in your faculty to be able to write effectively?" Fully 99% of respondents described writing as important or very important. This should come as no surprise because educators at every level of the educational system agree that writing is indeed important. The answers to question five, however, do provide us with a base of commitment, a starting point from which to examine what actions these administrators have taken and some clues to explain why they chose these particular actions. Out of such an examination of their motives we can explain some of the writing programs operating today.

Administrators provided much information about motive in their discursive responses to question ten ("I would appreciate your using the space below to comment on any of the issues raised by this questionnaire"). Several respondents noted that while they value writing instruction, it could only come at the expense of cutting courses in the subject areas of the faculty:
The curriculum of the veterinary college is probably over weighted with the necessities of the science and art of the discipline, therefore, adding on instruction in a skill that should have been acquired much earlier is of doubtful value.

This respondent identified effective writing skills as "very important" for graduating students, but gives two reasons for offering no instruction: first, writing instruction would use scarce funds that are needed to replace lab equipment (for example); and second, this faculty is not the proper place—not responsible—for this part of their students' education. Underlying these statements is a definition of writing as a skill that can be mastered ("spelling, grammar and handwriting") and that is separate from the study of the "content" of a discipline, a definition that does not attend to the ways writing about veterinary medicine shapes knowledge nor to the ways reading about veterinary medicine constructs students' visions of what it means to be a veterinary doctor. This comment also reflects an attitude that has been pervasive in universities in Canada—a failure to take responsibility for higher literacy. Clearly, administrators who identify writing as a "very important" ability for their students to have may also not be willing to act constructively to change the way their schools deal with—in some cases, ignore—writing.

Despite the attitude expressed above, many faculties seem willing to at least discuss changes to the ways they teach writing. Results from question eight of the survey show that half of all undergraduate faculties in Canadian universities have discussed or proposed establishing new kinds of writing instruction (defined in the survey question as "new courses, tutorials, a writing centre"). In addition, over half (57%) of all undergraduate faculties have discussed or proposed enhancing the writing instruction that they presently offer. Only fourteen percent of these faculties have discussed reducing the writing instruction that they offer (defined as
"suspending writing courses, increasing writing class sizes"), and only four percent have discontinued writing instruction. At the very least, writing instruction is on the table, a matter of high importance; at best, today's climate offers a remarkable opportunity for changing the way Canadian universities approach the teaching of writing.

In their deliberations about writing instruction, what factors influence the decisions of deans when they discuss funding for writing instruction? Two of the most important factors concern the cost of the proposed instruction and qualifications of the instructors. Question nine of the survey asked "If you were asked to provide or increase funding for writing instruction in your faculty, what factors would affect your decision: cost of program, qualifications of instructors, availability of instructors, change in writing skills of entering students, other?" Respondents listed all four factors as important, with cost of the program most likely to be a very important factor (56%). Qualifications and availability of instructors were also described as very important or important factors, as was "change in writing skills of entering students."

As institutions, Canadian universities almost unanimously face funding restraints that severely limit spending for new programs and, indeed, often cut back spending for existing programs through funding "increases" that only match inflation. Such policies have been in place in Ontario, for example, since the early 1970's and show no sign of easing (political promises notwithstanding). Consequently, universities face considerable pressure to cut spending, not increase it; implementing proposals for enhancing or developing new writing programs would clearly increase expenditures. The discussion and proposals of new courses outlined above, therefore,
seem even more remarkable given the current funding situation. In many ways, funding represents the single largest impediment to implementing writing programs.

However, even within the context of funding cutbacks, new initiatives keep surfacing as universities seek to address the needs of students of the 1980's and 1990's. Writing instruction in Canadian universities takes at least one of the following six formulations, which I derived from studying the 240 responses in the sample. These approaches often occur in combination with each other rather than alone as each university seeks to address the particular needs of their students as well as fulfill the mission of the university.

1. Writing Across the Curriculum

Several universities developed full-scale writing-across-the-curriculum programs: Dalhousie, University of King's College (Halifax), Laurentian, and Western Ontario. These programs typically require students to take courses which combine study in a particular discipline with study in writing.

2. Restrict Access Through Testing Barriers

Respondents often noted that admission requirements restricted admission to those students who already wrote well. In addition, a number of universities give a test in the first year (Bishop's, Brock, Calgary), and some give an exit exam (Concordia, Laurentian, McMaster). In another, more recent trend, some universities have abandoned large-scale testing (Alberta, Guelph).
3. Writing Courses in Content Areas

Many respondents reported offering courses in writing through their own faculty. These courses range from legal methods and research in Law faculties to "Communicating in Plant Biology" (Science, Manitoba). Some respondents reported supervised research report courses at the upper levels of study. Unlike formal WAC-program courses, these courses are not the product of university policies but of initiatives within specific disciplines.

4. English Literature Combined with Composition

This traditional combination of interests and responsibilities continues to provide a base of instruction for many undergraduates at universities such as British Columbia, Memorial, and Ottawa. Many English departments contest the idea that they remain solely responsible for writing instruction, a position that has led to writing courses in disciplines and writing across the curriculum (noted above).

5. Writing Centres

Writing centres form an important part of instruction at many universities (including Lethbridge, Memorial, and Queen's, among others). Fully-developed writing centres support tenured faculty, advise a substantial percentage of the student body (12% at Queen's), and serve as a resource to the entire university community through workshops, tutorials, and lectures.  

---

24 For more information, see Katherine McManus (Director of the Writing Centre at Memorial University), "Report to Respondents of the Writing Program Questionnaire," July 16, 1990.
6. Continuing Education

Continuing education departments (Toronto, Western Ontario) offer a variety of non-credit writing courses, often designed for English as a Second Language students. Some, like Ryerson Polytechnic Institute and Simon Fraser University, offer courses in professional writing through continuing education departments.

No one university combines all of the above elements into one program.

Several reasons account for this seeming lack of coordination:

- responsibilities for writing instruction range across departmental and disciplinary boundaries;
- writing across the curriculum challenges the traditional, historically-derived English literature/composition synthesis;
- testing programs and the accompanying non-credit "remediation" conflict with courses of study that define writing as learning and thinking;
- most writing instruction focuses on practice (style and correctness) rather than on theory and practice combined (rhetorical choice in legal writing, for example).

Administrators clearly value writing instruction and the development of writing skills for their students, as the programs described above testify. Often, however, the absence of any central or coordinating body for writing instruction impedes the development of programs that define writing as learning, that emphasize writing as the manipulation of information rather than as only the production of a document, and that posit a writing subject that is not narrowly defined by formalistic rules of grammar and genre.

D) What Attitudes did Respondents Articulate Towards Writing?

Two out of three respondents (61%) wrote discursive comments, usually in question ten, but sometimes in separate letters and marginalia. Many of these
comments speak volumes about the present state of writing instruction and tell us much about the writing subject and writing theories that define much of the writing instruction that universities provide today.

One position argues that there is no place for writing instruction in universities, at all: "We don't have such a program. Nor is it our responsibility." Another respondent wrote "We teach teachers how to teach writing, not how to write." Still others were more explicit in laying blame for the present state of student writing skills at the feet of the elementary and secondary school systems: "We feel that the problem lies in the elementary and high school systems. It is not the role of the university to teach English composition." This respondent casts composition as a "problem" for which there is a "solution," a characterization that suggests writing is a skill that can be acquired rather than a way of thinking and coming to know.

Definitions of writing as deficiency also undergird the following response:

We feel very strongly that remediation or writing instruction is the responsibility of the student rather than an obligation of the University. Accordingly, we feel that it is totally inappropriate to divert University resources to remediation programmes of any sort. If students cannot write, they should not be at university.

The programs in the Faculty (Audiology, speech-language pathology, occupational therapy and physical therapy) are very popular. Hence our admissions can be limited to the very best students and we have sufficient choice to permit a student body with 80% marks and good English from the outset.

These respondents also assume that writing can be "mastered" once and for all, and that the students in this faculty have in fact mastered the art of writing. There seems to be no concept of writing as shaping discourse or thought.

Other respondents simply acknowledge that students cannot write as well as they expect without commenting on solutions or blame:
Because admission to our Faculty is so competitive (lowest possible GPA is usually around 83%), we tend to attract "la creme de la creme". However, even some of them do not measure up in terms of what I expect of university students writing skills. So I can only presume that the situation in some of the other faculties is even worse. (Sadly, a prime example of this is the Faculty of Education.)

Still others acknowledge the need for writing skills but, for various reasons, argue that their particular faculty is not the place for such instruction:

It is generally acknowledged that writing skills--spelling, grammar and handwriting, in a significant portion of each class of students entering the College, is atrocious. The students have already experienced a minimum of two full academic years of university courses prior to admission and are relatively mature. It is my impression that the faculty assume that writing habits have been firmly established and all students have completed at least one English course in their pre-selection program, therefore, remedial work at this level may not have a very good return for cost. The curriculum of the veterinary college is probably over weighted with the necessities of the science and art of the discipline, therefore, adding on instruction in a skill that should have been acquired much earlier is of doubtful value.

The definition of writing invoked by this respondent--"spelling, grammar and handwriting"--is not markedly different from the earlier respondents I have quoted, nor is his assumption that this faculty can do little to teach their students anything new: the respondent cites cost, previous efforts at improving writing (the English course), and defines writing as "remediation." But there is a feeling that students need to learn to write, and if it were cost-effective (somehow, someway) this faculty would implement some kind of writing instruction.

Another respondent gives a different slant for not offering writing instruction:

We emphasize writing across the curriculum but have recently changed English 101 to a non-credit academic support status in view of the fact that secondary schools now require an OAC credit,\(^2^5\) with the result that incoming students have had 5 English courses including one OAC. Only

\(^2^5\) Ontario Academic Credit--fifth high school credit in English/Composition.
weaker students now take Eng. 101 (which is being renamed Academic Support 014).

Again, while this respondent also appeals to a definition of writing as mastering a skill, the response also admits that students need writing instruction and that it has a place at the university. In this case, the move is to instruction in writing-across-the-curriculum courses rather than in one first-year English course.

Some respondents acknowledge the importance of writing and the attempts of their institution to do something about providing instruction:

We don't consider teaching writing skills as a logical responsibility of our Faculty [Physical Education]. We do, however, support the idea that strong communication skills, including writing, are very important for our students. Most senior classes and some junior classes require term papers and other written work. Students' communication skills, as well as the content of these papers are evaluated. We devote a fair amount of time to improving writing skills through various assignments and activities within the BPE [Bachelor of Physical Education] curriculum.

Certainly, this faculty seems willing to embrace the idea of writing across the curriculum. The physical education faculty at another university goes further and offers its own writing course "designed to assist students who exhibited writing difficulty in 1st year (determined by their mark in a required 1st yr. course--English 110)." Similarly progressive steps towards providing the writing instruction students need appear in the comments of the dean of Forestry at the University of Toronto, who wrote:

We believe that writing skills and effective communication are essential elements of an undergraduate education. The most efficient way to emphasize this is to make sure all our staff include this component in their courses, be it by way of essays, lab reports, field notes, public speaking or oral presentations. Formal instruction at this stage of a students' career in writing skills does not seem to be very productive.

26 At the University of Saskatchewan. This course consists of six two-hour sessions and is taken by students in the first semester of their second year.
For this dean and this faculty, writing instruction assumes a very important role in the education of their students, who, as professional foresters, will be required to write and deliver reports and presentations for many different audiences and purposes. While we cannot be sure from the self-report in the survey exactly how the emphasis on writing plays itself out in the classroom, we can be assured that this faculty takes the matter seriously and is willing to work at improving this aspect of their curriculum.

We can investigate in more specific terms the curriculum underlying the following comments of an associate dean of engineering at the University of New Brunswick, who wrote:

We consider communication to be a vital component of an engineer's professional education. Most Departments [in Engineering] provide an emphasis on written communication (Civil Engineering more than most with several courses requiring written materials).

This faculty provides three courses in the civil engineering department alone that focus on the development of oral and written communication: "Technical Writing," "Oral and Visual Communication," and "Senior Report 1 & 2."

The writing subjects inscribed by curricula such as the engineering students at New Brunswick and the foresters at Toronto call for active professionals, people able not only to study and research in their area of expertise but who are also able to take that knowledge and put it to use in their dealings in public forums. These engineers and foresters must be able to not only determine the best solution to a problem—such as whether or not to conduct controlled burning of prairie grasslands—but also to present this information in rhetorically sophisticated ways. The foresters may have to write technical reports for senior members of their provincial departments of lands
and forests; they may also be called upon to defend this practice at public hearings called to protest the smoke and assuage public nervousness about the relative dangers involved. Clearly, these faculties understand the importance of teaching their students to use language not only to develop knowledge through research but also for a variety of purposes (persuasive and informative) and audiences (professional and public). The attitude of these writing subjects centers around active participation in the creation and dissemination of knowledge rather than simply producing knowledge in a manner analogous to producing a material good for others to distribute and consume.

E) Range of Instruction

Most of this discussion of the survey results has attempted to establish that writing is, in fact, taught in many different faculties by many different people at Canadian universities. The question I would like to address at this point concerns the nature of the instruction offered. As is evident from the discussions reported above, writing instruction occurs in many different forms. Exactly what form a particular kind of instruction takes depends upon what part of the institution delivers, and to some extent funds, the instruction. The categories discussed below derived from an extensive reading and rereading of course offerings provided in answer to question seven of the survey which called for the "names and descriptions" of the courses students were required or encouraged to take. The following table summarizes the categories and the number of times respondents mentioned each kind of instruction.
Table 8: Kinds of Writing Instruction Students are Encouraged or Required to Take Ranked by Number of Times Mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Instruction</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing in a Content Area (not English)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition course in English department</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language course in French department</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific, Technical, or Business Writing</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and composition</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit writing course</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative writing course</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Centre</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition/Rhetoric theory</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications (oral and written)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Arts or Humanities course</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-departmental writing course</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents included descriptions of a wide cross-section of courses in writing from dentistry to zoology. These courses often combine oral and written communications under one heading, such as "Communications 1" (Faculty of Dentistry, Dalhousie University) which lists as one of the main course objectives the development of communications skills through the study and practice of writing and through "group communications skills needed to successfully engage in professional debate, discussion and consensus building." This course combines the goals of introducing the study of the history and professional practice of dentistry with the development of both oral and written communication skills through the writing of essays and preparation of oral reports. "Communicating in Plant Biology" in the faculty of science at the University of Manitoba combines the study of oral and
written discourse (including illustration) with the production of knowledge in biology:

Practica and discussions on use of library research facilities, evaluation of seminars and botanical papers and preparation of written and illustrative material for publication and seminar delivery.

While such courses have not been traditionally thought of as writing courses, they clearly treat the issues of how writing—and in the case of plant biology, illustration—contributes to the formation of knowledge. In this context, writing texts about biology becomes a rhetorical activity, and students are encouraged to participate in a discipline whose knowledge formation can be accounted for at least in part through the study and practice of rhetoric.

A second large group of courses consists of composition courses in English departments. These courses include basic writing courses focusing on grammar and correctness, such as "English 093, English Composition" at the University of Manitoba. A course outline describes the goals as providing sufficient instruction in the following areas of composition so that students will be able to recognize and discuss them in their own writing and in that of others, and so that they will be able to employ them effectively in their own writing: phrases (gerund, infinitive, and participial; the agreement of subject and verb; the agreement of pronoun and antecedent . . .

At the University of Manitoba, the second level of courses on writing proceeds beyond sentence-level concerns about error to consider the process of writing, organizing, and developing ideas in essays. Concerns for language concentrate on emphasis ("by position, structure, repetition, rhythm"), diction ("denotation, connotation, exactness, appropriateness"), paragraph development ("lineal, ramifying,
circular, loose"), and sentence structure ("loose, cumulative, and periodic; parallelism and balance").

The results of the French survey showed that most universities offered courses in language through the French department. These courses varied in emphasis from what appear to be elementary language courses to courses on professional writing. Relatively few French-language universities (8) account for a proportionately larger share of courses on language than their counterparts in the the English survey. In addition, most of the French-language universities have testing policies in place for students. It is both surprising and encouraging to see that these universities offer instruction at many levels to support students whom the tests identify as being in need of help.27

Scientific, technical, and business writing courses form a third large group of courses. The engineering faculty at Queen's University offers an extensive series of courses of this nature. The mechanical engineering department, for example, offers courses on "Basic Technical Writing," "Technical Writing and Project Communications," "Effective Technical Communication," "Report Writing," "Effective Reporting," "Cohesion in English," and "Investigating English Style." The last two courses in the previous list are cross-listed with the linguistics department in the arts and science faculty. The calendar description for "Technical Writing and Project Communications" presents in capsule form the gist of these courses:

27 For more information about language policies in French-language universities, see "Composition in Twentieth-Century French-Language Universities" in Chapter Two.
The principles of effective communication are developed and applied to commonly met documents, presentations, and procedures associated with engineering design, development, contracting, and project management.

Included is instruction in analytical reporting, correspondence, specification, proposing, and product support documentation.

While common errors of language usage are reviewed, this is not a remedial English course and registrants are required to have writing competence at least equivalent to Grade 12 English Language.

This course teaches professional writing for engineers with an emphasis on both oral and written communication. The writing subject inscribed in this course will use language as a kind of communication "tool" to be wielded in much the same way as other tools of the engineering trade can be used. That is, the universe of language includes analytical, informative, and communicative functions in well-defined genres (such as product support documentation). This course circumscribes writing by limiting writing to a professional context and ignoring the interactions that engineers will have with people who are not engineers, including the public and other managers in their own companies. Often engineers present opinions in public forums to influence policy issues, for example; this course offers no connection to those discourse events. In the long run, circumscribing the writing subjects in this kind of course leads them to believe that they are objective technicians rather than ideologically-invested participants in the events that form our society. At Queen's, the various engineering departments work to avoid such a dislocation through other courses, such as "Ethics and Responsibility of the Engineer" and "History of Engineering 1 & 2." In addition, a civil engineering course called "Technical Report and Seminar" requires students to write and present orally different reports, including one report presented in a television studio. These other courses may build in some sense of connection between the students' work and their need to present this work in
a variety of communicative settings, but a sense of rhetorical situation needs also to be built through writing situations that do not exclude public discourse as either a genre or a mode of communicating that is important for engineers to study.

A fourth major category of writing courses consists of the traditional English department introductory course often called "Literature and Composition." Perhaps the best way to get a sense of this kind of course comes from reading the description presented to students:

English 100 has the dual purpose of teaching students to write effective expository prose and to read literature critically and with appreciation. Through a study of selected essays, students learn to use expository techniques such as classification, definition, comparison, and illustration; and in their writing they develop their ability to select and organize material, to state and develop a thesis, and to use language directed to a specific audience. Close reading of literary texts introduces students to the concerns of style, diction, and tone; to point of view and techniques of characterization; to the use of figurative lanugage; and to the conventions of particular literary genres. Students demonstrate their competence in exposition and their comprehension of the literature by writing a series of home and in-class essay assignments.28

These courses seek to provide a basic training in both the critical reading of literary texts and in the writing of essays that express the "appreciation" gained through this critical reading. The critical reading part of the course discusses concepts listed in the latter part of the course description above: style, diction, tone, characterization, point of view. In the composition part of the course, students learn to "select and organize material" using their critical reading abilities. These selections must then be unified and given coherence by a thesis statement before they are expressed in language suitable to teachers of these courses ("a specific audience"). Although

28 From a handout given at the University of British Columbia describing English 100, "Literature and Composition," dated June 1990.
grammar and usage are not mentioned in the general course description above, at some universities they form the content of the one-hour per week seminar for weak students. In addition, some universities require students to pass an English language competency test or test of writing ability in addition to taking the literature and composition course. These tests may include sections on grammar and usage. Clearly, literature and composition courses function as introductions to reading and writing within the discipline of English studies. As such, they define the writing subject as someone in control of the critical apparatus described above and who can then apply these ways of reading and understanding to produce texts that are similarly controlled and coherent. The subject of these texts does not look to the larger society for either confirmation about these readings or for an audience to write to; rather, the subject remains controlled and formalized.

Other categories of courses include non-credit writing courses, creative writing courses, writing centres, courses on composition and rhetorical theory, communications courses, non-departmental writing courses, and writing-across-the-curriculum programs. This list highlights the diverse nature of writing instruction in Canadian universities: instruction can be found in many different disciplines--and in some cases, in no discipline at all (non-departmental courses and writing centre instruction)--taught with a focus that serves the interests of those disciplines. In contrast, universities in the United States tend to ground writing in English departments and rely on freshman composition to provide an introduction to writing in university settings. In Canada, the reluctance of English departments to accept writing as a legitimate area of study and research and the consequent refusal to lead the university in the teaching of writing has created a situation wherein each faculty has had to attempt some solution of its own, for better or worse.
Profiles of Two Universities

The results of this survey provide a multidimensional view of writing instruction at institutions that replied to the survey. At the start of this study, I considered the idea that most instruction would come out of English departments, but in order to be sure of that I had to find out what, if any, instruction in writing took place in other departments. In fact, a considerable amount of writing instruction does take place outside of English departments. These "other" places take the form of writing centers, remedial or basic writing courses in student services or adult extension departments, and writing courses in specific disciplines.

To understand how these courses fit into the context of each institution, we need to take a look at how writing gets taught from the perspective of the entire university. The first example we will look at is Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. Queen's University provides an interesting example because this university has chosen to fund a large writing centre as a way of providing instruction to all the university's students. As well, different faculties offer courses in writing, led by the Engineering faculty which offers a series of courses in writing. The English department offers only one non-credit basic writing course and one first-year credit course. Table 9 summarizes the responses to the survey from the various faculties at Queen's.
Table 9: Writing Instruction at Queen's University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of faculties surveyed: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Number and names of responses:** 6
- Applied Science, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Arts and Science (English), Writing Centre; non-response from Business

**Courses in the disciplines:**
A) Applied Science
   - **Chemical Engineering:**
     - 301 Technical Writing;
     - 421 Research Project;
   - **Civil Engineering:**
     - 466 Technical Report and Seminar;
   - **Mechanical Engineering:**
     - 201 Basic Technical Writing;
     - 320 Technical Writing and Project Communications;
     - 380 Effective Technical Communication;
     - 381 Report Writing;
     - 382 Effective Reporting;
     - 383 Cohesion in English;
     - 384 Investigating English Style;
   - **Metallurgical Engineering:**
     - 352 Technical Report

B) Law:
   - 332 Legal Imagination

C) Arts (English):
   - 075 Effective Writing 1;
   - 175 Effective Writing 2 [English majors prohibited]

**Writing Centre**
The Writing Centre at Queen's was established in 1986. In the three years of operation between 1986 and 1989, demand for its services has risen from 579 enrollments to 1771 enrollments in tutorials, workshops, and writing courses. In 1989, the Centre served 12% of the student population. Students consistently value the Centre's personnel and services highly. Administrators see the centre as a cost-effective way to provide the instruction students need.
At Queen's, honours students in the arts don't take writing courses. This implies that writing is seen as something that is static and can be mastered rather than a "plastic art" (Susan Miller's phrase) or an act motivated by situation and exigency (Bitzer). Engineering departments—particularly mechanical engineering—value writing and communication skills highly, though there appears to be a lack of focus on writing theory within their course offerings. A writing centre is seen as a way of providing the instruction that students require but it also fails to provide an opportunity to research and theorize about what writing is and what makes it work. Nevertheless, the Writing Centre also functions as a resource for the entire university community by providing various services, including workshops for teaching assistants in many disciplines. The other element in the mix, the English department, offers two writing courses: a non-credit basic writing course (Effective Writing 1) and a course that English majors may not take for credit (Effective Writing 2). The proscriptions against the study of writing for English majors only serve to codify what most English majors will sense from faculty attitudes: the writing subject inscribed by the English department responds to the close reading of texts with grammatical correctness and closely-reasoned argument about literature based upon a cultivated sensibility. English majors do not study theories of writing or rhetoric per se.

The Law school, however, teaches both the theory as well as the practice of writing. The course description of Law 332, "Legal Imagination," reads "A writing course exploring what one can learn and say about the legal imagination, what it can mean to learn and to think and speak like a lawyer. Text: James B. White, The Legal Imagination." In the preface to the abridged edition of this text, White defines law as
not merely a system of rules (or rules and principles), or ... policy choices or class interests ... [but rather] a language, by which I do not mean just a set of terms and locutions, but habits of mind and expectations—what might also be called a culture. It is an enormously rich and complex system of thought and expression, of social definitions and practices, which can be learned and mastered, modified or preserved, by the individual mind ... [law] is a kind of cultural competence: an art of reading the special literature of the law and an art of speaking and writing—of making compositions of one's own—in this language. It is a branch of rhetoric. 29

White reiterates this claim elsewhere, noting that "while there are of course many useful and familiar ways to talk about law—say as a system of rules or as a structure of institutions—it is most usefully and completely seen as a branch of rhetoric ... [rhetoric is] the central art by which culture and community are established, maintained, and transformed" (28). White, and I suspect the professor teaching this course, treats rhetoric not as incidental to the law but as playing a formative role, as epistemological. Law is a "compositional process," the integration of legal texts with real world narratives, that takes place through "a language established and maintained by the legal community" and a language that imposes constraints on what can be said (Heracles' Bow 240-1).

Queen's represents a middle-of-the-road approach to teaching writing. Some departments—like the law school—are years ahead of others in terms of teaching writing as a rhetorical practice, while the administration of the institution seeks ways of providing "damage control" through a writing centre and first-year writing courses.

The responses from the University of Saskatchewan offer a different model of a university which does not offer much writing instruction. These responses indicate a lack of leadership: apparently there is no university-wide policy regarding how to

help students develop their writing skills. At Queen's, the university decided to fund
the writing centre as a response to a perceived need; at the University of
Saskatchewan, however, no such university-wide response appears to have been
made. Instead, several disciplines have developed their own courses, as Table 10
indicates.

Table 10: Writing Instruction at the University of Saskatchewan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Faculties Surveyed</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and names of respondents</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Commerce, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, Law, Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in the disciplines:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271 Introduction to the Teaching of Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371 Teaching for Improved Writing Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372 Teaching the Writing Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Engineering(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390 Oral and Written Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364 Professional Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Writing Improvement Course (6 2 hr. sessions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) All students in Engineering are required to take English 115.3.
The university offers a freshman English course, as do most universities in Canada. Beyond this course, one respondent to the survey identified English 115 as a prerequisite for all students. The education department offers what may be the country's most developed sequence of courses for training teachers of writing which are complemented by study at the graduate level: 870.3 Current Issues in Language Arts Education, 871.3 Trends and Issues in the Teaching of Secondary School Language, and 872.3 Trends and Issues in Teaching Writing in Secondary School. Two of the undergraduate courses focus directly on writing and teaching writing:

371.3 Teaching for Improved Writing Skills

This course has been designed to develop the writing skills of Education students, focusing on those writing forms commonly used in elementary, middle, and secondary classrooms, and leading to more dynamic and imaginative teaching of composition.

