

## Announcing . . .

### **Literature: The Human Experience, Third Edition**

RICHARD ABCARIAN and MARVIN KLOTZ, both of *California State University—Northridge*  
January 1982 Paperbound, about 1300 pages  
*Instructor's Manual available*

### **Language Awareness, Third Edition**

PAUL ESCHHOLZ, ALFRED ROSA, and VIRGINIA P. CLARK,  
all of *University of Vermont*  
January 1982 Paperbound, about 300 pages  
*Instructor's Manual available*

### **The Business Writer's Handbook, Second Edition**

CHARLES T. BRUSAW, *NCR Corporation*, GERALD J. ALRED,  
*University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee*, and WALTER E. OLIU, *U.S.  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission*  
January 1982 Paperbound, about 600 pages

### **Handbook of Technical Writing, Second Edition**

CHARLES T. BRUSAW, *NCR Corporation*, GERALD J. ALRED,  
*University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee*, and WALTER E. OLIU,  
*U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*  
January 1982 Paperbound, about 600 pages

### **Writing for Career-Education Students, Second Edition**

ANDREW W. HART and JAMES A. REINKING, both of  
*Ferris State College*  
January 1982 Paperbound, about 400 pages  
*Instructor's Manual available*

To request a complimentary examination copy, please write (specifying course, present text, and approximate enrollment) to:

**St. Martin's  
Press** • P.O. Box 5352 • New York, N.Y. 10163

## WPA

### Writing Program Administration

Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators  
Volume 5, Number 2, Winter, 1981

#### *Editor*

Kenneth A. Bruffee, Brooklyn College, CUNY

#### *Managing Editor*

Joseph F. Trimmer, Ball State University

#### *Editorial Board*

Lynn Z. Bloom, College of William and Mary (1981-83)

Dee Brock, Dallas County Community College (1979-81)

Charles R. Cooper, University of California, San Diego (1981-83)

Maxine Hairston, University of Texas (1980-82)

John T. Harwood, Pennsylvania State University (1981-83)

Richard Marius, Harvard University (1980-82)

David Rankin, California State University, Dominguez Hills (1979-81)

Nancy Sommers, New York University (1979-81)

William F. Woods, Wichita State University (1980-82)

*WPA: Writing Program Administration* is published three times a year—fall, winter, and spring—by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and the Office of College Information and Publications, Brooklyn College, City University of New York.

The Editors of *WPA* invite contributions that are appropriate to the interests and concerns of those who administer writing programs in American and Canadian colleges and universities. Articles on teaching writing or research in composition are acceptable only if they deal with the relationship of these activities to program administration.

Article length (flexible), 2,000-4,000 words. Authors should submit two copies and retain a copy for their own files. Material should be suitably documented, using the *MLA Handbook*, although as much reference as possible should be included within the text. Annotated bibliographies accompanying articles are encouraged, as well as any other apparatus which might make material more conceptually and practically valuable to working writing program administrators. The editors reserve the right to edit manuscripts accepted for publication to conform with the style of the journal. Manuscripts cannot be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Article deadlines: fall and winter issues, January 15; spring issue, September 15. Relevant announcements are also acceptable. Announcement deadlines: fall issue, August 1; winter issue, October 1; spring issue, January 5. Address contributions and editorial correspondence to Kenneth A. Bruffee, Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Brooklyn College, CUNY, Brooklyn, New York 11210.

Subscription with membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators: \$10/year (\$11.50 outside U.S.). Institutional subscription: \$20/year (\$21.50 outside U.S.). Single Copies, \$5 (\$5.50 outside U.S.). Make check or money order payable to Council of Writing Program Administrators. Address subscription and membership correspondence to Joseph Comprone, Treasurer, WPA, English Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40208.

Address advertising inquiries to Joseph F. Trimmer, Managing Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306.

The Council of Writing Program Administrators is a national association of college and university faculty who serve or have served as directors of freshman composition, coordinators of writing labs and workshops, chairs and members of writing program-related committees, or in similar administrative capacities. The Council of Writing Program Administrators is an affiliate of the Association of American Colleges.

*President*

Harvey S. Wiener, La Guardia Community College, CUNY

*Vice-President*

Winifred Horner, University of Missouri, Columbia

*Treasurer*

Joseph Comprone, University of Louisville

*Secretary*

Arthur Dixon, J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, Virginia

*Executive Committee*

David Bartholomae, University of Pittsburgh (1983)

Harry Crosby, Boston University (1981)

Maxine Hairston, University of Texas, Austin (1982)

E. D. Hirsch, Jr., University of Virginia, Charlottesville (1982)

Elaine P. Maimon, Beaver College (1981)

John Warnock, University of Wyoming, Laramie (1983)

Coming in February from St. Martin's Press

# THE BEDFORD READER



EDITED BY

X. J. Kennedy AND  
Dorothy M. Kennedy

A Major New Text  
from a Major New Imprint—

Bedford Books  
of St. Martin's Press

WPA  
Writing Program Administration  
Volume 5, Number 2, Winter, 1981

## Contents

Such good friends: Cooperation between the English department and the writing labs <i>Peggy Broder</i>	7
The view from the writing lab: Another way to evaluate a writing program <i>Muriel Harris</i>	13
Interviews and expectations: Hiring for the 1980s <i>Arthur M. Eastman</i>	21
Faculty unions: Bargaining according to the craft model <i>James Hanlon</i>	25
Bibliography of Writing Textbooks	31
Notes on contributors	49
In the spring issue	50
Announcements	51

Copyright © 1981 by the Council of Writing Program Administrators

Such good friends:  
Cooperation between the English department  
and the writing lab

*Peggy F. Broder*

Administrators of writing labs face a delicate problem. The students we work with have, in effect, two teachers for their English courses: one in the classroom, the other in the lab. Forestalling misunderstanding and friction under these circumstances demands all we can summon of anticipation, sensitivity, and tact.

As I did my best to cope with such problems during my early months as a writing lab director, I inevitably wondered how other writing lab directors manage, and decided to query a group of them. Because—as always—I was working with a limited budget, I chose a small sample of 25 directors and sent them a questionnaire.<sup>1</sup> Their responses provide a composite picture of problems, suggested solutions, and clear successes.

I sent four open-ended, nondirective questions to these directors:

1. Could you briefly describe any problems, major or minor, in articulating your writing lab's work with the freshman English program or with other courses?
2. Which problem is most serious?
3. What steps have you found effective in alleviating or eliminating each of these problems?
4. Is the director of your lab a full-fledged member of the English department? If not, does that fact create problems?

**Problems.** Replies to the questionnaire exhibit enough consensus to indicate that some generalizations can safely be made.<sup>2</sup> The problems that writing lab directors encounter when articulating their programs with English or other courses are strikingly similar. Fifty-eight percent of the replies report misunderstanding on the part of both faculty and students as to the role of the writing lab in helping students with their papers. This was also most frequently reported as the "most serious" problem writing lab directors encounter. Some faculty members feel extreme suspicion of the lab, fearing that tutors are "ghost-writing" papers for the students. Other faculty members seem to expect that they can send student papers to be evaluated and given a grade by lab personnel. Students, for their part, frequently view the lab as a proofreading or editing service.

Even when the lab's function is clearly understood by faculty and students,

problems arise. Some faculty members, for example, disagree with the lab's priorities as to the order in which skills should be taught, according to nine of my respondents. Directors of labs that use peer tutors report that some faculty suspect the qualifications of peer tutors. One respondent cited "inadequately-trained tutors" as a genuine problem, implying a deeper problem—that faculty at that institution are unwilling to support an adequate tutor-training program.

Other problems that almost all my respondents have had to deal with are faculty members who refuse to refer students to the lab, or who delay referring them until it is impossible to give them adequate help in the time remaining in the term; faculty who will not comply with the writing lab's request for a diagnosis of a student's problems, making it impossible to know how the instructor wants the student helped; and—this was almost unanimous—students who fail to attend regularly enough to make significant progress.

**A few solutions.** The answers to my third question offered valuable suggestions. At the root of most of these, predictably, are careful planning, continuing communication, and meticulous training of tutors coupled with on-going observation of their work.

More than half of my respondents suggest that one way of assuring that department and lab are not working at cross-purposes is to have the lab director elicit from the English department faculty an agreed-upon set of guidelines or priorities for tutoring students. Although philosophies of teaching composition will vary, a group of teachers can surely arrive at a common set of minimal standards for an acceptable paper and the lab director can stress these in training tutors. Later, as tutors become aware of varying emphases of individual instructors, they can respond by respecting these emphases. One teacher values concise, clear, and graceful writing; another, originality and sparkle; yet another, strong organization and correctness. Difficulties that might arise from such different preferences can be largely prevented by tutors trained in sensitive and intelligent management of the tutoring conference.

English departments and writing labs should also cooperate in establishing policies as to how instructors will treat papers that have been prepared with tutorial help. Are students to be allowed to work with a tutor at every step of the writing process or will they be required to do a paper on their own and get help only with the revision after the instructor has seen the initial effort? Will papers that have been written with tutorial assistance be graded in exactly the same way as those that are entirely a student's unassisted labor? Will instructors allow late submission of papers prepared with lab help, on grounds that students may have trouble getting an appointment, or may require a number of conferences to complete a paper?

My respondents agree it is important that such potential areas of misunderstanding be, as much as possible, anticipated. The lab director must be sure that his or her staff is clear about, and abides by, departmental policy or the preference of the individual instructor. Meticulous attention to these matters might even be one way to help to allay suspicions that tutors are "ghostwriting" students' papers for them.

Replies to my questions also recommend frequent reciprocal communication about writing assignments. No lab can function effectively with an English department unless tutors are fully informed about the assignments that students

are working with. Faculty should send a copy of each assignment to the lab and should be willing to respond to questions if the lab staff needs help in interpreting it. If students are given written grading criteria, the lab should have a copy.

Occasional meetings of department and lab personnel can also aid in preventing misunderstandings about assignments and in clarifying purposes and goals. A teacher who plans to make an elaborate or complex assignment, for example, might invite tutors to sit in on a classroom session, or might meet with them in the lab to go over it. Tutors, by the way, can be an invaluable aid in appraising assignments, for they are aware not only of outstanding successes but also of unexpected difficulties and confusions. Surely ill-conceived and ill-defined assignments account for a great many failures in student performance.

For its part, the writing lab staff must keep meticulous records of all conferences with students and must be prepared to consult with faculty members about student progress and problems. Some of the record forms sent to me as examples were impressively thorough. Teachers should be notified of the number of conferences a student has had on each paper and should receive a brief summary of what aspects of the paper were worked on. This can be done simply with a checklist, or the tutor can write a brief summary.

Some of my respondents included another warning that is relevant: the necessity for restraint in tutors' expressed attitudes to students. "Ghostwriting" a paper is only the worst of several errors that tutors can fall into. Only an inexperienced or ill-advised tutor would ever, for example, say to a student "This paper is really good! You ought to get at least a B on it."

Another of these potential trouble areas lies in the special feeling that tutors, particularly peer tutors, sometimes develop for students they work with. They often see how very hard the student has tried; they know the paper is much improved over early drafts; and if such effort results in a grade of only C- or D, it is sometimes difficult not to agree with the student that the teacher is unfair. But it may be that the student really did not fulfill the teacher's assignment—this is one compelling reason why the lab must have copies of all assignments. Or it may simply be that this is a teacher who rewards only life and sparkle in a paper and is unimpressed by the impeccable but dull. It may even be that the teacher is unfair. Whatever the case, tutor training must emphasize the professionalism of not criticizing an instructor to his or her students. It can do no good, and it can do a great deal of mischief.

**Making friends.** The mischief it can do is to alienate the English department faculty. That loss of friendship can be costly. To be effective, the writing lab must be supported by a teaching staff that has learned to have confidence in the lab and encourages students who need the lab's help to seek it. That confidence can, of course, be jeopardized in other ways. Occasionally a teacher will receive an unacceptable paper from a student who is getting help, or is supposed to be getting it, from the writing lab. In such cases, consultation with records might show that the student has not come in for conferences, has not taken the advice of the tutor, or is simply going to need more than a single term's work to bring his or her writing up to an acceptable standard. On the other hand, a tutor may have misunderstood the assignment, or may have been unwise enough to have taken the student's word about it. It is even possible that a tutor was perfunctory or gave the student bad advice. It happens. But these difficulties can be surmounted

with good planning, frequent consultation, and good will on the part of the lab director.

Lab tutors who are English majors can also strengthen the bond between lab and department. Familiar with many of the teaching staff, they too can serve as mediators between faculty and students, consulting on assignments or providing information about a student's progress. I am not, of course, recommending that the writing lab staff be limited to English majors. Some of my respondents point out the judiciousness of using majors from other disciplines as well. Their mere presence in the lab demonstrates that it is not only those eccentric people in the English department who attach importance to skilled writing.

My respondents also agree that harmony between the writing lab and the English department is much easier to maintain if the director of the writing lab is a full-fledged member of the English department. "This is crucial to maintain confidence and respect," was one reply. If the job of writing lab director is delegated to a part-time person, or one without full credentials, that fact suggests to the department, and to the rest of the institution, that the department doesn't really see the teaching of writing as a matter of much moment.

Further, only a member of the English department can be fully aware of departmental philosophies of teaching composition and know the individual instructors' strengths, weaknesses, and idiosyncracies. And only a member of the English department, particularly if he or she is a composition or rhetoric specialist, can make an invaluable contribution in planning and making changes in the composition program. By the same token, if the writing lab director is one of their colleagues, familiar and trusted, the English staff finds it easier to consult with him or her about lab policies, about individual students, or even about the effectiveness of assignments and exercises.