373.3 Teaching the Writing Process

The focus of this senior elective course is writing and the teaching of writing. The class is of interest to elementary, secondary, and post secondary teachers of any discipline who have to teach writing. Topics for this course include personal writing experiences, teaching the writing process, teaching modes of discourse, selecting appropriate evaluation procedures, and examining samples of students' writings.

These courses fulfill dual purposes: as they teach prospective teachers about writing, they also function as examples of how to run a writing classroom. The respondent to the survey made several important points in the response to question 10:

In a Language Arts program, students need to know how; hence reading and writing process is a real focus of a teacher education course.

The central focus of a teacher education course is to make students aware of the writing process so that they have more power over writing. The course is not deficit driven, but process driven.
Students need, in teacher education writing courses, to learn to see themselves as readers and writers. The typical student doesn't have this attitude.

At our University and in our College, the focus to deal with process approaches to language arts lies with individual language arts profs. There is no major College or University thrust to look at the issues involved with writing. There is a strong need on our campus for a context outside the teacher education language arts class to consider the issues involved with reading and writing.

I quote this response at length to indicate that sophisticated, informed practice in the teaching of reading and writing exist at some institutions and in some settings in Canadian universities. Certainly, the evidence from the survey suggests that the response quoted above shows an atypical knowledge of what writing is and what writing instruction should consist of; nevertheless, this response is not unique. What is typical of this response is the last part, the part that describes the lack of institutional direction or support for instruction based on current research into reading and writing practices. Another respondent also commented on the lack of institutional support for writing instruction in response to question 10:

The writing skills (or lack of them) of the undergraduate and graduate students in our programs has been and continues to be of concern to our faculty. We expect our graduates to be skilled in written English, but do not include adequate numbers of written assignments in our courses. We have included a required course in the humanities as a pre-requisite for entry to the Nursing program.

One faculty, Physical Education, offers a follow-up to first-year English as a way of continuing instruction rather than just casting adrift students with difficulties:

6 2 hr. sessions designed to assist students who exhibited writing difficulty in 1st yr. (determined by their mark in a required 1st yr. course--English 110.) Course is taken in 1st semester of their second year.
Clearly, this faculty continues to attempt to help their students learn to write. The nature of this instruction is remedial and unlikely to produce long-term increases in writing performance because of the short duration of the instruction. That the Physical Education faculty offers its own course as a supplement to the required first-year English course indicates that writing improvement occurs over long stretches of instruction and practice, and that requiring students to take one English course is not a reasonable or effective way to improve all student writing.

Summary and Conclusion

What, then, can be said about the present state of writing instruction in Canadian universities? First, the survey results establish that writing instruction is far more widespread than usually thought: fully 67% of faculties either require or encourage their students to take a course that has as a primary aim the improvement of writing skills. This instruction encompasses tutorials in writing workshops, non-credit courses in continuing education departments, introductory courses in English departments, courses in the disciplines that put a heavy emphasis on improving writing skills, courses in content areas devoted to writing, and courses that address the epistemological implications of writing in that discipline. The wide diversity of instructional offerings implies an equally wide range of institutional settings. Writing courses appear in many professional faculties and not exclusively in arts and arts and science faculties. Indeed, more than half of all law, agriculture, engineering and education faculties offer their own writing courses. Professional schools, as a group, are also more likely to require or encourage their students to enroll in writing courses than arts, science, or social science faculties.
Because of the marginal nature of writing instruction in non-arts faculties and the extensive use of graduate students in large programs in arts faculties, most instructors hold non-permanent positions. The lack of security and status accompanies a lack of research on the part of those who provide instruction. The lack of research can be attributed to many factors, including scarce funding and a disparate research community of scholars from education, English, psychology, and business departments (among others). Consequently, these instructors are unlikely to perform the kind of research that universities accept as proof of scholarly work and are unlikely to qualify for tenured positions.

Despite the lack of institutional rewards such as tenure and funding, administrators indicated that they value writing instruction highly. The high value attached to writing instruction appears tangibly in the growth of writing programs over the last 20 years and in proposals for new courses. This growth occurs despite severe funding restraints and the necessity of cutting core content courses to create room for writing courses. The new instruction in writing takes six basic forms that often occur in combination: writing-across-the-curriculum courses, testing, writing courses in content areas, literature and composition courses, writing centre tutorials, and continuing education courses.

Administrators offered a wide variety of attitudes to the teaching of writing. Those who see writing instruction as important and as worthy of study at university tend to support new and growing programs. They appear to outnumber those who define writing as remedial. The wide-spread support for writing programs and the resistance of English departments to the idea of teaching "service" courses caused faculties outside arts to institute their own instruction, including courses in disciplines
as diverse as dentistry and zoology. As a result, the range of kinds of instruction varies widely throughout universities and the university system. The programs at Queen's University and the University of Saskatchewan provide examples of how the various writing programs within a university operate at a university-wide level: Queen's adopted a large writing centre as a coordinating body in addition to the various courses in different faculties; Saskatchewan provides no coordinating body, leaving each faculty to create ad hoc arrangements such as the Physical Education remedial course.

At the beginning of this chapter, I introduced three questions to help frame the discussion of the results of this survey of writing instruction: One, how does writing instruction function as both the communication and production of knowledge in the university? Two, do theories of writing as shaping knowledge inform the instruction provided? Three, how do different disciplines locate the "writing subject" in their instruction? I would like to examine these issues now in light of the information that the survey provided to examine in what ways these theoretical issues interact with the practical problems of teaching writing at Canadian universities.

It might properly be said that the teaching of writing at Canadian universities functions to re-produce knowledge (in the Marxist sense of the term) rather than to produce it per se. Writing instruction is rarely seen as the site of social conflict or an opportunity to engage the important political issues affecting the country. Rather, almost universally courses focus on grammar and correctness as an important and basic component. It is this emphasis on the mechanics and basic grammar of English that Northrop Frye, F. E. L. Priestley, and other traditionalists invoke when they define literacy in a narrow sense. These courses may also proceed to a study of
genres or "forms" of writing appropriate to specific disciplines: the business résumé, the technical report, the literary essay. Occasionally some courses extend their treatment of writing to examine the situatedness of writing, either through an examination of rhetorical or composition theory or through the practice of writing in rhetorically-defined situations. These courses begin to treat writing as more than a product or static object to be delivered up and begin to conceptualize writing as communication subject to many variables that can never be fully and completely captured. We can never know fully how our written words will be understood or even know under what conditions they will be read. Writing courses that examine the indeterminacy associated with writing and reading are rare, although some do exist in discipline-specific contexts ("The Legal Imagination"). These courses most closely approximate Raymond Williams' concept of communication as the production of knowledge: the focus is on how writing contributes to the shaping of knowledge. The focus on knowledge clearly differs from the focus on producing communication in the sense of clear, concise, and correct prose. No writing course reported in the survey responses specifically linked the production of knowledge to issues of power. It is as if writing exists neutrally, apart from the issues it engages. The explanation for the failure to link knowledge with power lies in the definitions of writing that inform the epistemologies of those structuring and teaching writing courses.

In an attempt to address question two ("Do theories of writing as shaping knowledge inform instruction?")), I quoted Raymond Williams' description of a block to the full conceptualization of writing which comes from "the abstraction of communication that represents it as a one-way sender/receiver corridor" (Williams 50). This theory of writing informs most instruction and is described in more detail
as the conduit metaphor by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in *Metaphors We Live By:*

Within objectivist linguistics and philosophy, meanings and linguistic expressions are independently existing objects. Such a view gives rise to a theory of communication that fits the CONDUIT metaphor very closely:

Meanings are objects.
Linguistic expressions are objects.
Linguistic expressions have meanings (in them).
In communication, a speaker sends a fixed meaning to a hearer via the linguistic expression associated with that meaning.

On this account it is possible to objectively say what you mean, and communication failures are matters of subjective errors: since the meanings are objectively right there in the words, either you didn't use the right words to say what you meant or you were misunderstood. (206)

Most of the course descriptions supplied with the survey responses appear to depend upon the epistemology described above to organize the course. Courses often claim to help students to "improve their ability to write clear, forceful, effective papers" through the study of style, including choosing appropriate words and to emphasize "clear, precise, and concise" writing by students. The emphasis upon a rhetoric of grammatical and mechanical correctness, supplemented by a drive for clarity, precision, and conciseness serves well the interests of professional faculties and the employers who hire the graduates of these programs. Communication for business or large institutions attaches a premium to informative writing and penalizes or at least seeks to ignore issues of power within and without the corporation. Initially, the emphasis on clear and precise writing also serves students destined to work in these environments by helping them to cope with the various writing tasks that confront them. However, by masking factors such as seniority, competition, rewards, and liability, such an emphasis fails to educate students to understand how writing works
in the culture of the corporation. Further, as citizens in a democracy, such an emphasis leads people to read uncritically reports from the news media and the reports published by various government agencies on nuclear and environmental issues, for example. Much work needs to be done to conceptualize writing as shaping knowledge.

The third issue addressed in the introduction to this chapter concerned the "writing subject." How does the instruction provided at Canadian universities limit or create intellectual space within which students can write? In some ways, the issues of power and epistemology identified above cannot be extricated from this concept of a writing subject because strictures about clarity and precision necessarily narrow the scope of what students may write about in their essays or even if they write essays rather than resumés or technical reports. On a more fundamental level, the issue of the writing subject involves determining just what kind of consciousness and concerns the student writer can have while a participant in the university community. It is this construction of individuality through writing—and what students are not invited or allowed to write—that offers the greatest potential to renovate university writing instruction and to recast the kind of student inscribed through university practices. In some ways, I am describing a concept similar to the liberal arts ideal: an informed, able, ethical person who can function to develop a better society. It is this kind of writing subject that writing courses often do not address or inscribe through their practices because of the narrow focus on correctness and genre.

As writing subjects, students and instructors use the prescriptions of form and mechanics to achieve some kind of hold on the elusive nature of writing. Writing, Susan Miller notes,
treats the mixed and unstable confluence of anterior intentions and purposes and posterior "readings," "meanings," or outcomes as though they could be fixed. It is a living fiction of, not an achievement of, stability. (19)

The student writer who negotiates the gaps between anterior and posterior meanings often gets lost in the process. In place of the risk of losing students to uncertainty, most courses construct writing subjects who follow genre recipes and grammar strictures as guide posts through the forest. Rules that appeal to ultimate rights and wrongs help to control writing, but in important ways these same rules limit student ownership of texts by denying students the chance to explore texts fully and, indeed, develop their own texts.

Narrowly-defined writing subjects, theories of writing defined as a conduit for information, and an emphasis on writing as the production of a fixed product to be consumed by an educational machine all contribute to limit the usefulness of writing. These factors also create perceptions of writing as mechanical and utilitarian among faculty throughout the university, perceptions that ultimately lead to statements and decisions supporting the position that writing has no place at the university. Only through addressing the fundamental issues of theories of writing, the writing subject, and the purpose of producing writing can writing be reconstructed as a serious endeavour worthy of university study. In some institutions and some disciplines, this process is well under way. However, at the majority much needs to be done to rewrite curricula to address more fundamental issues than genre and grammar.

The next two chapters seek to further explore these issues in the context of particular writing programs at the University of Winnipeg and the University of New Brunswick. Detailed reports, interviews, and histories of each institution help to explain how the programs in place today came to be and provide much more detailed
information about those programs than course descriptions and course syllabi can provide.
CHAPTER IV
WRITING INSTRUCTION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

This chapter forms the first of two that seek to extend this description of current writing programs in Canadian universities beyond the data collected in the survey of administrators. The survey produced results that provide basic information about a wide range of writing programs; the case studies that follow provide detailed portraits of writing programs at two universities: the University of Winnipeg and the University of New Brunswick. In the detailed descriptions of writing programs at these universities we may be able to identify how writing programs come to be, what factors influence their operation and philosophy, and how writing is taught in Canadian universities today. The information presented in these chapters helps to answer the three main research questions that guide this dissertation:

- In what contexts—institutional, social, ideological, and technological—is writing taught to undergraduates in Canadian universities?
- In the universities that teach writing formally, how is this instruction carried out?
- What definitions of writing does this instruction presuppose and promulgate?

Specifically, the case studies that follow present more in-depth information about the context of the writing programs at these two universities by presenting interviews with a variety of people associated with the programs and by reviewing many different documents that describe the origin and operation of these programs. In the
course of interviewing people and examining documents, definitions of writing emerge, definitions that reflect linguistic, historical, and cultural factors. Conclusions presented in these chapters are based on the data reported of the programs described in these chapters as they were at the time of the case study site visits (in the Fall and Winter of 1990-91).

The following case studies attempt to grasp the complex relationship between the context of each writing program and the kind of writing instruction that takes place. An important factor in this attempt centres on understanding what it means to write in each locale. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz identifies this "task of seeing broad principles in parochial facts" as producing "local knowledge" (Geertz 168). The case studies presented here attempt to collect local knowledge of how each university's writing programs define and practice writing and attempt to identify, however tentatively, the "structures of meaning in terms of which individuals and groups of individuals live out their lives, and more particularly with the symbols and systems of symbols through whose agency such structures are formed, communicated, imposed, shared, altered, [and] reproduced" (Geertz 182). This dissertation focuses on writing instruction as an agent in changing the larger structure of meaning--the university. As one of the instructors in the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg commented, "the Writing Program faculty have worked fairly closely with the Access Committee and see educating non-traditional students as one of our chief goals/activities."1 Writing at the University of Winnipeg is defined and implemented within the context of improving access to the university for non-traditional students. Many other universities, both in Manitoba and across Canada,

1 J. McCleod-Rogers, personal correspondence, June 1991.
have not defined writing as part of a policy to improve access to university. Consequently, it is within the local knowledge of each university we find information both to describe the present state of writing instruction and to explain how this state of affairs came into being.

As case studies, these chapters extend the survey results by presenting information gathered from interviews with teachers, students, and administrators; from personal observations made while visiting the case study sites; from the examination of documents gathered at each location; and from library research at each university's library. The visits to the case study sites were quite short: four days at the University of Winnipeg and three days at the University of New Brunswick. Opportunities to visit classes were limited by interview schedules and my desire to obtain a comprehensive view of the institutional organization of each program rather than an in-depth view of the pedagogical workings of each program. The historical and cultural context of each program calls principally upon print evidence with some support from interviews with people who have taught in each setting during the last thirty years. Most of the data comes from interviews with teachers and administrators whose practices may or may not bear out their statements about what they think they are doing. In my analysis of these programs, I attempt to contextualize the statements of those involved in administrating or teaching the program with my own observations and with information from the survey results. At times, documents provided by the subjects of the interviews support or challenge informants' perceptions of how they teach and how the institution runs. Such tensions are perhaps inevitable, particularly in a program such as the University of Winnipeg where the curricula and administrative relationships have changed and continue to change rapidly.
The case studies draw upon qualitative methods often used in ethnographies to gather the data that forms the basis of the descriptions that follow and the arguments I present. Further, the data gathered for each case study explores the institutional organization and theoretical basis for each program of instruction in writing. Classroom practice, in and of itself, is a secondary concern because these practices—such as teaching writing as a process—depend on the overall context of writing instruction to become meaningful. As a case in point, English departments at both the University of Winnipeg and the University of New Brunswick claim to teach "writing as a process." At Winnipeg, most rhetoric and composition scholars would grant that writing processes receive considerable attention. At New Brunswick, however, the process is limited to revising sentences within the constraints of the current-traditional paradigm. Classroom practices, then, must be interpreted in light of more important issues, such as where writing is located in the institution and what purposes such instruction is meant to serve. The successes and failures with writing instruction in Canada and the reasons for its present configuration result from such larger issues. As part of my inquiry into writing instruction in Canadian universities, I have tried to ask 'Who is speaking' and 'What are the relations of meaning among the participants in each setting' (to paraphrase Foucault) as well as describe pedagogies in detail in an effort to contribute significantly to re-configuring writing instruction in Canada.

**Introduction**

I was drawn to the first case study, of the University of Winnipeg, because the Writing Program there confronts the distinction many Canadian university administrators draw between "university-level work" and "pre-university study." In
terms more familiar to those in composition studies, the distinction draws a line between basic writing and freshman composition and defines basic writing as something that has no place in the university. At the University of Winnipeg, the "basic rhetoric" courses and the rhetoric courses offered in the Writing Program collapse this distinction by attempting to make basic writers part of the university. I was interested in how the historical and cultural contexts of writing instruction at the University of Winnipeg may have contributed to including basic writing in its offerings. Beyond merely including a wider range of writing abilities, the University of Winnipeg Writing Program instructors developed courses informed by current composition theory. These courses seemed worth highlighting through in-depth description as examples of what writing instruction can be if it is informed by current composition theory.

At the same time, other aspects of the writing program also interested me. The Writing Program was attached to the English department. Most other Canadian university English departments have no extensive program of courses in writing. Furthermore, composition courses are often seen as "service" courses rather than as integral to studies in English language and literature. Clearly, the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg somehow established a different identity. In addition, the instructors in this Writing Program administered the program collaboratively rather than hierarchically. The case study that follows seeks to investigate this unique combination of factors and place that writing program in the context of other programs across Canada.

Data for the case study were collected from a series of interviews conducted during the week of November 26 to 30, 1990 with participants who helped plan and
implement the writing program. In addition to observations of classes and interviews with a wide variety of participants in the writing program (including students), I also examined historical evidence in calendars and senate minutes in the library. These documents were supplemented by documents provided by informants that described current policies and instructional procedures. I attempt to describe in detail the writing instruction provided at the University of Winnipeg by examining it within the context of the city and the goals of the institution. By examining this context, I seek to understand why writing plays such a large part in this university's undergraduate curriculum.

The organization of this chapter attempts to represent the Writing Program in categories drawn from the program itself rather than categories imposed from outside. The first subsections of the chapter attempt to provide a local context for readers by giving some information about Winnipeg, the University of Winnipeg, and the history of teaching writing at the university. The middle sections of the chapter adopt headings used by teachers and administrators to describe the Writing Program, such as "Developmental Rhetoric," "Rhetoric IA/IB," "The Writing Centre and Text Processing Centre," "English Department Writing Courses," and "Writing in the Disciplines." The concluding section notes the evolutionary nature of the program, comments on some limitations that remain, and compares the University of Winnipeg survey results with results from other small universities.

Winnipeg, Manitoba

The University of Winnipeg (UW) is located in the city of Winnipeg, province of Manitoba (see Figure 5). Winnipeg, a multicultural city of over 640,000 people, is home to the largest urban population of aboriginal people in North
Figure 5: Map Showing Location of the University of Winnipeg
America. Aboriginal peoples account for approximately ten percent of the population of Winnipeg, but they represent only one percent of the student body at the University of Winnipeg. Winnipeg's polyglot character—a heritage of the waves of immigration earlier in this century—contributes to the fact that English is the first language of less than half of the population of the city. In Winnipeg, weekly newspapers appear in fourteen different languages. After English, German is the second most common language as a result of the strong Mennonite community, and Ukrainian is the third most common language; French is well down the list. More recently, the city has welcomed a substantial influx of refugees from Southeast Asia. At the University of Winnipeg, this language diversity has contributed to the development of a full sequence of writing courses (including sections specifically devoted to second-language students) as well as initiatives by the administration to improve accessibility for both Aboriginal peoples and second language students.

Winnipeg also functions as the provincial capital and as such has provided the backdrop for many important scenes in Canadian history. In 1870, Louis Riel, a Metis, led the first of two revolutions against central Canadian interests from what is now Winnipeg. A hero in Quebecers' eyes and a treasonous villain in the eyes of Ontario (for his execution of a man from Ontario), Riel forced issues such as religious and linguistic tolerance to be incorporated into the statutes that established the province in 1870. A century later the statutory rights for French-speaking people in Manitoba became the centre of controversy again. As a result of a series of court

---

2 The term "Metis" denotes people of the Canadian prairie who have one (often French) white and one North American Indian parent.

3 For more information, see Kenneth McNaught, The Pelican History of Canada (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1982).
cases extending from a simple traffic ticket, Manitoba was forced to translate all official laws into French from English as the original statutes required (the original statutes required the province to translate all laws into French). Part of the opposition to the huge translation job that resulted centered on the privileging of French over other, larger, non-English language groups in the province. This concern for the multi-lingual groups within modern Canada also underlies Manitoba's refusal to accept the Meech Lake accord. The accord, which sought to bring Quebec into the Canadian confederation (Quebec still has not signed the Canadian Constitution of 1982), called for the curtailment of minority language rights within Quebec as a strategy to preserve the French language. In Manitoba, where one of every four people speaks a language other than English as a first language, the unequal application of minority rights for Quebec fixed public opinion solidly against the accord.

As brief as this summary is, it nevertheless suggests the importance of language issues in Manitoba. This summary also suggests something of the context that influences curriculum at Manitoba universities. At the University of Winnipeg, these language issues were, in part, responsible for the establishment of the writing program. The university used funds provided for increasing accessibility for non-traditional students and students from a broad economic and cultural cross-section of society to create the Writing Program. The University of Winnipeg's Writing Program is a recent development (it was first proposed to Senate in the mid-1980s), and to present it in context requires that we look now at the institutional history of teaching writing at the University of Winnipeg.

Administrators at The University of Winnipeg like to point out that it has always been a small but academically demanding and rigorous institution. Located in the central core of the city of Winnipeg, it is one of the two small universities in the province and has enrollments of 3,381 full-time and 4,434 part-time students. Brandon University is the smallest university of the three universities in the province with enrollments of 1,187 full-time and 1,982 part-time students. In contrast, the University of Manitoba (also located in Winnipeg) enrolls over 14,000 full-time and over 8,000 part-time students. Despite the relatively small size of the University of Winnipeg, it ranks third among Canadian universities in the number of Mellon Fellowships awarded to its students. Only the University of Toronto and the University of British Columbia have produced more.

This tradition dates from the establishment of the Presbyterian (Manitoba College) and Methodist (Wesley College) church colleges in 1871 and 1888 that later became United College (1938); in 1967 United College gained the status of a university and became the University of Winnipeg. Throughout this history, the institutions that formed the University of Winnipeg maintained a strong arts and science tradition as well as an important emphasis on theology. With the change from a privately-funded church college to a public institution in 1967 came the emphasis on equal opportunities to the education funded by the public:

---

5 All enrollment figures are taken from the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook.

6 This information was given by Michael McIntyre, Dean of Arts and Sciences at the University of Winnipeg, at a research presentation during the First National Writing Conference held in Winnipeg, November 28-30, 1990.
The University of Winnipeg represents a partnership between church and state into which the United Church of Canada has brought not only its assets of property and facilities which have been established over the years, but also the proud traditions it has maintained in the field of higher education in Manitoba. It will seek to raise the standards of higher education and to equalize opportunities for the enjoyment of its benefits. 7

These "proud traditions" include the University's decision to remain "an urban university by choice, committed to the liberal arts and sciences, to teaching, and to civic activism" (Calendar, H-1). The emphasis on civic activism and on serving the immediate community changed the nature of the institution because the demography of the downtown core of the city has changed radically in the past forty years. Much of the population that would formerly have occupied the area around the university has moved to the suburbs, and many of the students who might formerly have attended the small liberal arts college have opted to attend the University of Manitoba. The university survives through student aid programs. More than half of the university's students receive student aid, the highest proportion of any university in Canada. 8

The character of the institution changed largely after becoming a public institution in 1967:

In the decade that followed [incorporation as a public institution] the University of Winnipeg accommodated fully two-thirds of the increase in university enrollment across the province. This was done by affording new constituencies--working class youths, people in work, women in the home, senior citizens--opportunities to pursue degrees at times and places consistent with their lifestyles. (Calendar, A-1)

---

7 From the University of Winnipeg Faculty of Arts and Science Calendar 90-91, page H-1. Further references to the calendar will appear parenthetically in the text.

8 This information was given by Michael McIayre, Dean of Arts and Sciences and the University of Winnipeg, at a research presentation during the First National Writing Conference held in Winnipeg, November 28-30, 1990.
With the influx of a new kind of student, the university became aware of the need to adapt its offerings to accommodate this diverse group. The Writing Program is one of the most recent and successful initiatives aimed at retaining at-risk students. The Dean of Arts and Sciences, Michael McIntyre, is "quite pleased" with the first-year completion rates from the program, which show that over 93% of the students who were admitted to the university conditionally and who were referred to the Writing Program completed their first year (only 79% of students who were not referred completed first-year studies). He attributes the high rate of completion to the attention the writing program gives to the "affective domain, the welcoming part of the university, [which] provides the affective basis so that at-risk students can take risks." To a large extent, the Writing Program instructors developed and implemented the welcoming atmosphere that Dean McIntyre refers to and that is beginning to spread to other parts of the institution.9

I found no other writing program in Canada that discussed the use of writing instruction for affective goals. In addition, Dean McIntyre claimed that his program is unique because

1. All courses are taught by full-time faculty who specialize in the field of writing and rhetoric. Students have regular one-on-one meetings with their instructors.

2. The Writing Program integrates writing courses, tutoring, computers, writing centres, and streamed sections for ESL students.

3. The Program deals with writing as a process not just a product. This means that we deal with all stages of writing from invention through to drafting, problem-solving, and revising.

---

9 An article in the February, 1991 University Affairs discusses the writing program as an element in the University's accessibility program ("Winnipeg Report Calls for Accessibility Action," p. 9).
These claims, however, are not completely accurate. Many of the course syllabi attached to the survey in Chapter Three discussed how these courses taught "writing as a process." Of course, many people borrow this phrase and apply it to descriptions of courses that more closely resemble current-traditional writing instruction (see, for example, the discussion of the English department offerings at the University of New Brunswick, Chapter Five). Many other writing programs appear to teach the processes of writing (see, for example, the discussion of the Education Department at the University of New Brunswick, Chapter Five). McIntyre's claim that the Writing Program is unique simply because it integrates many different kinds of writing instruction seems to be accurate. Most universities in Canada lack cohesive, university-wide policies to implement writing instruction. However, several universities in Quebec also locate writing instruction in one institutional locale (University of Montreal, Laval University). Finally, although the University of Winnipeg's courses are all taught by "full-time faculty who specialize in the field of rhetoric and composition," most of the "faculty" are full-time instructors rather than professors. The University of Winnipeg Writing Program is unique in its combination of the elements described above, though it may not be unique in its adoption of certain elements that appear in many other writing programs. The attention to non-traditional students, however, does appear to be both unique and a model for other universities to copy.

_A History of Writing Instruction at the University of Winnipeg_

As a newly founded church college, Manitoba College (one of the institutions that evolved into the University of Winnipeg) did not teach writing with attention to retaining at-risk students. The calendar for 1886 lists under one of the eleven
examination areas one paper on Aristotle: the *Rhetoric* (Book 1, chapters 1-7) and *Ethics* (Book 1). The sections selected for reading form an interesting combination of a theory of language use and a purpose for using language. The chapters selected from the *Rhetoric* define rhetoric, describe rhetorical proofs, and lead into a discussion of political oratory and "the good." Book one of the *Ethics*, subtitled "The Good for Man," explicitly extends this discussion by identifying politics as "the science of the good for man."\(^{10}\) Such heady stuff did not last long.

By the turn of the century, writing instruction had taken a much more practical turn. The calendar for Wesley College (another of the institutions that amalgamated to form the University of Winnipeg) in 1899-1900 lists courses in writing at the first, second, and fourth years of the Bachelor of Arts. The first-year course combined reading models of composition with "the investigation of rhetorical principles along the lines laid down in Genung's `Outlines of Rhetoric'."\(^ {11}\) The calendar also notes that the examination at the end of the course consists of one two-page essay which "shall be accompanied by the plan upon which it was constructed" (16). While students also studied literature in the first year, that study was not connected with composition. The second year's exam, unlike the first year, held students responsible for the content of the prose models they read. The calendar also lists Barrett Wendell's *English Composition* as the text for the rhetoric course for the fourth year (25). Literature texts comprise six of the other seven texts listed for study.

---


\(^{11}\) *Calendar of Wesley College, Winnipeg Man. Session 1899-1900* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Free Press, 1899), page 15.
in English, however; this shift marks the trend away from political oratory to belletristic criticism.

By 1917-18, the Wesley College calendar shows no courses labelled as rhetoric courses. The three levels of instruction available in 1900 had been condensed into one course called "English Composition" that uses prose models and practice to teach writing ("at least 2,000 words for each term"). In 1924-25, an interesting change appears: the first-year composition course splits into three sections according to the disciplines of the students in them although the content remains largely literary readings and essays of appreciation. One course "is designed especially for students in Pre-Engineering and Pre-Medical Courses," another course uses a text entitled "Theory and Practice of Technical Writing" and calls for first-year Engineering students, and a third course targets first-year Arts students. By 1946-47 the calendar for United College lists what appears to be a basic writing course called "Special English":

This course is limited to an intensive practical study of the mechanics of English Composition. Diction, the grammar of sentences and paragraph structure will be considered, with the object of securing clarity and concision of style. A précis or a short essay will be required weekly of every student.

The other composition courses have been dropped completely from the English department offerings while the literature offerings continue to grow.

By 1967-68, the year the University of Winnipeg was granted a university charter, composition had been formally joined with literature in the traditional

---

12 Wesley College Calendar, 1924-25, pages 57-58.

13 United College Calendar, 1946-47, page 64.
literature/composition course. The course focused on the study of literature; composition involved writing about literature using texts with titles such as *The Fundamentals of Clear Writing*. Within six years, however, the literature/composition synthesis broke apart and two new courses appeared: "Composition" and "Creative Writing." This new composition course noted writing outside of English studies for the first time:

Practical analysis of the dynamics of effective writing and of prose style. Regular assignments, especially in the writing of expository, argumentative, and descriptive prose . . . criticism in individual conferences and class discussions. Some treatment of the conventions of scholarly writing appropriate to different disciplines and different audiences will be provided.\(^{14}\)

The mention of different disciplines and audiences outside of English studies signals the kind of interest that helped the dean of arts and the English department initiate the Writing in the Disciplines program underway today. As late as 1983-84, this course description had not changed, but instead it was named "Advanced Composition" to distinguish it from a new course called "Basic Composition":

A review of basic concepts and conventions of grammar, punctuation and mechanics, and of analysis, organization and development. Regular practical exercises and individual attention will help those with serious writing problems to learn to write prose appropriate for university students. *May not be counted for credit towards a Major in English or used to meet the Basic Arts requirement.*\(^{15}\)

The bold face in this course description underscores the attitude that influences much discussion at Canadian universities regarding basic writing: writing is a skill that should be mastered before students commence university study. Courses such as

\(^{14}\) *University of Winnipeg General Calendar, 1974-75.*

\(^{15}\) *The University of Winnipeg, Faculty of Arts and Science [General Calendar] 1983-84*, page B-22.
"Advanced Composition" and "Basic Composition" are seen by many as compromises in the battle against illiteracy. That they existed at the University of Winnipeg suggests that administrators at this university did not view writing instruction as only a pre-university study. Many respondents to the survey reported in Chapter Three made this very point in their comments on the survey form. These criticisms were first made 100 years ago when the Board of Overseers of Harvard University appointed a committee to investigate why entering students at that university failed to meet standard expectations. James Berlin reports that the committee determined that

Learning to write was a responsibility of the lower schools . . . Knowing nothing about writing instruction, the Committee members focused on the most obvious features of the essays they read, the errors in spelling, grammar, usage, and even handwriting. They thus gave support to the view that has haunted writing classes ever since: learning to write is learning matters of superficial correctness. 

The paradigm of writing instruction that focuses on error and grammatical correctness has been termed "current-traditional rhetoric." Current-traditional rhetoric, founded on an epistemology that denies the rhetor's role in making meaning, holds that all discourse falls into one of the four modes: description, narration, exposition, argumentation/persuasion. Consequently, instruction in writing focuses almost exclusively on style, with a heavy emphasis on grammar, usage, and correctness. The emphasis on correctness continues today in the Writing Program. However, it has been supplemented with an emphasis on invention drawn from a much different epistemological view of writing as discovery of truth or meaning.


17 See Berlin, Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges, pages 58-76 for a fuller discussion of this point.
This brief review of the history of writing instruction at the University of Winnipeg sketches a pattern that corresponds to the broad patterns of development and retrenchment that mark most university writing instruction in Canada. The church colleges of the middle and late nineteenth-century offered a rhetoric tied to both oral and written discourse, a rhetoric very much influenced by the ethical duty of the preacher to lead people towards goodness. As universities expanded their missions to provide a cultured education for the upper classes, literary study of English authors became increasingly important, eventually displacing rhetoric altogether and converting composition into belles-lettres essay writing. The increase in enrollments in professional studies throughout the twentieth-century and the subsequent decline in the dominance of arts and science faculties created pressure for a different kind of writing instruction, a writing instruction shaped to serve the needs of these professional disciplines. As the remainder of this chapter will show, the University of Winnipeg's emphasis on basic writing constitutes a remarkable addition to this history because of the definition of these students as sophisticated learners engaged in serious and important work, work that has the potential to change them and their society in small but vital ways.

**Writing Instruction**

As the quote from Dean McIntyre suggested above, the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg represents a unique combination of three separate but related components. The first component consists of courses offered through the English department: Developmental Rhetoric, Rhetoric IA and IB, Rhetoric II, Writing in the Disciplines. In addition, two teaching internship courses are offered by the writing centre directors through the education department. The second
component consists of the writing centres and the tutors who work there. The third component is made up of the proposed writing-intensive courses which are part of the university-wide "Writing in the Disciplines" initiative. The courses offered by the English department have developed from two distinct theoretical bases: Developmental Rhetoric and Rhetoric IA and IB came out of an educational background which sees writing as discovery, while Rhetoric II and Writing in the Disciplines come out of a current-traditional rhetoric which defines writing by mode or form (description, narration, exposition, argumentation/persuasion). In the past, the instructors who taught Developmental Rhetoric and Rhetoric IA and IB were drawn from the Writing Program, while Rhetoric II and Writing in the Disciplines were taught by professors from the rest of the English department. The gap between these groups in theories of writing as well as institutional status has narrowed in the last year or so and continues to close as instructors from both the Writing Program and professors from the rest of the English department begin to teach each other's courses, though the two groups remain essentially distinct. The remainder of this chapter describes the different components of the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg.

Administration of The Writing Program

The Writing Program grew out of a perception by the faculty at the University of Winnipeg that their students were no longer developing the "cognitive, analytic, and expressive skills" necessary to succeed in university and beyond. The education traditionally associated with a liberal arts curriculum disappeared in the

---

face of a changing student body, one that was a "much more diverse and diversely prepared group than they once were" (2). In addition, exploding class sizes transformed many discussion or seminar classes into lectures. In the words of three people who helped set up the program, "It became increasingly clear that specific attention had to be paid to the intellectual and expressive skills which have been traditionally identified as the broadly adaptive, enabling consequence of liberal education" (3). The proposal for the Writing Program "passed the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Senate, and the Board unanimously" (4).

That the proposal passed at all represents something of a triumph. Many universities in Canada have not been able to agree on how best to provide writing instruction for their students. Respondents to the survey reported in Chapter Three often commented that such a proposal was badly needed at their own institutions (the University of Saskatchewan), that similar proposals had been voted down (Wilfrid Laurier University), or that their present writing programs owed their genesis to similar proposals (the Writing Centre at Queen's University).

In the document submitted to the University of Winnipeg Senate that recommended the establishment of the Writing Program, the committee called for the typical hierarchical administrative structure headed by "the Director and a committee of the instructors in the programme."19 While the report does not clarify the responsibilities of the committee of instructors, it indicates that the director will play an important role in the administration of the program:

The Director's responsibilities will entail some combination of programme administration; developing and instructing in workshops for prospective and continuing instructors; co-ordination of writing-across-the-disciplines components, including liaison with other departments and programmes in the development of appropriate support materials, calendar entries, etc.; and some teaching responsibilities within the programme.20

The original director, hired after an exhaustive international job search, to run the Writing Program, Professor Roland Huff, worked in these capacities for three years.

At the time of the site visit for this case study, the instructors in the Writing Program ran it as a collaborative effort. The instructors organized themselves into three groups: curriculum, program development, and research. As part of its work, the curriculum committee revises the textbook that the Writing Program publishes and designs the standard syllabus used in each writing course. The program development committee forms a liaison between the Writing Program and the community, working with groups such as the Peguis Indian Reserve, the Core Area Initiative, and the Rising Sun Alternative School. The research group works to identify research interests and sources of funding. One person was elected to head each of the three groups, and these three people form what is called the "coordinating committee" that performs many of the functions that the program director was responsible for, such as meeting with the Dean and with the head of the English department. Once each month the entire Writing Program staff meet with the Dean and head of the English department to further ensure that all instructors have a chance to express their opinions directly to representatives of the university administration.

The collaborative model described above stands outside the range of most traditional organizational structures in university writing programs. It owes its origin, I think, at least in part to the gender of the people working in the Writing Program. Seven of the eight instructors in the Writing Program in Fall 1990 were female, and none of these instructors held rank as a professor. This group has consistently led the pedagogy of the Writing Program away from an objectivist epistemological position in their teaching toward a much more community-centred, social model of writing and learning. While it would be overly simplistic to account for the Writing Program's goals solely in terms of either sex or gender, the epistemology enunciated by some members of this group clearly values connection and relatedness to others, values associated with feminine epistemologies. In an essay entitled "Toward a Woman-Centered University," Adrienne Rich discusses the changes that must take place to create a university that is not "a hierarchy built on exploitation." For Rich, "the underlying mode of feminist teaching style is . . . by nature antihierarchical," a style that is "more dialogic, more exploratory, less given to pseudo-objectivity, than the traditional model" (145; 143). In her essay, Rich notes Mina Shaughnessy's keynote speech at the 1973 Conference on College Composition and Communication and Shaughnessy's objection to the use of numbers in quantitative evaluations of student achievement. For Shaughnessy, numbers and the decontextualized nature of

21 This is in the process of changing. Three of the eleven instructors are now male, and three of the Writing Program instructors received assistant professor status as of Fall, 1991.


texts used to create these numbers divorces student writing from the "web of discourse" that gives meaning to words. For Shaughnessy--and Rich--only through exploratory, dialogic conversation can both teaching and administration become feminized or put back in touch with real human lives.

Related discussions of collaboration occur in Women's Ways of Knowing. In this book, the authors collaborated in a study of women's lives, seeking to identify how women come to know and make sense of the world. The authors conclude that rather than working toward a relativism based on an analytical, evaluative approach to knowledge that values distance and autonomy (the goal William Perry identified in his study of intellectual and ethical development of men), women develop toward subjective knowing that values connectedness, interdependence, and "the inner voice" of intuition. The authors describe women who move beyond listening to "the inner voice" as "constructivists" who prize sensitivity to situation and context: "For constructivists, the moral response is the caring response . . . . They reveal in the way they speak and live their lives their moral conviction that ideas and values, like children, must be nurtured, cared for, placed in environments that help them grow" (149, 152).24

The Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg reflects both the hierarchical model and the new collaborative model in both administration and curriculum. The previous director urged instructors to use teaching techniques such as "minimal marking." In responding to student papers in student-teacher

24 Related discussions of the different forms collaboration can take in the process of writing--both hierarchical and dialogic--occur in Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford's Singular Texts/Plural Authors (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990).
conferences, instructors were encouraged by this director to avoid reading the student essays beforehand, read and respond to the essays in five to ten minutes, and then usher the student out the door. The instructors objected to this practice, feeling that they at least needed to read the drafts ahead of time and that the "Mr. Transmission" (a sarcastic reference to an automotive company) method of conferencing reflected an objectivist epistemological stance they were uncomfortable with. Further, they felt that the rationale for this process was to burden them with other tasks in addition to teaching. In ways similar to this, the hierarchical administrative system affected the curriculum and the students.

Instructors in the Writing Program noted that the collaborative system works to allow the instructors to structure their time to satisfy the conflicting demands of administration and students. As the work of Rich and Belenky et al. would suggest, the collaborative model allows these instructors to discuss and respond to other positions, to be sensitive to the context of other people, before making decisions that affect either their co-workers or their students. These instructors felt that the group process encourages teachers to discuss and modify curriculum decisions based on their own experiences and those of their peers. In addition, the collaborative model resonates with the affective goals that many instructors valued as integral components of the instruction that they provided. They want students to "feel like they can do this [write well]," "increase their self-esteem," and build "friendships and networks" both inside and outside classes as integral parts of fostering learning. These classes still define writing as problem-solving, but they go about the business of teaching with an emphasis on using groups and peer-response as ways to accomplish both affective and cognitive goals. Ultimately, these instructors want to produce students empowered by writing through a process of "dealing with the whole human being."
Comments such as this reflect the desire for connectedness mentioned by Belenky et al and the need for more than numbers that Mina Shaughnessy identified.

The next few sections of this chapter present descriptions of the various methods of providing instruction through the Writing Program. Because the collaborative model of administrating the program had been in place for only six months at the time of the case study site visit, instructors in the Writing Program noted that this instruction relies mainly on methods that reflect the cognitive basis established early in the development of the program under the direction of the previous director. Nevertheless, some aspects of what might be called a feminist teaching practice surface in the comments of the instructors and tutors.

_Developmental Rhetoric_

Developmental Rhetoric is the first course that many students encounter in the Writing Program. Students are placed into Developmental Rhetoric on the basis of high school grades (lower than 60% in senior English); a diagnostic writing sample confirms or changes that placement in the first week of the semester enabling students to move into Rhetoric IA or IB. The course description provided in the syllabus identifies the basic components of instruction:

The major instructional objectives of Developmental Rhetoric are to assist students to achieve competency in a number of specific areas: writing standard English; organizing information in written form; limiting and establishing a thesis; logically developing ideas; and supporting assertions and arguments with evidence or concrete examples. Students who have particular problems will be referred to the Writing Centre on a mandatory basis.25

The syllabus also notes that

The primary purpose of Developmental Rhetoric is to teach the process that mature writers go through when they create written texts. By learning this process, students will acquire a variety of invention, drafting, and revision skills and strategies. Although all parts of the writing process are interrelated and recursive, students will learn the process by applying it in stages to each of the major writing assignments.  

The assignments and journal entries that form the bulk of written work in the course do not receive grades (other than a pass/fail). Three or four mandatory student-teacher conferences occur at regular intervals throughout the term. These conferences tend to focus on specific "problems" with each student's texts. Barry Nolan, an instructor in the program, tries to "respond as one reader . . . and then move to strategies--what do you [the student] think you can do if this is the case?"

Instructors team-teach developmental rhetoric classes. Pairs of classes--each with 15 students--often meet in the writing centres. Both instructors attend every class and circulate among the various groups, who work at six-sided tables. Outside of class meetings, instructors hold conferences with their own students and mark their own students' work. Occasionally group work will be interrupted for "a short presentation that will be delivered in the familiar lecture fashion. Most of the time, however, the instructor moves from group to group to help problem-solve." In the developmental rhetoric class I attended, students worked in groups of four or five reading drafts of their essays aloud. Directions written on the board focused peer response on "Thesis" and "Assertions and Evidence." Students listened carefully to each other's essays and commented freely and good-naturedly on each other's work. They had been working in these groups for ten weeks and seemed at ease with the

26 Pages 3-4 of the "Prospectus" for developmental rhetoric.

27 From Writing Program Coursebook 1990-91 (Winnipeg: University of Winnipeg, 1990), page iv.
prospect of reading their drafts, even when I observed the class. Essay topics included politics ("Who was the better prime minister, Laurier or Trudeau?"), recycling, and literacy.

Sheila Page, one of the instructors of the developmental rhetoric class described above, commented that "all we're looking for is meeting acceptable standards" which are defined in the coursebook as focus on central idea, development of ideas, coherence through transitions, cohesion at the sentence level, and correct grammar, usage, and mechanics. Developmental Rhetoric focuses on "trying to break students from first draft/final draft syndrome and into a writing process." In this course, the interactions between student and teacher tend to be more often oral than written, and they use a more focused heuristic than that offered in Rhetoric I. The goals of the course include helping students develop a sense of personal success, a sense that students are "happy with what they write and think about" and that they "think about things more clearly and fully." Increases in self-esteem and experience with success both are the intention of the curriculum of developmental rhetoric and are particularly important for non-traditional students, who need to leave the course feeling they can write well. According to Eleanor Sumpter, an instructor in the Writing Program, this sense of competence derives in large part from an increase in skill level:

"Developmental Rhetoric and Rhetoric I make the students feel good about writing well because both courses teach them to write well (i.e., write thoughtful, focused,
organized, developed, and edited essays).30 Cognitive development, through writing as thinking, occurs in concert with affective development.

This sense of accomplishment and community comes from completing the assignments for the course in a cooperative, collaborative atmosphere. The assignments in the course include writing exercises in class, journal writing, and formal writing assignments. In-class writing assignments are often tied to major assignments, such as free writing exercises that function as invention material. The journal assignments seek to reinforce writing as a process by asking students to use the left-hand page for invention work, drafting, and commenting on the actual entries, which are written on the right-hand side of the notebook. The journals do not receive grades but students are told "the quality of your submissions will influence your final grade. Further, to be eligible to receive a grade, you must complete the journal."31 Four writing assignments complete the course: students must write essays on a childhood experience, an issue analysis, a problem-solution, and on research they perform. The last three papers take advantage of background papers that the instructors supply as starting points. The three background papers reproduced in the coursebook---on "animal rights," "literacy," and "television's effect on society"---provide a short introduction to the issue, quotations from several sources, and a short list of references students are expected to supplement with personal reflection, heuristics, and library research. To complete the course satisfactorily, students must turn in all four papers (including all invention notes and drafts), turn in their completed journals four times during the semester, pass a series of four usage tests

30 Personal correspondence, June 1991.

31 From page 176 of the Writing Program Coursebook.
with a mark of 90% on each (sentence structure, punctuation, pronoun agreement, subject/verb agreement), incur no more than three unexcused absences, and complete mandatory meetings with tutors at the writing centres if necessary.

In the introductory section of this chapter, I quoted Dean McIntyre's description of the Writing Program as unique in its focus on teachers rather than the products of writing. The approach described above, while perhaps not unique, certainly provides a stark contrast to many university basic writing courses. Current-traditional writing courses at the basic or developmental level assume that students in these courses simply do not understand the grammar of the English language. Consequently, the instruction offered focuses on grammar drills and mechanical correctness. At the University of Winnipeg, instruction heavily weighted on the process of writing assumes that some, and perhaps many, of the errors students make reflect thinking processes and choices students make based on their understanding of the writing situation they are faced with. Consequently, writing instruction needs to focus on understanding why students make their choices and helping them to identify and solve whatever problems face them as they write. This approach owes its origin to Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* and the research Shaughnessy's work has inspired in the last fourteen years. Unfortunately, many developmental writing programs show no sign of either being aware of or understanding this research. The University of Winnipeg represents both an exception to the rule and an exceptional example of what it means to teach the process, not the product.

*Rhetoric IA/IB*

Rhetoric IA/B is the second course in the Writing Program sequence and in many ways this course closely resembles Developmental Rhetoric. The coursebook
developed by the instructors in the Writing Program functions as the text for both courses. The same instructors also teach both courses, and the procedures for using the writing centre and text processing centre (described below) are identical in Rhetoric I to those adopted for Developmental Rhetoric. The course description follows:

This course focuses on learning and practising a sequence of invention, drafting, and revision strategies. It also encourages students to assess their own and other students' work for such writing fundamentals as quality of detail, consideration of audience, clarity of purpose, and use of proper mechanics. Application of these skills to research procedures and research-based writing will be emphasized.32

One of the major differences concerns grades: students receive grades in Rhetoric I rather than a pass/fail designation. Another distinction concerns the writing assignments: the assignments for Rhetoric I ask students to write a modern folktale, create a formal proposal to perform research, conduct research on the basis of the proposal they wrote, and to write a timed in-class essay. These assignments move students a step closer to encountering the kind of writing they will regularly be asked to perform at the university: write proposals that include annotated bibliographies of other people's research, perform and report on research the student undertakes, and write timed essays. Although it is unlikely that students will be asked to write folktales at the university, that exercise connects with the others by "moving students towards approaching writing as process, towards collaborative strategies."33

32 From a prospectus for Rhetoric I sent to me by Jaqueline McCleod-Rogers, August 1990.

33 Jaqueline McCleod-Rogers, personal correspondence, June 1991.
Unlike Developmental Rhetoric, Rhetoric I comes in two varieties: pen and paper (IA), and computerized (IB). The computerized classes use the same syllabus and coursebook as the pen and paper classes, but they take place in the "Text Processing Centre" (described below). The main goal of this version of the course is to provide students with access to technology in the hopes that students will learn to "integrate a mature composing process with the word-processing capacity of computers." Barry Nolan, an instructor in the Writing Program, commented that "only eight or ten of the twenty-two students in a class have really incorporated WordPerfect 5.1 as part of their writing process." According to Nolan, some students tend to play with the computer partly because they aren't familiar enough with it, a consequence of not being able to spend enough time in the Text Processing Centre. More importantly, the computers tend to work against the goals of community and collaborative activity that the instructors in the Writing Program value highly; these machines are not networked, and the physical setup of the

34 Plans are underway to offer Developmental Rhetoric in a computerized version in Fall, 1991.


36 Jaqueline McCleod-Rogers disputes these figures, commenting that only one of 25 is unable to incorporate WordPerfect 5.1 into the writing process. McCleod-Rogers links student ability to incorporate WordPerfect 5.1 with success in this course. In later correspondence, Nolan commented that almost all students incorporate WordPerfect into the writing process. What seems to be at issue here is the degree to which students incorporate the computer into their composing process.

37 Jaqueline McCleod-Rogers commented that the text processing centre is available for extended hours. Perhaps Nolan's comment reflected the inconvenience of having to travel to the university to have access to computer facilities. Nolan mentioned in later correspondence that the centre was "so busy that some students cannot find a free computer." Dean McIntyre announced at the First National Writing Conference that the university had acquired funding for another computing centre.
computerized classroom (which also functions as the Text Processing Centre) may inhibit group work by the way its rows of machines force students to sit with their backs to each other (see Figure 6). Eleanor Sumpter commented that "although it is harder to get students working in groups in the computer lab than in a regular classroom, the layout of the lab encourages interaction between students facing one another, and the large space between the rows, coupled with the wheeled chairs, facilitates group work." Part of the problem, according to Nolan, is that "students are interested enough in their own writing (and in word processing) that they tend to cut group work to a minimum so that they can get back to their computer." On the other hand, Nolan also noted that the strongest writers are drawn to the computerized version of Rhetoric I because of their belief that "learning on computers is somehow better" and that familiarization with computers leads to jobs.

This introduction to academic discourse completes the course offerings of the Writing Program, but these two courses operate with the help of two other important components: the Writing Centre and the Text Processing Centre, both of which remain under the control of instructors in the Writing Program.

---

38 Personal correspondence, June 1991.
Figure 6: Layout of the Text Processing Centre
The Writing Centre and Text Processing Centre

The Writing Centre and Text Processing Centre, together with a block of offices and meeting rooms used by the Writing Program instructors, occupy the basement of Graham Hall, a building that houses the offices of the sociology, philosophy, and classics departments. These facilities are, in the words of Deborah Schnitzer (the director of the Writing Centre), "significantly hidden" and removed from the main teaching building that houses the offices of other faculty. 40 These facilities are connected to other buildings by short hallways and vestibules but removed from the rest of the English department and the main areas where students congregate and where classrooms are located.