There are other ways in which members of the English department can and should be closely involved in the writing lab. One of my respondents reports that specialists in dialect, English as a second language, rhetoric, grammar, and style have been invited to participate in seminars with tutors. The director of the composition program can discuss philosophy and goals with the lab staff. The lab should, in fact, welcome observation and comment from any member of the teaching staff, at any time. A standing writing-lab committee in the English department can help focus these comments. Several respondents pointed out that it is also helpful to have tutors visit each freshman English section at the beginning of the term to explain the goals and procedures of the lab.

Such mutual exchanges not only enable the lab to continue to improve its methods and its services, but they also allow faculty members to feel confident of the quality of instruction the labs offer. All of the lab's resources—books, exercises, supplementary assignments, self-help materials—should be freely available to teachers for consultation. Some labs have more space to store this kind of thing than the freshman program's director has. A few respondents report such success in this aspect of their lab program that they have to keep developing fresh materials because of piracy on the part of the instructional staff!

Finally, the writing lab director must assume responsibility for full and on-going communication not only between the writing lab and the English department, but also between the lab and the rest of the institution. One respondent reports her most serious problem was the equation of good writing with good

grammar, and of teaching writing with teaching grammar, by faculty in other disciplines. There is no better way to avoid misunderstanding of the lab's role than reminders of how the lab helps students—and perhaps more important, what it does not or cannot do. Devices for this include tours of the lab, classroom visits by tutors, occasional meetings or open houses for lab and instructional staffs. Keeping up regular contacts is one of two essential ways to dispel fears that the tutors are less than competent, that tutors are writing the students' papers, or that tutors are in any way undercutting the relationship between students and their classroom teachers.

The other essential way is, of course, to deliver the goods: to do our job in such a way that students and faculty see an improvement in the writing of students who are faithful in their attendance at the lab and who work to follow tutors' suggestions.

A writing lab's effectiveness reaches far beyond students in a freshman English course, and all these suggestions can be applied to establish and maintain a good working relationship between the lab and all departments of the entire institution. Understanding and cooperation strengthen the lab and, more importantly, also provide maximum educational opportunity for the students.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Using the *Writing Lab Directory* compiled by Muriel Harris and her colleagues at Purdue University, I selected 25 labs across the country. Because my initial curiosity was piqued by wondering whether other lab directors had problems similar to those I was encountering, I chose institutions in which the writing labs seemed to be connected with English departments. As it turned out, two of my respondents reported that their labs are not connected to the English department. One of these directs a purely remedial lab and the other, a lab that is part of a department of freshman writing separate from the English department. Fifteen of the 25 directors responded, all generously, some by sending me supporting materials: full descriptions of their programs, copies of forms that they use for referrals, samples of fliers, even handbooks for tutors. My thanks are due to all of them.

<sup>2</sup> For the sake of brevity this article indicates that the main role of the writing lab is as adjunct to a freshman English program, and that the only faculty we deal with are English teachers. In fact, the responses to my questionnaire make clear the labs' increasingly wider range in helping students in all disciplines and at all college levels—a trend I heartily endorse. I also refer to the staff of a writing lab as tutors, although in many cases the tutoring is done by graduate teaching assistants or peer tutors.

## The view from the writing lab: Another way to evaluate a writing program

*Muriel Harris*

The assessment of writing programs is usually based on some means of evaluating the proficiency of students' writing, on the report of outside reviewers, or on student evaluations of classroom teaching. While these may all be necessary and useful, there is also another less quantifiable way to peer into the depths of a writing program. To see what is really going on in all those classrooms up and down the corridor, a writing program administrator can spend a few hours in the program's writing lab.

This visit will not soothe the savage provost who demands statistical evidence of minimum competence, nor will it stave off a dean intent on proving the program is cost-effective. But it will offer a way to look at some aspects of writing programs that are rarely available for public view. Most labs do not merely reflect the quality of the program they serve. They reflect, in an intensified and heightened form, its characteristic traits. After listening in on tutor-student conferences and watching the operation of the lab, the director of a writing program can gather useful insights into the program's real standards and goals; the degree of consistency from one section to another of a writing course; the extent to which classroom teachers are involved with their students' progress; the manner of that involvement; and the degree of their own improvement as teachers. All that is needed to gather this information is patience and a set of questions to ask oneself while observing what's going on. For those with a few hours to spare and a lab to spend them in, the following questions can lead to unexpected insights.

**What kinds of help is the writing lab providing?** In a strong composition program there is a commitment to teach writing to every student in every composition course and not merely to shuffle them routinely through the semester. Thus, though the lab staff will spend part of their time with students from basic or remedial courses, they should also be working with students in the regular course sequence who need extra instruction. These are the students who need help to fill gaps where the rest of their classmates are reasonably proficient. Often, such students are potentially good writers with only a few weaknesses. But their teachers cannot afford to devote class time to problems that only concern a few students. Since acquiring writing skills is not a sequential act, it is very likely that most classes of average writers will include one or two students who have difficulty, for example, with spelling. Another student or two will get locked into a single-sentence pattern that goes on relentlessly, page after page. Still another, terrorized in the dim, dark past by some nameless, faceless, well-meaning high

school teacher, inserts commas after every third word. There are always several students who, at first, need inordinate amounts of help to generate ideas. And occasionally a student, sometimes an older person returning to the classroom after an absence of several years, is traumatized by once again having to produce academic prose. The student might be either unable to start writing or troubled in at least four ways about the first two sentences he or she has written. And so on. The list is as varied as the problems that confront writers. Yet classroom teachers cannot add on all the extra hours needed to give these students individualized help. A center for supplementary, personalized instruction is ideally suited to do just that.

If diversity characterizes the kinds of problems student writers have, then diversity of lab instruction also indicates a well-rounded program in which teachers are concerned with a full spectrum of writing skills when they grade papers. An observer strolling through the writing lab ought to hear a great variety of topics being discussed. While one tutor and student are working on pronouns, another pair may be discussing revision strategies. Apostrophe rules may be the subject of still another tutorial session, or perhaps the topic is invention strategies or the use of transitions. Variety is the key here because when teacher recommendations and student requests consistently focus tutorial sessions on only one aspect of writing, such as the elimination of grammatical error, the program will be lopsided in its emphasis. Equally off-balance is a program where students from composition courses rarely appear in the lab to review punctuation rules or learn how to proofread for spelling errors. Instead, there should be a potpourri of discussions on grammar and mechanics, on composing processes, on rhetorical matters, on vocabulary and word choice, on footnote format—in short, on all the matters that concern writers learning to write.

Yet a diversity of topics for instruction is not all that characterizes a healthy writing lab program. The subjects for discussion must also focus on *relevant* writing concerns, not simply provide band-aid kinds of help to appease the teacher or calm the student. For example, lab sessions should be spent probing for writing topics that engage the student's interest, but should not be spent frantically searching for what will "please the teacher." Tutors may need to help students learn how to gather their thoughts on a reading assignment, but they should not help the student to guess what some particular teacher wants the essay to say. Tutors may also need to help students understand criticism of their writing, but ought not to be continually counseling students who were crushed by harsh or degrading comments on their papers. What the eavesdropping observer ought to hear, then, are tutorial discussions on a wide range of topics relevant to useful and appropriate writing instruction.

**On what basis do tutors decide which skills to work on with students?** One of the major needs of a composition program is a clearly articulated set of standards and goals, a hierarchy of skills to be mastered, or some general sense of direction based on a discernible philosophy of composition. Whether or not there is a common syllabus from one classroom to the next, the lab tutor ought to have some sense of these goals, and each student ought to have some assessment of how his or her writing stacks up against the program's criteria for effective writing. When teachers carry the program's goals into their classrooms, they will do so in part by indicating clearly to each student what the student's writing strengths and

weaknesses are. In the writing lab, this means that students know what they need to work on, that their need matches a deficiency that is evident in their writing, and that there is a relative consistency from classroom to classroom about what constitutes major writing deficiencies.

When all is working well, a student who appears in the lab will be able to inform the tutor, with a teacher's referral sheet, comments on a graded paper, or an oral explanation, what it is they should focus on. Even the statement, "My teacher says I need to use more specific details and examples in my papers" will give the lab session a useful sense of direction. If the paper the student has brought along does lack concreteness, the tutor and student can plunge in efficiently. An effective partnership among teacher, student, and tutor has been established. But when students do not know what they want to work on or make incorrect guesses, then the teacher may not have given clear guidance or established specific goals for writing proficiency. The tutor and student will then flounder around trying to guess why the paper in front of them got a C or D. The student will try to guess which of the teacher's comments to attend to or will suggest a writing problem that isn't evident in the paper. Without a sense of what the program is trying to teach students, the tutor is equally lost. How important are spelling errors? Are underdeveloped paragraphs something the tutor and student should deal with immediately in a first-semester course, or is that a topic normally discussed later? Should the tutor be teaching revision strategies to help students with problems in organization if the teachers' assignments are mainly in-class writing with which extensive revision is not possible? Should the tutor encourage the student who wants to try to write a science fiction story to fulfill an assignment in comparison/contrast writing, or should the tutor steer the writer into expository prose because that's what the program stresses? Smooth coordination and common assumptions shared by the program director, the teaching staff, the students, and the lab tutors will answer these questions when it is reasonably clear to everyone which writing skills are being taught, how important they are in assessing proficiency, and approximately when, or in which course, they are covered.

Writing labs often have itemized referral sheets for the teachers to use, and in a well-coordinated program, the administrator and writing lab director have hammered out the referral sheet together by agreeing on the items to be included. The lab director then knows that what he or she trains the tutor to teach is what the classroom teachers will be emphasizing as well. If the program stresses writing as a process, the tutor should be ready to help students with brainstorming techniques or other invention strategies. If the program places its major emphasis on some specific degree of proficiency in grammar and mechanics, then lab instructors should have a strong repertoire of instructional materials and strategies to teach the necessary rules and editing skills. If syntactic maturity is a major goal, then the lab ought to have a good supply of techniques and materials on sentence combining, sentence variety, and so on, to help students for whom classroom instruction is insufficient.

If there is consistency in standards from one class to another, this too is evident in the lab. When students enrolled in the second semester, or quarter, of a composition sequence come to the lab and seem to be victims confused by nonuniform criteria, then standards are clearly not consistent. One symptom of this inconsistency is a lab overflowing with students enrolled in the second course

who are suddenly asked to accept, from different teachers, very different assessments of their overall competency in writing. When a student staggers into the lab with a D or F on the first paper of the second writing course in a sequence and tells the tutor that he or she got As and Bs in the first course, disparity in standards is a distinct possibility.

The size of the program and the program director's own standards will determine whether five or 50 of such students are accurate indicators of a real problem of grading consistency. The program administrator observing in the lab also ought to be listening for students who voice their confusion about different rationales for high and low grades. Typical of such a problem is the student who confronts a tutor, with failing paper in hand, and says in tones of righteous indignation, "See, last quarter we were graded on our *ideas*, not mechanics." If the "ideas" in the paper are unfocused, undeveloped, or disorganized, then the student hasn't learned what constitutes effective writing and is in the lab for appropriate reasons. But if the student has focused his or her energies on only one aspect of writing while ignoring other skills, then there is indeed a problem. Another typical example of inconsistency is the student who explains that he or she was graded for "originality" last semester and seems bewildered by this semester's low grade. If this student's paper is a reasonably creative, but otherwise inadequate piece of writing, this may indicate that the program administrator has a problem of nonuniformity of goals to tend to. But again, it is the administrator's decision as to how many of these students indicate a real symptom of inconsistency across the program.

**Do teachers follow the progress of their students who attend the lab?** The answer to this question will indicate something about the extra effort, the conscientiousness, and the concern for the student's improvement that is prevalent in a program. Some teachers will remain only a name on a referral slip; others will become close co-workers with the lab staff because they feel the need to be actively involved with what their students are doing. The teacher who works with a tutor, making suggestions for areas of study and watching for subsequent improvement in the student's writing, expends both time and energy, two commodities in short supply when people teach writing.

But time-consuming as it is to teach an entire class and to structure supplementary instruction for certain students, some teachers do all this and still manage to check in occasionally with the lab tutor and read over the lab folders to see what their students are doing. These conscientious teachers add a great deal to their students' learning by this interaction. The motivation they provide for the student to keep on working is enormous. When a student has labored long and hard with a lab tutor on the complexities of sentence fragments, there is no reward or incentive to continue working quite like the teacher's comment on the next paper that pays tribute to the reduced number of fragments. By contrast, teachers who consider their jobs done when they instruct students to go down the hall to the lab where "they" will help are on the verge of abandoning the student and relinquishing responsibility for the student's learning. The unspoken message to the student is that such work isn't very important anyway.

There are several ways to observe the degree to which teachers are involved in the supplementary instruction of their students. In most labs, records are kept for every student, and the observer can note how frequently each teacher comes to

the lab to check students' folders or talk with the tutors. Or tutors can be observed talking on the phone or going down the hall to the teachers' offices. Listening to the first few minutes of tutorial sessions, the observer can also acquire evidence of the degree of the teachers' involvement. When tutors and their students meet, they often spend the first few minutes reestablishing contact, filling each other in on what has happened since their last meeting or planning for what they'll do next. Some students begin by sharing with the tutor a paper that has been returned to them since the last session. "My teacher said that now I'm really learning how to use transitions in this paper," or "My instructor wrote on the paper that I should keep working with you on how to narrow a topic." Such comments are a clear indication that the teacher is aware of the student's lab work. Or the lab tutor might suggest the agenda for the session by saying, "I saw your instructor a few days ago, and he thinks we ought to go over paragraph development in that antiabortion paper you handed in last week," or "I got a note from your teacher, and your spelling is really improving. She said she'd talk with you about what we should work on next." These comments are overt signs of an effective and active partnership between lab and classroom.