For Deborah Schnitzer, the Writing Program and the Writing Centre's role within that program remains subversive by design of the traditional culture of the university. The writing program and the collaborative, sustaining community integrated within it is "fastened to the back of a dying model--hierarchy." For her, it is possible to change the institution through the community of tutors and classes that operate within the Writing Program. To effect this change, students must be "empowered through developing a repertoire of voices, choices, [to] try out different techniques. . . . [they're] not just here with broken voices to be fixed. They have a right to be here." In an interview, Schnitzer talked of treating students as "whole human beings" who grow through their experiences in the Writing Centre to the point at which they can take charge of their lives and re-define the power structure that governs the rest of the university (and the world) by challenging it from a position of

40 James Baker, a student and a tutor in the Writing Centre, also commented on the isolation of these offices: "I didn't even know Graham Hall existed. Graham Hall is full of offices, not classrooms."
knowledge and strength. She wants to educate students who have tested out new voices, are fond of sharing and working collaboratively, and who see the value in life beyond the statistical measures such as grade point average. Schnitzer sees non-traditional and second-language students as "an extraordinary gift" because they "teach us how to listen," they draw attention to the limits of what we know, and they help us identify our assumptions about teaching and writing. While she admits to being idealistic, Schnitzer insists that these viewpoints guide her approach to teaching through the Writing Centre. Schnitzer's comments about teaching "the whole human being" and rejecting the "heirarchy" of the university echo Adrienne Rich's ideas about revolutionizing university curricula and administrative structure quoted earlier in this chapter. Her emphasis on the development of "voice" also suggests a similar epistemological viewpoint to one of the stages identified with feminine intellectual and ethical development as described by Belenky et al. in *Women's Ways of Knowing.*

Catherine Taylor, the director of the Text Processing Centre, clearly shares many of the views of Schnitzer. Taylor comments that "computers are a wonderful boon to students who need help the most... A computer can mean liberation from terrible handwriting... [and encourage] students who loathe to write with pen and ink [to] work for many hours on the computers." The texts these students produce are "written in light: the work looks marvellous and professional." Taylor emphasizes the affective side of writing in her comments because she, like most of the instructors I talked with, values the affective side of student development as much as the cognitive side. Students must feel at home, that they belong in the university, as they develop the cognitive skills that they will have to apply in their writing careers at the university and beyond.
Deborah Schnitzer and Catherine Taylor foster their commitment to people and to collaborative work through the operations of The Writing Centre and Text Processing Centre, both of which function under the same guidelines. These centres are available to students not presently enrolled in Writing Program courses. Both also function as resources for Developmental Rhetoric and Rhetoric I under the "mandatory referral" policy. Mandatory referral occurs when students are referred to either centre by their instructor if the instructor feels the student needs additional help in a particular area. In the words of the Writing Program Coursebook,

Mandatory Referral can occur when your instructor feels that a writing issue warrants immediate attention. In this instance, you work with a tutor for one-hour weekly sessions and then work in the Centre for up to three other hours per week using centre staff and resources to help you manage writing assignments with more assurance. (iv)

Students must fulfill their obligations in the centres before they will be granted credit in their course.

The nature of the work done in the centres varies with the student. The coursebook notes that students who score less than 90% on the usage tests will be referred to the writing centre for group workshops or individual help mastering mechanics and grammar. In addition, students who need more help working on any stage of the writing process can also find help in the centres. The initial meeting between student and tutor consists of a long discussion (up to an hour) based upon a "Registration Form." During the interview, tutors ask students nine questions, including:
What areas of writing do you feel you need to work on?

Aside from the writing you do in your Rhetoric course, what kinds of writing do you do now, or have you done in the past?

Do you make a plan before writing?

What is the hardest part of writing for you [followed by a list of prompts]?

The rest of the form and interview identifies the kinds of writing the student performs and stresses the process of writing. Every two weeks the tutors send a formal progress report to the instructor that lists "the date of each session, topic of each session, specific problems, progress made (if any), assignments given."  

The tutors play an important role in this instruction and form one of the outstanding features of the writing instruction in the Writing Program. At one point in 1989-90, 86 tutors provided help to students who came to the Writing Centre or Text-Processing Centre. Tutors enroll in two of four Bachelor of Education courses that introduce them to the administrative details of the writing and text-processing centres and to the processes of tutoring. The background of the tutors varies:

Most tutors in the two centres have little or no previous teaching experience and are not experts in the processes of writing and language acquisition. Yet they make an enormous difference to the students that they work with. They are carefully chosen for qualities of empathy and interest in the subject of writing and academic thinking. Some intend to become teachers; many don't. . . . Some have previous training in the subject area via a rhetoric course, but seldom in teaching the subject area. Some were tutored themselves in an earlier term.  

---

41 From "University of Winnipeg Writing Centre/Text-Processing Centre Progress Report."

42 From Tutoring Manual for Interns in the Writing Centre and the Text-Processing Centre, page 5.
These students learn to tutor through the first of four courses offered by the faculty of education. In the first of these courses, students are introduced to "the theory and practice of teaching writing on an individualized basis to students who have writing problems." Deborah Schnitzer and Catherine Taylor teach these courses with the help of experienced tutors ("administrative interns") who are themselves enrolled in a second course entitled "Internship in the Development and Administration of the Writing Centre." New tutors participate in a workshop at the beginning of the term that familiarizes them with the workings of the centres, issues of analysis in student writing (including the use of cloze tests and T-unit counts), and methods of individual tutoring. At the workshops, students also learn how to provide individual instruction for students who come to the centres for help with their writing. The readings for this course include Muriel Harris' *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference*. Tutors taking this course attend a one-hour weekly seminar led by a centre director and a one-hour workshop led by experienced tutors (administrative interns) in addition to tutoring students for three hours each week.

Ida Lang, an experienced tutor in the Text-Processing Centre, commented that "the supportive, sharing, helping feeling goes on in the whole program." She learns as much as the students, and prefers to describe this experience as sharing knowledge rather than as teaching (which she associates with the transmission of information from one who knows to one who doesn't know). Lang's own fear of writing has diminished through her work in the writing centre because she has learned strategies that enable her to write and she has learned that others face the same difficulties she faces. She likes to work with people, a fact that explains her

43 From course outline for "Tutoring Internship in the Writing Centre."
move to the community orientation of the centres, which she sees as a move "away from the isolation of academic work." In her work in the computerized writing centre, Lang finds ways to share knowledge about computers as well as about writing with students. While the idea of students working with computer programs such as "Grammatik 3" or some of the invention and grammar programs that the centre installed evokes images of solitary students, the atmosphere I observed differed considerably. None of these programs works exactly the way the manufacturers hope they will, and the resultant confusion offers students and tutors a multitude of opportunities to interact to make recalcitrant programs and machines behave. People group around machines when a student calls for help, converse until the problem is either solved or circumvented, and disperse until the next opportunity/problem arises.

While the employment of upper-class undergraduate students as tutors may have resulted from a shortage of money and of graduate students or part-time workers, peer tutoring supports the goals of the instructors who run the Writing Program. Peer tutors work collaboratively with students to find solutions to writing problems. As students themselves, they are able to put their fellow students at ease by sharing similar experiences and perhaps even solutions to some of the problems encountered. This sharing, and the growth of a network of familiar faces, helps students referred to the Writing or Text-Processing Centres feel more at home in the university (or at least in one small part of it). Like Developmental Rhetoric, the writing centres contribute to furthering the goals of writing instruction at the University of Winnipeg, including access and retention of non-traditional students.

The second of the two bachelor of education courses, "Internship in the Development and Administration of the Writing Centre/Text-Processing Centre,"
acquaints tutors with the administrative side of the centres. Tutors in this course assist in planning the pre-term workshop for tutors new to the centres, but their main responsibilities focus on holding weekly workshops for small groups of new tutors and on developing or refining materials for use in the centres. James Baker and Jean-Paul Marcoux, administrative interns in the Writing Centre during the fall semester 1990, ran one of these workshops for new tutors. Thirteen tutors registered in their workshop, which met once a week for one hour. At the beginning of the term, the first half of this hour focused on reading announcements and covering day-to-day business such as filling in some of the seventeen different forms used to track students in the centres. In the second half of the hour Baker and Marcoux would set a topic or topics for discussion—such as "coming up with an outline for tutoring, so tutors know where they are and where they have to go"—that often centred on sharing problems or successes the tutors encountered. During the course of the semester, the workshops gradually became less formal and more focused on discussion among the new tutors as these tutors gained experience and directed the workshops to discussions of issues they faced when dealing with students.

Dr. Annabelle Mays, director of the bachelor of education program that supports these writing courses, noted that the second of the two internship courses functions as "a conscious model for getting bachelor of education students to set up writing centres in their schools when they graduate." She also pointed out that education students may extend their study of teaching writing into a third course by choosing to do individual study in areas related to the teaching of writing. Dr. Mays acknowledges that having students work as tutors provides cheap labour for the writing program, but she is quick to point out that the tutoring experience also provides students with teaching experience, experience that serves education students
particularly well, and that the students "love the challenge and responsibility" they encounter.

Although Dean McIntyre did not mention them when he described the characteristics that made the Writing Program unique in Canada, the extensive use of peer tutors and the extensive use of technology in a writing centre make these aspects of the writing program unique in Canada. A more traditional pattern would show no communication whatsoever between Education and a writing centre. In the case study of the University of New Brunswick (see Chapter Five), the Education faculty had very little to do with the university writing centre. The small size of the Education department at the University of Winnipeg may account for the flexibility that allowed their imaginative peer tutoring project to flourish. The administrative people who collaborated to design and support this system deserve credit for their imaginative use of limited resources. Far from feeling exploited, the tutors I interviewed seemed genuinely pleased to be part of this program. The instruction provided to them as part of the education courses clearly support the educational goals of the courses, and the amount of tutoring (tutors are responsible for three students who they meet with individually) seems well within the limits of how much work can be expected as part of a course. Tutors contribute an important component to the Writing Program as a whole because they lend support to the instructors, who do not have time for individual tutoring. Beyond that advantage, the tutors provide new students with student faces they can identify with in the largely faceless institution.
English Department Rhetoric Courses

The instruction described so far—Developmental Rhetoric, Rhetoric IA/B, and the courses described above—all fall under the jurisdiction of the Writing Program. Even the education courses described above are taught by Writing Program instructors. Despite the use of the term "rhetoric" in the naming of these courses, they resemble more closely "composition" courses; that is, the emphasis in Writing Program courses falls on composing written texts. The courses offered by the English department—Rhetoric II and Writing Across the Disciplines—strike a balance between analyzing written texts and composing them, a balance perhaps more closely associated with traditional uses of the term "rhetoric."

Students who exempt from the university-wide requirement to take Rhetoric I may enroll in Rhetoric II. In their description of writing courses at the University of Winnipeg, Neil Besner, Roland Huff, and Michael McIntyre describe Rhetoric II:

Like Rhetoric I, this course requires that students learn a mature composing process and introduces them to research procedures. The course also deals with the nature of post-modern discourse. Students are asked to consider the constructed and often changing relationships between writer, text, and audience, and to examine the interrelated tensions of these three variables in their own writing and in a limited number of texts.\(^4\)

Rhetoric 2 provides a writing course for the students who perform well in high school (and who exempt from Rhetoric IA/B), a course directed at the traditional liberal arts student identified in the introduction to this chapter. Unlike Rhetoric I, Rhetoric II makes use of a reader and reading exercises to sharpen students' analyses of written texts, skills that will help them analyze their own prose compositions. This course

proceeds through a study of modes of discourse--narrative and descriptive, expository, persuasive--combined with a "letter to the press" assignment and two assignments calling for revisions of earlier work. Less attention is paid to the process of producing texts, and more attention seems directed toward studying the forms that texts ultimately take.

The English department also offers a second course, "Writing Across the Disciplines":

This course will explore writing skills common to a variety of writing projects in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. Units of the course will combine theoretical discussion of several kinds of writing (argumentative, evaluative, persuasive, expressive) with practical class work and assignments slanted to students' varied disciplines and prospective professions.

"Writing Across the Disciplines" focuses on writing about content outside of English studies. However, the rhetorical model for analyzing and producing texts appears to come from within the traditional study of literary texts, using categories such as expressive and persuasive discourse that appear in the work of James Kinneavy, for example. Strangely, the main category from James Kinneavy's schema for discourse-referential--does not appear at all. Referential discourse, according to Kinneavy, includes most categories of discourse outside of traditional English studies, such as scientific and informative discourse.45

The two courses outlined above form the base for what department chairman Don Jewison hopes will become a four-year program in linguistics and writing which would develop students for a master's level program in rhetoric. At the present time,

---

the department does not offer a master's degree, and it sees the development of a degree based on reading, writing, and language as an alternative to the literature master's offered by the University of Manitoba.

Writing in the Disciplines

The third major component of writing instruction at the University of Winnipeg—after the Writing Program and the Department of English courses—consists of "Writing in the Disciplines" courses. At the time of the case study site visit, this program was more potential than kinetic: none of the proposed courses had been planned or taught. Consequently, the following description focuses on the planning that had been done to prepare for the eventual implementation of these courses.

The Writing Program and the "Writing in the Disciplines" requirement formed two parts of the "rhetoric and composition requirement" proposed to the University Senate on June 17, 1986. At that time, the Senate decided that "the Writing Requirement [writing in the disciplines] and the Rhetoric and Composition course [Rhetoric IA/B] will constitute the Writing Program, which shall be administered by a Director."

Until his resignation as the director of the Writing Program, Professor Huff worked closely with John R. Hofley, Associate Dean (Curriculum), Faculty of Arts and Science. The main responsibility for the "Writing in the Disciplines" initiative rests now with Professor Hofley (a sociologist with no formal training in

46 From a memo dated June 17, 1986 from A. Ross McCormack of the Academic Development Committee to Dick Bellhouse, Secretary, Academic Senate. This memo, and a report from the senate subcommittee on the writing program, is recorded in University of Winnipeg Senate: Minutes and Agenda, 1986/87.
rhetoric and composition) who works with instructors of the Writing Program and professors from across the faculty.

The senate committee whose report formed the basis for the Writing Program began its work by visiting writing programs at Montana State University, consulting "a number of experts in writing, particularly Andrea Lunsford . . . a world authority in the field," and surveying writing programs in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, and British Columbia. The results of this research led to what is now the "Writing Program": Developmental Rhetoric, Rhetoric IA/B, and the writing centres all were first proposed in this document. This report also describes "writing intensive courses" as the logical and necessary followthrough to continue student growth in writing; the authors did not want students to simply take one course at the start of their degrees—they wanted some kind of continued instruction. The authors felt that growth is "probably best achieved through regular course work which is writing-intensive" (4). The report does not propose a series of new courses located in the English department, opting instead for the retooling of existing courses in all disciplines so that these existing courses included a writing intensive component. At the time of the case study site visit, the "Writing in the Disciplines" initiative remained in the planning stages. Consequently, no course descriptions or syllabi were available.

Professor Hofley accounts for the five years of planning convincingly. The first year focused on accumulating funding for the Writing Program by saving money given to the University by the provincial government as "redressment grants," grants

---

meant to redress the underfunding of the previous few years. This first year also focused on hiring a Director for the Writing Program. In the second year, the faculty union "went after the budget" allocated to set up the Writing Program. In the midst of budget wars, Professors Hofley and Huff conducted what Hofley characterized as an exhaustive series of interviews with "every department and every member of every department to publicize and listen for ideas for the 'Writing Program'." In response to these interviews, Hofley and Huff decided to offer instruction through two courses--Developmental Rhetoric and Rhetoric IA/B--and the writing centres.

Towards the end of the third year, the senate subcommittee reviewed proposals of what were now termed "Writing in the Disciplines" courses. The committee felt that these proposals were too prescriptive, and in response decided to consult James Reither of St. Thomas University (Fredericton) because of Reither's successful experience designing and running a writing program at St. Thomas University. At the beginning of the fourth year, Professor Reither held a two-day off-campus workshop for faculty. The Writing Program faculty were not invited because Hofley wanted to "maximize attendance of the number of faculty members outside the Writing Program" and limit attendance to workable numbers. The workshop succeeded in getting "a core of faculty outside the 'Writing Program'" to form an ongoing group of about thirty faculty that has met regularly since then. Many of these professors already incorporated writing in their courses, and they used the group to share ideas and to test out new ideas. At the start of the fifth year (September

48 Professor Hofley in an interview conducted November 29, 1990.

49 Personal correspondence, June 1991.
1990), a second workshop (conducted by Andrea Lunsford) convinced the group that it knew enough to start offering courses on an experimental basis.

At the time of the case study site visit, the Senate subcommittee on writing and the faculty who meet regularly to discuss writing in the disciplines have decided to implement the "Writing in the Disciplines" program according to the following plan:

We should begin to implement the W.I.D. component on a voluntary basis. We should establish ten teams comprised of three faculty, one from the writing program and two from outside the program. Each team would be assigned two departments. The teams would meet with their departments and explain the purpose of W.I.D. courses. Each department would be asked to suggest a minimum of one to a maximum of three courses for 1991-92 that would be writing intensive. The team would provide help with the design of the course and we would endeavour to have the courses scheduled in rooms that enable group formations. We would also provide workshops for the faculty who opt into the program.\(^{50}\)

Professor Hofley, fully aware of the importance of widespread support for the writing-in-the-disciplines program, hopes that by using patience "we get into a situation where we don't have to legislate it." He hopes that the example of faculty who are already building revision into their assignments, who already ask students to write shorter papers, and who regularly confer with their students will convince faculty who are not using this approach that they are missing something valuable.

---

\(^{50}\) From a memo from John R. Hofley to "All participants in W.I.D. workshop and members of Subcommittee," October 1, 1990.
Conclusions: Work in Progress

In response to a draft of this chapter, Jaqueline McCleod-Rogers emphasized "the element of growth that is still central to the Program." In the ten months since the site visit to the university, many changes have been made to course descriptions, additional instructors have been hired, and some Writing Program instructors have been granted assistant professor status. The preceding pages of this chapter describe a program in the process of evolving, often in different directions from the past. Whatever conclusions one could make need to be based on the data reported of the program as it was in the Fall of 1990. But conclusions, in and of themselves, are not important or perhaps even relevant given the evolving situation. More important are the issues that the people involved in the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg have faced and that others across Canada face: hiring instructors, choosing administrative structures to house programs, and creating programs that address the needs of changing student populations. The rest of this chapter seeks to discuss these issues and to locate the University of Winnipeg Writing Program in relation to writing programs at other universities across Canada by using comparative data from the survey results. In the next few paragraphs, I will summarize some of the important issues raised by the data reported earlier and suggest what I see as the challenges that remain for writing instruction at the University of Winnipeg.

What does it mean to write and teach writing at the University of Winnipeg? The political nature of accessibility programs for non-traditional students and students whose first language is other than English play an important part in bringing students to the University of Winnipeg. In a culturally- and ethnically-diverse city, I

---

expected to see evidence of a multicultural approach to the teaching of writing. After all, if weekly papers appear in fourteen different languages it seems reasonable to expect some cultural diversity in the classroom. Unfortunately, the university does not reflect the city:

Although Aboriginal persons in Winnipeg, the most rapidly growing segment of the city's population, already constitute approximately sixteen percent of the population, fewer than one percent of our students are of aboriginal descent. Furthermore, the participation in university of working class men and women from areas of the city like Transcona is lower than that of Aboriginal people. Other evidence supports the arguments of many immigrant and ethnic groups that universities are, for all practical purposes, closed to them.\textsuperscript{52}

Such an approach would value diversity, both in the content of what students were asked to read and the language they were permitted to use to express their experiences.

In the Writing Program itself, students read very little literature or non-literary prose of any kind other than student writing in process.\textsuperscript{53} Joy Ritchie, in a study of a freshman composition class, concluded that "We do not become members of a community by parroting or learning by rote the forms and conventions of the dominant group. We learn, as Bakhtin suggests, by appropriating various voices from the community and transforming those into our own unique idioms, which we then join to the on-going conversation of our discipline" (173).\textsuperscript{54} Many other

\textsuperscript{52} From "Diversity and Excellence in Education: An Integrated Approach to Improving Accessibility at the University of Winnipeg." Final Report of the President's Task Force on Student Accessibility at the University of Winnipeg (September 1990), page 11.

\textsuperscript{53} The course syllabi I reviewed listed only handbooks, dictionaries, and the Writing Program coursebook (exercises and composition principles) as required texts.

\textsuperscript{54} "Beginning Writers: Diverse Voices and individual Identity" in College Composition and Communication 40 (1989): 152-174.
commentators have delineated the political nature of language instruction, pointing out the ways Standard English reinforces the values and concerns of the middle class and status quo. This policy leaves little room for readings that confront or celebrate cultural diversity. In the language that students were asked to use, a heavy emphasis on grammar and mechanics and too stringent rules on usage tests leads me to suggest that students are asked to check their language at the door when they enter the university. The very way they express themselves, a key factor in building and maintaining identity, comes under severe attack when students are asked to pass usage tests with grades of 90% or better. Where does this concern with correctness in usage come from, and why has it been grafted onto rhetoric courses? The early part of the chapter sketched a history of the university as a church college that taught an oral and written rhetoric derived from the medieval *ars praedicandi* (art of preaching). In the early part of the twentieth century and through the middle of this century, current-traditional rhetoric supplanted the broader vision of rhetoric with a rhetoric based on the analysis and appreciation of literature (belles-lettres) and a practice of composition that valued correct expression. Today the instructors of the Writing Program grapple with the legacy of current-traditional rhetoric as they try to extend the universe of discourse to include all academic writing. The emphasis on cognitive development through problem-solving, for example, represents a distinct break from the past teaching of writing as style.

---

But the emphasis on correct usage continues a tradition rooted in attenuated rhetorics of style. Sociolinguists Marcia Farr and Harvey Daniels emphasize the importance of culture in the teaching of composition. Although they base their research in pre-university contexts, their comments can also be applied to post-secondary conditions because the factors they identify—such as cultural difference—span the entire educational enterprise. Farr and Daniels contend that

Many of the difficulties that such students [students who do not come from mainstream culture] have in succeeding, and becoming literate, in school can be explained by the complexity of the differences between their home culture and the school culture. . . . Cultural difference in language practices that are a part of very different ways of viewing and operating in the world must be taken very seriously indeed.56

Farr and Daniels note that the cultural dissonance experienced by non-mainstream students effects written production in all facets of language use including phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse beyond the sentence. Non-mainstream students "who unconsciously know and use, as part of their native communication system, other discourse patterns which do not match the school's model of literacy presumably have a much more difficult transition to make [than mainstream students]" (41). Consequently, instruction in writing—if it is to accommodate non-mainstream or culturally diverse students—needs to address the difficulties of students who will never "master" Standard English usage because of interference between languages or dialects. The Writing Program requirement that all students pass usage tests with marks of 90% clearly works against policies meant to encourage diversity and access for non-traditional groups.

56 Marcia Farr and Harvy Daniels, Language Diversity and Writing Instruction, ERIC: 1986.
Linked to the changing and competing theories of rhetoric described above are changes in the organization of the institution. The English department, long suspicious of writing, appears to be integrating writing into its conception of what English studies should be. Professor Jewison, chair of the department, notes that "a sizable number of faculty [he lists six] hired to teach language and literature have had rhetoric credentials similar to those hired to teach in the Writing Program." In addition, many changes in the course offerings for students include a basic writing course, new sections of Rhetoric I for science students, and an upper division course in "Rhetoric in the Disciplines." At the same time, notably absent from this list are any courses that address theoretical or historical issues: no history or theory of rhetoric or of composition courses appear to be in the offering. Even while the department validates the practice of rhetoric, it seems to be denying students any chance to study the theory or history of this practice. Ultimately the erasure of history and theory may stultify the initiatives to teach writing effectively because neither students nor teachers will see themselves as creating and participating actively in the constructing of language and neither group will have any language with which to talk about how they use language for social purposes. A knowledge of the history of teaching writing at the University of Winnipeg, for example, might cause instructors there to wonder why Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was once used as a course book. The history of teaching writing at the University of Winnipeg might point out a precedent for the Writing-in-the-Disciplines courses currently being implemented: in the 1920's, the English department offered specialized courses to Engineers. One

---

57 Personal correspondence, June 26 1991. To my knowledge, only one of the professors and instructors hired at the University of Winnipeg has a PhD specializing in rhetoric and composition.
major challenge concerns teaching contemporary theories of writing in addition to the practice of writing.

In this chapter I have tried to identify what Geertz calls "the structures of meaning in terms of which individuals and groups of individuals live out their lives" (182). These structures include a unique administrative arrangement that places a high value on collaboration among peers, a series of courses and tutorials meant to open the university to a more diverse student body, and a re-introduction of rhetoric to studies in the English department. In the context of this dissertation, the description of the Writing Program in this chapter attempts to provide a concrete example of the abstract data that the survey provided in Chapter Three. Before leaving the University of Winnipeg Writing Program and moving on to a discussion of how writing is taught in departments of engineering, education, and continuing education (not to mention English) in the next chapter, we need to consider the degree to which the University of Winnipeg Writing Program is representative of programs at other universities in Canada.

Many large universities (i.e., with full-time enrollments of over 10,000 students) teach writing with the aid of a small army of graduate teaching assistants (University of British Columbia; Concordia University; York University). Many other large universities employ either full-time or part-time instructors (University of British Columbia; McGill University; York University). Smaller universities (i.e. with full-time enrollments of under 5,000 students) rely on part-time instructors. Only five of the 21 small universities employed more than eight people to teach writing, and only Winnipeg employed full-time instructors. The others relied on a combination of part-timers and English department professors. The average for all 21
small universities was six people who taught writing—three part-timers and three from the professor ranks.

These numbers indicate that the University of Winnipeg program is indeed unique, and further that it represents a greater commitment to the informed teaching of writing than is the case at many other institutions of a similar size. The full-time instructors at Winnipeg have the opportunity to switch to the rank of assistant professor as well as the comraderie and encouragement that comes with having a group of people who collaborate intensively to develop and implement writing instruction informed by current research. The institutions which rely on part-time instructors cannot hope for the same commitment from their employees, people who rarely have a chance for promotion or encouragement for research (research is a requirement for the instructors as well as professors at Winnipeg).

Survey results also show that small universities are more likely than large universities to both require and to encourage students to take writing courses, and, of course, Winnipeg is no exception. In fact, Winnipeg's range of writing courses exceeds the range of most universities regardless of size. Small universities like Winnipeg are also more likely than large universities to be developing or enhancing writing programs.

Earlier in this chapter I quoted Dean McIntyre's description of the unique aspects of the University of Winnipeg Writing Program: a reliance on full-time rather than part-time instructors; the integration of writing instruction under one administrative unit; and the adoption of a process-based pedagogy. As the survey results suggest, McIntyre is both right and wrong. Parts of the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg are unique, such as the administrative structure used to
coordinate the Writing Program, while others are much more common than McIntyre suggests (such as the adoption of a writing-process pedagogy). In the chapter that follows, I will present data collected from a larger, more traditional, and less diverse institution—the University of New Brunswick. It, too, presents characteristics that are both unique and common to many universities in Canada and so provides another opportunity for understanding how writing instruction functions within a local context.
CHAPTER V
WRITING PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK

Chapter Four provides an example of how one university has chosen to accept the challenge of increasing its students' literacy through programmatic instruction in writing. The faculty (professoriate) at the University of Winnipeg accept rather than avoid demands for such instruction; at an institutional level, writing instruction finds funding and departmental acceptance. Chapter Five seeks to set the case study of the University of Winnipeg into relief by describing a university where the challenge of literacy has not been accepted at an institution-wide level. Although they agree on the need and desire of students to study writing and improve themselves as writers, administrators at this institution cannot agree on a policy to ensure that all students have access to writing instruction. The resulting "Balkanization" of writing instruction within the university engendered separate writing programs in Engineering, Education, Extension Services, and English in the University of New Brunswick. These programs do not appear to communicate well with each other or to share basic premises about what writing is and how to teach writing.

The following case study examines the research questions guiding this dissertation from another angle, in this case provided by the institutional circumstances at the University of New Brunswick. This chapter provides a contrast to the University of Winnipeg Writing Program. The various programs at the University of New Brunswick (UNB) form a diffuse, uncoordinated effort to respond
to the needs of all students for writing instruction. At the disciplinary level, however, I will argue that the four programs provide a kind of writing instruction tailored to their particular disciplinary environments. Engineering stresses a writing process and a "writing subject" who solves problems through a process that integrates writing and engineering. Education focuses on developmental aspects of student writers by having them write, read published research about writing, and talk with other students extensively about their writing. Extension services provides instruction that seeks to help students overcome their fear of writing and lack of knowledge about processes of writing. English concentrates on improving the style of student writing about literature. Because of their focus on style in literary essays, the English department functions as simply another discipline whose students need help writing. The English department does not provide the leadership and theoretical awareness of language use found in some other universities in Canada. The remainder of this chapter explores each institutional site for writing instruction in more detail. To understand the tensions that led to such fragmentation, we need to understand the local history of writing instruction at the University of New Brunswick.

*Fredericton, New Brunswick*

The University of New Brunswick is located in Fredericton, New Brunswick, a city of approximately 50,000 people (see Figure 7). Like the University of Winnipeg, the University of New Brunswick is located in the provincial capital; unlike the University of Winnipeg, the University of New Brunswick is the provincial university (the "flagship" or leading research centre). Full-time enrollments in 1989 (the most recent year for which figures are available) reached 8,262 full-time students
and 2,720 part-time students.\footnote{These figures were taken from the 1991-1992 Undergraduate Calendar of the University of New Brunswick Canada, page A-4.} Eighty percent of the undergraduate students come from within the province, while the remainder are drawn principally from the other Maritimes provinces and Quebec.\footnote{This information came from Roger Ploude, Chair of English, during a personal interview on January 18, 1991.} Roger Ploude, chair of the department of English, commented that "this is not a rich province; in fact, it's one of the poorest provinces in the country. It means something because a lot of the kids we deal with come from backgrounds where they often don't have access to books or ideas like they would in other places."\footnote{Personal interview of January 18, 1991.} Economic indicators, such as unemployment figures and value of manufactured goods, support Ploude's contention: in both categories, New Brunswick ranks among the poorest provinces, with very little manufacturing activity and very high unemployment rates.\footnote{Rates for unemployment in 1986 were 14.4%, second only to Newfoundland's. Value of manufactured goods and building construction ranked in the lowest three or four of the ten provinces. See "Canada's Economy" and "Canada's labor Force" in 1988 Canadian World Almanac and Book of Facts (Toronto: Global Press, 1987), pp. 414-430.} Comments that the students have little access to money or to "backgrounds" that would help them succeed in university culture suggest that accessibility to higher education and writing programs (particularly basic writing courses) would be important issues for the university. However, no informant mentioned them nor do university documents that I reviewed mention them. The explanation, I believe, lies at least partially in the history of the institution generally and in the history of teaching writing particularly.
A History of Writing Instruction at the University of New Brunswick

Tradition influences the development of writing programs, arguing silently that what worked in the past will suffice for the future. In the late eighteenth-century the University of New Brunswick received one of the first university charters granted in Canada. To understand why its programs take their present form calls for understanding the weight of as well as the values of tradition that inspired and, to some extent, continue to shape the education provided at this university.

The yearly Undergraduate Calendars (catalogues of courses) for the University of New Brunswick usually contain a historical sketch that outlines the origins of the university, grounding that history in Loyalist sentiment and calling for the study of literature rather than oratory:

As the American Revolutionary War drew to a close, thousands of Loyalists gathered in New York City to await transportation to homes in other British Colonies. Among these Loyalists were Charles Inglis, a former interim President of King's College, New York (Columbia); Benjamin Moore, later President of Columbia; and Jonathan Odell, minister and pamphleteer. These men were the visionaries of their day. In the midst of war, privation, and exile, they drew up a plan for the future education of their sons in the Nova Scotia wilderness. Recognizing that the new American nation would provide education only in revolutionary "Principles contrary to the British constitution" and that the cost of an overseas education would be prohibitive, they urged upon the representatives of the British government to consider the "founding of a College . . . where Youth may receive a virtuous education" in such things as "Religion, Literature, Loyalty, & good Morals . . ."5

While this passage does not explicitly exclude oratory, the emphasis on religion, literature, and loyalty stress obedience over disputation. When this colony was founded, government existed by royal decree rather than through representatives of

5 From 1991-1992 Undergraduate Calendar of the University of New Brunswick Canada, page 1.1.
the people in a legislative assembly. James Hannay, author of a two-volume history of the province of New Brunswick, wrote that "The Royal Prerogative was exalted at the expense of liberty, and any man who ventured to set limits to it was looked upon as a traitor."\(^6\)

But what was the nature of the "revolutionary" ideology and education that the Loyalists objected to so strongly? Both Michael Halloran and Warren Guthrie maintain that the Ramistic rhetoric adopted by the Puritan settlers had by the mid-eighteenth-century become a much fuller rhetoric that resembled classical rhetoric, dividing the art into invention, arrangement, style, and delivery.\(^7\) Further, this revived art of rhetoric increasingly found voice in the English language rather than in Greek or Latin orations, and primarily in oral rather than written communication. The great number of debating and literary societies founded in the mid-1700's also used English rather than the classical languages when conducting their meetings. The combination of this increased use of English, the recovery of a rhetoric based upon public affairs (relying principally upon Quintilian and Ciceronian definitions of rhetors as citizens involved in the conduct of public life), and the increased tolerance and even promotion of the idea of having students dispute political subjects led to the following disputation questions at Harvard:

---


- Are the people the sole judge of their rights and liberties?
- Is a government tyrannical in which the rulers consult their own interest more than that of their subjects?\(^8\)

Topics such as these question the very basis of Loyalist beliefs in the supremacy of the British constitution and, through that constitution, the power of the monarchy and the House of Lords. At the very least, disputations of this nature suggest alternatives to the British constitution, and the answers to these questions proposed in a post-revolutionary setting would certainly challenge the position of the aristocratic compact ruling the colony.

Objections arose to the ruling aristocracy as immigration transformed the colony from "the quiet, cultured haven of the Loyalists" in the late 1700's into a bustling lumber and ship-building centre by the middle of the nineteenth-century (Pacey 60; Firth 24). Political speeches and newspaper articles attacked the college because it was a visible symbol of the ruling aristocracy:

The college never won the confidence and support of the people at large, and this because it was regarded, with some justification, as an aristocratic and Anglican preserve ... until 1846 all members of the College Council had to subscribe to the doctrines of the Church of England. (Pacey 60)

Objections to the curriculum also questioned whether "the young men of the province ... were squandering their precious time and the province's more precious funds by spending several years pursuing classical studies" (Firth 24). According to Firth, these attacks form part of the larger debate about the degree to which practical studies, such as engineering and forestry, should be included in the curriculum of the

\[^8\] These questions appear in a list of topics for public disputation at Harvard University quoted in Halloran, 251.
university. Despite the ferocity of these attacks, the classical emphasis survived into the twentieth century.

The classical emphasis was apparent in the early years of the "College of New Brunswick" (1820-29). In his 1828 address to the first graduates of the college, James Somerville reviewed their curriculum. In addition to extensive study of classical Greek and Roman language and literature, the students read orations by Demosthenes, part of Aristotle's Rhetoric, two books of Cicero's De Oratore, and five books of Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria. Somerville described his educational goals for this reading in terms of a Ramistic rhetoric founded on style rather than as part of a revived classical rhetoric:

In the perusal of these Standard Authors, it was my endeavour to point out to you, those beauties of Sentiment and of Style, which being founded, not upon casual associations, but, on permanent principles laid deep in human nature, distinguish every work of real excellence from those performances which owe their celebrity merely to humour, caprice, or the fashion of the day. (Somerville 740)

Later in the same speech, Somerville advises the two graduates to continue their study of rhetoric because "you are both destined for public Speakers." He recommends all of Aristotle's Rhetoric, Cicero's De Oratore, and Quintilian Institutio Oratoria:

With the latter [Quintilian] every Scolar should be intimately acquainted, as it is perhaps the most perfect Treatise of its kind extant. Read with care the whole Twelve Books, but more especially, from the Eighth Book to the end. If you do this, you will gradually find your Taste to become more correct, and your Style more neat, pure, and harmonious. (740)

Somerville focuses on "Taste" and "Style" rather than on invention, arrangement, and delivery in his educational goals because the public speaking these students were likely to be called upon to perform took place in "cultured" society rather than in the
more open town hall electoral meetings of the new republic to the south. This emphasis upon cultural distinction and identification enables students to function as "public" speakers in a closed, or at least clearly limited and demarcated, political environment (political compacts among the Anglo-Canadian establishment rather than elections determined government policy). In its emphasis upon style, Somerville's rhetoric already distinguished itself from the rediscovered classical rhetorical tradition of the American republic that Halloran and Guthrie describe.

By the 1860's much of the reading in classical rhetoric that Somerville noted in the address quoted above seems to have disappeared from the curriculum. Instead, first-year students at the University of New Brunswick studied composition as a supplement to their study of literature:

[the] Freshmen attending my lectures on English Literature are required to write on two days of the week a comprehensive and exhaustive analysis of one or two Chapters of Quackenboss's[sic] Rhetoric, and are on the third day examined orally upon their contents. On Saturday they read a Composition upon some subject which I have previously appointed & explained. This system has answered every rule; the Students become thoroughly acquainted with the contents of their Text Book, and their compositions show decided marks of progress in increased facility of expression and in greater correctness of style. (D'Avray 1863)

J. Marshall D'Avray, the professor responsible for the teaching of composition and literature at the newly incorporated University of New Brunswick (1859) during this period, subordinated the study of composition to the study of literature and turned the study of composition away from classical rhetoric toward an exclusive emphasis on prose composition.9 The focus on prose composition encouraged "facility of

expression" and "correctness of style," elements that continue to dominate the present instruction in English at the University of New Brunswick. Such a study affords an immense mass of most valuable information in the history of the rise and progress of literary effort, from the first rude Bardic songs of the Celtic nations of Wales and Ireland, the elaborate metrical poems of the Saxons, the Fabliaux and chivalric romances of the Normans, to the poetry of Chaucer, Surrey, Sidney, Spencer, Shakespeare; from the harsh inversions and obscure metaphors of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles to the polished, clear, and flowing sentences of an Allison, or a Macauley--and in order that the lessons be learnt--the principles of elegant diction thus acquired may be practically applied, one lecture in every week is devoted to composition--to that direct instruction in the art which alone can confer the skill to avoid the errors and to imitate the excellencies of our best writers. (D'Avray 1862, p. 2)

This method of teaching writing--one lecture in every week devoted to composition--survived intact at least until the 1950's at the University of New Brunswick, and in fact continues on today as part of the introduction to literature courses at many other Canadian universities. D'Avray's students were expected to read and absorb patterns of written expression; the tutorials provided exercises to help students avoid errors. In his annual report to the president of the university in 1871, D'Avray mentions the problems some students have with grammar and pronunciation and comments that the Senior examination included a question asking students to "correct certain sentences containing many faults and to justify their corrections by giving the Rules which had been violated" (D'Avray 1871). In an earlier report to the president, D'Avray noted that writing instruction includes a knowledge of the principles of rhetorical style, which he defines as the "freedom from [expressing] puerile ideas childishly" through the development of a "sense of correct conception, logical inference, and pure expression" (D'Avray 1864). D'Avray emphasizes "facility of expression" and "correctness in style" through the study of both grammatical and rhetorical principles.
(D'Avray 1863). This strategy remains the basis of teaching writing in the English department at the University of New Brunswick today.

In composition studies today, the pedagogy D'Avray describes fits the mold of "current-traditional rhetoric." Current-traditional rhetoric emerged from the attenuation of the revived classical rhetoric described by Halloran and Guthrie into a rhetoric of style that focused on stylistically sophisticated and mechanically correct prose. Current-traditional rhetoric remains a very powerful influence on the pedagogies of the present-day English and, to some extent, Engineering departments at the University of New Brunswick. In the years since D'Avray's time, little seems to have changed in the essential nature of the rhetoric taught in the English department there. With the establishment of a chair of English literature, logic, and metaphysics in 1868, and a separate chair of English in 1909, the march began toward establishing English literature as the centerpiece of liberal education at the University of New Brunswick, with rhetoric (as an area of study) all but lost and composition occupying a subordinate and truncated role.

The most notable changes of the 20th century at the University of New Brunswick have all occurred since 1950 as three sites other than English within the university have begun offering writing instruction--Engineering, Education, and Extension Services (adult and continuing education). The period 1900-50 saw few innovations, at least in part because occupants of the chair of English "seldom remained for very long" (Pacey 66). In the 1940's, however, increased funding for the library and positions in the Arts faculty (there were a total of 27 faculty in 1950) afforded the stability necessary to attend to curricular matters (Pacey 67).
In 1949 the English department offered three courses that included some formal instruction in writing: English 100, "An Introduction to Literature"; English 110, "Course for Applied Science Students"; and English 330, "Course for Third-year Engineers." The "Introduction to Literature" course resembled courses at other major Canadian universities such as Toronto, McGill, and Queen's with its primary emphasis on critical methods used to study literature, with a minor emphasis on composition (Johnson 868). The course at the University of New Brunswick was "designed to familiarize [students] with the critical methods employed in the study of various literary forms and to provide assistance in the writing of clear and concise prose" (1949 UNB Calendar 108). At the University of New Brunswick, three lectures per week were devoted to literary works, while a weekly tutorial was made available "for those needing special assistance in English Composition" (1949 UNB Calendar 109). While the study of composition and rhetoric had begun as the basis of humanistic training under Somerville (who prescribed readings in Aristotle and Cicero), by 1949 composition and rhetoric had been transformed into an adjunct to the study of literature for inept students. Its role had become corrective rather than generative, a role that by definition aimed at enforcing standard codes of language use and forcing others to conform to them. Rhetoric went from the centrepiece of liberal education (an art of generating thought and action) to the margins of the academy (as a gatekeeper enforcing correctness) where it remains.

The "Course for Applied Science Students" differed from the "Introduction to Literature" by switching the focus of the course to writing rather than critical reading strategies:

Concerned primarily with the writing of clear and concise English prose, this course is designed also to encourage discriminating reading and logical thinking.
Three lectures per week, both terms, and a weekly tutorial for those needing special assistance in English composition.

This course description lists two texts, one of which appears to be a college literature reader (McCallum's Revised College Omnibus) and the other a composition text by Norman Foerster and J. M. Steadman called Writing and Thinking (1941). Despite its title, the authors of Writing and Thinking collapse the distinction they offer in their title by maintaining that

the words required for the expression of the thought or feeling are the words inherent in the thought or feeling itself. They are not cunningly devised by the writer, invented and arranged by him with a view to impressing the reader. He does nothing but find them in the place where they spring to life, i.e., in the mind. (3)

These authors, and presumably the teachers who adopted this text, disparage the classical conception of rhetoric as including invention and arrangement. Their text reflects this attitude through its emphasis on style: two-thirds of the text is devoted to "Correctness" (grammar, punctuation, mechanics, and spelling) and "Effectiveness" (diction, unity, emphasis, clearness). The section most likely to contain material on invention, entitled "Substance-Gathering Material," occupies but two pages of the 434 in the book and discusses only non-written methods of creating "ample substance": thinking, observing, discussing, and reading (76). As the composition text for both "An Introduction to Literature" and "Course for Applied Science Students," Writing and Thinking functioned within the bounds of the "Current-traditional rhetoric" introduced at the University of New Brunswick in the mid-nineteenth century by D'Avray and challenged by Daniel Fogarty of Saint Mary's University (Halifax) in his 1959 text, Roots for a New Rhetoric, which calls for writing instruction based on a synthesis of rhetorical principles from Kenneth Burke, I. A. Richards, and the general semantics movement.
The third writing course listed by the English department in 1949, "Course for Third-Year Engineers," reflects the past and continuing demands for more practical education. The English department staunchly defended the "humanist tradition" of teaching literature against the demands of "technical education" and the teaching of writing. The calendar description for the "Course for Third-Year Engineers" shows signs of the tensions these demands produced:

This course is designed to improve the student's powers of self-expression, and to induce an appreciation of good literature. It will consist of the study of selected prose texts and of the writing of essays and reports.(110)

Unlike arts students, these students must be "induced" to appreciate literature; they are also given the opportunity to write "reports," a concession made to their program of study. Within five years this course disappeared from the calendar, a victim of the demands of the Engineering faculty that their students be taught how to write reports, technical documents, and business correspondence rather than how to read English literature. Throughout the 1950's and 1960's the English department offered various literature courses designed for non-Arts students in Engineering, Forestry, Physical Education, and Business Administration. These courses usually list a series of major authors--Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden--and drop all references to the teaching of writing.

By the 1970's, however, the course descriptions for non-Arts students show the lack of agreement about the content and goals of English courses, with the department of English refusing to teach courses that did not focus on literature. The following description of English 1010 provides a case in point:
Content and nature of this course is established by a committee drawn from the faculties of Engineering and Forestry and from the English Department. For students in Engineering, Forestry, Business Administration, and Physical Education.

The calendar description tells us only that a committee is trying to work out a compromise, and that they haven't been able to settle on anything in time for the printer's deadline. That this course must be drafted by a committee from various faculties is also an oddity, suggesting that struggles for control over the content of this course continued into the 1970's, ending only when the Engineering department began offering its own technical writing course. Beginning in the mid-1950's and continuing to the present, the Engineering department began experimenting with offering its own writing courses in response to the refusal of the English department to offer courses that did not focus on literature. In an interview, Professor Eric Garland, Associate Vice-President and Professor of Engineering at the University of New Brunswick, recalled that the Engineering department took over the technical writing course and "were glad they did it." The technical writing course grew out of the department's efforts to improve its students' abilities to make effective oral and written presentations. These rhetoric courses--variously titled "Public Speaking," "Presentation and Thesis," and "Oral and Visual Communication"--embody elements of the full classical rhetoric described by both Hallovan and Guthrie earlier in this chapter. These courses include both oral and written discourse and exclude the study of literature.\(^\text{10}\)

Engineering was not the only faculty that had begun offering its own writing courses in the 1970s. During this time, the Education faculty began offering separate

\(^{10}\) See the subsection entitled "Writing Instruction in Engineering" later in this chapter for a description of these courses.
courses on the teaching of writing. This faculty offered a course called "Process in Composition" in 1979-80; before this time instruction on how to teach writing occurred in several "methods" courses, such as "EDCI 5141, Teaching of High School English."\textsuperscript{11} In 1978-79 the faculty began offering a course called "EDCI 5214, The Relationship Between Language, Thought, and Culture" and another course focused specifically on helping students improve their own writing, "EDCI 1214 (6), Communication: Written Composition".\textsuperscript{12} A later section of this chapter will describe this course more fully.

The fourth site for writing instruction on the University of New Brunswick campus—in addition, that is, to English, Engineering, and Education—began in 1982-83 under the Department of Extension and Summer Session as the "Writing and Study Skills Lab." As its title suggests, writing instruction occurs in this institutional context alongside academic and personal counselling, and instruction on study habits. This service began one year before the university instituted its "Competence in English Test." A large portion of the Lab's work consists of offering support and providing instruction for students who fail to pass the competency test. In her yearly report, Judith Potter (Coordinator of Adult Learner Services) described how the Lab works in relation to the test:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Before writing the Competence in English Test (CET), all students received letters from the Registrar's Office offering the lab as one of the options to assist them in meeting the CET requirement. Finally, after CET results become available, individuals who failed the test were contacted by mail to invite them to meet with a Lab tutor. (Potter 2)}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} From page 166 of the 1971-71 University of New Brunswick Undergraduate Calendar.

\textsuperscript{12} From page 263 of the 1978-79 University of New Brunswick Undergraduate Calendar.
In 1990, the university Council of Deans voted to discontinue the Competence in English Test. Because much of the work the Study Skills Lab provides supports students who fail the test, discontinuing the test may affect the amount of tutoring that the lab provides. In the years since it opened, the Lab has increased the volume of appointments kept (from 127 in 1982-83 to 330 in 1989-90), the number of individuals seen (from 72 in 1982-83 to 180 in 1989-90), and the number of workshops it runs (from 3 in 1982-83 to 31 in 1989-90).

This sketch outlining the history of writing instruction at the University of New Brunswick argued that, far from not teaching writing until the so-called "literacy crisis" of the 1970s, the University of New Brunswick has taught students to write from the very inception of the university. The nature of this instruction, however, has been contested throughout this time and remains in flux today. Begun as an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum in the earliest years (requiring the study of Aristotle and Cicero), writing instruction has through the years been transformed into only a written discourse (using a definition supplied by Quackenbos in the mid-nineteenth century), its present status as an amorphous art assuming many different guises within the English (as style), Engineering (as oral and written discourse), Education (as written composition), and Extension (as remedial) departments. Writing instruction has gradually fallen out of favour since the 1870's, partially because of the rise of literary studies but also because of the reconfiguration of rhetoric as primarily written rather than oral, and as primarily stylistic rather than epistemic. These changes led to the narrowing of rhetoric in English studies and the consequent development of writing instruction in other disciplines at the university. The remainder of this chapter extends the historical argument outlined above by focusing on descriptions of
how individual departments, working in isolation, have attempted to help their students learn to write.

**Writing Instruction in the English Department**

The 1991-92 Undergraduate Calendar lists seven writing courses—courses, that is, that spend at least one-third of class time discussing writing or the elements of good writing—offered by the English department. The English department defines writing courses as courses that discuss writing or the elements of good writing. The English 1000 enrolls the most students and forms the core course, and for those reasons will dominate the discussion below. In addition to English 1000, the department offers two other first-year courses—"Fundamentals of Clear Writing" and "Fundamentals of Effective Writing"—but enrollments in these courses suffer from budget restrictions that limit the number of sections offered each year. Two other courses focus on "English as a Second Language" and "Literary English for Non-Anglophones." Finally, the department offers an intermediate writing course called "Expository Writing" that has an enrollment cap of 18 students and "Creative Writing and Practical Criticism" with an enrollment cap of 10 students.

Despite the range of courses listed above, the bulk of writing instruction done in the English department focuses on English 1000. This course is a descendent of the composition/literature synthesis identified by Nan Johnson as the peculiarly Canadian approach to literacy in universities because it incorporates both

---

13 The definition of a writing course comes from the department's own statement in a document entitled "Proposal for First Year English Course for all non-Arts students" which notes that "This is not a writing course, though students will be required to write essays (a total of 6) which will be marked for expression and organization as well as for content. However, no class time will be spent discussing writing or the elements of good writing."
"composition instruction and critical analysis--a synthesis which was the distinctive legacy of nineteenth-century Canadian adaptations of British-style belletristic rhetoric" (Johnson 868). The course functions as an introduction to both "the discipline of reading and to the principles and practice of university-level composition" (1991-92 Calendar 6.90). While the literature/composition course has a long heritage in this century, English 1000 was designed explicitly to improve literacy skills among first-year students rather than train students in any one discipline:

English XXXXX is designed as a course of study which gives opportunity for concentrated and closely directed practice in the arts of writing and reading to the beginning university Arts student. It is being proposed at this time because of numerous complaints and mounting evidence that the lack of these skills now harpers students from advancing as well as they should in their arts courses, whatever discipline the student may happen to have elected as his [sic] major. The instruction in writing is directed solely toward producing clear and effective expository prose as would apply generally to sophisticated literate human uses--not to specialties such as creative writing, nor to the particulars of any one field of intellectual expertise.14

About the time English 1000 was proposed, the university implemented its "Competence in English Test," another response to the "numerous complaints" identified above. The test was composed of two parts: a multiple-choice section on grammar and mechanics and a short writing sample. In addition to the exigency for the course--literacy skills--we need to note the explicitly cross-disciplinary nature of the reading and writing that the course designers proposed. These guidelines attempt to establish a course distinctly different from the composition/literature synthesis

14 From "Report of the Special Committee on a Compulsory English Course." Professor Ploude identified this as a document describing what eventually became English 1000.
referred to above by broadening the base of reading and of writing to focus on non-
belletristic discourse.

What is the nature of the writing instruction provided in the English
department? At the University of New Brunswick, English 1000 has been divided
into two parts, with the first half of the course devoting two-thirds of class time to
composition and one third to reading literature; in the second half of the course this
ratio reverses and one third of class time concentrates on composition. In a course
syllabus, Professor Roger Ploude, chair of the English department and coordinator of
this course, describes the workshop approach to writing used in the first half of
English 1000:

In the first term, 2/3 of class time will be devoted to writing.
Considerable time will be spent analyzing samples of students' writing
and discussing the elements of writing covered in chapters 19-30 of
the Harbrace College Handbook. Students should read the first 18
chapters of this text during the term and bring any questions to class.

The first eighteen chapters of the Harbrace College Handbook deal with grammar,
mechanics, and punctuation. The sections Professor Ploude discusses in class focus
on diction and effective sentences. Ploude's classroom exercises can be grouped into
three categories: sentence-level errors, sentence-combining exercises, and paragraph
coherence. A typical sentence-level exercise provides a short instruction followed by
10-20 sentences for students to rewrite:

Rewrite the following sentences, correcting all errors of grammar and
punctuation.

1. All the residents have good jobs and each of them have a boat camper and a
   stately luxurious home.
2. I will try to attend the meeting failing that I will send my report to the
   committee which assist the Chairman.
Ploude also uses sentence-combining exercises to build syntactic maturity. A typical exercise in this mode directs students to rewrite a series of simple sentences into compound and complex sentences:

Using your knowledge of subordination and punctuation, write one good sentence from the following lists of related facts:

1. William Wordsworth was born in 1770.
2. He published his first poem in 1793.
3. The poem was called "Descriptive Sketches".
4. The poem was inspired by his trip to Europe.
5. He took this trip in 1790.
6. Wordsworth considered "Descriptive Sketches" one of his finest poems.
7. It is curious that critics neglected the poem for years.
8. These critics considered the poem inferior to Wordsworth’s later work.

Ploude commented in an interview that "I do a lot of this [teach punctuation and subordination].