Finally, the observer can also look for signs of teachers actively encouraging student use of the lab. In some programs, teachers bring their classes in for a tour of the lab at the beginning of the semester.<sup>1</sup> Other labs post weekly lists of the names of students who have worked in the lab that week.<sup>2</sup> Teachers who expend effort in encouraging their students to seek supplementary instruction will thus be seen touring the lab with their classes or checking attendance lists or trying other methods that demonstrate their interest.

**Is the lab being used as a resource place for teachers as well as students?** In most programs, composition courses are taught by a variety of people, many of whom cannot or are not willing to spend the time and money necessary to keep up with journals, conferences, and research in the field of writing. Yet the continued success of a writing program depends on the professional vitality of its staff. If teaching composition is to be generally thought of as a lively art throughout the program, then there has to be a focal point, a resource place, where journals and books are easily accessible. The library could serve this purpose except that it is primarily a place to study and a repository for permanent materials, not the handouts, topic assignments, conference announcements, and new textbooks that are part of the teaching of writing. Composition as a field is so pedagogically oriented that the teaching staff needs access to a variety of teaching materials as well as books and articles. The faculty lounge or cafeteria might also do, but the needed resources would have to be brought in and tended.

But writing labs are talking places anyway. And most labs have a variety of resources close at hand. Materials are continually being created and/or collected to use in teaching and in training tutors. Writing labs are places that bring together teaching and learning to teach, good talk and ready reference. They serve as excellent resource rooms for faculty.<sup>3</sup> It is a sign of health in a writing program if its lab cultivates interest in its collection of books and materials by the rest of the composition staff. Thus in a composition program where there is a genuine interest in avoiding the same old tired syllabus from semester to semester, the resource section of the writing lab will be humming with activity—teachers reading books, checking out journals, borrowing copies of the lab's home-grown

materials, and depositing copies of their handouts and exercises to share with others.

**Is the lab being used by students other than those in freshman composition courses?** If a writing program is known around campus for purveying nothing more than a timeserving semester or two in freshman composition, there will be few, if any, requests for continued assistance with writing. Students who heave a sigh of relief when completing freshman composition won't even consider returning for help with term papers, reports, essay exams, or résumés. On the other hand, programs that have earned respect among both students and faculty, and whose composition teachers have convinced their students of the importance of writing well and of the need to continue expending effort on improving writing skills, will continue to receive requests for help. One purpose of a lab—the flexible arm of a writing program—is to provide instruction beyond the traditional classroom. Where the composition program has generated interest in writing in other disciplines, and has provided assistance in developing writing-across-the-curriculum activities, the lab will be offered *and* used as the writing program's support system for the rest of the campus. If the development of effective writing skills is a lively and ongoing concern of the whole campus, students will come to the lab for help with a variety of writing assignments in other courses.<sup>4</sup>

Because many labs reach out enthusiastically and easily to serve campus-wide needs, the lab may also offer a variety of additional programs: workshops for clerical staff, review sessions for graduate school and job applications, conferences and short courses for the community, and so on.<sup>5</sup> The observer ought to examine these programs to see whether there is any involvement or assistance by other members of the composition staff or whether the lab staff is left on its own. Is the writing program working hand in hand to assist the lab in delivering the message that writing skills are important and that writing improvement is an ongoing part of everyone's education?

For the observer looking at a writing program through the lens of its writing lab, the questions offered here may lead to still more questions, depending on what is observed. But in the long run, the questions are of less interest than the answers, and the answers are perhaps of even less interest than the solutions.

The solutions are likely to be of special value to the program because the view from the lab reveals the effect of classroom instruction in its most keenly felt and personal form. When the observer sees that students who are intent upon learning how to become better writers are being sent to the lab for that purpose by concerned teachers, then the program that lab is a part of is obviously flourishing. If work in the lab is perfunctory and timeserving, then the odds are great that the whole program is equally perfunctory and timeserving. If writing lab tutors are merely crisis interventionists and caterers to the ambulatory wounded, then there is a high probability that, whatever the writing program as a whole may look like on paper or in the breathless hopes of administrative personnel, that program is a shambles.

A final caution. Even when the lab and program are relatively healthy, there is a type of weakness that can be debilitating both to the lab and to the writing program and that may produce negative answers to every question the observer may ask. That weakness is the lack of integration between the lab and the program it is

nominally part of. Integration of lab and program is a key to the success of both, not only because they reinforce each other but because they must work together as the scope of writing programs widens. Today, writing instruction is spreading rapidly beyond English and composition-program classrooms. The advent of writing-across-the-curriculum and of core-curriculum programs with a writing requirement calls upon faculty members who teach content courses in every field to take responsibility for the quality of student writing. As a result, writing program administrators—those who run tutorial centers and those who run the larger programs encompassing those centers—must take responsibility for integrating an enormous variety of values, aims, and anxieties. Only a clear, practical understanding by all faculty of the appropriate uses and limitations of the writing lab, and conversely a clear, practical understanding by the lab administrator of the goals of the faculty at large, can make a college-wide writing program truly effective.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Irene Lurkis Clark, "Integrating Lab and Classroom at a Large University," *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 5 (March 1981), 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> Lorraine Perkins, "Encouraging Student Attendance," *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 5 (June 1981), 7-8.

<sup>3</sup> Muriel Harris, "Making the Writing Lab an Instructor's Resource Room," *College Composition and Communication*, 28 (December 1977), 376-78.

<sup>4</sup> Kate Hymes, "Interdisciplinary Programs and the Writing Lab: The Evolution of a College Writing Lab," *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 5 (January 1981), 5-7; Susan P. Robbins and Mary C. Grattan, "The Role of Writing Centers in Writing Across the Curriculum Programs," *Writing Lab Newsletter* (forthcoming).

<sup>5</sup> Muriel Harris and Kathleen Blake Yancey, "Beyond Freshman Composition: Other Uses of the Writing Lab," *Writing Center Journal*, 1 (Fall/Winter 1980), 43-49; Willa Wolcott, "A Writing Center Reaches Out," *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 5 (May 1981), 7-9.

## Interviews and expectations: Hiring for the 1980s

*Arthur M. Eastman*

**Editor's Note.** At the 1980 Modern Language Association convention in Houston, the Association of Departments of English sponsored a series of workshops on the job market. At the plenary session of that series, several experienced department heads discussed their interviewing methods. *WPA* invited one of these, Arthur Eastman, then president of ADE and English Department chairperson at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, to write up his informal remarks, because they seemed especially relevant to the needs of WPAs involved in hiring composition faculty. We are grateful to Professor Eastman for responding to our request.

What follows is a description of the interviews we conduct with candidates for bottom-rung assistant professorships in English at Virginia Tech. The point of offering it to the readership of *WPA* is that as far as our English Department staffing requirements are concerned, Virginia Tech is typical of many programs throughout the country, and the people we interview tend to be typical of those applying for college teaching jobs in our field today. Their expectations and ours—and the consequent satisfactions or frustrations of both—bear on the health of the writing programs we administer. Our expectations at Virginia Tech are that, if we are intelligently selective, the faculty we choose will meet our institutional needs and help our students write better. More often than not the candidates' expectations, although they contain a fair recognition of the necessity of teaching composition, include a long, strong hope that the teaching of literature will be all, most, or much of their lot a few years into their careers. Since this will not be the case for most of them, it's important to disabuse them as early as possible, which means during the interview.

Our interviews begin with questions about the dissertation. Candidates usually know more in their special areas than we do, so it is with interest that we ask and with interest, we hope, that they answer. What we are trying to discover is something about the candidates' minds—their ability to handle concepts, to organize an expository essay, to accommodate their communication to an audience. We are thinking ahead sometimes to the possible use of a candidate in a particular course in literature or literary theory. But more importantly, we are thinking of the candidates in composition classrooms. We are trying to imagine the kind and power of thinking that they will embody for their students, the rhetorical stances they will exemplify. If they are inarticulate, can we hope their students will be any different? If they cannot make plain the topic on which they

have been lavishing months and years of study, will they be able to make plain this week's assigned essay?

Sooner or later we put the dissertation aside and ask candidates what they would do if given a classroom and, within the course of a term, the task of bringing 25 raw freshmen to a significantly higher degree of literacy. We are not especially interested in the branch of rhetoric candidates subscribe to, or even whether they have heard of Hairston, Winterowd, Young, or Hirsch (although we wouldn't fault candidates if they exhibited some acquaintance with names so august). What we hope to see is evidence of the candidates' approach to the problem of teaching. If they've been working as TA's in their graduate institutions, they may have followed set syllabi without exploring them. Would the candidates begin the term by having their students write? If not, why not? If they would, hoping to arrive at diagnoses, what sorts of things would they look for? How would diagnosis bear on their teaching? Do they have in mind any sorts of progression—for example, from word to phrase to clause to paragraph to essay or the other way around, or from topics of immediate and personal interest to those more general? We are less interested in the nature of the approach than whether there is one, less keen on the progression than on whether the organization is principled. We ask about grading. Do the candidates consider themselves easy, tough, middle of the road? What do they think grades should indicate? Do they believe in analytic or holistic grading? Do they take points off for errors? Do three errors make an automatic flunk? Answers to questions about how the candidates grade tell us a lot about what they teach, and how.

There are more questions. Perhaps the two most important are how the candidates see themselves professionally five or 10 years down the road, and what they would like to know about us. The answer to the first question—or the lack of an answer—tells us whether the candidates are clear-sighted, blind, or in between. It may also tell us a lot about whether, in the long run, they will be at home in the profession as we practice it or be imprisoned by it. Whatever they want to know about us (and if it's retirement plans or how soon we grant paid leaves, we suspect we're wasting their time and ours), we try clearly and explicitly to communicate the kind of institution we are.

What we are is a very common kind of institution, a state university. Virginia Tech is not the oldest in the state nor the most prestigious. But it is a big, comprehensive, land-grant university with 20,000 students and seven separate colleges. Every college requires freshman English coursework and some require electives in the humanities. Among the electives allowed by most colleges are courses in English and American literature. The number of our majors is not great—about 40 in each graduating class. And we have perhaps 50 graduate students; the M.A. is the highest degree we grant. Since our graduate operation is small, we lack the large numbers of teaching assistants that many state universities have. This means that we staff most of our courses with regular faculty, the people we interview, their predecessors, and their successors. Between 55 and 60 percent of our courses in any one term are freshman composition. Another 10 percent are courses in exposition for business majors or technical writing for engineers, somewhat arbitrarily placed at the junior level but open to all. And between 20 and 25 percent of our courses are sophomore-level introductions to literature.

These are significant statistics. They define the shape of our academic reality.

They constitute the mortgage on our pedagogic energies in the years ahead. They mean that year in, year out, assistant professors *and* associate professors *and* full professors will teach more composition than anything else. They mean that during most terms the load will be two courses in composition and one course in literature. Far more often than not the literature course will be at the introductory level—a survey of English, American, or world literature, or an introduction to the genres: science fiction, fantasy, the Bible as literature, and so on. The staff will teach these courses to students who, by and large, are in class not out of heart's desire, but out of curricular necessity. More than half of them will have chosen muteness as their chief classroom strategy. This last point is one we probably won't stress in describing ourselves, but it is an important aspect of our reality and of institutions like ours, nevertheless.

Otherwise, by being as clear as we can be about ourselves, we try hard to help our candidates understand what we are, what in fact most big and middle-sized state institutions are, particularly those without doctoral students to provide a broad, exploitable under-population of teaching staff. And we try no less hard to make clear our expectations: good teaching and genuine scholarship realized in significant publication.

Aware of the cynicism with which such expectations may be viewed, we risk being repetitively explicit about both of them. The teaching must be good or the candidate will never last. Teaching is our first line of activity. We visit classes. We require student evaluation. Good teaching, we tell our candidates, is necessary for tenure and promotion.

Necessary but not sufficient. We expect scholarship as well, research that matters (or its equivalent from poets, novelists, playwrights), research that is brought to completion, that stands the test of rigorous examination. We mean articles or books that illuminate our understanding of literature in any of the scores of ways we all know—historical, sociological, philological, linguistic, new critical, structuralist. We mean investigation into matters pedagogical and rhetorical, into the processes of composing and interpreting. And we mean not simply the beginnings of accomplishment in these realms, but evidence of staying power, of continuing growth.

It is the more important to make these two levels of expectations very clear, very early, because to many people in our profession, they seem at odds with each other. Freshman composition is at one end of the scale (traditionally, the bottom end); significant scholarship at the other (traditionally, the top). And tradition has it that professionals develop their scholarship in tandem with their teaching. Research feeds the classroom, and the excitements and questions of the classroom incite and stimulate research. Generally, according to the tradition, this happens most often, most fruitfully, when the courses taught are advanced and in the area of the young faculty member's particular interests. It simply cannot be that way with us, unless the research relates to writing. At Virginia Tech, as at most state universities, it may be years before the Miltonist can do much more than wave a passing greeting to one of the master's sonnets or odes in the classroom, before the Shakespearean sails again down the Cydnus with Cleopatra, before the dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon glides into the assistant professor's Victorian section. So we work to make clear that although faculty members here will labor in the composition vineyard part of the time, they will be laboring in the scholarly vineyard another part of the time, but on their own. They will not experience the

traditional reciprocation of teaching and research, but they will be expected nonetheless to grow in scholarly stature. The life of the mind, we propose, is available to us, and a genuine community of teacher-scholars is what we can be, if we have the vision and discipline to bring it to pass.