The next series of exercises Ploude uses focus on coherence and organization within paragraphs. These exercises can take three forms: a series of three or four paragraphs taken from student essays that form subject matter for class discussion; a single student paragraph with each sentence numbered that students rewrite or "polish"; or a series of statements similar to the sentence-combining exercise quoted above that students use to write a coherent paragraph.

This instruction itself takes place as part of a teaching process. In an interview, Ploude noted the sequence and context of these different exercises:
Here's what we do a lot of. When the student writes an essay, the first class after the essay we usually, when we go through the essay, this is the way we teach grammar. We pick out six examples of student writing that represent common types of weaknesses of sentence structure or grammar. We type it up, pass it out, and go over it reinforcing weaknesses... and then we try to type up a couple of their paragraphs to get at the larger elements of their writing.\footnote{Personal interview January 18, 1991.}

It is important to note that for Ploude the "larger elements" of writing means the paragraph, not the essay as a whole.\footnote{Personal interview January 18, 1991.} Further, although Ploude mentioned the importance of writing as a process, in his view the process of writing cannot be taught. In Ploude's words,

After all, writing is a process. It's a difficult thing to try and get people on the faculty to understand. They will often want to look at things as mechanical. It's much more a process... something that develops and grows... [In English 1000] we don't teach them a body of knowledge. We can't give them rules for good writing. We can't give them rules for good grammar, or some rules for good grammar. We can't give them rules for writing a good paragraph... We can tell them what a good paragraph should be: it should be structured, it should develop a good focus, but those are abstractions.\footnote{Personal interview January 18, 1991.}

Neither Ploude's course syllabus nor the Harbrace College Handbook emphasizes the nature of the writing process or the ways students can explore and refine their own writing processes. At issue here is the extent to which writing can be taught. Earlier in the chapter I quoted from Foerster and Steadman's Writing and Thinking, a text that denied any role to invention in the writing process. Ploude seems to agree with this philosophy. In a report to the Arts faculty about English 1000, Ploude discussed the department's decision to adopt the Harbrace College Handbook for all its courses.

\footnote{Personal interview January 18, 1991.}
Several instructors argued that the *Harbrace College Handbook* provided insufficient coverage of

the various types of paragraph development (cause and effect, analogy, comparison and contrast etc.) and that this type of instruction was woven into the very philosophy of the course. The course, they felt, required a writing text which was a rhetoric as well as a handbook.\(^{18}\)

In response, Ploude wrote that

the fundamental purpose of the course as far as writing is concerned is to raise the student's awareness of style and to encourage him/her to organize material and to strive for clean, precise, and lucid expression. If a student can organize material and write in a sharp, clean prose, then that student should be able to manipulate the various rhetorical strategies to suit the occasion. Furthermore, I do not feel that we need a rhetoric to teach rhetoric. One can teach the various types of paragraph development by requiring students to try these types and by analyzing their efforts in class.\(^{19}\)

Style remains the focus of writing instruction and the truncated rhetoric taught in English 1000. Ploude, and the instructors that disagreed with the adoption of the *Harbrace College Handbook*, seem to equate rhetoric with the modes of paragraph development developed in the mid-nineteenth century. To some extent, these modes continue to define much of the writing instruction that currently takes place, although Robert Connors argues--perhaps wishfully--that the modes no longer dominate writing instruction. Certainly the modes no longer dominate current theory and research about writing.\(^{20}\) While Ploude mentions that students will need to

---

\(^{18}\) Quoted from "Report on English 1000 (1983-84). *The Harbrace College Handbook* is still the writing text for this course.

\(^{19}\) Quoted from "Report on English 1000 (1983-84).

\(^{20}\) For a description of the development of the modes of discourse, see Robert J. Connors, "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse," *College Composition and Communication* 32 (1981): 444-55. For an argument that the modes still dominate, see Kathleen E. Welch, "Ideology and Freshman Textbook Production:"
"manipulate the various rhetorical strategies to suit the occasion," neither his course syllabus nor the Harbrace College Handbook gives any instruction in the rhetorical situation (Bitzer), rhetorical occasions (Aristotle), or in invention strategies used to manipulate discourse to suit an occasion (such as presented in the stasis theory of the Roman rhetoricians).

A possible explanation for this omission may lie in the clearly demarcated and limited possibilities for discourse in English 1000. Although the course was designed as an introduction to reading and writing for all arts students, the majority of readings in the course could best be classed as literary, and perhaps more generously classed as bellettristic. In Ploude's syllabus, readings drawn from the Scott, Foresman reader included essays by G. K. Chesterton and E. B. White, and short stories by Ernest Hemingway and James Joyce. In the second term of the course, the readings are all drawn from literary texts, with selections from Shakespeare, Keats, Browning, Arnold, Yeats, Eliot and others. Student writing seems limited to either personal experience essays (where invention strategies consist of remembering) or literary essays (where invention consists of reading and re-reading).

Of course, much research in rhetoric and composition studies argues against teaching the attenuated rhetoric described by Ploude above. In his 1959 text Roots for a New Rhetoric, Daniel Fogarty (Dean of the school of education at St. Mary's University in Halifax) provided a name for the attenuated rhetoric employed in English 1000: current-traditional rhetoric. Fogarty used this term to identify a rhetoric that had lost touch with its philosophic roots, which he locates in Aristotle's works. Fogarty hoped to re-establish the connection between philosophy and rhetoric.

by introducing and examining the theories of I. A. Richards, Kenneth Burke, and the
General Semanticists (Alfred Korzybski, Irving I. Lee, Wendell Johnson, and Samuel
I. Hayakawa) and then drawing connections between these theorists and the content
of writing courses. In Chapter Five of *Roots For a New Rhetoric*, Fogarty identifies
the goal of his work as

> an attempt to provide, for teachers and formulators of courses, a
> survey of the promising elements of current theory in rhetoric so that
> they may make the choices and adaptations that suit the needs of their
> first-year courses, variously titled English 1, composition, the writing
> of speeches, and communication. Clearly such a synthesis will have to
> answer the social and educational challenges of the coming decade.²¹

Thirty years later, Fogarty's work apparently has not influenced the first-year courses
at the University of New Brunswick.

Nevertheless, *Roots for a New Rhetoric* has influenced many researchers in
rhetoric and composition, most notably Richard Young and James Berlin. In his
histories of composition teaching in the United States, Berlin adopts Fogarty's term--
current-traditional rhetoric--to describe the emergence in the nineteenth-century of
rhetorics that overly emphasize correctness in usage, grammar, and mechanics. In
*Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*, Berlin describes how
current-traditional rhetoric modified classical rhetoric:

---

The invention of discovery of classical rhetoric is replaced by a managerial invention, taking the shape of the forms of discourse—description, narration, exposition, and argument. Rhetoric, it is asserted, cannot teach the discovery of the content of discourse, but it can teach students to manage it, once found, so that it appeals to the appropriate faculty. This new invention is thus made part of arrangement. Since language must be chosen to embody the content of thought, the study of diction and sentence structure becomes an abiding concern, both resting on eighteenth-century theories of language.22

At the University of New Brunswick, English 1000 employs a truncated form of this current-traditional rhetoric because the professors in charge of the department resist even the kind of invention Berlin describes above—as managerial or based on the forms of discourse. Professor Ploude's resistance to the use of rhetoric texts to teach writing—which Ploude and the other instructors define by reference to the modes of discourse—provides some evidence of the resistance to rhetorical theory in writing instruction. In the end, this resistance impoverishes the teaching of writing and of English literature, and adds fuel to fires of those critical of the English 1000 course, which has been derided as "that grammar course."

Writing Instruction in Engineering

Outside the English department, English 1000 faces similar challenges. Professor A. O. Landva, who teaches technical writing for the civil engineering department, commented that while the English department teaches Shakespeare and "that kind of English" (which he associates with English 1000), engineering students need a much different kind of instruction.23 Landva also pointed out that the English department is incapable of providing the kind of instruction engineering students


23 Personal interview, Jan. 18, 1991.
need because of the technical nature of the discourse engineering students must master. Landva bases this argument on the need for a practitioner of the discourse to teach it, commenting that because "I write and read these things [technical reports and papers] myself all the time" he can provide his students with more insight into how to write them. The next section of this chapter examines the nature of writing instruction needed by students in engineering. The following description of the courses the faculty provides is based on both print evidence and personal interviews with two of the professors who teach these courses.

The engineering school at the University of New Brunswick consists of seven departments: chemical, civil, electrical, forest, geologic, mechanical, and surveying engineering. Respondents to the survey reported in Chapter Three identified fourteen writing courses, that is, fourteen courses that offer instruction in writing. The bulk of these courses (eleven) fall into a category described by terms such as Senior Report, Work Term Report, and Thesis. Civil Engineering offers two of these courses, both at the senior level:

Senior Report I

Presents some of the approaches used to formulate a proposal for an engineering study. During the course, each student will present a proposal which will serve as the basis for the course CE 4993 Senior Report II.

Senior Report II

A written document, the subject of which is a topic of interest to the student. The subject is investigated by all means available to the student with the guidance of a member of the Civil Engineering faculty. The student is required to present the subject of the report orally and attend similar presentations by colleagues.

The first of these courses focuses on proposal writing, usually as an extension of the discussion of proposals provided in the technical writing courses. They usually meet
for only one hour each week, and operate as a way of getting students to perform some of the preliminary work necessary for the second course. Senior Report II meets four times each week; work on the research, writing, and presentation of student work proceeds much more rapidly. The writing instruction in this course consists of two components: one-to-one tutorials between the professor directing the research and each student, and weekly meetings attended by all students in the course and a professor who coordinates the research projects. Senior Report II courses, with the exception of Surveying Engineering, all require students to present their work both orally and in writing.

The emphasis on oral as well as written communication marks the engineering strand of writing instruction because it calls for a necessarily broader conception of rhetoric. The audience includes the teacher/marker, of course, but in many cases the conception of the audience becomes quite real. Senior reports must be presented as conference papers before a live audience of peers and professors. In this arena, a rhetoric focused entirely on stylistic concerns misses the mark. Memory and delivery reassert their importance as aspects of rhetoric that orators must concern themselves with. In fact, both invention and arrangement also reassert themselves as important concepts for these students when they attempt to determine what they can say in a limited time and how best to arrange their material in order to explain or persuade their audience. This re-emergence of a rhetoric consisting of both oral and written elements is ironic. The battles to establish practical education in the university in the nineteenth-century were fought in defense of the liberal arts, including rhetoric, but in the time since then the liberal arts have come to exclude rhetoric (in the sense of a full, classical rhetoric) as we have seen in the analysis of English 1000. The
"practical" education of engineering, on the other hand, enacts both oral and written rhetorics that do not focus exclusively on stylistic concerns.

The three other courses that the engineering departments teach provide more information about exactly what this rhetoric consists of. "Communication and Introduction to Design," a second-year mechanical engineering course that meets five times each week, combines the study of oral and written communication with the study of how to design engineering solutions to problems. The combination of writing and oral presentations with design methods for engineers comes together in what Professor Garland calls "The Engineering Approach to Problem Solving." Figure Eight provides a graphic conception of how engineers solve problems using this approach. The process moves in a clockwise direction, beginning with the collection of information and moving successively to "search for ideas," "evaluate alternatives," "analysis and design," "initial solution," "experiment and test," to "present solution." While this process seems linear, the circle in the centre of the diagram called "feedback" moves counter-clockwise and functions to suggest the possibility of moving from one stage of the process to another depending on the circumstances. This feedback circle provides the opportunity for recursive processes such as rewriting a proposal or reevaluating a design at any stage of the problem solving process. Garland recommends that a process analogous to the "Engineering Approach to Problem Solving" should be used to help engineering students learn to write and make oral presentations.

---

While "Communication and Introduction to Design" moves on to more traditional engineering topics such as "power transmission" and "machine components," two civil engineering courses provide more intensive instruction in both oral and written communication. Professor Garland teaches "Oral and Visual Communications" using the problem solving methodology described above:

Oral communications: includes topics related to public speaking, rules of order for conducting a meeting and techniques of interviewing.

Visual communications: includes the use of video-tape equipment, preparation of transparencies and slides for projection and the use of photographic equipment. Students are responsible for organizing a conference.25

While the focus of this course remains on presenting material through oral and visual means, the preparation of these presentations often depends upon written texts. This kind of oral communication would best be described as secondary orality, a phrase Walter Ong coined to describe oral performances that take place in a literate environment.26 In this sense, "Oral and Visual Communication" incorporates written communication because many of the texts delivered orally must first be written. The process of creating these texts remains essentially similar for Garland because the choice of a mode of communication comes only as a result of or in service to a rhetorical purpose (to explain or persuade, for example). Garland developed the following schema to suggest how he adapts the "Engineering Approach to Problem Solving" to communication:


- Identify your need to communicate
  (Sometimes it's better to say nothing)
- Assemble your information
  (Mentally and Physically)
- Weigh your options and the consequences
  (Identify alternatives)
- Decide on mode to use
  (Conversation, speech, report, letter, memo, meeting, etc.)
- Develop a draft or initial response
  (a prototype)
- Try your ideas on others
  (feedback is essential)
- Finish your preparation and then do it
  (monitor your performance)27

Garland designs this course so that the students are asked to attempt "real rather than academic exercises" that demand a synthesis of problem solving skills, writing skills, and presentation skills. The course syllabus notes that students organize a conference each year for the oral presentations resulting from senior reports. In addition, other "real" exercises have included "adapt[ing] the game of ice hockey so it could be played by those who use wheelchair baskets" (Garland 148) This project "taxed the ingenuity of the students to successfully communicate their ideas to the members of the local wheelchair basketball team and convince them to try this new game" (Garland 148). Written documents, such as the rules for the new game and press releases publicizing the project, were integrated with oral presentations to the basketball team in what Garland sees as a real-life problem solving situation. Garland maintains that "[c]lass activities have demonstrated those who apply the basic systematic [engineering] approach develop their skills faster and achieve a higher level of competence" (150).

Although the "Engineering Approach" seems linear and straightforward, two aspects suggest that more room than might be imagined may exist for debate and dialectic. The first aspect consists of the counterclockwise feedback circle in the middle of the diagram (Figure 8). As I commented earlier, the feedback loop suggests that comments about a solution may cause writers to move back and forth between stages of the process. A second aspect of this approach to writing that suggests room for dialectic concerns the emphasis on teamwork that pervades an engineer's professional and student life. Garland commented that students get "team marks" for "team output." In the ice hockey example described above, students in that group worked as a team to organize the event with very little intervention from Garland and with no hope of succeeding without cooperation and commitment from the other people on the team. Within the "Engineering Approach," different members of a team may be responsible for different stages of the process; alternatively, each member of the team may be reviewing earlier stages of the process in light of the work they perform further on in the process. In *Singular Texts/Plural Authors*, Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford describe an approach similar to the one Garland uses in their description of the collaborative writing processes of an engineering firm:

The CQM[an adaptation of the Critical Path Method] thus plays a role in every aspect of this group's efforts. The form itself maps every stage of the process--from their original analysis of the scope of work through the information-gathering and technical stages (including preparation of maps and other graphics) and through pencil, preliminary and final drafts--relating each stage to the organizational format or outline of the final document.28

---

Garland’s emphasis on group work mirrors the process employed by professional engineers, and, as Ede and Lunsford note, this process forms part of the fabric of the written texts that document the solutions the team creates.

"Oral and Visual Communication" operates in tandem with another civil engineering course, "Technical Writing":

Written communication skills are developed through the use of lectures, tutorials, demonstrations, and writing assignments. The intention is to make students more competent in the use of technical English and to provide them with the technical skills required for writing, including word processing, sketching, graphics, and technical lettering. 29

Unlike "Oral and Visual Communication," "Technical Writing" does not make extensive use of collaborative or group writing. The course focuses instead on introducing students to the stylistic and formalistic requirements of writing in an engineering environment and then testing them individually on their knowledge of these conventions. It does not appear to integrate engineering methodology with writing processes but functions to introduce students to the terminology and forms they will be expected to use. Lecture topics include "Documentation"; "Engineering Library Lecture"; "Illustrating technical documents, graphing, sketching, technical lettering" (handwriting on engineering drawings); "PC Info Bench"; "Report writing"; and "Technical proposals and technical specifications." In addition to lectures, the course uses a series of weekly workshops and eight assignments to encourage students to make this knowledge part of the way they study. Assignments ask students to write citations to documents in a particular format, find items in the Engineering library, illustrate and letter technical documents, and compose in various

29 From "Course Objectives of Dr. A. O. Landva's 1991 syllabus for CE 2903--Technical Writing (dated 1991 01 03)."
modes: business letters, application letters, resumes, proposals, technical specifications, and reports.

Within the context of "Technical Writing," Professor Landva focuses on improving student writing in two ways. The first category of concerns might best be termed correctness of usage, spelling, and mechanics. Landva maintains that proper spelling and grammar form a necessary basis for effective writing. When students show up in his course, they appear to be poorly prepared--"partial illiterates" in Landva's words--who need extensive help with the mechanics of written language. Landva maintains that "you can't have them leave here[the university] like that" and described his goal for "Technical Writing" as aiming at "producing reports better than the average engineer does today." To improve the mechanical correctness of student writing, Landva wielding a red pen when he marks assignments, requires that students buy a grammar text for use in the course, and provides an additional list of what the students have dubbed "Landva's Rules." "Landva's Rules" occupy most of an eight-page handout given to students during the first week of class; the rules themselves range from proscriptions against certain usages ("'feel' (abolish from technical writing!!)") to prescriptions for correct usage of various linguistic elements ("quotation marks . . . use sparingly; keep in mind that the entire Bible was written without them!"). In Landva's view, technical writing should be seen as "another engineering tool." As with other engineering tools, technical writing should be used correctly, precisely, and skillfully, qualities that can be gained only through a sound knowledge of grammar, usage, and mechanics. When he recently edited a volume of technical papers for publication, Landva used the same techniques with his peers for

30 Quotations in this paragraph are drawn from a personal interview, January 18, 1991.
producing error-free and stylistically correct English. Because of this and similar experiences, Landva feels that his emphasis on correctness forms part of a larger social fabric that will govern his students' lives beyond the university rather than as some queer predilection peculiar to himself.

It would be a mistake to focus entirely on correctness in this discussion of the way Professor Landva teaches "Technical Writing." In the latter half of the course Landva directs student attention to rhetorical matters as he moves them from preparing different parts of discourses (citations, sentence structure) to writing complete texts: letters, resumes, proposals, technical specifications, and reports. In preparation for writing these complete texts, Landva lectures on rhetorical aspects of producing effective writing. One of the topics he introduces, an "Information Matrix," serves to identify both the different parts of a typical technical document as well as suggest a process for producing texts.31 The matrix consists of a sheet of paper with four vertical columns divided by four horizontal rows. Nine of the sixteen boxes in this checkerboard-like frame contain a short title ("Title," "Abstract," Introduction," "Purpose," "Development," "Results," "Conclusions," "Summary," "References") to describe one information block in the final report; in each of these nine boxes a short phrase directs the writer to include certain features in the report ("Purpose--State why you did the work"). In an accompanying handout, Landva explains that this heuristic allows students or groups of students to work on more than one block of the matrix simultaneously. He also points out that students begin with any block and so organize their writing process according to personal preference and the exigencies of the assignment. The information matrix used by Landva focuses

31 From "CE 2903: Selected Overheads."
student attention on the conception and arrangement of written discourse, topics akin

to the first two canons of classical rhetoric (invention and arrangement). In addition,
Landva explicitly links these canons to a process of composition that allows for
individual diversity—students can start at any point and proceed by jumping back and
forth between information blocks rather than marching lock-step through a linear
process. The matrix also points out the ways engineers transform writing by
developing a process of composition linked to the matrix that explicitly advocates
multiple authorship and suggests ways for the matrix to be adapted in collaborative
writing settings.

Why all the attention to writing in an engineering program? Both Professor
Garland and Professor Landva referred to a recent article in an international
engineering journal that identified the capabilities of recent engineering graduates.
The article lists the three most important facets of an engineer’s education; included
among the three was the ability "to communicate effectively with colleagues,
employers, clients, and preferably also with informed members of the public." 32 The
authors of the article surveyed the capabilities of recent civil engineering graduates
and found that respondents rated "Writing and speaking" as "most important" more
often than any technical area of an engineer’s education. Respondents also rated
recent graduates’ abilities to speak and write as "inferior" more often than any other
area of their education. While the survey reported in Chapter Three shows that some
other engineering schools in Canada have impressive writing programs (Simon Fraser
and Queen’s universities), most have been slow to recognize the importance of

32 J. Molgaard and J. J. Sharp, "The place of complementary studies in an
engineering programme," Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Part 1, 88
writing to both the education and professional advancement of their students. The program at the University of New Brunswick demonstrates that the study and practice of writing need not be antithetical to engineering education and, in fact, may well be a necessary and important part of an engineer's education.

**Writing Instruction in Education**

Engineering, as a field of study, maintains close ties to the work world. The study referred to above calling for more attention to the education of engineers' speaking and writing skills takes its impetus from the ratings of recent graduates who have just entered the workforce. Another field of study with close ties to the working lives of their graduates is education. The writing programs in education form the third area that teaches writing at the University of New Brunswick.

Like engineering, education treats writing both as a subject in and of itself as well as making it a subsection of one or two other courses. Professor G. Clarke, Dean of Education, responded to the survey reported in Chapter Three by noting that "Students must complete 3 communications courses--2 must focus on writing." He also commented that "Our students must teach children and adolescents to write. Therefore, we place considerable emphasis on the issues you are addressing." A brief survey of the university calendar of courses provides substantial evidence to support Clarke's statements. The education faculty offers upwards of twenty courses that address some kind of communication. Three courses focus on graphics and drawing as communicative arts in the vocational education division. Various departments offer communication courses (which integrate writing with speaking and reading) tailored to their fields, such as "Teaching Native Language," "Teaching ESL," and "Business Communications." Two upper division courses directly address writing:
"Process in Composition" studies various composition theories and requires students to conduct research on some aspect of written language, while "Teaching Discussion and Debate" uses "speech and writing to exchange, present, support, and synthesize ideas."33 In addition, a group of courses on teaching language arts synthesize listening, reading, writing, and speaking. The courses that Clarke identified as required of students, however, come from a series of nine courses that provide a foundation for work by students in the "English, Language Arts, Library and Media Education" division. Of these nine courses, three focus on reading and appreciating poetry, prose, and drama; one course discusses mass media; one course examines role-playing and oral interpretation as a teaching tool. Four of these nine courses provide direct instruction in writing and speaking: "Communications: Argument and Persuasion," "Communications: English Language," and "Communications: Speaking Practice." The remaining course, "Communications: Written Composition," directly helps students to improve their ability to write.

Professor George Haley, instructor of "Communications: Written Composition," organized this course in opposition to what he sees as the standard practice of teaching writing at universities:

33 From the 1991-1992 Undergraduate Calendar of the University of New Brunswick Canada, p. 6.68.
Most often when people teach writing at universities, our university included, they teach them grammar. They teach them right English, rhetorical techniques like think logically, have a beginning, middle and an end...this is the topic you're going to write on, or in really liberal classes, here are the three topics, choose one. I would like you to turn that in to me on November 30 and I'll give it back to you on December the 7th, and so what they do they take them from them, they're usually written on November 27th, 28th, 29th—the second day they give them to the typist—then they're given back to them, often with very few notes, and a grade. What happens next is the writer takes the paper, flips to the back immediately, sees what his grade is, folds it up and puts it away...that's the standard writing practice.  

This caricature of how teachers enact current-traditional rhetoric in university classrooms prompted Haley to devise a different approach to teaching writing. Haley's new approach builds upon composition research by Donald Graves and Donald Murray:

So I thought, maybe it's time to take freshmen and see if we can't do something else with them. If they write every day, for example, in a reflective journal, what happens if you give them a choice of topics? Do what [Donald] Graves says you can do with children, and we know it works with children, what do you want to write about? What are ten things you want to write about? Why don't we take those and start our writing course on the basis of what you want to write about. Let's talk about that. And then let's read about writing from a variety of sources. Let's read Graves, let's read Murray...and see if that's helpful to us. But we won't do any of that until we start writing and until some of those things become problematic for us.

When Haley begins the course he quickly defines writing as a process of discovery, telling students

This is a writing course and I'm not going to teach any grammar and I'm not going to teach any—almost grammar—the grammar of writing, paragraphs and that stuff. So on our first class I started the class, I asked them what they want to write about and I tell them what I'm writing about...so I share with them my topics and say this is what I've done.

34 Personal interview, January 19, 1991.

He then asks students to freewrite and share what they've written with the class. Although students often won't read their writing to the whole class the first day, they usually will share it with one or two other students. From this start students begin to assemble a portfolio of writings to be evaluated at the end of the term. Part of the process of writing involves having students attend conferences with Haley in pairs so that both Haley and another student respond as readers to student drafts.

Haley organizes his writing course as a workshop with students sharing their writing and working at revising drafts on subjects of their own choosing because he wants education students to have experienced this way of teaching writing so that when they go into classes [as teachers] they'll do it, they'll remember [to teach writing this way]. I want them to realize as well that writing is all those things that you and I talked about.

Earlier in the interview, I asked Haley to define writing. Haley's emphasis on letting students choose their own topics suggests a broad view of what writing can be, and Haley's definition of writing clearly allows for a wide variety of discourse:

[Writing] is a way of knowing, its a way of organizing, its a way of learning, its a way of exploring...but then there's the other part where its just transactional. It's a way of communicating with others. And writing is a source of beauty...but its also a way of creating beauty.

Students in Haley's education classes experience writing quite differently than students in either the engineering or English classes described earlier. The aesthetic approach of appreciating good literature shows up in Haley's reference to beauty and in references he made to student poems that the whole class responded to with admiration. Haley's definition of writing also includes the transactional writing that engineering classes focus on. More importantly, just as the engineering classes have an agenda informing their constructions of discourse--to help students improve their
writing within the context of the "engineering approach" of a professional engineer--Haley's education classes also function both to improve student writing as well as to help students internalize a way of practicing as a professional teacher.

**Writing Instruction in the Department of Extension and Summer Session**

Unlike the three areas considered above--English, engineering, and education--the fourth area that teaches writing belongs to no specific discipline. The Department of Extension and Summer Session "provides a variety of courses, programs and services for individuals who need or prefer to study on a part-time basis at either campus as well as at several off-campus locations." 36 The Writing and Study Skills Lab is one of the various programs and services this department supervises.