That this is a challenge, we recognize. We do our best to help our young faculty obtain grants and achieve worthy publication. We read their articles, review their grant proposals, write letter upon letter of recommendation. Thus far we've had a fair measure of success. And our success, begins, we think, at the interview, when we put our questions carefully, and even more carefully analyze the answers, when we frankly describe the kind of institution we are and what we expect of our faculty.

## Faculty unions: Bargaining according to the craft model?

*James Hanlon*

*Faculty vs. Administration: Rights Issues in Academic Collective Bargaining* by Margaret K. Chandler and Daniel J. Julius. *The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education*. Baruch College, CUNY, 1979, 116 pp.

Long-range planning, retrenchment, promotion, appointment, nonrenewal of appointment, tenure: on nonunionized campuses, WPAs are likely to think that these are problems to be dealt with by higher administration. Even though WPAs in nonunionized situations may hear plenty from their staff regarding pay, fringe benefits, travel funds, and rights and privileges of part-time staff, they are likely to consider such issues more or less peripheral to the more central problems of running a writing program.

But like it or not, in addition to their important role in designing the writing curriculum and delivering appropriate, high-quality instruction in writing, many WPAs do have front-line administrative responsibilities. Tenure, pay, hiring and firing practices, the special problems—indeed, neglects—endured by part-time faculty are “working condition” issues that will not go away. On a unionized campus, a WPA’s responsibility for solving these problems is not merely contextual. It is often where much of the action is.

Unlike more traditional and established academic administrators, the WPA in many institutions must work daily with the whole spectrum of professional personnel: established academicians, apprentice teaching assistants, and part-time faculty. The quality of work of such a diverse group depends in large part on perceived relationships among members of the various subgroups and on their shared confidence in a reasonably secure livelihood while delivering writing instruction. In a time of retrenchment and a declining job market for new instructors, the pressures on WPAs to deal effectively and fairly with such matters as job security and working conditions of the staff can be especially severe. In extreme cases, WPAs may find themselves in a very tight middle between a disgruntled, threatened writing faculty and a fiscally harried, apparently indifferent administration.

As a result, the issues dealt with through faculty unionization and academic collective bargaining are issues that all WPAs inevitably must confront, formally or informally. A primer of unionization, union values, and union practices should be required reading for WPAs. From this point of view, Chandler and

*WPA: Writing Program Administration*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Winter 1981

Julius's *Faculty vs. Administration* is not a bad text for an overview of emergent unionism.

What Margaret Chandler, professor of business, Columbia University, and Daniel Julius, director of personnel services, Vermont State Colleges, offer is a systematic analysis of 142 collective bargaining agreements from two-year colleges and 63 agreements from four-year colleges. This sample includes two-thirds of all agreements in effect in American colleges and universities as of July, 1979. Using their own rating scales, Chandler and Julius assess the relative strengths of contractual clauses dealing with seven "crucial areas which are at the center of power struggles in organized schools": long-range planning, retrenchment, promotion, appointment, nonrenewal of appointment, tenure, and management rights. They apply a common scaling code to contractual language dealing with tenure, promotion, nonrenewal, and appointment; likewise, they apply appropriately devised separate codes to long-range planning, retrenchment, and management-rights clauses. They use tables to assess the relative strengths of contractual clauses dealing with these seven areas; each table distinguishes between two-year and four-year colleges.

They offer further analyses of these assessments in view of several independent variables: region; bargaining agent (American Federation of Teachers, American Association of University Professors, National Education Association, independent agents, and mergers among these); size of student body; affiliation of the institution (public or private); faculty size; and institutional type. The central chapter of the monograph (Chapter IV) enables the reader to analyze and more fully comprehend the tabular assessments. Because the authors quote only occasionally from the contracts themselves, the reader has little opportunity to see precisely how contractual language correlates with the authors' scaling of the relative strengths of given clauses. Nonetheless, there is sufficient quotation from contracts to offer the uninitiated reader considerable insight into contractual legalese and its application to the workaday life of college professors.

Following the introductory chapter, a brief second chapter offers some historical background on the issue of faculty rights. Harvard's turn-of-the-century president, Charles Eliot, laid the familiar groundwork. Chandler and Julius quote him as he blithely cites contradictory university statutes, one of which clearly gives the president a final authority in university governance and the other equally clearly gives the faculty strong rights of governance. The third chapter offers a questionnaire-based review of the way administrators tended to respond at first to collective bargaining. In general, administrators responding to this questionnaire feared they had been "had" by the advent of collective bargaining, and their responses tended to indicate a need to recover lost power. "Run past them [the faculty]," said one. "Recoup!" said another. Following the central fourth chapter, the monograph concludes with a summary of the study and a somewhat sketchy argument for viewing professors as "craft-type unionists."

This term is a key to the argument of this book. Chandler and Julius note that the craft union "takes responsibility for selecting, training and evaluating its members and controlling their movement on the career ladder" (page 87). Such a model of unionism is much more complex than the traditional American model. For example, in recently concluded negotiations, the union that represents Pennsylvania's state, county, and municipal employess (AFSCME) had to negotiate only three clauses in their contract. In contrast, the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculty (APSCUF) must negotiate some 30 clauses.

In their conclusion, Chandler and Julius show that the Yeshiva case has very recently made craft unionism a serious issue. In this case, the university administration argued that faculty insistence upon participating in university management in effect deprived faculty of an adversarial relationship with management—a relationship that is legally essential to the traditional model of American unionism. Since the Chandler-Julius study was published, the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the argument of Yeshiva University management. This decision will therefore probably delimit—perhaps sharply delimit—faculty aspirations to govern their colleges as modern guildsmen and women.

Whether they follow the craft model or not, faculty unions have burgeoned in the past decade and a half. At the time of the Chandler-Julius study, nearly a quarter of all faculty and professional staff belonged to unions. About one-third of all four-year institutions were organized, as were about one-half of all two-year institutions. Although the complexity of this study and the short perspective we now have on faculty unionism allow for only slight generalization, I will note two significant insights the work offers into this new state of affairs.

1. Collective bargaining should not be viewed as an all-or-nothing power struggle between faculty and administration. No neat and pervasive inverse relationship emerged from the Chandler-Julius assessment of contractual language dealing with administration and faculty association rights in highly organized states. That is, in many contracts that Chandler and Julius examined there appeared relatively strong assertions of the rights of *both* parties. Contracts thus may serve more to define rights and roles of faculty and management than to usurp the rights of one or the other party.

2. Collective bargaining is not a source of erosion-through-compromise of traditional faculty rights. The study speaks clearly on this matter: "When faculties achieved strong rights guarantees in the administrative and personnel fields, they were winning them across the board. Professional unions were not trading contractual safeguards on tenure for gains in nonrenewal" (p. 54). Further, there "was no evidence that rights were being traded for money" (p. 81).

As a WPA myself, and as current campus APSCUF negotiations representative, I found these insights valuable. In fact, I read the Chandler-Julius monograph as a whole with considerable interest. Approximately a decade ago (about four years after I joined this faculty), the Pennsylvania State Legislature passed Act 195, enabling public employees to organize. Immediately thereafter, the 14-campus state college system was directed by Commonwealth administrative fiat to choose a bargaining agent. Befuddled, many of us futilely voted "No Union." But a union we soon had, like it or not. I myself waited a couple of years to sign on as a dues-paying member. Some faculty members still resist joining. But by now, APSCUF has become a way of professional life for most of us.

What I have discovered as a WPA in this situation is that on a unionized campus, the WPA should learn to work actively within the union organization. Since many contracts allow the union president power of appointment to many committees, on a unionized campus a WPA could be squeezed out of critical committee assignments if he or she remained outside the union. Similarly, contractual recognition of the WPA function outside the union would probably "force" the

WPA out of faculty status into administrative status. This formal recognition would irreversibly alter the role of WPA from that of leader-teacher to that of administrative functionary. Instead of such contractual recognition, the WPA should seek a memorandum of agreement with the administration to determine the WPA's role: released time for WPA affairs, supervision of teaching assistants, job description, and so on. Because the delivery of effective writing instruction is nontraditional—often individualized and supplemental to standard instruction—the WPA should not rely on formal contractual evaluative schemes. Instead, the WPA should devise appropriate ways to support effective writing faculty when they face contractually designated committees deciding on promotions, tenure, sabbaticals, and merit raises.

A WPA should also resist contractual recognition of writing faculty as a separate department. In the first place, it is difficult to specify contractually a fair equivalent of a full load of writing courses. Further, writing faculty usually have a teaching specialty other than teaching writing, so they should continue this specialty through identification with the appropriate department. Likewise, if writing teachers remain within an established department, humanities teachers whose departments have been threatened by declining enrollments and who therefore may be facing retrenchment may be retrained as writing faculty and may be able to maintain their tenure through part-time occupation as writing faculty. Many contracts provide for such retraining and retention of tenured faculty. Another way the WPA can work through the existing departmental structure is to encourage writing-emphasis components in established courses. As incentive, the WPA can assist in making effective assignments in such courses, can coordinate writing center assistance for students in these established courses, and can provide readers for help in evaluating assignments. In short, departmentalization would tend to isolate the writing faculty. But the WPA who makes effective use of the existing and contractually sanctioned organizational structure and who works through the established curriculum can expand his or her influence without becoming mired in traditional departmental and curricular rivalry.

At the same time that unionization can help WPAs, however, it can also create new problems. No doubt about it, unionization—in combination with such factors as austere budgets and declining enrollments—can breed an entrenched faculty. Yet the WPA in many, if not most, institutions must also deal effectively with adjunct and part-time faculty and with personnel who run academic support services such as writing centers. To remain in the good graces of these hard-working people, the WPA must become their champion. This role will inevitably create tension between the WPA and established faculty. The active WPA must face up to this tension, arguing, for example, in favor of indefinitely continuing one-year “temporary” appointments for adjunct faculty who have proven willing and effective. So also should the WPA seek to bring support and adjunct faculty their fair share of travel funds (if any exist!) and of such fringe benefits as hospitalization insurance and retirement contributions.

Likewise, if conditions of entrenchment require that WPAs employ senior faculty in writing programs, the WPA must exercise firm, and likely unwelcome, leadership in seeking quality instruction from such faculty. This leadership must take into account Richard Marius's “pessimistic view” of the potential of such

faculty (WPA, Winter, 1980). In this role, the WPA is likely to be perceived as a meddling administrator. Nonetheless, this situation offers an opportunity for such strange bedfellows as senior faculty, youthful apprentices, and outsider adjuncts to work together in a common and worthwhile endeavor. Their cooperation helps establish peaceful working conditions and helps revitalize the faculty working under those conditions.

In short, the WPA in a unionized institution, it seems to me, must know the union, lead from within the union, and at times challenge the union to respond to the special needs of an effective writing program. Of course, no contract, however specially designed, can serve fully all of the concerns and interests of the WPA. Nor should it. It is up to the effective WPA to use the contract carefully and flexibly to serve the cause of increasing literacy across the campus and throughout the curriculum.

# Bibliography of Writing Textbooks

*Joseph Trimmer*

The following annotated bibliography is addressed to WPAs and writing teachers charged with the responsibility of surveying, evaluating, and selecting textbooks for writing courses. The bibliography lists only texts that are new or revised this year—i.e., books with a 1981 or 1982 copyright. The books are classified by audience, or course, and then by type (see classification outline below). Publishers of the texts have chosen the categories within which each text is listed and have provided the information used in the notes. The notes have been edited to present information in a uniformly factual, nonevaluative way. Prices and projected dates of publication are tentative. A directory of participating publishers appears at the end of the bibliography.

The editors envision publishing this bibliography as an annual scholarly service to the profession. But continuing the service will depend on the response of the WPA membership. Please let us know if you think it's worth repeating.

## Classification Outline

### **I. Developmental Writing Texts**

- A. Handbooks
- B. Rhetorics
- C. Readers
- D. Workbooks

### **II. Freshman Composition Texts**

- A. Handbooks
- B. Rhetorics
- C. Readers
- D. Workbooks
- E. Special Texts

### **III. Advanced Writing Texts**

- A. Composition and Literature Texts
- B. Special Texts

## I. Developmental Writing Texts

### A. Handbooks

*The Basic Writing Book* by Joyce Stith (Little, Brown and Company; 368 pages; \$10.95; February, 1982). A brief grammar handbook that begins with a section on paragraph and essay writing, thus emphasizing the connections between grammar and the writing process.

*College Reading and Study Skills: A Guide to Academic Communication Skills*, Second Edition, by Nancy V. Wood (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 288 pages; \$9.95; October, 1981). A guide to basic communication and study skills—particularly reading and writing but also listening and speaking—essential to success in college.

*Copy/Write: Basic Writing Through Controlled Composition* by Donna Gorrell (Little, Brown and Company; 208 pages; \$7.95; February, 1982). A guide to correct writing using 33 model essays for assignments in controlled composition. *Copy* assignments cover grammar by asking students to copy essays while manipulating and transforming words or sentences according to instructions. *Write* assignments cover rhetoric by using the same essays as models for original student writing. Includes traditional grammar exercises.

*Successful Writing at Work* by Philip C. Kolin (D.C. Heath and Company; 352 pages; \$11.95; January, 1982). A text for students considering careers in such fields as service-oriented science, health care, and business. There are step-by-step guidelines for writing letters, memos, questionnaires, instructions, and reports.

*To Be Exact: A Handbook for Revision* by John W. Presley (Prentice-Hall; 320 pages; \$10.95; March, 1982). A basic grammar book of instruction, practice, and reference that emphasizes identifying and solving errors. Starts with paragraphs and moves to sentences. Includes fill-in type exercises and a reference unit.

### B. Rhetorics

*Clear Thinking, Clear Writing: Paragraphs Under Control* by Beverly Spears Blackmon and James W. Dewsnap (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 256 pages; February, 1982). Focuses on the processes of thinking and writing essential to any level of discourse. Deals first with the paragraph and moves to the short essay. Uses student writing as examples.

*Commanding Essays*, Second Edition, by Helen Mills (Scott, Foresman; 352 pages; \$10.95; February, 1982). A step-by-step guide to writing based on the mastery approach. Sequential units, beginning with general and specific ideas, lead students logically through the organization and development of expository and argumentative essays to special applications such as essay exams, report writing, and the research paper.

*Composition Five: Basic Skills for Writing* by Lillian Small Anthony and J. Kenneth Sieben (Scott, Foresman; 384 pages; \$8.95; February, 1982). A low-level developmental text that integrates basic reading and writing skills. Uses popular magazine articles as examples.

*Improving Writing: A Positive Approach* by Alan Casty (Prentice-Hall; 352 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). A step-by-step approach to improving writing, from paragraph to essay. Emphasizes modifiers and parallel construction; and uses brief essays as models to follow.

*A Plan for Writing*, Second Edition, by John C. Brereton (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 264 pages; \$11.95; October, 1981). A developmental rhetoric with a handbook and workbook on usage and grammar.

*Sentences, Paragraphs, and Essays: An Integrated Approach*, Second Edition, by Kathleen A. Hart and Alice C. Heim (Little, Brown and Company; 448 pages; \$10.95; February, 1982). A guide to sentence combining, sentence structure, grammar and usage, and essay writing. New edition features expanded treatment of the "writing process" and of sentence combining.

*Sequence: A Basic Writing Course* by Rory D. Stephens (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 288 pages; \$11.95; November, 1981). A low-level grammar and rhetoric workbook that divides the process of essay writing into a series of manageable sub-skills from choosing a subject to revising.

*TRRPWR: Think, Read, React, Plan, Write, Rewrite*, Third Edition, by W. Royce Adams (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 368 pages; \$11.95; October, 1981). A basic composition text-workbook with readings and a rhetorical emphasis. Begins with the thinking process and ends with revision.

*Thinking in Sentences: A Guide to Clear Writing* by Nancy Cavender and Leonard Weiss (Houghton Mifflin; 224 pages; \$8.95; spiral binding; December, 1981; Instructor's Manual). A developmental approach to problems of sentence structure based on cognitive principles rather than grammatical precepts. Skills include perceiving, categorizing perceptions, seeing logical sentence relationships, gathering evidence, and drawing conclusions.

*The Writing Experience*, Second Edition, by Carol Schoen, Elaine Avidon, Nila Gandhi, and James Vaughn (Little, Brown and Company; 272 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). Combines writing, language usage, reading, and classroom exercises to involve students actively in the writing process.

*Writing Reason* by Ann R. Mermal (Macmillan; 160 pages; \$8.95; January, 1982). A focus on the basic elements of composition, especially paragraphs, that lead to the short theme. Section objectives, self tests, numerous examples and assignments. Brief handbook of common errors.

### C. Readers

*Discovering College Reading, Thinking and Study Skills: A Piagetian Approach* by Elaine Landeau Cohen and Mary A. Poppino (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 320 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). Uses an inductive method based on Piagetian theory.

*Essential Reading Skills* by John W. Presley and William M. Dodd (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 368 pages; \$9.95; October, 1981). A reading skills book of 100 reading passages, ranging from ninth-to-twelfth-grade reading levels, accompanied by comprehension questions. Emphasizes five basic reading skills.

*In Context: Reading Skills for Intermediate Students of English as a Second Language* by Jean Zukowski-Faust, Susan S. Johnston, Clark S. Atkinson, and Elizabeth E. Templin (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 320 pages; \$10.95; November, 1981). A skills-based reading text for low-intermediate students, primarily college-bound ESL students.

*Insights and Ideas: A Beginning Reader for Students of English as a Second Language* by Patricia Ackert (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 208 pages; \$10.95; November, 1981). A high beginning-level ESL reader that emphasizes the reading skills of main ideas and inference. For a one-semester ESL reading class or eight-week intensive course.

#### D. Workbooks

*A Basis for Composition* by Barbara Carson (Charles E. Merrill; 320 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). Connects and integrates grammar and composition. Contains variety of exercises designed for learning, not testing, and does not restrict students to paragraph writing.

*Connecting and Combining in Sentences and Paragraphs* by Helen Mills (Scott, Foresman; 256 pages; \$8.95; February, 1982). Unit-mastery approach to how language works, and how to develop syntactically mature sentences; provides the foundation for organizing paragraphs and essays logically, and prepares students for college-level work.

*English as a Second Language Composition Workbook* by Jann Huizenga, Courtenay Snellings, and Gladys Francis (Scott, Foresman; 288 pages; \$8.95; February, 1982). Step-by-step introduction to the conventions of expository writing for the low-intermediate ESL student.

*English Fundamentals, Form C*, Seventh Edition, by Donald W. Emery, John M. Kierzek, and Peter Lindblom (Macmillan; 320 pages; \$8.95; January, 1982). A text-workbook with a comprehensive step-by-step survey of basic grammar, sentence structure, paragraph forms, writing essay tests, and writing whole essays. Many exercises on tear-out sheets.

*Foundation: Building Sentence Skills* by Thomas Neuburger (Houghton Mifflin; 384 pages; \$9.95; softcover; January, 1982; Instructor's Manual). A workbook designed to correct the most common student errors in sentence structure, punctuation, and work usage. A "teacher's support package" contains tests, alternate exercises, and classroom management strategies.

*Grammar and Punctuation Workbook* by T. Norwood Selby (Little, Brown and Company; 400 pages; \$8.95; January, 1982). A traditional, basic grammar and punctuation workbook, organized with grammar covered first, then mechanics and punctuation. Many exercises.

*The Least You Should Know About English, Form A*, Second Edition, by Teresa Ferster Glazier (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 304 pages; \$11.95; October, 1981). Presents only the indisputable essentials of grammar needed to solve basic writing problems.

*On Paper*, Third Edition, by H. Wendell Smith (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 320 pages; February, 1982). Covers the basics of grammar and usage within the context of the writing process. The new edition covers only topics essential to developing a basic fluency in writing.

*The Paragraph Book* by C. Jeriel Howard and Richard Tracz (Winthrop; 128 pages; \$8.95; December, 1981). A text-workbook that guides students from the paragraph to the essay. Provides examples and exercises that form unified patterns of discourse. Includes models from student and professional writers.

*Punctuation and Mechanics* by Mary Lewick-Wallace (McGraw-Hill; 288 pages; \$9.95; October, 1981). A programmed workbook covering punctuation and mechanics. Very low reading level designed especially for use in lab settings.

*Reviewing Basic Grammar* by Robert E. Yarber (Scott, Foresman; 288 pages; \$8.95; February, 1982). A grammar text-workbook using few technical terms. Focuses on the most common errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling. Sentence-combining exercises are built around topical subjects.

*Sentence Making: A Writing Workbook in English as a Second Language* by Robert G. Bander (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 312 pages; \$10.95; October, 1981). A text-workbook providing practice in all the patterns, forms, and types of English sentences.

*Success With Words: Mastering Spelling* by Howard Kingsley and Eleanor Heffner (Charles E. Merrill; 160 pages; \$7.95; 8 cassettes; \$95; March, 1982). Audiotutorial program using "whole word" study approach and test-study-test method. Completely self-instructional and self-paced.

*Success With Words: Mastering Vocabulary and Dictionary and Thesaurus Skills* by Howard Kingsley and Eleanor Heffner (Charles E. Merrill; 288 pages; \$8.95; 8 cassettes; \$95; March, 1982). Workbook with optional enrichment cassettes using a "words in context" approach. Uses skill-specific instruction and is completely self-instructional and self-paced.

*Troubleshooting: Basic Writing Skills*, Second Edition, by William Herman and Jeffrey M. Young (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 320 pages; \$11.95; October, 1981). A workbook for remedial composition covering the basics of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

*Vocabulary Expansion I* and *Vocabulary Expansion II* by Dorothy Rubin (Macmillan; 419 pages and 288 pages; \$8.95 and \$7.95; January, 1982). Volume I focuses on Latin roots, combining forms approach to vocabulary building. Volume II emphasizes other techniques such as context clues. Both volumes include games, puzzles, and exercises.

*Workbook 2000* by John A. Higgins (Harper and Row; 300 pages; \$11.50; March, 1982). This workbook for developmental-remedial writing includes more than 2000 practice items. Simple explanations of usage assume no prior knowledge of grammar and use few technical terms.

*The Writer's Studio: Exercises for Grammar, Proofreading and Composition*, Second Edition, by Betty Rizzo (Harper and Row; 432 pages; \$11.50; December,

1981). Remedial English workbook with tear-out format. Gives instruction in basic grammar, proofreading, and composition skills. Includes excerpts by minority and "third world" writers. Answers to all exercises included.

*Writing Skills for Technical Students* by Delaware Technical Community College (Prentice-Hall; 320 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). A modularized format with reproducible tests for each module. Has a diagnostic test to start; and uses sample paragraphs from actual business situations.

## II. Freshman Composition Texts

### A. Handbooks

*Guide to Rapid Revision*, Third Edition, by Daniel D. Pearlman and Paula R. Pearlman (Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing; 104 pages; \$3.50; September, 1981). The basics of style, usage, grammar, and mechanics arranged alphabetically by the correction symbols commonly used by instructors. Concise instructions for correction and supporting examples follow each correction symbol.

*Harbrace College Handbook*, Ninth Edition, by John C. Hodges and Mary E. Whitten (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 544 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). Concisely illustrates grammatical rules and principles of effective prose and provides many exercises. Easy to use in class or for reference. Expanded treatment of paragraphs, rhetorical modes, invention, and research paper.

*Index to English*, Seventh Edition, by Wilma R. Ebbitt and David R. Ebbitt (Scott, Foresman; 320 pages; \$7.95; November, 1981). Alphabetically organized handbook covers the fine points of grammar, word choice, mechanics, rhetoric, and style.

*The Little Rhetoric and Handbook*, Second Edition, by Edward P.J. Corbett (John Wiley & Sons; 550 pages; \$12.95; January, 1982). A concise rhetoric-handbook that deals with the process of writing (in the rhetoric), matters of grammar, style, paragraphing, punctuation, and mechanics (in the handbook). Treats thoroughly the fundamentals of the composing process.

*The Macmillan Handbook of English*, Seventh Edition, by Robert F. Willson, John M. Kierzek, and W. Walker Gibson (Macmillan; 512 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). Combination rhetoric-handbook with discussion of history of the language, modern usage, writing about literature and films, résumés and sentence combining. Workbook and instructor's manual.

*The Portable English Handbook: An Index to Grammar, Usage, and the Research Paper*, Second Edition, by William Herman (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 456 pages; \$6.95; October, 1981). An elementary handbook with exercises, covering all skills essential for beginning writers, alphabetically arranged and written in an informal style.

*Practical English Handbook*, Sixth Edition, by Floyd C. Watkins and William B. Dilligham (Houghton Mifflin; 384 pages; \$8.50; softcover; December, 1981). Concise yet thorough explanation of the best practices in writing American

English. Accompanied by an instructor's annotated edition, diagnostic test, and correction chart.

*A Practical Guide for Writers*, Second Edition, by Diana Hacker and Betty Renshaw (Winthrop; 448 pages; \$10.95; November, 1981). A rhetoric handbook emphasizing writing as a process. Covers description, narrative, and exposition. Includes student examples. Discusses choosing appropriate language, choosing a voice, and using nonsexist language. Instructor's manual available.

*Prentice-Hall Handbook for Writers*, Eighth Edition, by Glenn Leggett, David Mead, Richard Beal (Prentice-Hall; 544 pages; \$10.95; January, 1982). Handbook with new organization of punctuation; revised logic chapter; new use of a whole paper as example; new exercises on business writing. Supplemented by a kit for teachers including the diagnostic test by Ron Newman.

*New English Handbook* by Hans P. Guth (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 498 pages; January, 1982). Offers a full and carefully explained treatment of fundamentals; "Back to Basics" exercises in many areas; a logical teaching sequence; and useful charts and checklists.

### B. Rhetorics

*The Able Writer: A Rhetoric and Handbook* by John Broderick (Harper and Row; 384 pages; \$11.50; November, 1981). This text emphasizes edited English as distinguished from spoken English or informal writing. Complete coverage of prewriting, outlines, and grammatical terminology. Approach is grounded in sociolinguistic methodology.

*The Active Writer* by Michael J. Frisbie, Douglas Checkering, Susan B. Frisbie, Arthur Hall, Joe Keroes, Melanie Spelling and Patricia Ann Telefson (Macmillan; 448 pages; \$10.95; January, 1982). Pragmatic presentation of writing skills; analytical discussions of paragraph, essay, sentence, word. Many exercises and student examples, two chapters on sentence combining, one on writing term papers.

*Assignments in Exposition*, Seventh Edition, by Louise E. Rorabacher and Georgia Dunbar (Harper and Row; 400 pages; \$8.50; December, 1981). Emphasizes logical thinking as the basis for effective writing, discusses the rhetorical devices and methods most useful in the chief types of expository prose. Methods are illustrated with many short readings by contemporary authors.

*From Cases to Composition* by Linda Woodson (Scott, Foresman; 384 pages; \$8.95; November, 1981). A composition text that uses specific situations ("cases") in a rhetorical context as writing assignments. Standard rhetorical organization.

*A Contemporary Rhetoric*, Third Edition, by Maxine Hairston (Houghton Mifflin; 512 pages; \$13.50; hardcover; December, 1981; Instructor's Manual). A comprehensive text designed to help students become critical readers and clear thinkers as well as competent writers. Emphasizes such rhetorical concerns as audience, purpose, and voice.