Although the Writing and Study Skills Lab began operations in 1982-83, it grew significantly with the arrival of its current director, Judith Potter, in 1986-87. Statistics in the report of the Lab's activities for 1989-90 show that the Lab served 180 individuals in a total of 330 tutorial appointments and held 31 workshops for an additional 783 students. The tutorial sessions attracted students with the following statistical profile: More female students used the service than male students (55.6 female; 44.4 male), and almost half (49.5%) of the students were 25 years or older. Virtually all of the students (91.7%) pursued undergraduate degrees when they contacted the Lab. Full-time students accounted for three-quarters of the students using Lab services. Most students requested help with writing skills (52.9%), while the next most sought after instruction concerned study skills (30.4%). Like the

---

36 From the *1991-1992 Undergraduate Calendar of the University of New Brunswick Canada*, p. 4.5.
tutorial participants, workshop participants attended sessions on essay writing and note taking and study skills more than any of the other workshop topics. Workshop participants were also largely full-time students (67.8%), although a significant number were part-time students (26.4%). Workshop participants came from a variety of disciplines, including forestry (19%), arts (16%), no degree (15%), business (10%), and nursing (10%).

Two promotional brochures describe the services that the Lab offers. The individual tutorial sessions help the student with current assignments. No extra work is given unless requested by the student... Tutors will help you to analyze the writing process and will assist with any stage of academic writing: selecting a topic, doing research, organizing material, writing a rough draft, and revising.

The most recent addition to the Centre's resources provides students with access to computer assisted instruction in composition and editing on the Macintosh computer. Although this description suggests a kind of set agenda for tutors in these sessions, Potter commented that

What we try to do is work with students on whatever it is they're having difficulty with. If a student calls and says they want to come in, what the secretaries will do is suggest that they bring in something that they've been working on. We try not to load them with extra work because most of these people are having troubles anyway surviving so we tend to work with them on what they're doing. So, we don't have a formula curriculum we follow. It's strictly an individual thing.

---

37 Non-university students accounted for the remainder.

38 From "Writing and Study Skills Assistance at UNBF."

Once students arrive at the Lab, tutors attempt to build a supportive atmosphere to help students get over their fear of writing:

A lot of the people we get are terrified... giving them a whole lot of rules and strict regulations to follow is not going to be particularly helpful to them. What they have to do is kind of get over their fear and understand what the process involves.40

To accomplish this, tutors take a developmental view of writing rather than a stylistic focus on grammatical and mechanical errors.

Workshop sessions also take a developmental view of writing, focusing on the process of writing an essay rather than on grammatical and mechanical correctness:

Essay Preparation

What are the characteristics of a "good" paper? What is the process involved in writing an effective essay? In this session you will examine the steps in crafting an essay, beginning with selecting and focusing a topic through to producing the final draft. In addition, with the assistance of a UNB reference librarian, you will learn key steps in accessing resource materials.41

Tony Tremblay, a tutor in the Lab and instructor for this workshop, provided a copy of the workshop handout that described the kind of process the Lab used as a model for students. Unlike the "writing as discovery" model of the writing process advocated by Professor Haley of education, the process described in the Lab materials appears to be very much a linear, step-by-step procedure. The text of the handout encourages students to "break the task into parts and then do one part at a time." The handout then describes the various steps from "Select and focus a research area" through to "Prepare footnotes and bibliography."


41 From "Learning and Teaching Resource Centre: Writing and Study Skills Workshops, Winter Term."
The lack of a less rigid conception of the process of composing in the Lab may come as a result of personnel who staff the Lab. The graduate students who staff the Lab have little access to training in teaching writing other than a one or two day orientation with Potter at the beginning of the academic year. The English department does not offer courses on rhetoric and composition theory and pedagogy, a gap that leaves the tutors on their own. At the end of each academic year, tutors leave the Lab and return to the English department as teaching assistants, leaving the next group of tutors to reinvent the wheel the next year. These circumstances constrict the ability of the Lab to offer instruction based on current research in writing.

**Conclusion**

As this description suggests, writing instruction has a long and checkered history at the University of New Brunswick. The institution (and, in fact, the province) was founded in opposition to American ideals of freedom and liberty. As Rick Coe has pointed out, to this day Canadians associate liberty with "'license' and 'licentious,' hence with the self-indulgent and anti-social excesses of individualism" (851). Freedom, for Canadians, is relative: it always takes place within a social system of law and order and rarely implies the absence of restraints. As the history of writing instruction presented earlier in this chapter suggest, early efforts to establish the University of New Brunswick encouraged the study of religion, literature, and good morals. Such a study lent itself to the reading of literature as exemplars rather than the production of public discourse for republican purposes. The rhetoric enacted in the early stages of the university sought to locate subject matter in the bellettristic arena rather than the public forum. The early emphasis on style over invention
continues to this day in the department of English. When the literature department formed in 1909, the emphasis on style solidified. However, with the introduction of professional studies at the university—that is, engineering and education—came demands for a rhetoric that defined discourse more widely and as a practical art rather than an exercise in literary appreciation.

The data gathered in this case study warrant three general conclusions. The first conclusion concerns the range of rhetoric enacted in each of the different disciplinary areas. In English, the five classical canons have been reduced to one—style. In Roots for a New Rhetoric, Daniel Fogarty describes how this reduction of the classical canons of rhetoric completes a process of narrowing begun in the 1500s by Peter Ramus and Omer Talon. This process worked to separate invention, argumentation, and arrangement (parts they assigned to logic) from style and delivery (which they assigned to rhetoric). In the works of Descartes and Bacon, "logic became the instrument of inquiry" and rhetoric became the art of clear, concise communication (19). George Campbell and Hugh Blair did not challenge this movement, according to Fogarty, and their texts were used until the end of the nineteenth century when "it became the aim of rhetoric courses to teach young people the 'correct' grammar that was then so much more necessary for social acceptance" (20). The narrowing ends finally when only an emphasis on style remains. Memory and delivery play no part because the discourse produced in English courses takes only a written form.

---

In engineering, however, the canons of invention and arrangement have been integrated with the engineering discipline's problem solving method. The result is that the boundary between rhetoric and logic blurs as students synthesize elements from both engineering methodology and rhetorical practice. Indeed, even the canon of memory plays an active part of Professor Garland's courses where students must give several formal presentations. The engineering synthesis of rhetoric and logic becomes most apparent in the demand for both oral and written products of this research process. In education, the rhetoric enacted includes elements from four of the five classical canons (memory plays no active role). Students are encouraged to view writing as the discovery and invention of ideas which they then "shape" or arrange into stylistically sophisticated prose. Moreover, in both engineering and education, the ways each instructor teaches writing is consciously modeled on situations the instructor expects students to encounter outside the classroom, either as an apprentice engineer or as an apprentice teacher. In both disciplines, a very immediate "practice" will follow from the "theory" discussed in these courses. The experiences of engineering and education students outside the classroom bears a direct relationship to their experiences within the university. Of course, there is no reason that a similar relationship cannot exist between what students of language study and what they encounter outside the university, as the professional writing programs at the University of Sherbrooke and the University of Waterloo attest. Nevertheless, the program at the University of New Brunswick does not stress such a congruence. The range of rhetoric in this institution, then, varies according to discipline and to the cultural values represented in each discipline. English department professors, led by the head of the department and steeped in literary tradition, see themselves as the last bastion of the humanist tradition; part of this
tradition disavows practical application of its study, and as a result remains suspicious of the practical art of teaching writing. Engineering and education, with their roots in professional communities, engage practical arts and applications of their study, including the study of writing.

The second conclusion that data from this case study suggests is that writing becomes transformed in each institutional setting that houses it. Writing becomes more than just a broader use of the classical canons discussed above; it takes on different goals depending on the setting. Writing practices range from effective writing in engineering (to explain or persuade) to affective writing in extension services (to conquer fear). In English writing becomes stylistic adroitness (to express ideas in sophisticated ways), while in education writing becomes a developmental learning tool (to discover and to develop as a person).

The final conclusion I want to draw from the evidence gathered in this case study concerns leadership. As the history of the English department's role in teaching writing suggests, the English department has been reluctant to view writing broadly enough to encompass the interests of any of the other three areas that teach writing. Informants in all three of these areas criticized the English department's handling of the university competency test, and two of these informants actively worked to have the test cancelled. Further, the different areas that teach writing were not aware of what the others were doing. Each acted as a discrete element, and no mechanism appeared to exist to bring them together to discuss their common interests. Despite the potential for extremely interesting and enlightening exchange, very little seems to be happening. The potential exists at the University of New Brunswick today for improving the teaching of writing—broadening the canons of discourse and
encompassing different aims for discourse. Whether or not this potential transforms the teaching of writing depends on the willingness of the various constituencies who teach writing to meet and rethink their curricula in light of competing assumptions.
CHAPTER VI
ISSUES AND EXPECTATIONS

This dissertation began with an investigation of culture as played out in the history of writing instruction in Canadian universities. This history uncovered, among other issues, the idea that both French and English-language universities played the role of "citadelles nationales," beacons of the dominant culture (Harris 27). Within each culture's universities, the study of language became secondary to the study of literature in the early twentieth century and important social values attached to rhetorical ability were lost. Reading and writing essays showing an appreciation of the literature displaced the values associated with rhetorical ability, but these essays of appreciation performed other important cultural functions--such as cultural assimilation--in the early twentieth century and continue to perform these functions today. Even while departments of English cemented a style-based definition of writing as bellettristic appreciation, movements in the French-language universities in the 1960s and 1970s posited a definition of writing that included invention and arrangement along with style. In English-language universities since the 1950s, a few writing programs located in departments outside of English studies--such as engineering and education--have shown signs of going beyond style-based definitions to view writing as shaping reality, whether that reality is located primarily in engineering processes or in explorations of the self.
As this brief survey suggests and as the survey reported in Chapter Three (on current writing instruction) demonstrated, great disagreement exists in Canadian universities about what "writing" means. Respondents defined writing as handwriting and mechanical correctness; as belletristic appreciation; as a process of coming to know the self; and as a process of creating knowledge within a discipline. This survey also documented a variety of attempts to bridge the disjunction between past patterns of writing instruction--primarily as a supplement to literary study--and contemporary patterns of writing (as shaping knowledge through a process of discovery or invention). At present, a wide variety of approaches and hybridization among approaches complicate any general statements. Nevertheless, the survey results document lush undergrowth in the forest--many respondents reported that their programs continue to expand. While the programs are beginning to establish themselves, they must compete with current-traditional rhetoric, and this competition hampers their growth through problems like non-permanent employment, the lack of research opportunities for faculty, and limited opportunities for advanced study in rhetoric and composition.

The case studies of writing programs reported in Chapter Four of the University of Winnipeg and in Chapter Five of the University of New Brunswick described both traditional approaches (in the English department at the University of New Brunswick) and innovative designs (evident in the interweaving of engineering and writing at the University of New Brunswick). Innovative approaches to teaching writing often come from within "professional" departments, such as the engineering and education departments at the University of New Brunswick. Within these professional departments writing is most likely to meet the demands of writers not involved in belletristic study. In the engineering faculty at the University of New
Brunswick, the combination of writing and research under one rubric--"The Engineering Approach to Problem-Solving"--locates writing within the engineering discipline as well as emphasizing the process of writing by noting the role of writing at each stage of the process of problem-solving. In institutional locations such as engineering, writing becomes primarily symbol-using--the use of symbolic representation to solve problems--rather than cultural appreciation, a transformation as stunning in both its disjuncture from traditional approaches to writing instruction as it is appropriate to students of contemporary Canadian universities.

Canadian students no longer leave universities to enter a stable social structure dominated by a small group of Anglo-Canadian families; rather, the country they inhabit trades and competes on the international market, and the people who populate their country come from and maintain ties to many different nations and cultures. These students call into question the dominance of British literature as sufficient subject-matter for courses meant to reflect national culture, and the recent proliferation of courses in Canadian and Commonwealth literature all mark initial moves away from a domineering "British" literature. Yet neither the introductory courses in English literature included in the survey responses that I know of nor most writing courses mentioned in the survey responses show much recognition of or appreciation for these issues. In the Writing Program at the University of Winnipeg, students read no literature or non-fiction prose other than each other's essays, but they do engage in a sophisticated "problem-solving" approach to writing. In the University of New Brunswick introductory English course, students read traditional "classics" of English literature and write essays of belletristic appreciation based on a truncated rhetoric focusing on style. Neither of these courses addresses the needs of a "national culture" relevant to Canada in 1991. Instead, the course in English at the
University of New Brunswick seems a vestigal reminder of the power that Anglo-Canadians originally used to control the curricula of university English departments. Such curricula, and the goals of assimilation and domination that motivated them, seem out of touch with the demographics of present-day Canadian society and with the goal of multiculturalism as a state policy in Canada. Literature represents one dimension of English studies; writing instruction characterizes a second dimension. As part of an examination of the role writing should play in the national culture, we need to examine how various theories of writing--current-traditional rhetoric, writing as bellettristic appreciation, writing as shaping knowledge--could address national goals for writing instruction. Is there a theory (or combination of theories of writing) suited to educating Canadian university students in ways that would make them better citizens, more able to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century?

The remainder of this dissertation explores three issues that arise from the investigations described above:

1. Given that universities in Canada have functioned (and continue to function) as "citadelles nationales," what is the appropriate function of writing instruction within these institutions? That is, what "nation" do they represent?

2. Within most current writing programs, Canadian universities have characterized writing as a product. What are the economic implications of teaching writing as a process and conceiving of student writers as problem solvers and symbol manipulators rather than as mass-producers of a commodity?

3. Within Canadian universities considerable disagreement exists about what "writing" means. Because this definition is an issue of public policy, we must ask "What needs to be done to change the 'public idea' of writing in Canadian universities?"

Each of these three issues grows out of the data gathered and presented earlier in this dissertation. The first question has roots in Chapter Two, which investigated the
history of teaching writing in Canadian universities. The second question owes its
genesis to the innovative writing programs (particularly in engineering) reported in
both the survey results in Chapter Three and the case study chapters, programs that
conceive of writing as a process of symbol manipulation. The third question arose
from disagreements about how to define writing among respondents to the survey
reported in Chapter Three—an investigation of current writing programs—and evident
in the different programs of writing in engineering, education, English, and extension
services described in the case study chapters. Together, an exploration of—and
tentative answers to—these questions comprise the most important conclusions and
implications of my investigation of writing instruction in Canadian universities.

Writing and National Goals

It is easier to think of literature and the national culture than of writing and the
national culture in the Canadian context. Partly this difficulty comes from the
extensive domination enjoyed by the French and English cultures. Few university
constructions of culture link the culture of the "First Nations" or Aboriginal peoples
with the national culture. Rather, most university constructions of culture elide the
contributions of multi-culturalism to the larger culture. It is no surprise, then, that
Anglo-Canadians conceive of university culture almost strictly in terms of British
culture, and within English departments almost exclusively so. Recent additions of
courses on Canadian and American literature notwithstanding, the bulk of reading
focuses on British authors.

Scholars in the United States and Canada have traced links between the
history of their respective national cultures and dominating the study of English
language and literature. Robin Harris maintains that "As in French Canada, the same
two purposes—the training of clergy and the general education of the future leaders of society—underlay the establishment of the first colleges and universities in English-speaking Canada" (27). Harris was reflecting on the period around 1860 when he made this comment, and at that time, of course, Canada did not exist per se but only as a group of North American British colonies. The national mission for the French peoples under the political domination of the British consisted of maintaining their ties with French culture and institutions through the establishment of classical colleges and rigid adherence to the standard classical college curriculum. The national mission for Anglo-Canadians—who included in their number many Loyalists who had fled the United States—focused on preserving British tradition. Professors at King's College, Windsor (N. S.), for example, were subject to the following statute in 1802: "No professor directly or indirectly shall teach or maintain any atheistical, deistical or democratical principles or any doctrine contrary to the Christian faith, or to good morals, or subversive of the British constitution" (quoted in Harris 29; my italics). The "nation" invoked by a phrase such as "national culture" meant Britain, not Canada. Writing instruction functioned as part of a larger, social rhetoric meant to enable the clergy to preach well and to enable the upper classes to train their youth for important roles in government and society. Nan Johnson concludes that nineteenth century rhetorical practice "formulated a mandate for the discipline of rhetoric that inevitably evoked the ambitions and ideals of the dominant culture it was designed to serve" (Nineteenth Century 246).

While Johnson elides the differences between American and Canadian cultural contexts, others do not. Henry Hubert maintains that English studies in Canada built upon a foundation of philosophical idealism expressed in the works of
Matthew Arnold and championed by many professors at the turn of the century (Hubert 318). According to Hubert,

All English studies programs, including those with a balance between rhetoric and poetics, such as those at McGill and Dalhousie, were transformed into curricula featuring the literature of the mother country. Works of North American authors, both Canadian and American, were largely ignored in official syllabi. In the 1880s and 1890s, instruction in rhetoric turned largely into composition as an adjunct to the study of English literature. Rhetoric was therefore largely subverted into the writing of the expository essay within the context of literary criticism. (319)

According to Hubert, the pattern outlined above continued in force until the 1960s. In many English departments (including the University of New Brunswick), this pattern describes the present practice of writing instruction. The connection between a national culture and the teaching of writing remains an appeal to British culture rather than to Canadian culture and to a rhetoric focusing on the appreciation of literature rather than on encouraging democratic principles of public discourse.

In the United States, the relation between a national culture and the study of English literature developed in a somewhat different manner. Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* also affected the development of English studies in America, particularly in the study of literature (Applebee 23; Graff 12). According to Arthur Applebee, those who supported Arnold's brand of humanism did so "because schooling with its attendant 'culture' was seen as a new agent of social control" (23). Of course, the "culture" invoked here called upon American, as well as British authors, in the building of a unique American culture. Gerald Graff criticizes scholars like Terry Eagleton who describe plans for the development of literary studies as "social control," a method of instilling national pride and moral values (12). Graff disputes the effectiveness of such plans in an American context, although he allows that "the American situation may have to be distinguished from that of France
and England, where the traditional social elites were more powerful and more able to resist professionalization than were their counterparts in the United States" (13). Unlike Canada, the United States did not completely sublimate writing instruction under literary study. Even in the midst of the furor over Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy*, literature gained entrance to the academy as subject matter for test of skill in composition, priorities that have been reversed today (Applebee 30). Because of its tenuous position in the academy, literature formed only part of the connection between the study of English and the national culture. The other part, of course, was composition.

Many rhetoric and composition scholars have traced the history of teaching rhetoric and writing at American colleges and universities. The rhetoric taught at Harvard in the seventeenth century was Ramistic--"grounded in a highly stereotyped understanding of rhetorical situations"--and "suitable for a homogeneous and stable society" (Halloran 246; see also Guthrie (2): 15-18). Rhetoric at this time took Latin as its language, not English, and served "the cultured class . . . [as] a necessary tool for reaching the stock of past learning" (Guthrie (1): 21). In the eighteenth century, the Latin rhetoric described above gave way to a fuller, more classical rhetoric based on the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian (Halloran 249; see also Guthrie (2)). English, rather than Latin, became the dominant language used, a change that made it easier for students to apply such a rhetoric to public issues than before (Halloran 251). As public discourse, this rhetoric became entwined with the future success of the United States as a nation. In the nineteenth century, however, colleges shifted their focus from educating the future leaders of the country to providing opportunities for individuals to seek advancement (Halloran 261-262). Consequently, current-traditional rhetoric developed throughout the nineteenth century partially in response
to the changing social mission of universities and colleges from community-based goals to individual goals.

The quotation from Nan Johnson reproduced earlier—that nineteenth-century rhetorical practice served the interests of the dominant class—harmonizes with the view of Gerald Graff, a historian of English studies. In his discussion of how composition was taught at Harvard, Graff quotes a student and instructor at Harvard in the 1880s who noted that "Harvard's composition courses had been established by President Eliot as an attempt 'to maintain the traditional culture of Harvard, threatened by the loss of social exclusiveness and the protection of the classics'" (Graff 66). Many other commentators have noted the effects of Harvard's changed entrance requirements in the 1870s, changes which caused high school curricula to adopt a model of composition using English literature as subject matter. Eliot's influence extended to the nation though his chairmanship of the "Committee of Ten." The vision of English studies created by this committee stresses "expression" rather than persuasion, understanding rather than public discourse (Applebee 30-33; 38). Susan Miller characterizes the resulting instruction as "a national course in silence" because of the focus on surface errors in the marking of the essays that students wrote (Textual Carnivals 55). In Miller's view, composition served—and continues to serve—national goals in the sense that it reifies prevailing class structures (see also Berlin, Nineteenth-Century 72).

Today, perhaps the most outspoken commentators on national goals for English studies in the United States are Richard Ohmann and E. D. Hirsch. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy offered a blueprint for re-establishing a national consensus of "What every American needs to know." In Hirsch's view, the roots of illiteracy stem
from school systems that no longer teach a core curriculum of knowledge. Without this core knowledge, some Americans are unable to function in society and find the corridors of power closed to them because they find themselves unable to communicate with those who hold power. The resulting bifurcation into discrete groups within American culture threatens the very stability of the American nation, and Hirsch maintains that something must be done to rectify the situation. To this end, Hirsch identifies a core of knowledge in both *Cultural Literacy* and in the recent *Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*. Only through "accumulating shared symbols, and the shared information that the symbols represent, can we learn to communicate effectively with one another in our national community" (*Cultural Literacy* xvii).

Many scholars have challenged Hirsch's conceptions of cultural literacy within the terms of his basic tenet that cultural ideas form the basis for society. Janet Emig, for example, notes that

My criticism of Hirsch is that all he has produced is a catalog. He has never given the profession the criteria by which he decided to divide his arbitrary list of topics and allusions among the grades. I would be interested to know how he did it and why. The objections [sic] so many of us had to his taxonomy was that it was decontextualized.\(^1\)

The decontextualization that Emig objects to strips items in the lists of the culture or subculture that gives them meaning, with the result that the middle-class biases of school systems transform this so-called "objective" knowledge for its own purposes. In the end, this process of transformation tends to conserve the middle-class, white, male tradition and builds an inertia to revisionist efforts meant to include various cultures and points of view in the tradition. Unlike Emig, Ohmann objects to Hirsch's idea of cultural literacy on the grounds that Hirsch fails to "interrogat[e] nationalism

as an educational purpose" (15). While Hirsch rightly acknowledges the political problem of deciding the content of cultural literacy, he comes to no satisfactory answer to the question of who decides what goes on the lists. Finally, Ohmann challenges the idea that democracy in culture and education is possible "when there is no democracy, no equality, no empowerment for the many outside those spheres [culture and education]" (15).

Canadians seem much less prone to debates about the national culture or about literacy for a variety of reasons. Canadian culture, by virtue of traditional ties to the United Kingdom and France, adopted attitudes and beliefs from those cultures without question. If a national culture exists in Canada, it exists only as a consensus of cultures rather than as an essentially singular concept. Provincial responsibilities for education also inhibit the design of a national culture for educational purposes. Historically, each province has encountered a different reality, a local reality of much more immediate importance than a national one. The resulting education patterns follow regional lines rather than seeking to accomplish federal goals.

Recent events in Canada's history challenge the local--one might say provincial--mentalities of Canadians. Faced with the desire of Quebecers for the separation of Quebec from Canada and the increasing alienation of the western provinces from the rest of Canada, Canadians of all geographical areas have had to reconsider their national identities. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, part one of the Constitution Act of 1982, forms a primary text in this re-assessment. The analysis that follows seeks to identify principles of nationality from that text as a first, speculative attempt to identify the principles that might inform the teaching of writing in universities. That is, what values and beliefs in the Canadian constitution
should we enact in writing classrooms? How can the model of rhetoric enacted in the
writing classroom work self-consciously and self-critically towards national values
and beliefs?

While full answers to questions such as these clearly fall outside the scope of
this chapter, I would like to identify general directions and points of departure for
thinking about the issue of writing and the national culture. My argument is that we
need writing instruction based on principles that develop each student's powers to
participate in public debate. Students may not always or ever be called upon to give
political speeches themselves, but at a minimum they must be able to enter into a
dialogue with the speeches of others, to be able to analyze discourse critically, and to
imagine alternatives to what they read and hear. Writing essays of appreciation about
English literature, in and of itself, is not a sufficient condition for achieving critical
awareness of issues on this scale. The recent enactment of the Charter of Rights and
 Freedoms relies on public debate to succeed. One of the main purposes of the
Charter was to spur national debate of issues such as multiculturalism and language
and to encourage both the wide knowledge of these issues and thoughtful review of
them.

The public implied by these motives—that is, the people who must be able to
review these issues thoughtfully—would benefit from writing instruction based on

2 In *The Triumph of Literature/The Fate of Literacy*, John Willinsky calls for
a broadening of traditional ways of teaching English to include "other language
structures on which this culture builds its towers and homes, its jobs and schools, its
leisure and recreational vehicles"(190). Stephen Greenblat also argues forcefully for
the importance of connecting the teaching of literature to current cultural conditions
(particularly political events) in "The best Way to Kill Our Literary Inheritance Is to
Turn It into a Decorous Celebration of the New World Order" in *The Council
more than the study of literature in English or the production of essays in various modes (personal experience, description, narration, etc.). Rather, writing instruction needs to include ways of determining the important question under examination, ways of questioning, ways of shaping language to both construct views as well as to express views. Such instruction could--at least potentially--take place in any discipline at the university. The important features of the instruction, however, must not be primarily or exclusively stylistic. The focus should be on a full rhetoric, one that spans the classical canons of invention, arrangement, style, delivery, and memory--or a study of rhetorics that provide choices for students to use in the ways they approach their writing.

Much of this dissertation has argued that writing instruction already takes place within the context of disciplinary structures at present. But while writing instruction must respond to disciplinary pressures and constraints, it must also answer to national goals for writing instruction. To demonstrate how writing instruction may be able to answer to both disciplinary and national calls, I would like to examine the case of engineering. As the report of writing instruction in the University of New Brunswick Engineering faculty demonstrated in Chapter Five, writing instruction in engineering must answer to disciplinary constraints such as incorporating itself into the problem-solving methodology used by engineers. At the same time, however, this writing instruction is not without content. Professor Garland selected, among other projects, a wheelchair hockey experiment to provide his students with a challenge but also to make them aware of what they could do to help others in the community. The rhetorical project--improving communication skills through oral presentations and written briefs--combines with the ethical beliefs of the course instructor who believes that engineering students must take their places in public life,
and not quietly either. Engineers want to improve the world that we all share, not just the world's bridges or buildings. In its attention to values outside of engineering, writing instruction in engineering intersects with the national goals promoted in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Other disciplines are equally open—and perhaps avoid at their peril—the need for addressing current national goals for education and the international implications of economic movements.