*Design: Rhetoric and Anthology for College English*, Third Edition, by Fletcher Flynn and Thomas McGuire (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 512 pages; October, 1981). Offers students tools to write essays (Book I, the Rhetoric) and to read and study essays written by other students and by professional writers (Book II, the Anthology). The new edition offers students more basic instruction in the writing process, including such topics as invention, audience, organization, and revision.

*Make Your Writing Count: From Free Writing to Structured Composition*, Second Edition, by Regina M. Hoover (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 272 pages; \$11.95; October, 1981). A class-tested, low-level rhetoric that employs the Macrorie approach to composition. Students are taught to feel comfortable with their own writing ideas by moving from personal journal writing into more formal, structured modes of college composition.

*The Practical Stylist With Readings* by Sheridan Baker (Harper and Row; 416 pages; \$10.95; December, 1981). This alternate version of *The Practical Stylist*, Fifth Edition, provides 50 readings by classic and contemporary authors. Covers a wide range of subjects and styles.

*Real Writing: Argumentation, Reflection, Information* by Walter H. Beale (Scott, Foresman; 352 pages; \$7.95; December, 1981). The rhetoric portion of the following item.

*Real Writing: Argumentation, Reflection, Information with Stylistic Options: The Sentence and the Paragraph* by Walter H. Beale, Karen Meyers, and Laurie L. White (Scott, Foresman; 576 pages; \$13.95; December, 1981). First part provides a course in argumentation. Reflective and informative writing also treated. Emphasis on invention, purpose, and strategies. Second part focuses on structure and style in the sentence and paragraph; many exercises.

*Seven Steps to Better Writing* by Lea Lane (St. Martin's Press; 250 pages; \$7.95; January, 1982). Brief rhetoric provides a step-by-step guide to the process of writing nonfiction prose. Emphasizes concepts and techniques useful in college writing and in real-world situations.

*Situational Writing* by Gene Krupa (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 192 pages; February, 1982). Emphasizes the purpose of writing and the need to communicate effectively to different audiences. Uses student writing to show how writers adapt rhetorically to a variety of situations. Forty-two writing situations provided as starting points.

*Short English Handbook*, Second Edition, by David E. Fear and Gerald J. Schiffhorst (Scott, Foresman; 336 pages; \$6.95; November, 1981). Concise, complete coverage of basic writing problems with advice on how to solve them. New edition features revised research paper chapter, a new section on sentence combining, more exercises, and updated examples.

*Steps in Composition*, Third Edition, by Lynn Quitman Troyka and Jerrold Nudelman (Prentice-Hall; 500 pages; \$10.95; January, 1982). An integrated essay anthology that has grammar, rhetoric, vocabulary, and spelling drills in each

chapter. It has new material on verbs and seven new essays. Chart on use in writing labs at the end of the book.

*Writer's Guide*, Seventh Edition, by Wilma R. Ebbitt and David R. Ebbitt (Scott, Foresman; 416 pages; \$9.95; November, 1981). The rhetoric and composition portion of the following item. General index included.

*Writer's Guide and Index to English*, Seventh Edition, by Wilma R. Ebbitt and David R. Ebbitt (Scott, Foresman; 702 pages; \$12.95; November, 1981). Traditional, thorough coverage of rhetoric and style in a practical edition. Index covers fine points of grammar, syntax, mechanics, and usage. New illustrative material throughout.

*The Writer's Options: Combining to Composing*, Second Edition, by Donald A. Daiker, Andrew Kerek, and Max Morenberg (Harper and Row; 320 pages; \$10.95; December, 1981). Building on what students, as speakers of the language, already know about English, this text applies the principles of sentence combining to the total writing process.

*Writing for Career-Education Students*, Second Edition, by Andrew W. Hart and James A. Reinking (St. Martin's Press; 400 pages; \$10.95; January, 1982). Basic composition text designed for students enrolled in vocational-technical programs. Focuses on the kinds of writing students will actually do in their classes and on the job.

*The Writing Process: Discovery and Control* by A.D. Van Nostrand, Cyril Knoblauch, and Joan Pettigrew (Houghton Mifflin; 224 pages; \$10.95; softcover; January, 1982; Instructor's Manual). A brief, process rhetoric that stresses how to get started writing and how to keep going. Stresses audience analysis, peer review, and revision.

*Writing Well*, Fourth Edition, by Donald Hall (Little, Brown and Company; 432 pages; \$11.95; January, 1982). Emphasizes clear writing style, building on the fundamentals of composition—words, sentences, paragraphs, the whole paper. Illustrative examples from leading contemporary authors, practical exercises, and reference apparatus.

### C. Readers

*The Bedford Reader* by X.J. Kennedy and Dorothy M. Kennedy (St. Martin's Press/Bedford Books; 500 pages; \$8.95; February, 1982). Rhetorically organized collection of 56 essays, eight of them written specially for this text and accompanied by a postscript about how the essays were written. Includes pedagogical apparatus.

*A Collegiate Reader: Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum* by Laurence Behrens and Leonard Rosen (Little, Brown and Company; 576 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). A thematically organized, 11-unit interdisciplinary composition reader. Each unit focuses on a topic treated in an actual college course, and provides several selections, with review questions, discussion questions, and writing suggestions. Apparatus stresses writing syntheses, summaries, and critiques.

*Common Ground: A Thematic Reader* by Jane Epstein and Laury Magnus (Scott, Foresman; 480 pages; \$8.95; December, 1981). Sixty essays organized around themes of common human experience. Includes an introductory section on how to read and write an essay, four annotated essays showing rhetorical and stylistic devices, and questions for writing and discussion.

*Discovering Ideas: An Anthology for Writers* by Jean Wyrick (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 456 pages; \$11.95; January, 1982). A thematically organized reader that includes an alternate rhetorical table of contents. Mostly essays, with some literature.

*Language Awareness*, Third Edition, by Paul Eschholz, Alfred Rosa, and Virginia Clark (St. Martin's Press; 300 pages; \$8.95; January, 1982). A non-technical reader on language for freshman composition. Forty selections organized in 10 sections emphasizing issues of language usage and language's role in society and culture. Includes pedagogical apparatus.

*Language Power* by Carol Boltz and Dorothy Seyler (Random House; 320 pages; \$8.95; November, 1981). A collection of 34 readings about language designed to help students understand and use language with more control. Exercises and writing assignments accompany the readings.

*Literary Reflections*, Fourth Edition, by William R. Elkins, Jack Kendall, and John R. Willingham (McGraw-Hill; 544 pages; \$11.95; October 1981). Thematic reader containing essays, short fiction, poetry, and drama. Apparatus consists of introductions, summaries of main ideas, discussion questions, topics for composition, and topics for longer composition.

*The McGraw-Hill Reader* by Gilbert H. Muller (McGraw-Hill; 750 pages; \$9.95; October, 1981). A reader for composition courses consisting of 120 essays organized around major areas in the liberal arts curriculum. Includes both contemporary and classical selections. Each essay is followed by 10 questions focusing on content, language use, writing topics, etc.

*Models for Writers: Short Essays for Composition* by Paul Eschholz and Alfred Rosa (St. Martin's Press; 300 pages; \$7.95; January, 1982). Sixty-two prose selections, averaging under 100 words each and designed to be good reading for contemporary students. Eighteen important rhetorical topics and modes. Includes pedagogical aids.

*Patterns of Exposition 8* by Randall E. Decker (Little, Brown and Company; 430 pages; \$8.95; January, 1982). Forty-six selections divided into 10 sections, each illustrating a particular rhetorical technique. Provides general introduction, section introductions, two headnotes for each selection, content, form, and vocabulary questions, and writing assignments.

*Plain English Rhetoric and Reader*, Third Edition, by Gregory Cowan and Elizabeth McPherson (Random House; 448 pages; \$10.95; November, 1981). A step-by-step rhetoric with readings for inexperienced or insecure writers. Over 50% of the readings and student papers in this edition are new.

*Purpose and Pattern: A Rhetoric Reader* by Elizabeth Penfield (Scott, Foresman;

448 pages; \$8.95; December, 1981). Modern and classic selections provide students with a variety of patterns of development in writing. Selections organized according to Kinneavy's four modes of discourse. Questions for discussion and writing topics.

*The Reader and the Writer: Essays for College Writing* by Robert E. Yarber, Conn P. McAuliffe, and Martha McAuliffe (Scott, Foresman; 288 pages; \$8.95; February, 1982). Forty-six essays of varying length and difficulty. Twelve chapters cover specific rhetorical principles and offer writing tips, followed by illustrative selections. Includes questions for discussion and writing.

*The Reading Commitment* by Michael E. Adelstein and Jean G. Pival (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 512 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). Seventy-seven essays with extensive apparatus designed to improve both reading and writing skills. Organized according to traditional forms of discourse, moving from personal, descriptive, and expository writing to argumentative and persuasive writing.

*Shaping Prose* by Sheena Gillespie, Linda Stanley, and Robert Singleton (Winthrop; 400 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). Fifty-eight essays organized by the four traditional types of writing. Stresses writing as a process and includes questions and suggestions. Contains thematic and rhetorical tables of contents. Instructor's manual available.

*The Short Prose Reader*, Second Edition, by Gilbert H. Muller and Harvey S. Wiener (McGraw-Hill; 384 pages; \$9.95; October, 1981). Forty-two essays averaging two and one half pages in length and arranged by rhetorical mode. Apparatus for each essay includes author biographies, words to watch, building vocabulary, understanding the writer's ideas, exploring the writer's ideas, ideas for writing, and more writing projects.

*Speaking of Words: A Language Reader*, Second Edition, by James MacKillop and Donna Woolfolk Cross (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 324 pages; \$11.95; January, 1982). A language reader that features articles from popular contemporary sources on a variety of practical linguistic situations.

*Studies in Fiction*, Enlarged Third Edition, by Blaze O. Bonazza, Emil Roy, and Sandra Roy (Harper and Row; 864 pages; \$9.50; December, 1981). A short-story reader that includes 101 selections from American, English, and continental writers. The introduction addresses issues such as plot, characterization, language, and theme. Each story is followed by discussion and writing questions.

*A Writer's Reader*, Third Edition, by Donald Hail and D.L. Emblen (Little, Brown and Company; 544 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). Alphabetically arranged freshman composition anthology offering 81 selections; 51 of them are expository essays and the rest are a variety of other prose forms—stories, poems, letters, and journal entries. Headnote, study questions, and writing assignments accompany each selection. Contains both a rhetorical and a thematic index.

*Writing in College—And After* by Suzanne S. Webb (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 288 pages; \$8.95; January, 1982). Forty essays, half belletristic and half drawn from the world of work. Extensive apparatus helps students identify the similarities and differences in the two kinds of writing.

*Writing With a Thesis: A Rhetoric and Reader*, Third Edition, by David Skwire (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 288 pages; \$11.95; December, 1981). A revision that continues to emphasize the development and support of a thesis.

#### D. Workbooks

*Grammar and Composition Skills: Generating Sentences and Paragraphs*, Third Edition, by Hulton Willis, James L. Pence, and Roseann Duenas Gonzalez (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 352 pages; \$11.95; October, 1981). Teaches the basics of English grammar, conventional usage, paragraph development, and the art of composing sentences.

*Harbrace College Workbook, Form 9A* by Sheila Y. Graham (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 352 pages; \$7.95; December, 1981). A self-contained workbook following the basic organization and numbering system of the *Harbrace College Handbook*. Exercises are written on the theme of sports. Suitable either as a supplement or an independent text.

*Harbrace College Workbook, Form 9C* by Sheila Y. Graham (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 352 pages; \$7.95; December, 1981). Similar to Form 9A in organization and function; differs in degree of emphasis on grammar. Exercises are written on the theme of the world of work.

*The Portable English Workbook* by William Herman (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 320 pages; \$5.95; January, 1982). A traditional workbook that provides practice in the fundamentals of college writing from basic grammar to the complete composition.

*Practical English Workbook*, Second Edition, by Floyd C. Watkins, William B. Dillingham, and John T. Hiers (Houghton Mifflin; 272 pages; \$7.50; softcover; January, 1982; Instructor's Manual). Exercises with some grammar review designed to be used independently or as a supplement to *Practical English Handbook* or other handbooks.

*Prentice-Hall Workbook for Writers*, Third Edition, by Donald C. Rigg and Melinda G. Kramer (Prentice-Hall; 320 pages; \$8.50; February, 1982). Brief text with many exercises to improve grammar skills. Follows the structure of the *P-H Handbook for Writers*, Eighth Edition, and supplements the Diagnostic Test for Writers by Ron Newman. Can be used alone.

*Short English Workbook*, Second Edition, by Gerald J. Schiffhorst and David E. Fear (Scott, Foresman; 256 pages; \$5.95; December, 1981). Designed for use independently or as supplement to any reference handbook. Provides drill in a practical format, giving special attention to student writers' most common problems. Expanded exercises and new sentence-combining section.

*Stylistic Options: The Sentence and the Paragraph* by Walter Beale, Karen Meyers, and Laurie L. White (Scott, Foresman; 320 pages; \$7.95; December, 1981). Exercises focus on structure and style in the sentence and paragraph; sentence and paragraph combining; sentence and paragraph generation and imitation; and organization and transition. Can supplement any rhetoric.

*Clear Thinking for Composition*, Fourth Edition, by Ray Kytte (Random House, 192 pages; \$5.95; November, 1981). A new edition that stresses how to think clearly in order to write clearly. Discusses reasoning skills and how to use them for logical and persuasive writing.