In the final chapter of _Roots for a New Rhetoric_, Canadian Daniel Fogarty offered his vision of how writing instruction could be reconfigured to address what he saw as the fundamental changes occurring in society in the late 1950s. Fogarty based his new vision of rhetoric on a synthesis of the rhetorical theories of I. A. Richards, Kenneth Burke, and the General Semanticists (Alfred Korzybski, S. I. Hayakawa, Irving J. Lee, and Wendell Johnson). In this synthesis, rhetoric is "the science of recognizing the range of the meanings and the functions of words, and the art of using and interpreting them in accordance with this recognition" (130). A "new" rhetoric would need to consider its own basic presupposition as all disciplines must do in a time of crisis and challenge; it will need to broaden its aim until it no longer confines itself to teaching the art of formal persuasion but includes formation in every kind of symbol-using, from a political speech to a kitchen conversation; it will need to adjust itself to the recent studies in the psychology and sociology of communication; and, finally, it will need to make considerable provision for a new kind of speaker-listener situation—the area of group discussion. (130)

Fogarty himself proposes a course for first-year students based on his synthetic definition and the three provisions outlined above. He divides his course into three main parts: a "philosophy" of communication combining linguistic theories of the role words play in communication with theories of discourse derived from Richards and Burke; an interdisciplinary "science" of communication drawing elements from
psychology, sociology, and other disciplines whose work contributes to knowledge about communication; and an "art" of communication that foregrounds composition, discussion, conversation, public speaking, professional writing, and nonverbal means of communication (134-136). Fogarty offers this outline not as a recipe but as a menu of choices, and urges teachers to "consider the particular requirements of his [or her] cultur[al] area, philosophy of education, financial limitations, curricular structure, and practical aims, and then choose those elements in the three rhetorics that meet his [or her] particular needs" (140).

Three teacher/researchers at St. Thomas University in Fredericton, New Brunswick, provide a recent example of writing instruction that extends Fogarty's vision of how writing might be taught. Jim Reither, Russ Hunt, and Doug Vipond have developed a pedagogy that takes Fogarty's three statements about how writing instruction needs to change itself and developed a way of teaching writing appropriate to Canada in the 1990s. Fogarty's first statement claims that instruction will have to broaden its aim from formal persuasion to include "every kind of symbol-using, from a political speech to kitchen conversation." In an upper-division rhetoric course, Reither has students use Kenneth Burke's Language as Symbolic Action as a core text to supply a theory of rhetoric. Fogarty identified Burke's work as one of his sources for his proposed course. Fogarty's purpose in selecting Burke was to provide a theory to inform writing instruction; the practice Fogarty identified as "current-traditional rhetoric" appeared to have no coherent theoretical base. Using Burke as a point of departure, Reither has students witness, analyze, and discuss a wide range of symbol-using. Reither extends the universe of discourse by moving students outside the classroom. During the case study visit reported in Chapter Five, I was invited to attend a meeting of Reither's rhetoric class. The "class" took place in
a packed auditorium where Elijah Harper, MLA (member of the provincial legislative assembly in Manitoba) spoke about his role in defeating the amendments to the Constitution Act (1982) that would have allowed Quebec to sign the constitution (the Meech Lake Accord). Harper played a pivotal role in defeating this legislation, legislation that would have allowed Quebec to status as a "distinct society" while denying similar status to Aboriginal peoples. Harper's speech provided a perfect opportunity for students to experience the vital importance of rhetoric in public affairs. Harper spoke for over an hour using no written text but instead using a series of stories to talk about his role and to explain his motivations for opposing the legislation. Harper also used the speech to try to build understanding between the mostly white audience and the community of first nations that he represented. His speech functioned as an alternative discourse to mainstream language use, because it relied upon slower cadences, narrative structures of argument, and an unhearsed delivery meant to establish the directness and honesty of the speaker.

In addition to basing instruction on a firm theoretical basis applicable to the entire range of symbol-using, Fogarty also noted that writing instruction would need to "adjust itself to the recent studies in the psychology and sociology of communication" and "make considerable provision for a new kind of speaker-listener situation--the area of group discussion." Reither, Hunt, and Vipond (a psychology professor) link these two concerns by identifying the social nature of writing as collaborative group work. In "Writing as Collaboration," Reither and Vipond discuss a method of teaching writing as collaboration which extends group work from discussion to coauthoring, workshopping, and knowledge making. Reither and Vipond organize their courses as "'Collaborative Investigations'" (862) into a question set by the teacher. As a group, students and teachers "identify a range of
areas of researchable interests within the general project set by the professor," identify research questions, research and report on the results of their investigations, and produce a "course book" that contains the final essays or statements of all the research teams in the class (Reither "Writing in the Disciplines"). At each stage of the course students experience various forms of coauthoring to "achieve efficiency and quality in reading, writing, and reporting" (864). Throughout the reporting of the results of their investigations, students engage in "workshopping" as they present their interim reports to the class and then revise in light of responses from classmates. Reither and Vipond

[m]ake the course collaborative in the knowledge-making sense by setting a research question and a long-term goal of developing knowledge claims that could fit in a scholarly field's knowing. Get the students reading in the literature of a field, to listen in on the conversation, to find out who's talking about what, how they're talking about it, why they're talking about it. (865)

The admonition to have students "listen in on the conversation" owes an intertextual debt to Kenneth Burke's metaphor of texts as speakers at a cocktail party that never ends. In addition to this veiled reference to Burke, many of the references in the works cited to "Writing as Collaboration" cite recent research in composition. Reither and Vipond also base their version of collaborative writing on recent work in sociology, citing texts such as *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology* in their works cited. This combination of recent work in sociology with rhetoric and writing results in the kind of reinvention of writing instruction that Fogarty seemed to have in mind--an instruction informed by interdisciplinary knowledge of the complex act of writing. I offer this discussion of Reither, Hunt, and Vipond's method of writing instruction as one example of writing instruction that meets the needs of the changing national culture. Collaborative inquiry seems ideally suited to promoting some of the values mentioned in the
Charter--such as multiculturalism--and others which are unspecified but implicated in the Charter--such as the need for collaboration and consensus, dissent and diversity.

Tolerance for dissent becomes an issue of critical importance in public discourse because of the need for each political group to make its voice heard. Discordant voices--such as those of Elijah Harper--are not merely to be tolerated but are in fact vitally important to successful democratic processes. In the forward to The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary, Richard Ohmann asserts that "we can't move far in the liberatory directions beaconed by most of these essays until we are in sync with movements outside the universities and schools at least as coherent and forceful as movements of the late 1960s" (xv). In Canada, the formation of the Parti Quebecois in Quebec and the Reform Party of the western provinces mark powerful movements outside of universities that seek to re-form Canadian society. These kinds of dissident movements provide evidence that teachers of writing should "help the next generation find its own way of being critical, dissident, disloyal" (Ohmann xvi). But how? Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg are currently developing a reader for composition courses, tentatively titled Negotiating Difference, which seeks to provide materials that both present traditional histories and problematize those histories with documents that support alternative historical accounts. Andrea Lunsford and John Ruszkiewicz are also working on a reader, tentatively titled Reading Between the Lines, that presents students with readings from opposing political viewpoints in an effort to engage them in writing about important political, cultural, and social issues. By making these kinds of issues the content of writing courses, teachers of writing can connect their instruction to advancing the values promoted in the Charter of Rights and in this way move towards fulfilling national goals for education.
As a basis for encountering the discourse of the nation, students must build an understanding of the values implicit in the culture and made explicit in documents like the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It is not sufficient to rely on implicit values alone, in part because the implicit values of any one student probably do not span the range of values cited in the Charter. In fact, the exigency for the Charter of Rights and Freedoms lies in civil rights abuses by various provincial and federal governments in Canada in the twentieth century. These abuses range from the internment of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War to attempts to silence opponents of those who hold political power (see Greene 17-23). By its very existence the Charter of Rights and Freedoms itself argues that we need to make explicit these values so that they can be discussed. And as Canada moves from a democracy based on legislative supremacy and common-law tradition to a democracy based on judicial rule through an entrenched Charter of Rights and Freedoms similar to the United States Bill of Rights, the country will come to rely more heavily on a different kind of populace, a people more willing to participate in public debate. One of the primary means for both developing and conveying these views, of course, is through writing instruction that integrates/implicates politics, culture, and community.

**Writing and Economics**

The second issue that warrants discussion identifies some of the connections between writing instruction and the economy within which this instruction takes place. Just as writing instruction takes place within cultural contexts rather than in a vacuum, so, too, does writing instruction take place in particular economic settings and in relation to larger economic movements. I quoted Fogarty above to the effect
that writing instruction must take account of findings in other fields, such as
sociology and psychology. To these I would now like to add economics.

First, I want to consider the idea that writing instruction in the 1990s needs to
mesh with other disciplines concerned with "symbol-manipulation." Words are, of
course, symbols of ideas that generate other symbols and so on into infinity.
Combined with the emphasis in other disciplines upon the manipulation of
mathematical symbols (often combined with the use of computers), the manipulation
of words as symbols rather than as things themselves constitutes a more adequate
theoretical basis for writing instruction than the emphasis on words as things, essays
as products. Second, I want to consider how such an emphasis on writing instruction
as symbol manipulation demands a different kind of economic contract with those
who teach writing. The results of the survey reported in Chapter Three pointed out
that most writing instructors work under temporary contracts as graduate teaching
assistants or full- or part-time instructors. The plight of those who occupy similar
positions in the United States has been well documented (see Slevin "Depoliticizing";
Connors "Underclass"). In the Canadian context, I would like to explore what needs
to be done to ensure that the workforce for teaching writing as symbol manipulation
has access to the material conditions necessary for such endeavours (time for
research, money for books and travel to conferences, security and stability of
income).

Robert Reich (a political economist at Harvard) argues that we are in the midst of the
integration of national economies into a global economy. As part of this integration,
national barriers to trade are falling--witness the recent free-trade agreements
between Canada and the United States and the present negotiations between the United States and Mexico. With the removal of trade barriers, structural changes in the economy occur as the jobs of "routine producers" (those whose jobs consist of repeating the same operation over and over--data entry into computers, assembly-line workers, textile workers) shift to countries with lower labour rates. Reich identifies two other functional classes of jobs: those of "symbolic analysts" (people whose jobs consist of problem-solving, problem-identifying, and strategic-brokering--research scientists, bankers, consultants), and "in-person servers" (those who perform repetitive tasks who are also in direct contact with those they serve--everything from auto mechanics to real estate agents). The jobs of "in-person servers" largely depend on the success of "symbolic-analysts" because "symbolic-analysts" compete internationally through their contributions to multinational and joint-venture corporations to earn their (large) share of profits. "In-person servers," on the other hand, compete locally because the very nature of their work prohibits workers at remote locations from providing services in person. So while they are free from foreign competition, the amount of local wealth available for "in-person servers" to compete for depends upon the success of the "symbolic-analysts." In Reich's analysis of the American economy, the ability to generate wealth resides in both the ability of "symbolic-analysts" to add value to projects through their skills of manipulating symbols--"data, words, oral and visual representations"--and in the number of "symbolic-analysts" that the country can produce.

Reich devotes two chapters to describing "The Education of the Symbolic Analyst." In the chapter focusing on formal schooling, Reich argues that most formal schooling today is still organized to produce people fit to work in the economy of the 1950s. The schools provide a "standard assembly-line curriculum divided neatly into
subjects, taught in predictable units of time, arranged sequentially by grade, and controlled by standardized tests intended to weed out defective units and return them for reworking" (226). Such training may have been appropriate to the mass-production economy of scale achieved in the United States in the 1950s, but today the jobs filled by such graduates pay less and less and tend to migrate "offshore" to countries with lower wage scales. As a result, most schools in the United States no longer offer adequate preparation.

However, Reich points out that "some American children--no more than 15 to 20 percent--are being perfectly prepared for a lifetime of symbolic-analytic work" (227). Although these children often have access to the very best materials, teachers, and libraries, the important factor underlying the cultural advantages of most of these students lies in the ways they are taught to manipulate ideas and concepts. Reich argues that the collection of facts (contrary to what E. D. Hirsch argues) is not central to the education of these workers, although as students they do accumulate a large storehouse of information. Rather, the important dimension of their education lies in the way these students are taught to manipulate information:

More important, these fortunate children learn how to conceptualize problems and solutions. The formal education of an incipient symbolic analyst thus entails refining four basic skills: abstraction, system thinking, experimentation, and collaboration. (Reich's italics; 229)

As Reich sees things, symbolic-analysts will "spend much of their time communicating concepts--through oral presentations, reports, designs, memoranda, layouts, scripts, projections--and then seeking a consensus to go forward with the plan" (233). In short, they will need to collaborate with others continually, with much of this collaboration taking the form of written discourse. To develop skills as collaborators, students need an education in which they
learn to articulate, clarify, and then restate for one another how they identify and find answers. They learn how to seek and accept criticism from peers, solicit help, and give credit to others. They also learn to negotiate—to explain their own needs, to discern what others need and view things from others' perspectives, and to discover mutually beneficial resolutions. (233)

Prohibitions against helping other students and admonitions to work singularly and quietly undermine the goals of education for symbolic-analysts. Collaboration of any kind, and collaborative writing particularly, develops skills that will be necessary for the productive lives of these students.

The collaborative writing courses of Rather, Hunt, and Vipond described earlier in this chapter fit just the kinds of education Reich describes. Rather than set out to "cover" a set body of knowledge, students identify problems, seek out solutions, and attempt to contribute to knowledge-making through various experiments or forays into written research or, indeed, by conducting research themselves. In one of his classes, Rather supervised students who acted as self-taught ethnographers in a study of the teaching strategies of six professors ("Writing as Collaboration," 863). As researchers and as writers, students in these classes perform all four of what Reich calls the basic skills: abstraction, system thinking, experimentation, and collaboration. Identifying a problem and suggesting possible solutions requires abstraction; systematic thinking occurs in the identification of research areas and methods in answer to the problem; students experiment to discover potential solutions and refine research questions; and collaborative writing—both in small groups and as a class working on one large project—occupies the central concern of Rather, Hunt, and Vipond.

On a theoretical level, economics and writing intersect in the interest in the work of Reich and Rather, Hunt, and Vipond. Both groups share very similar views
of the factors that education should have when we view their concerns conceptually. I would like to turn now to another intersection of writing and economics—the material conditions of writing teachers. The survey reported in Chapter Three supplied figures to suggest the conditions under which these instructors work. Fully 60% of all writing teachers work as non-permanent employees—graduate teaching associates, part-time or full-time lecturers. The material conditions of these employees put them almost unanimously under the poverty line. In Toronto, a family of four would be better off on welfare than on an income of $42,000 (Can.) per year. Even a full-time lecturer would be hard-pressed to earn anywhere near that kind of money, while a part-timer’s earnings would average somewhere around $3,000 per course. Graduate students earn slightly more than part-time lecturers per course—about $4,000. Whatever else may be true, these employees work in conditions that make their own advancement of knowledge exceedingly difficult to undertake.

While the valuing—de-valuing—of writing teachers seems plain, the route out of this morass is not. The kind of education Reich describes cannot occur under current working conditions. Administrators at some universities claim that employees at the instructor level must have graduate coursework and conduct research in rhetoric and composition in order to work towards professor status. While that may be a typical policy of universities, it leads to a self-fulfilling prophecy forecasting shortages of appropriately qualified instructors. If universities require graduate training in rhetoric and composition, where are employees to obtain it? Only two universities in Canada offer such training, and both are already overtaxed providing such training to their own students. Furthermore, English departments at many universities—where one might expect similar programs in rhetoric and composition to develop—define themselves either formally or informally as
departments of English literature and expressly deny any responsibility for teaching writing at any level, let alone establishing a specialization in rhetoric and composition. To escape from the status of lecturer, employees must obtain graduate training that is unavailable to them in Canada, and very few possess the financial resources to move to the United States to study there. At this point, the issue of writing instruction and economics becomes one of public policy or public perception. Administrators and many faculty members at universities conceptualize of writing in reductive ways, ways that lead them to institute material conditions that prevent universities from offering writing instruction similar to the instruction Reither, Hunt, and Vipond and Reich advocate. I would like to turn now to a consideration of what must be done to change the public idea of literacy at the university level.

Writing and Public Policy

Part of Chapter Three describes the different attitudes to writing instruction expressed in the discursive comments on responses to the survey ("What Attitudes did Respondents Articulate Towards Writing"). Some administrators view writing as a process that can be mastered once and for all, preferably before students arrive at the university. Part of this attitude comes from underlying definitions of writing as "spelling, grammar, and handwriting" and the consequent definition of writing as remediation and deficiency. Other administrators, however, have established and funded writing instruction within their own faculties. Sometimes this other instruction suggests remediation, but sometimes it becomes an integral part of the goals of education within that faculty, such as Forestry at the University of Toronto. Finally, some administrators define writing in terms of the methods of investigation of their own disciplines. As Chapter Five showed, the civil engineering department
of the University of New Brunswick defines writing as part of the "Engineering Approach to Problem-Solving."

Perhaps the most important point about these attitudes is that they can all be found on the same campus, and even in the same departments. As Chapter Five showed, writing in the English department focused on stylistic choice and convention; writing in Extension Services taught forms and a single, lock-step process of composition within a context of supporting students as they struggled to enter the university. Writing in Education emphasized processes of composition, writing as personal exploration, and teaching writing through workshops and peer feedback. Though none of these institutional sites defines writing as reductively as "spelling, grammar, and handwriting," considerable tension exists between competing definitions. The English department, which controlled the Competency in English Test that all students needed to pass to fulfill graduation requirements, defined writing as grammar, mechanics, and decontextualized writing that took no account of a process of composition. The test failed to help students write better at least in part because it failed to define writing in terms of both a process of composition and as a method of knowing based in specific disciplines.

That the definition of writing is contested, situated, and subject to rhetorical manipulations within the university seems clear. How these definitions of writing are manipulated within the context of the university presents the single largest unexplored issue that confronts those who would change the ways writing is conceived of and taught at Canadian universities. The final pages of this dissertation identify some of the principles drawn from public policy analysis that may point the
way to constructing a plan for enacting the "revolutionary" changes in the way universities teach writing that Jim Reither has called for.\(^3\)

Traditional theories of public policy describe public policy as the allocation of scarce resources, a definition drawn from economics and one that is based on the assumption that public policy consists of maximizing the net benefits of any course of action. Recent critics of "public policy as economic system" argue that this prevailing view disregards the role of ideas about what is good for society and the importance of debating the relative merits of such ideas. It thus tends to overlook the ways such normative visions shape what people want and expect from their government, their fellow citizens, and themselves. And it disregards the importance of democratic deliberation for refining and altering such visions over time and for mobilizing public action around them.\(^4\)

In *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*, statistician Giandomenico Majone argues that "in a system of government by discussion, analysis--even professional analysis--has less to do with formal techniques of problem solving than with the process of argument."\(^5\) Majone calls for a new vision of policy analysis as rhetorical because analysis is based in large part on "producing evidence and arguments to be used in the course of public debate" (7). For Majone, "many policy constraints can be eased only by changing attitudes and values . . . [which] always involves a certain amount of persuasion" (9).

\(^3\) See March 1989 issue of *Inkshed*.


If writing instruction is seen as a public (in the sense of public within the university) policy, and if the goal of changing that policy is conceptualized as a rhetorical activity according to the way Majone views policy analysis, the "revolution" Reither calls for in the way universities teach writing will only come as a result of changing the values and attitudes of administrators to writing. While many who responded to the survey reported in Chapter Three hold a reductive view of writing, many others viewed writing as rhetorical and some as epistemic--part of the knowledge-making process of their disciplines. Within many universities in Canada, the "policy space" for writing instruction has become more and more crowded with both individual policies (such as the various departments at the University of New Brunswick each setting up their own writing programs) and with what Majone calls "unplanned policy change" or changes that happen, for example, at the classroom level that circumvent the policies adopted by the policy makers. The recent phenomenon of writing programs in over half of all faculties at Canadian universities suggests that this policy space will soon become subject to new, university-wide policies governing writing instruction such as the proposals reported at Wilfrid Laurier University, the University of Winnipeg, Queen's University, and others.

At some institutions, the process of instituting university-wide programs has already begun, with the University of Winnipeg as a prime example of this process. In a space of about four years, the University of Winnipeg Senate authorized the study and then implementation of a "Writing Program" to address the needs of all entering students. A key rhetorical move in the establishment of this program was to characterize writing instruction as "cognitive development." As cognitive development, professors throughout the university could agree with the large expenditure of funds needed to begin the program. This important argumentative
move sought to change attitudes and values (as Majone notes), with the resulting change in policy. That such a change depends upon argument and persuasion seems obvious, but at other institutions (Mount Allison University, Wilfrid Laurier University) similar attempts to initiate or modify writing programs have failed, in part because reformers were unable to change the prevailing attitudes and values towards writing instruction. At Wilfrid Laurier University, the report to the senate mentions "remediation" many times and focuses on "deficiencies" of students while not mentioning either "cognitive development" or the relation between rhetoric and epistemology in the various disciplines called upon to teach writing courses in their proposed "designated writing courses." The definition of writing invoked by the committee reporting to the senate had not changed, and so the proposal was evaluated according to how efficiently grammar, mechanics, and organization could be taught—through a writing centre or through special markers for each designated writing course. The proposed system was not demonstrably more efficient, so it was dropped. Had the committee presented their case as an argument wedding writing instruction to epistemology, the results might have been different, but even if they had not succeeded in passing their proposal they would have educated the senate, an important step for future proposals.

As a public idea, writing instruction in universities has become less an issue for English department heads to deal with and more an issue that the entire university has been called upon to comment on. Increasingly, universities senates—not English department heads—are the new audience for proposals regarding writing instruction, and it is this audience that writing teachers must address. Writing programs have much greater chances for success when they conceptualize writing as problem-solving or as integral parts of the knowledge-making processes of specific disciplines.
than when they refer to remediation of grammar and mechanics based on the current-traditional paradigm of instruction.

The debate about the place of writing instruction in universities also needs to be connected to the debate about general literacy in Canada. This dissertation began by referring to Canadian initiatives that celebrated International Literacy Year, such as the formation of the National Literacy Secretariat and the publication of *More Than Words Can Say: Personal Perspectives on Literacy*. As part of the educational system, and as one of the chief providers of adult education in Canada, I contend that universities have a responsibility to teach writing in theoretically current ways, in ways that challenge students to question how they use language to accomplish various ends as well as how to analyze the ways others use language. Rather than limiting this study to the correct use of grammar and mechanics, universities have an obligation to encourage all students to become more adept composers of written language. Traditionally, creative writers are the only people thought worthy of classes in writing. But as more and more evidence argues for the place of writing in disciplines as various as engineering, education, biology—even mathematics and public policy—universities will need to address questions such as "What does it mean to write in engineering?" If universities are to shoulder some of the responsibility for enlarging our understanding of literacy in all its senses, they will need to conceptualize and practice writing instruction according to theoretically current methods and in the service of national goals for education. It is no longer responsible (if it ever was) for universities to patch together a plan for a writing centre or clinic and then claim to be addressing the needs of their students, and it would be rare indeed for plans of this nature to reflect on how they contribute to national goals for education. Research already published and in progress establishes directions for
future inquiry into the relationships between writing and knowledge, and examples exist of writing programs that integrate writing and knowledge-making practices. The challenge that remains is to change the public idea of writing, first within the university and then outside it. That challenge must be met by those who currently teach writing at universities, who must not deem themselves satisfied with teaching their own courses. In the words of Majone, "Policy actors not only pursue their goals within the limits set by the existing framework; they also strive to change those limits in their favor" (95). Teachers and researchers of writing need to direct their efforts at changing the university if they are to transform writing instruction into a dynamic study of how humans use language.

**Implications for Future Research**

Future research about writing instruction in Canadian universities could extend many of the findings reported in this dissertation. In the area of history, much work remains to be done to document how writing instruction has been taught in French-language universities. Some of this work might coincide with a case study of a writing program at a French-language university. Such a case study would help to describe in detail the motivations behind teaching writing in French, and the results might shed some light on how writing is taught in English through the comparison of the two systems. Further comparisons might be drawn with the theory and practice of writing instruction in postsecondary institutions whose students are mainly Aboriginal peoples. Comparative studies that might result from such research could tell us much about how deeply writing instruction is imbued with culture and could expose some of the assumptions of English-language instruction through that comparison.
Much future research is needed to describe in detail how writing instruction takes place in the classroom. The case studies reported above discuss some of the methods and content of a few teachers, but further studies--perhaps ethnographic studies--could describe teaching methods and goals in much more detail. Research in this vein could also follow-up questions whose resolutions are only suggested in this dissertation about the place of computers in writing instruction. What does it mean to incorporate computers in the "writing process?" Can computerized tutorials replace human instructors adequately? What are the economic implications of having access to computers for writing, and in what ways are cultural values embedded in computer architecture passed along to students through computer-based writing instruction? We also need to find out what students are writing about, the content of their writing, in order to determine what possible connection that content has to either their disciplines or their country.

Much research remains to be done that explores the extent to which writing can be said to have epistemic capabilities. Does writing create knowledge? Does the degree of knowledge-making capabilities vary with the disciplines that employ writing? If writing does have epistemic qualities, should it be the domain of the English department or of each discipline that employs writing? Connected with the issue of writing and knowledge-making is the issue of institutional status for writing programs. Typically, writing programs are devalued, trivialized within the university. Future research needs to explore to what extent such trivialization is a necessary condition for enforcing the status quo, from opening universities to alternative ways of knowing and from alternative students. Writing has the power to teach students to be subversive of the culture of the university by asking them to question the ways things are. To what extent is this power kept under control by reductive
conceptualizations of writing? What are the dynamics of institutional power that prevent writing instruction from claiming a theory for practice and from theorizing about the practice of teaching writing?

Throughout this dissertation I have suggested that writing--in both theory and practice--reflects cultural, social, and political tensions in both the local and national spheres. If universities are to contribute significantly to the development of literacy, they must promote the study of how cultural, social, and political conditions affect literacy and writing. As I have outlined in this concluding chapter, the study and development of literate skills in Canadian university students must indeed be sophisticated if these students are to fully contribute to debates about national identity and to compete in the international marketplace. The road to achieving such sophisticated research and curricula must begin by changing public ideas of literacy and writing within universities. Changing these public ideas of literacy and writing will only be accomplished by connecting the study and practice of writing with important national and economic goals. Arguing for change is the single most important challenge for university teachers of writing in the 1990s and beyond and the first step in developing a truly liberal education for the students of tomorrow.
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