#### II. Freshman Composition Texts

##### E. Special Texts

*Free Writing and Pre-Writing: Case Exercises for the Writer* by Richard C. Veit (Prentice-Hall; 128 pages; \$4.95; March, 1982). Writing activities book, organized by rhetorical modes that begins with free-writing and leads to longer assignments in case form.

*The Little, Brown Guide to Writing Research Papers* by Michael Meyer (Little, Brown and Company; 240 pages; \$4.95; February, 1982). Comprehensive guide to writing a research paper. Provides step-by-step instructions on selecting a topic, gathering and ordering information, and writing the paper. Deals with content and style as well as mechanics. Offers annotated reference sources, sample notes, bibliographical entries, annotated student paper, walking tour of a typical library. May also be used for upper-division students.

*The Research Paper: Process, Form, and Content*, Fourth Edition, by Audrey J. Roth (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 224 pages; December, 1981). Guide to both the process of writing research papers and correct structure and format. Revised format and a new nonliterary sample research paper.

*A Rhetoric of Argument* by Jeanne Fahnestock and Marie Secor (Random House; 416 pages; \$10.95; December, 1981). A composition text about constructing written arguments and shaping them for a particular audience. Each chapter contains illustrative readings.

*Style in Technical Prose: A Text/Workbook* by Ronald K. Messer (Scott, Foresman; 256 pages; \$7.95; January, 1982). A reference-workbook for technical writing. Focuses on aspects of technical prose with exercises and examples. Useful independently or as a supplement.

*Writing and Logic* by Gerald Levin (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 256 pages; \$7.95; February, 1982). Integrates the study of writing and logic, introducing elementary topics in inductive and deductive reasoning and the most important informal fallacies.

*Writing Essays About Literature: A Guide and Style Sheet* by Kelley Griffith, Jr. (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 192 pages; \$6.95; January, 1982). Guide to the process of writing an essay about literature, including finding a topic, critical approaches, organization, style, format, and documentation. Many annotated sample essays.

*Writing From Sources* by Brenda Spatt (St. Martin's Press; 350 pages; \$8.95; March, 1982). A guide that stresses how to read for information; how to quote, paraphrase, and summarize; how to work with different, even contradictory, sources; and how to write papers based on wide reading.

*Writing Research Papers: A Guide to the Process* by Stephen Weidenborner and Domenick Caruso (St. Martin's Press; 250 pages; \$4.50; January, 1982). Guide to planning and doing library research, organizing and writing research papers, and documenting sources. Exercises test student's understanding of the process.

### III. Advanced Writing Texts

#### A. Composition and Literature Texts

*American Short Stories*, Fourth Edition, edited by Eugene Current-Garcia and Walton R. Patrick (Scott, Foresman; 736 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). Updated collection of representative works that shows the growth and development of the short story in America, with selections by highly regarded American authors. Includes introductions and biographical-critical sketches.

*Exploring Literature* by Bernard Drabeck, Helen Ellis, and Hartley Pfeil (Houghton Mifflin; 976 pages; \$11.95; softcover; December, 1981). A collection of stories, poems, and plays organized by literary element (character, conflict, setting, and language). Integrates the analysis of literature with writing about it. Instructor's manual.

*Fiction 100*, Third Edition, by James H. Pickering (Macmillan; 1,088 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). Comprehensive anthology of short fiction; includes more than one story by certain authors. Glossary of literary terms; short authors' biographies; and instructor's manual.

*An Introduction to Poetry*, Fifth Edition, by X.J. Kennedy (Little, Brown and Company; 512 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). A text-anthology containing 422 poems, ranging from traditional to contemporary. Follows a traditional approach in discussing the forms of poetry. Deals with both writing a paper about a poem and writing a poem. Offers discussions of poems and questions to stimulate student interest and an anthology of criticism.

*Literature* by James H. Pickering and Jeffrey D. Hoepfer (Macmillan; 1,024 pages; \$16.95; January, 1982). A text-anthology of fiction, poetry, and drama with introductions to each genre. Instructor's manual.

*Literature: The Human Experience*, Third Edition, by Richard Abcarian and Marvin Klotz (St. Martin's Press; 1,300 pages; \$11.95; January, 1982). Introduction to fiction, poetry, and drama arranged in five thematic sections. Alternate table of contents lists works by genre. Appendices on formal aspects of literature, alternative critical approaches, and writing about literature.

*Narrative Techniques* by Janet Burroway (Little, Brown and Company; 448 pages; \$12.95; February, 1982). A guide to beginning fiction writing. Each chapter discusses an element of narrative, provides illustrations and examples, includes two stories for discussion, and concludes with a series of assignments for improving narrative skills.

*Poetry: Sight and Insight* by James W. Kirkland and F. David Sanders (Random House; 448 pages; \$9.95; October, 1981). An anthology of over 400 poems that

treats the elements of poetic technique inductively, i.e., by emphasizing reading the poems themselves with a minimum of technical terms.

*Seven Contemporary Short Novels*, Third Edition, edited by Charles Clerc and Louis H. Leiter (Scott, Foresman; 736 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). Seven American short novels published during the past 30 years. Adds new selections by Malamud, Atwood, LeGuin, and Kosinski. Novels demonstrate basic literary principles and new developments in the short novel as a literary form.

*Story First: The Writer as Insider* by Kit Reed (Prentice-Hall; 150 pages; \$10.95; April, 1982). A fiction writing text with an informal, personal approach. Class-tested. Has a practical section on the writers workshop.

*Three Genres*, Third Edition, by Stephen Minot (Prentice Hall; 350 pages; February, 1982). Introduces students to all three genres of writing, emphasizing the techniques of writing. Covers the film industry and new writers including women and black writers.

*To Read Poetry* by Donald Hall (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 350 pages; \$11.95; November, 1981). An anthology of poetry that helps students read and understand a poem by emphasizing the wholeness of each poem and the process of its creation.

*Writing Poems* by Robert Wallace (Little, Brown and Company; 320 pages; \$9.95; March, 1982). Introductory creative writing poetry text that includes an anthology of poems for further study.

*Writing Themes About Literature*, Brief Edition, by Edgar Roberts (Prentice-Hall; 224 pages; \$6.95; January, 1982). Brief version, revised to suit the abilities of current students. Includes an anthology of sample themes and a new chapter on personal response.

#### B. Special Texts

*The Business Writer's Handbook*, Second Edition, by Charles T. Brusaw, Gerald J. Alred, and Walter E. Oliu. (St. Martin's Press; 600 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). Comprehensive handbook of grammar, style, format, and procedure for students of business writing. Alphabetically arranged; includes topical key to entries, checklist of writing process, and cross-reference index.

*Common Sense in Business Writing* by Richard J. Londo (Macmillan; 416 pages; \$12.95; January, 1981). Practical techniques for effective business writing, covering letters and reports. Instructor's manual.

*Creativity and the Writing Process* by Olivia Bertagnolli and Jeff Rackham (John Wiley & Sons; 250 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). An anthology of essays dealing with the creative writing process. Classic and contemporary essays offer "new writers" a broad range of ideas and insights on how the writing process works.

*English Grammar* by Martha Kolln (Macmillan; 288 pages; \$14.95; January, 1982). Systematic description of the rules of English grammar, drawing from both current and traditional theories. Exercises, discussion questions, and instructor's manual.

*Form and Style: Theses, Reports, Term Papers*, Sixth Edition, by William G. Campbell, Stephen V. Ballou, and Carole Slade (Houghton Mifflin; 224 pages; \$7.95; spiral binding; December, 1981).

*Guide to Managerial Communication* by Mary Munter (Prentice-Hall; 168 pages; \$5.95; January, 1982). A summary of techniques for business and professional communication that explains "how to do it" and "what to check for." Covers both writing and speaking.

*Handbook of Technical Writing*, Second Edition, by Charles T. Brusaw, Gerald J. Alred, and Walter E. Oliu (St. Martin's Press; 600 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). Comprehensive handbook of grammar, style, format, and procedure for students of technical writing. Alphabetically arranged; includes topical key to entries, checklist of the writing process, and cross-reference index.

*How to Write for the World of Work*, Second Edition, by Thomas E. Pearsall and Donald H. Cunningham (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 384 pages; \$12.95; December, 1981). Process-oriented text provides models and instructions for writing correspondence and reports commonly used in the world of work. For courses in professional, occupational, and business writing in departments of English and business.

*Let's Talk Business: Improving Your Communication Skills* by Carl Kell and Paul Corts (Winthrop; 320 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). Focuses on business communications giving equal coverage to writing and speaking. Integrates communication theory, communication skills, and management principles. Instructor's manual.

*Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric and Grammar for ESL Students* by Regina Smalley and Mary R. Hank (Macmillan; 228 pages; \$9.95; January, 1982). For intermediate-level ESL; practice in rhetorical strategies, review of grammar structures and verb tenses; handbook for grammar and mechanics. Instructor's manual.

*Strategies for Technical Writing: A Rhetoric With Readings* by Mary M. Lay (Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 352 pages; \$14.95; December, 1981). An applied rhetoric, with readings from the world of work, that introduces technical, business, and English students to professional writing techniques.

*Technical Writing: Principles and Forms*, Second Edition, by Deborah C. Andrews and Margaret D. Blickle (Macmillan; 480 pages; \$13.95; January, 1982). Application of rhetorical principles to professional writing and speaking. Covers visual presentation, audience analysis, and oral reports and meetings. Instructor's manual.

*Tutoring Writing: A Sourcebook for Writing Labs* by Muriel Harris (Scott, Foresman; 352 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). A collection of essays for writing lab faculty that addresses all the basic concerns of teaching writing in writing labs and learning centers. Mostly original articles written by instructors in writing labs across the country.

*Understanding Movies*, Third Edition, by Louis Giannetti (Prentice-Hall; 512 pages; \$13.95; March, 1982). Comprehensive film-appreciation text revised with new visuals; new chapter on the actor.

*Pocketbook for Professional and Technical Writers* by Earl Bingham (Wadsworth Publishing Company; 300 pages; November, 1981). A brief reference guide for students in technical and professional writing courses. Two-part format. Part I: the technical writing process. Part II: an alphabetically organized handbook including grammar, usage, mechanics, and writing format.

*Working Papers: A Teacher's Observations on Composition* by A.M. Tibbetts (Scott, Foresman; 192 pages; \$9.95; December, 1981). The "working papers" of a long-time teacher of composition and well-known student of language addressed to writing teachers. Essays cover five areas of teaching composition: readability, grammar, stance, organization, and argument.

*Write for Results: How to Write Successful Memos, Letters, Summaries, Abstracts, Proposals, Reports and Articles* by William Andrews and Deborah Andrews (Winthrop; 132 pages; \$6.95; December, 1981). Guide to writing proficiently on the job. Moves from analyzing the problem and audience, through planning, to final writing and editing copy.

*The Writing Laboratory* by Joyce S. Steward and Mary K. Croft (Scott, Foresman; 192 pages; \$9.95; February, 1982). A brief guide for writing lab faculty explaining how to set up and maintain an effective writing lab. Comprehensive bibliography surveys most available lab materials.

*Technical Writing*, Second Edition, by John M. Lannon (Little, Brown and Company; 656 pages; \$12.95; January, 1982). Introductory technical writing text that emphasizes the process of writing: chapters move from purpose and audience to models, and then to assignments. New edition features the use of a second color, an expanded chapter on adapting a report to the audience's needs, expanded coverage of the research report, new chapters on style and on proposal writing.

## Directory of participating publishers

- Bobbs-Merrill  
College Division  
P.O. Box 7080  
4300 W. 62nd Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206  
317-298-5595
- Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.  
College Division  
757 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
212-888-4226
- Harper and Row  
College Division  
10 East 53rd Street  
New York, New York 10022  
212-593-7375
- D.C. Heath  
College Division  
125 Spring Street  
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173  
617-862-6650
- Holt, Rinehart and Winston  
College Division  
383 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
212-872-2553
- Houghton Mifflin  
College Division  
One Beacon Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02107  
617-725-5732
- Little, Brown and Company  
College Division  
34 Beacon Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02106  
617-227-0730
- Macmillan  
College Division  
866 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
212-935-6750
- McGraw-Hill  
College Division  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020  
212-935-6750
- Charles E. Merrill  
College Division  
1300 Alum Creek Drive  
Columbus, Ohio 43216  
614-258-8441
- Prentice Hall  
College Marketing  
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632  
201-592-2227
- Random House  
College Division  
201 East 50th Street  
New York, New York 10022  
212-572-2293
- St. Martin's Press  
College Division  
175 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10010  
212-674-5151
- Bedford Books/St. Martin's  
College Division  
175 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10010  
212-674-5151
- Scott, Foresman and Company  
College Division  
1900 East Lake Avenue  
Glenview, Illinois 60025  
312-729-3000
- Wadsworth Publishing Company  
College Division  
10 Davis Drive  
Blemond, California 94002  
415-595-2350
- John Wiley and Sons, Inc.  
College Division  
605 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10016  
212-850-6000
- Winthrop Publishers, Inc.  
College Division  
17 Dunster Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138  
617-868-1750

## Notes on contributors

**Peggy Broder** teaches at Cleveland State University and is supervisor of the Writing Center there. Her Ph.D. in English is from Case Western Reserve University. She has published articles on Thomas Kinsella in *Eire-Ireland* and in the *Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* as well as articles on writing and teaching in the *Iowa English Bulletin*, the *Writing Lab Newsletter*, and the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*.

**Arthur Eastman** has chaired the English Department at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University since 1977. Before that he chaired the English Department at Carnegie-Mellon University. He is the general editor of the *Norton Reader*, coeditor of the *Norton Anthology of Poetry* and *Masterpieces of the Drama*. His article "How Visitation Came to Carnegie-Mellon University" (*ADE Bulletin*, 1969) has been reprinted in Kenneth Eble's *The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching*. He has served on the NCTE's Commissions on Curriculum and Literature; he is past president of the Association of Departments of English (ADE). At present he is a member of his department's Composition and Research Group.

**James Hanlon** has taught English at Shippensburg State College for 14 years. An ABD in English from the University of Virginia, he first became active in the writing curriculum as a participant in Janet Emig's NDEA Institute in Composition at the University of Chicago in 1968. He participated in the NEH-University of Iowa Institute on Writing in 1979 and has since served as Director of Composition at Shippensburg. During the 1960s, he prepared some 20 reviews of books recommended for secondary English curriculums by American Education Publications. He is currently a candidate for the Ph.D. in English, with a concentration in rhetoric, at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He has read papers on teaching composition at conferences of the Pennsylvania State Colleges and at the Delaware Valley Writing Council.

**Muriel Harris** is associate professor of English and director of the writing lab at Purdue University. Her Ph.D. in English is from Columbia University. A founder and editor of *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, she has served as associate managing editor for the College English Association. Her *Tutoring Writing: A Sourcebook for Writing Labs* will be published this winter by Scott, Foresman. She has contributed to several books in the NCTE *Classroom Practices* series and to the Jossey-Bass *New Directions* series on improving writing skills. Her articles have appeared in *College English*, *CCC*, *English Journal*, and *Journal of Basic Writing*. She is currently investigating the writing needs of technical writers and engineers.

Joseph F. Trimmer is the managing editor of *WPA* and director of the writing program at Ball State University. The author of many studies of American life and literature, he has also published widely on teaching writing. His texts include *American Oblique: Writing About the American Experience* and *The Riverside Reader*.

## In the spring issue

Defining the role of WPAs

Reconciling composition and literary studies

## Announcements

### *Technical writing at MLA*

The Association of Teachers of Technical Writing has organized three panels for the 1981 MLA convention in New York City: Teaching Specialized Technical Writing; Research in Technical Writing: Process and Product; and Humanistic Approaches to Technical Communication. These sessions will be held on December 29 at noon, 1:45 p.m. and 9 p.m. respectively. Please consult the convention program for room assignments.

### *Call for papers*

The 1982 Maryland Composition Conference will be held at the University of Maryland, College Park, on Friday, April 16, 1982. Papers that focus on the following three issues are invited: new developments in evaluating student growth in writing; integration of faculty: part-time instructors, English teachers, and teachers from across the disciplines; and a definition of preprofessional writing. Proposals and papers may be individual presentations of approximately 20 minutes; panel presentations of approximately 90 minutes; workshop sessions of approximately 90 minutes; and debates. The preferred deadline is December 10, 1981. Papers will be accepted until January 8, 1982. Send proposals, papers, or inquiries to: Susan Kleimann, Conference Chairperson, Department of English, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

### *Regional conference at El Centro College*

El Centro College will hold a Regional Conference on Writing Across the Curriculum on March 6, 1982. This conference will be the culminating activity for the N.E.H. grant through which El Centro established its writing-across-the-curriculum program. Speakers will include grant consultant Elaine Maimon of Beaver College, Maxine Hairston of UT, Austin, John Baugh of UT, Austin, Jim Corder of TCU, Martha Hastedt of Austin ISD, Joann Cockleras and Dick Fulkerson of ETSU, and Tom Warren of OSU. For further information, write to Caroline McGown, Communications Division, El Centro College, Main and Lamar, Dallas, TX 75202; 214-746-2348.

### *Reference shelf*

*Visible Language*, a journal published since 1967 by Merald E. Wrolstad, is concerned with "research and ideas that help define the unique role and properties of written language." Its advisory board is multidisciplinary and international. Editorial and subscription correspondence should be addressed to *Visible*

# We've got all bases covered... McGraw-Hill English Texts.

## NEW 1982 TITLES

THE MCGRAW-HILL READER  
Muller

THE SHORT PROSE READER,  
2/e  
Muller-Wiener

LITERARY REFLECTIONS, 4/e  
Elkins-Kendall-  
Willingham

READING AND STUDY SKILLS,  
2/e  
Langan

PUNCTUATION AND  
MECHANICS  
Lewick-Wallace

STUDY SKILLS: FOR ADULTS  
RETURNING TO SCHOOL, 2/e  
Apps

COPING WITH COLLEGE: THE  
EFFICIENT LEARNER  
Kagan



College Division  
McGraw-Hill  
Book Company

## RECENT 1981 TITLES

ENGLISH SKILLS, 2/e  
Langan

A CRASH COURSE IN  
COMPOSITION, 3/e  
McMahan

CREATING COMPOSITIONS, 3/e  
Wiener

SPELLING  
Lewick-Wallace

VOCABULARY BUILDING AND  
WORD STUDY  
Lewick-Wallace

READING AT EFFICIENT  
RATES, 2/e  
Raygor-Schick

1221 Avenue of the Americas/New York, New York 10020

*Language*, Box 1972CMA, Cleveland, OH 44106. A subscription is \$15 a year.

Barbara McDaniel has compiled an index by name, title, and subject for *Teaching Composition: Ten Bibliographical Essays*, edited by Gary Tate and published by Texas Christian University Press. Copies of the index are available at \$4 plus 60¢ for mailing. Order from Verlain Books, P.O. Box 1234, Blaine, WA 98230.

### *WPA at MLA*

At the MLA convention in New York City this December, Elaine Maimon will lead a discussion on "Writing Program Administration: Dealing With an English Department." Panelists will be Peter Conn, University of Pennsylvania; Winifred Horner, University of Missouri/Columbia; and Merrill Whitburn and S. Michael Halloran, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Please consult the convention program for hour and room. WPA's general membership meeting will follow this special session.

### *WPA at CCCC*

At the CCCC convention in San Francisco next March, Elaine Maimon will lead a second discussion of "Writing Program Administration: Dealing with an English Department." At this session, the panelists will be Daniel Fader, University of Michigan; Richard Young, Carnegie-Mellon University; and Peggy Broder, Cleveland State University. Please consult the convention program for hour and room. A general meeting will follow the session.

### *Regional notices*

*WPA* gladly publishes short accounts of regional WPA activities. The journal also publishes announcements of coming events. But since the deadline for announcements is many months in advance of each issue's mailing date, regional associations may find it more convenient to report their activities in *WPA* after they have happened. Please see the front matter of this issue for announcement due dates.

### *Writing In the Humanities*

The National Endowment for the Humanities will sponsor a five-week institute in Writing in the Humanities at Beaver College, June 28 to July 30, 1982. Prospective participants must apply in teams of three: two college or university instructors from the same institution (one in writing, one in another humanistic discipline) and one instructor (in English, social studies, or foreign language) from a secondary institution in the same geographic area as the college or university. For further information and application write to: Professor Elaine P. Maimon, Beaver College, Glenside, PA 19038; 215-884-3500, X320.

## Membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators

Membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators includes a subscription to *WPA*. The membership fee is \$10 a year in the United States and \$11.50 a year in other countries.\*

To apply for membership, please fill out this form and return it with a check or money order payable to the Council of Writing Program Administrators. Send the form and fee to Joseph Comprone, Treasurer, WPA, English Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40208.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Amount enclosed \_\_\_\_\_ \$10 \_\_\_\_\_ \$11.50

\*Members who join during the period September 1 through January 15 will receive the fall, winter, and spring issues of the current year's volume. Members who join from January 15 through September 1 will receive the last issue of the current year (spring) and the first two issues of the next volume (fall and winter).

**Change or revision of name and address.** If the name or address printed on your *WPA* mailing label is incorrect or has changed, please print the complete, correct information below and send it to Kenneth A. Bruffee, Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York 11210.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

# Make the "write choice" ... new '82 titles from Prentice-Hall

## UNDERSTANDING MOVIES, Third Edition

Louis Giannetti, Case Western Reserve  
University  
1982 512 pp. (est.) Paper \$13.95

## GUIDE TO MANAGERIAL COMMUNICATION

Mary Munter, Stanford University  
1982 168 pp. (est.) Cloth \$12.95  
Paper \$ 6.95

## PRENTICE-HALL HANDBOOK FOR WRITERS, Eighth Edition

Glenn Leggett, formerly President,  
Grinnel College. C. David Mead,  
Michigan State University.  
Richard S. Beal, Boston University  
1982 544 pp. (est.) Cloth \$10.95

## FREE WRITING AND PRE-WRITING: Case Exercises for the Writer

Richard C. Veit, University of North  
Carolina, at Wilmington  
1982 128 pp. (est.) Paper \$4.95

## STEPS IN COMPOSITION, Third Edition

Lynn Quitman Troyka, Queensborough  
Community College,  
Jerrold Nudelman, Queensborough  
Community College  
1982 480 pp. (est.) Paper \$10.95

## WRITING THEMES ABOUT LITERATURE, Brief Edition

Edgar V. Roberts, Herbert H. Lehman  
College  
1982 224 pp. (est.) Paper \$6.95

## KEYS TO A POWERFUL VOCABULARY, Level I

Janet Maker, Los Angeles City College.  
Minnette Lenier, Los Angeles Pierce  
College  
1982 240 pp. (est.) Paper \$9.95

## IMPROVING WRITING: A Positive Approach

Alan Casty, Santa Monica City College  
1982 400 pp. (est.) Paper \$9.95

## THREE GENRES, Third Edition

Stephen Minot  
1982 350 pp. (est.) Cloth \$13.95

## COLLEGE READING: Strategies for Success

Lee Vogel Kolzow, Harper Community  
College. Jane Lehmann, Elgin Com-  
munity College  
1981 352 pp. (est.) Paper \$8.95

## WRITING SKILLS FOR TECHNICAL STUDENTS

Delaware Technical and Community  
College  
1982 352 pp. (est.) Paper \$9.95

## TO BE EXACT: A Guide for Revision

John W. Presley, Augusta College  
1982 350 pp. (est.) Paper \$10.95

To order or reserve examination copies, please write:  
Robert Jordan, Dept. J-881, Prentice-Hall Inc.,  
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632

For "SUPER-QUICK" Service, Dial TOLL FREE  
(800) 526-0485\* between 9:00 a.m.-4:30 p.m.  
EST, Mon.-Fri.

\*not applicable in New Jersey, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico

# New from Harper & Row!

## Rorabacher & Dunbar ASSIGNMENTS IN EXPOSITION

*Seventh Edition*

12/81. 400 pages/tent. Paper.

## Baker THE PRACTICAL STYLIST WITH READINGS

12/81. 416 pages/tent. Paper. Instructor's  
Manual.

## Bonazza, Roy, & Roy STUDIES IN FICTION

*Enlarged Third Edition*

12/81. 864 pages/tent. Paper. Instructor's  
Manual.

## Broderick THE ABLE WRITER

*A Rhetoric and Handbook*

11/81. 384 pages/tent. Paper. Instructor's  
Manual.

## Higgins WORKBOOK 2000

3/82. 300 pages/tent. Paper. Instructor's  
Manual.

## Rizzo THE WRITERS' STUDIO Exercises for Grammar, Proofreading, and Composition, *Second Edition*

12/81. 432 pages/tent. Paper. Instructor's  
Manual.

## McCallum WORDS PEOPLE USE Passive/Active Vocabulary Skills for Students of ESL

3/82. 260 pages/tent. Paper.

## Ross UNDERSTANDING ENGLISH

*A Listening Approach to ESL*

192 pages/tent. Paper. Instructor's Manual.  
Tape Program (available from Dept. of En-  
glish, Ball State University).

To request examination copies, write to Suite 3D, Harper & Row, 10 East  
53d Street, New York, NY 10022. Please include course title, enrollment, and  
present text.



# Prentice-Hall



# Harper & Row

WPA: Writing Program Administration  
© Council of Writing Program Administrators

# Great Scott!

## Basic Skills

---

**Composition Five  
Basic Skills for Writing**  
Sieben / Anthony  
Available February 1982

**Reviewing Basic Grammar**  
Yarber  
Available February 1982

**Connecting and Combining  
in Sentences and Paragraphs**  
Mills  
Available February 1982

**Commanding Essays  
Second Edition**  
Mills  
Available December 1981

## ESL

---

**English as a Second Language  
Composition Workbook**  
Huizenga / Snellings / Francis  
Available January 1982

## Freshman Composition

---

**Real Writing: Argumentation,  
Reflection, Information with  
Stylistic Options: The Sentence  
and the Paragraph**  
Beale / Meyers / White  
Available December 1981  
(also available in split volumes)

**From Cases to Composition**  
Woodson  
Available October 1981

**Writer's Guide and Index to English  
Seventh Edition**  
Ebbitt / Ebbitt  
Available November 1981  
(also available in split volumes)

**Short English Handbook  
and Short English Workbook  
Second Edition**  
Fear / Schiffhorst  
Available December 1981

**Common Ground  
A Thematic Reader**  
Epstein / Magnus  
Available December 1981

**Purpose and Pattern  
A Rhetoric Reader**  
Penfield  
Available December 1981

**The Reader and the Writer  
Essays for College Writing**  
Yarber / McAuliffe / McAuliffe  
Available February 1982

## Technical Writing

---

**Style in Technical Prose:  
A Text/Workbook**  
Messer  
Available February 1982

## Professional Books

---

**Working Papers  
A Teacher's Observations  
on Composition**  
Tibbetts  
Available January 1982

**Tutoring Writing  
A Sourcebook for Writing Labs**  
Harris  
Available December 1981

**The Writing Laboratory  
Organizations, Methods,  
Management**  
Steward / Croft  
Available February 1982

For further information write  
Meredith Hellestrae, Department SA  
1900 East Lake Avenue  
Glenview, Illinois



**Scott, Foresman and Company**